

## Abstract

Title of Dissertation: Global Sympathy: Representing Nineteenth-Century Americans' Foreign Relations

Sarah J. Sillin

Dissertation Directed By: Professor Robert S. Levine  
Department of English

Over the past two decades, scholars have established sympathy's key role in nineteenth-century literary culture and the development of U.S. nationalism. While examining the bonds that feeling forges among citizens, however, critics have largely neglected the question of how sympathy also links Americans to the larger world. Representations of global sympathy—wherein characters from different cultures share one another's joy and pain—pervade nineteenth-century U.S. literature. My project analyzes how authors narrativized the nation's political, territorial, and cultural changes, while underscoring the persistent importance of feeling in defining America's global role.

“Global Sympathy” tells a story about what happens when writers imagine Americans as the kith and kin of foreign peoples. Beginning in the early national period, the first chapter explores how James Fenimore Cooper employs tropes of foreign friendship to establish Americans' equality to the British, inviting readers to re-imagine the British Empire as a valuable trading partner. My second chapter considers the importance of Christianity to Nathaniel Hawthorne and Maria Cummins, whose Protestant American heroines become metaphorical sisters to people in Italy and Syria, respectively. Read together, these pre-Civil War writers evoke confidence in Americans' ability to navigate foreign relations amidst political instability.

Yet with increasing U.S. expansion, writers in the second half of the nineteenth-century expressed growing concern about America's foreign influence. Chapters three and four center on minority writers who employ sentiment to criticize the effects of imperialism on "foreign" peoples both within and outside the nation. María Amparo Ruiz de Burton participates in Gilded Age literary critiques of America as unfeeling and undemocratic, and develops an international courtship narrative to convey U.S. oppression of both "native" Californios and foreign nations like Mexico. Pauline Hopkins's turn-of-the-century fiction constitutes part of a broader body of literary responses to the Spanish-American War. Hopkins questions U.S. imperialism and racism by imagining the world, rather than the nation, as a family. More broadly, this project analyzes how Hopkins and all of the writers I study translate foreign politics into intimate terms and—by depicting U.S. citizens' affective ties to diverse peoples—insist on America's obligations to the international sphere.

Global Sympathy:  
Representing Nineteenth-Century Americans' Foreign Relations

By

Sarah J. Sillin

Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctorate of Philosophy  
2013

Advisory Committee  
Professor Robert S. Levine, Chair  
Professor Martha Nell Smith  
Professor Carla Peterson  
Professor Edlie Wong  
Professor Deborah Rosenfelt (Dean's Representative)

© Copyright by  
Sarah J. Sillin  
2013

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation project has its roots in Professor Levine's graduate seminar on Rethinking Empire and Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century American Literature, which introduced me to influential work in the field of Global American Studies. I was deeply fortunate to continue working with Professor Levine as the chair for this project, given his unstinting commitment to guiding and challenging graduate students. Indeed, he and Professors Smith, Peterson, and Wong have all modeled an incredible intellectual generosity in engaging with the ideas of my project, while also fostering my development as a writer over the course of numerous drafts. Their guidance has proven essential in helping me both to locate my central, unifying concept of global sympathy and to recognize how writers' depictions of U.S.-foreign attachments shifted across the century. I am thankful to Professor Rosenfelt for kindly agreeing to represent the Dean of the Graduate School for my dissertation defense. I am also profoundly grateful to the warm community of faculty and graduate students in the University of Maryland's Department of English, particularly my faithful editors and sounding boards, Michelle Boswell and Amanda Dykema. And finally, I wish to thank Adam Mansur for ceaselessly encouraging my work in so many ways from my applications to graduate school through to this complete draft of my dissertation.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	iv-vi
Introduction .....	1-23
1. International Friendships: James Fenimore Cooper as Cosmopolitan Patriot . . .	24-74
2. Christian Sisters: American Sympathy Abroad in Maria Cummins & Nathaniel Hawthorne .....	75-124
3. María Amparo Ruiz's Anti-Reunion Novel: Marriage & the Failure of American Sympathy .....	125-175
4. The Global Family: Sympathy, Mesmerism, & Empire in Pauline Hopkins . . .	177-221
Coda .....	222-227
Bibliography .....	228-253

## Introduction

Near the middle of Maria Cummins's antebellum novel *El Fureidis* (1860), the British hero observes a devastating earthquake in a small Syrian village. He views this "great calamity" as "a call for public sympathy and aid" from the villagers' Syrian neighbors.<sup>1</sup> He thereby expresses the familiar association of sympathy with local and national communities. However, Cummins challenges this association when it instead falls to the novel's British and American protagonists to provide both the sympathy and material aid needed for the village's recovery. Strikingly, Meredith's remarks in this scene anticipate a common emphasis within current studies of sympathy: the role shared feeling plays in uniting a country and its inhabitants. Yet the novel's subsequent representations of international benevolence suggest the need for sympathy that transcends national borders, a subject that has received much less critical attention than national sympathy. Representations of international sympathetic bonds—what I will call global sympathy—recur throughout nineteenth-century U.S. literature, linking Americans to a broad array of foreign peoples. This project examines how, as the U.S. nation developed, writers invoked fellow-feeling to address Americans' changing relations to one another and to the world.

Sympathy, stated simply, is shared feeling. To sympathize with someone is to suppose that you are that person, to imagine the pleasure or pain s/he is experiencing, and to enter into that experience.<sup>2</sup> As Adam Smith explains in his familiar example of sympathy, when "our brother is upon the rack," "by the imagination we [can] place ourselves in his situation . . . we enter as it were into his body" and "his agonies are thus

brought home.”<sup>3</sup> While sympathy became the “most highly valorized emotional form” in nineteenth-century America’s culture of sentiment, this process of identification and imagination was nonetheless a contested subject.<sup>4</sup> Nineteenth-century writers and current scholars alike have sought to define what inspires sympathy, who constitutes an appropriate subject of it, and what political and social effects sympathy produces. These debates have emerged, in part, because of the central role feeling played in Enlightenment philosophy following the shift to republican forms of government in Western Europe. Adam Smith and David Hume, among others, theorized how, in the absence of feudal social and political structures, sympathy could foster a sense of national cohesion among fellow citizens.<sup>5</sup> Following the Revolutionary War, Americans turned to the discourse of sympathy to understand what linked them to one another, as well as to foreign peoples. Thus it is important to recognize the persistence of Enlightenment conceptions of sympathy, which nineteenth-century literature both drew on and revised. The central authors of this study—James Fenimore Cooper, Maria Susanna Cummins, Nathaniel Hawthorne, María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, and Pauline Hopkins—employed sympathy to represent changing U.S. domestic and foreign relations. Yet these and numerous other U.S. writers also expressed pressing concerns about sentiment in a global context. Their works raise questions about when sympathy could transcend cultural and racial differences and when it reinforced such distinctions, at times to the detriment of those it was supposed to benefit.

Enlightenment theories of sympathy proved important to Americans because, as Kristin Boudreau argues, sympathy offered “a source of social order that relied on natural passions rather than on the tyranny of a single political leader.” As a result, “Thomas



Jefferson and Benjamin Rush avidly read Hutcheson, Hume, and Smith and looked to natural human affections to provide the fundamental bond of political union.”<sup>6</sup> Garry Wills has argued that, in keeping with Scottish common sense philosophy, Jefferson viewed men as equals on the basis of their shared moral sense.<sup>7</sup> According to Wills, Jefferson’s draft of the Declaration of Independence suggests that the bonds of the nation would be based in man’s inherent capacity for feeling. Meanwhile, in the decades after independence a number of popular novels, most notably Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852), employed sympathy to critique the nation for allowing the tyranny of slavery, rather than ostensibly just “natural passions,” to dominate the social order. Even writers who criticized the nation’s failure of feeling, though, expressed an interest in the role sympathy could play in U.S. politics and culture.

American novels take up the Enlightenment belief that sympathy could alter both individuals and the nation. We see this in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, which is known for emphasizing the value of feeling in fostering reform. Consider Stowe’s depiction of an encounter between a white politician, Senator Bird, and the fugitive slave Eliza. Bird learns to feel for Eliza because he understands the pain of losing a child, as Eliza would if she and her son were to be captured. Bird’s sympathy disrupts both his sense of difference from slaves and his relation to the government, as he violates a fugitive slave law he previously helped to pass. Here sympathy proves destabilizing, but also promises greater national coherence as it links the enslaved and free, white and African American. Stowe’s writing reflects the belief that sentiment has the potential to bind the nation together, and moreover exemplifies how American writers revised earlier notions of who constitutes a deserving subject of sympathy. While Stowe asserts the need for sympathy

among Americans, she suggests why authors of the era expressed hope and concern about *international* sympathy as well, considering the influence over individual and national identities that she assigns to feeling. Stowe herself would go on to write an international novel, *Agnes of Sorrento* (1861-1862), that also centers on the power of sympathetic bonds to reshape communities, though here in the novel's Italian setting.<sup>8</sup>

Given the significance that philosophers, statesmen, and authors alike attributed to domestic and foreign sympathy, it became important to understand what could elicit or limit this sentiment. While Hume and Smith both viewed sympathy as a response to witnessing another's feelings, Smith, as Michael Frazer notes, explored the array of factors that influence people's capacities for shared feeling.<sup>9</sup> In particular, in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), Smith suggests that people feel for those whom (a) they are physically close to, (b) they resemble and thus find it easier to identify with, and (c) they view as virtuous and thus worthy of sympathy. Relationships that depend on people's proximity to and identification with one another came to be associated with sympathy. Smith especially emphasizes the association of sympathy with family, asserting that families are "placed in situations which naturally create this habitual sympathy," and that such sentiments result from the familiarity among family members who share a home (260). Sympathy among family members is *so* common that, Smith asserts, a "general rule is established that persons related to one another in a certain manner ought always to be affected toward one another in a certain manner" (260). Consequently, "there is always the highest impropriety and sometimes even a sort of impiety in their being affected in a different manner" (260). In other words, the expression of particular sentiments—such as familial sympathy—involved deeply ingrained social conventions.

These conventions, in turn, became models for the relations among fellow citizens as they came to view one another as siblings within the national family and learned to feel for each other.

Smith posits that this association of national bonds with sympathy arises as sympathy emerges within the family and then spreads to encompass the nation while rarely expanding beyond its borders. Because shared feeling depends upon a sense of similarity and proximity, he argues, people from different nations could seem too far removed from each other—whether geographically, culturally, or racially—to elicit one another’s sympathy. Moreover, Smith suggests that fellow citizens are more likely to share a common interest in their country’s welfare, which fosters their sympathy, whereas neighboring countries inspire “jealousy and envy” and more distant nations indifference.<sup>10</sup> Taking Great Britain as an example, he observes that “we . . . call the French our natural enemies,” whereas neither the British nor French evince much feeling toward China or Japan.<sup>11</sup>

Given the influence of Enlightenment thinkers in early national U.S. culture, it is perhaps unsurprising that nineteenth-century U.S. writers likewise depicted feeling as linking the nation. However, a number of U.S. writers also contested the notion that foreign peoples were too distant to elicit sympathy, thereby challenging Enlightenment philosophy and re-thinking feeling’s political and cultural significance. Cummins’s *El Fureidis*, quoted in the opening paragraph, is just one of many nineteenth-century novels to depict Americans’ encounters with foreign peoples. From the nation’s founding, America’s political and cultural leaders expressed anxiety about the U.S. nation’s standing in the global sphere, from fear that America lacked power in the global sphere to

concern that the country was abusing its international influence. During the 1790s, conflict erupted between Republicans and Federalists over the nation's relations to European empires; these debates suggest the significance that Americans attributed to foreign relations in shaping the nation. Across the nineteenth century, writers represented the country as immersed in international affairs, whether by depicting America's colonial roots, immigration history, slave trade, international commerce, or missionary work. Moreover, they asserted that America's connections to the world were based on a sense of shared feeling and that U.S.-foreign encounters strengthened these bonds.

American writers had already begun exploring the significance of sympathy to U.S.-foreign relations in the 1790s, as we see in the work of Royall Tyler (1757-1826). His novel, *The Algerine Captive* (1797), centers on a young American—Updike Underhill—traveling the country and then the globe, at times in a ship called the *Sympathy*. As the aptly named ship suggests, Tyler depicts the influence of feeling on Americans' attempts to traverse cultural divisions and navigate foreign relations.<sup>12</sup> Over the course of the novel, Underhill forges sympathetic attachments to the Africans, Algerians, Muslims, and Jews that he encounters. In part, the protagonist's foreign feeling suggests that international attachments could foster national critique, as he comes to chastise America for its lack of compassion toward African slaves. Notably, this critique underscores the value of forms of sympathy that transcend racial, cultural, and national divisions. Yet shared feeling also proves dangerous, for Underhill's sympathy and naiveté render him vulnerable to the Algerian pirates who enslave him. Nonetheless, Tyler suggests that foreign alliances are essential to Americans when Underhill regains

his liberty by becoming the object of sympathy for the Portuguese sailors who transport him out of danger.

Tyler illustrates the central role global sympathy played in narratives of the nation from its founding and the Federalist Era onward.<sup>13</sup> His protagonist asserts that Americans are the “BRETHREN” of foreign peoples, and God is “the common parent of the great family of the universe,” so Americans must learn to feel for their global family (96). Yet while Underhill’s use of metaphor suggests foreign feeling should be as powerful as the sympathy that unites a family, his foreign attachments are short-lived. By emphasizing the instability of these international bonds, the novel speaks to the context of the late eighteenth century, when U.S. foreign policy had yet to be defined. For instance, the loss of British naval protection and lack of clear foreign policies left the government uncertain of how to negotiate for the return of U.S. citizens held captive in Algeria, like Tyler’s fictional protagonist.<sup>14</sup> Over the following century, as the nation established its economic, political, and military strength, U.S. writers would begin to depict more durable international bonds. *The Algerine Captive* anticipates nineteenth-century literature’s representations of Americans’ complicated relations with foreign powers.<sup>15</sup>

If we are to understand the importance of sympathy to U.S. culture, we must look beyond Americans’ domestic ties and explore the relation between feeling and foreign affairs. Much as theories of sentiment offered nineteenth-century Americans a way to explain what unites fellow citizens to one another, Americans revised these theories to address the nation’s international affiliations. Drawing on the language of feeling, U.S. authors explored what links Americans to Western Europeans, Ethiopians, Mexicans, Syrians, Filipinos, and Native Americans, among many other peoples. By reading U.S.

literature as developing and revising Enlightenment theories of sympathy, we find nineteenth-century authors representing sympathy as a complex moral process that responds to the intricacies of U.S.-foreign ties.

\* \* \*

In analyzing the importance of feeling to U.S.-foreign encounters in nineteenth-century literature, I draw on scholarly debates regarding sentiment's place in American culture. Over the last thirty years, scholarship on antebellum American literature has established the significance of sentiment to the era's social and political landscape. Seminal studies by Ann Douglas and Jane Tompkins demonstrated that sentimentality permeated U.S. culture, even as the two critics debated whether sentimentality signaled a troubling ideology or offered a culturally resonant aesthetic mode. Shirley Samuels expanded on this work by editing a groundbreaking collection of essays that examines how sentimental literature engages with concerns about the body politic, particularly with respect to gender and race. These essays consider the effects of America's culture of sentiment on minority groups; for instance, Laura Wexler describes sentimentalism's role in justifying assimilationist policies directed at Native Americans. I take up these issues by exploring nineteenth-century depictions of feeling's influence on Americans' treatment of racially and culturally diverse peoples both within and beyond the nation, though, unlike Wexler, I question whether sympathy is always a matter of domination and control.

To explore the relation between nationalist sentiment and foreign sympathy, I engage with work by Amy Kaplan and Elizabeth Barnes, who demonstrate that, at times, Americans' expressions of foreign sympathy reaffirmed a sense of U.S. exceptionalism by cloaking imperialist violence in the guise of benevolence. Both scholars take up concerns about sympathy's harmful effects on its subjects by tracing the long association of sentiment with violence and imperialism in U.S. literature.<sup>16</sup> Kaplan addresses the troubling relation between expressions of feeling and expansionism by asserting that sentimental literature is implicated in U.S. imperialism. Her paradigmatic term "Manifest Domesticity" conveys the international implications of nominally domestic literature. Novels ranging from Susan Warner's *The Wide, Wide World* (1850) to Richard Harding Davis's *Soldiers of Fortune* (1897), she argues, imply Americans' need to bring domestic order to foreign peoples. Barnes further explores the relation between sympathy and violence in domestic texts. She asserts that whereas scholars tend to situate sympathy in opposition to violence, nineteenth-century novels commonly depict acts of violence as inspiring compassion in the perpetrator. Notably, her claim resonates with my analysis of works by Cooper and Cummins, wherein international conflicts engender sympathy. Indeed, Barnes suggests the international significance of sympathy's ties to violence by arguing that sympathy remains a core component of U.S. exceptionalism and its influence on foreign policy. Her epilogue reads George W. Bush's 2004 presidential campaign—in which he asserted that Americans need to "love thy neighbor"—as employing a rhetoric of compassion that masks his desire for international warfare that would extend the reach of the nation's global power.

In focusing on U.S. writers' complicity in imperialism, Kaplan and Barnes neglect other forms of foreign relations represented in nineteenth-century literature. One of the arguments of my dissertation is that nineteenth-century U.S. authors addressed America's international relations in diverse ways that merit more nuanced analysis.<sup>17</sup> We can further our understanding of such representations, in part, by recognizing that sympathy refers to the willingness to share not just in others' pain, but also a broader array of feelings, including pleasure. Nineteenth-century novels include scenes where characters' pity signals a troubling sense of distance from and superiority to the object of their feelings. Yet when we look at the array of American authors' portrayals of cross-cultural attachments—which include characters sharing in foreign peoples' pleasure *and* pain—we can see that depictions of global sympathy work to diverse ends.

Such depictions are highly complex and sometimes contradictory, in part because sympathy evokes tensions about the relation between the individual and community. Adam Smith and other Enlightenment writers observed that sympathy fosters the regulation of private sentiments in the service of community cohesion while threatening to collapse the identity of the sympathizer with the subject of his/her feeling.<sup>18</sup> As Kaplan and Barnes suggest, nineteenth-century literature likewise conveys the threat of sympathy.<sup>19</sup> In particular, depictions of global sympathy raise concerns that Americans who forge strong foreign attachments may lose their own cultural, religious, and political identities, or fail to recognize foreign peoples' autonomous identities. Thus writers explored the very quality that made sympathy powerful and troubling: its ability to blur the distinctions among individuals so as to foster a sense of unity.<sup>20</sup>



Analyzing the persistence of cross-cultural and international sentiment in American literature helps us to rethink sympathy studies, but it also speaks to recent work that asks what we might gain from resituating American literature in a global framework.<sup>21</sup> Wai Chee Dimock conveys the thrust of this scholarship in her challenge to the idea that literature “is the product of one nation and one nation alone, analyzable within its confines.”<sup>22</sup> This global turn, I suggest, helps us recognize that writers found a vocabulary for moving beyond the nation by engaging with sentiment, feeling, and affect (or the physiological expression of feeling). Across the century, U.S. writers represent Americans who feel for foreign peoples and earn their sympathy and, in so doing, portray feeling as the very foundation of international relations.

To understand how nineteenth-century writers evoked global sympathy, I examine depictions of Americans as the friends, spouses, and family of the foreign peoples who populate literature of the era. Notably, these relationships—friendship, marriage, and kinship—function as key sympathetic tropes for U.S.-foreign ties. Through such tropes, authors played on readers’ assumptions that friends, spouses, and family members ought to feel for one another in order to suggest that international relations should likewise be based in sympathy. Yet the central novels of this project—James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Pilot* (1823) and *The Prairie* (1827), Maria Cummins’s *El Fureidís* (1860), Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *The Marble Faun* (1860), María Amparo Ruiz de Burton’s *Who Would Have Thought It?* (1876), and Pauline Hopkins’s *Of One Blood* (1902-1903)—attest that foreign feeling remained a source of debate across the century.

Each chapter focuses on a sympathetic trope—friendship, Christian sisterhood, marriage, and family—that offers writers and readers a distinct way of understanding

what links Americans to the world and what obligations these ties entail. In exploring the tropes that serve as figures for foreign relations, I engage with earlier studies of nineteenth-century friendship, marriage, and kinship by Ivy Schweitzer, Caleb Crain, Nina Silber, and Cindy Weinstein, among other scholars. Yet whereas each of their studies focuses on a particular relationship that links Americans to one another, I survey a variety of tropes that authors employed as models for foreign relations. Some authors depicted Americans as members of a global family whose international heritage fosters sympathy for foreign peoples; others showed how, by participating in international travel, Americans could forge new cross-cultural friendships and marriages.

Notably, all of the novels I examine suggest that cosmopolitanism—i.e. knowledge of and appreciation for foreign cultures’ artistic and scientific achievements, as well as their spiritual insight—fosters an understanding of foreign cultures and so helps Americans identify and sympathize with foreign peoples. At the same time, we begin to see what a vexed concept cosmopolitanism was through writers’ disparate depictions of Americans’ cosmopolitan encounters and sympathetic relationships. In various texts, these bonds allow the United States to become a valuable trading partner, a “city on a hill” spreading religious truth, or a burgeoning empire. Characters’ sympathy for one another serves, at times, as a metonym for shared feeling between two nations. Yet the authors included in this study explore how cosmopolitan bonds and the sympathy they foster not only mediate the relations between nations, but also lead to connections that transcend national divisions. For instance, Cummins and Hopkins imply that Christian sympathy could ultimately unite all peoples as their spiritual bond overcomes competing national loyalties.<sup>23</sup>

Expressions of global sympathy prove central not only to celebrations of the nation, but also to “insiders’ critiques,” to borrow Anne Goldman’s term. An insider’s critique deploys the author’s intimate knowledge of the nation to portray troubling aspects of its culture and politics.<sup>24</sup> While critiques of the U.S. nation run throughout nineteenth-century literature, from Tyler’s picaresque novel to antebellum sentimental novels and postbellum satires, the insiders’ critiques discussed in this project are striking in their emphasis on Americans’ lack of sympathy. Such novelists as Ruiz de Burton and Hopkins depict American protagonists who have been disillusioned, dispossessed, or enslaved by their country and hence marked as “alien” or “foreign.” These characters develop foreign attachments in order to find the sympathy lacking in America, as well as to reform or escape the nation.

Even as the novels in this study offer divergent political and cultural commentary, they resonate with each other formally, as they all incorporate elements of romance in their depictions of Americans’ foreign ties. Therefore my readings provide an opportunity to explore sympathy’s relation to genre and narrative structure. As Nina Baym notes, nineteenth-century authors and critics offered differing definitions of the romance. My project employs what Baym terms the “synchronic” definition of romance as a type of novel, specifically a novel that centers on a courtship and often incorporates allegorical and fantastical elements.<sup>25</sup> Romance is a broad category, which includes such variants as the historical romance, the romance of reunion, and the imperial romance. While my purpose is not to intervene in debates on what defines the romance, I am interested in whether, as Emily Miller Budick inquires, “the formal features of the text signify a particular form of ‘relation’ between romance and the world it mediates.”<sup>26</sup> Each of my

chapters draws on the premise that nineteenth-century romances offer a way to reconsider broader social and political concerns.<sup>27</sup> Although the romance is associated with imagination and fancifulness, these qualities do not preclude its engagement with political and social concerns.<sup>28</sup> Rather, the genre explores the nation's identity and its relation to the world, as scholarship on the historical romance, romance of reunion, and imperial romance reminds us.<sup>29</sup>

Romances address political and social concerns, in part, through the figure of family, which often serves as a metonym of the nation that comments on what unites and divides it. The characters' marriages evoke the nation's reproductive future and speak to questions such as what the country will pass on to future generations. At the same time, though, American romances attend closely to U.S.-foreign relations. They portray historic, fictional, or figurative battles that bring American characters into contact with foreign peoples and thus allow writers to explore the qualities that help Americans navigate such encounters. Further, the romances in this study suggest that Americans' capacity to forge foreign attachments fosters their success both in conflict and courtship, while a lack of compassion or misdirected sympathy threatens the nation's welfare. Yet not all of these texts work to consolidate a sense of America's identity or celebrate its expansion; at times, U.S. writers also consider how foreign sympathy might fundamentally reshape conceptions of the U.S. family and even destabilize the nation's borders.<sup>30</sup>

In order to represent America's international ties, these novels draw on foreign literary influences. Critical debates as to whether nineteenth-century romancers created an "American" genre or remained indebted to European predecessors have proven

difficult to resolve. I suggest this is because American romances represent the nation by establishing its relations to foreign cultures. For instance, James Fenimore Cooper has been read *both* as foundational to U.S. national literature *and* dependent upon Sir Walter Scott's historical romances. By revising an ostensibly British genre to represent America's development, Cooper signals that the nation's identity emerges, in part, through its encounters with the British. In other words, the form of Cooper's novels is integral to their emphasis on America's position as a nation among nations.<sup>31</sup>

Romances were, of course, not the only nineteenth-century texts to explore Americans' international ties by revising "foreign" literary forms.<sup>32</sup> Depictions of global sympathy can be found in contemporaneous poems, some of which circulated internationally, that portray Americans' cross-cultural attachments. My chapters on the tropes of marriage and family in postbellum novels also examine John Greenleaf Whittier's "The Crisis" (1848) and Rudyard Kipling's "The White Man's Burden" (1899), which employ similar tropes as figures for foreign relations in order to address U.S. expansion. Moreover, writers from across the century explored global sympathy in their nonfiction prose. All of my readings are influenced by nonfiction works, including travel letters and essays written by the study's central authors, as well as works by an array of other U.S. writers, from Margaret Fuller to Frank Norris. Though I focus on just a handful of novels that represent America's economic, political, and cultural ties to the world, I identify and explicate thematic elements that were central to numerous works of nineteenth-century U.S. literature.

\* \* \*

*Global Sympathy* tells a story about what happens when writers imagine themselves as the kith and kin of foreign peoples. Over the course of four chapters, I trace U.S. writers' use of feeling to address shifts in domestic and foreign relations, as well as to portray the effects of international bonds on the nation's future. The first two chapters center on early national and antebellum writers who evoke confidence in Americans' ability to navigate foreign relations amidst political revolutions and imperial interventions. By contrast, the third and fourth chapters suggest that—with increasing U.S. expansion—writers in the second half of the nineteenth-century expressed growing concern about America's foreign influence. Nonetheless, the study as a whole demonstrates the centrality of foreign sympathy, in its many forms, to nineteenth-century U.S. literature.

Beginning with the 1820s, the first chapter examines how James Fenimore Cooper's historical romances create an origin story for America that is based in international and cross-cultural encounters. Cooper, who implies that Americans' foreign affinities strengthen the U.S. nation, evinces what Kwame Anthony Appiah describes as “cosmopolitan patriotism.” In his novels on the Revolutionary War and national expansion, Americans' foreign friendships secure the nation's autonomy, while fostering its economic, territorial, and cultural growth. These relationships suggest Americans' ability to recognize foreign peoples as potential allies, whose merits foster a sense of sympathetic identification. Representations of foreign friendships in *The Pilot* and *The Prairie* evoke optimism that the U.S. nation can draw on its history of international ties to expand its borders and influence and incorporate new peoples. Writing on the heels of the

War of 1812, Cooper counters arguments that the nation should limit its ties to the Western hemisphere in the manner of the Monroe Doctrine and instead valorizes foreign affiliations. Yet, by the 1840s, his representations of the past express increasing doubt regarding the country's future. The chapter concludes with a discussion of *The Deerslayer* (1841), which emphasizes the violence of colonial America, suggesting that the Age of Jackson altered Cooper's views on America's international role. Even this shift in his depictions of foreign encounters, though, underscores the value Cooper attributes to cross-cultural attachments, while evoking the versatility of such attachments in shaping America.

The second chapter turns from representations of global sympathy based in patriotism to depictions of religious faith as engendering shared feeling. As antebellum America expanded its economic influence abroad, Americans' participation in international missionary work grew.<sup>33</sup> Literature from this era explores faith's capacity both to foster attachments across national and cultural differences and to distinguish Americans from the larger world. We see these possibilities at work in Maria Susanna Cummins's *El Fureidîs* and Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*. Set in Syria and Italy, respectively, these novels depict Protestant American women who inhabit cosmopolitan communities where they become Christian sisters to foreign peoples. By representing characters who are adopted into foreign families, the novelists naturalize Americans' cross-cultural ties. Both novelists suggest that their protagonists' refined sensibility and faith provide them with the cross-cultural insight needed to advance reform abroad. Yet the authors also evince concern that Americans' sympathy may provoke foreign peoples' resistance or involve Americans in the political instability and

violence that Syria and Italy experienced in the mid-nineteenth century. Though Cummins and Hawthorne are conventionally read in opposition to each other, both *El Fureidis* and *The Marble Faun* meditate on how Protestantism shaped U.S.-foreign attachments. Both reveal the era's concern with the relation between religion and violent conflicts at home and abroad.<sup>34</sup>

Postbellum literature, meanwhile, offers a sharp rejoinder to earlier celebrations of U.S. Christianity and democracy in the form of insider's critique. Gilded Age novels contest claims of U.S. exceptionalism by satirizing Americans for privileging self-interest and wealth above faith, sympathy, and democracy. Chapter Three explores this era through the work of the Mexican American author María Amparo Ruiz de Burton. Her first novel, *Who Would Have Thought It?*, portrays wealthy New Englanders and U.S. politicians as hypocrites. Their self-proclaimed religious and republican virtues disguise their exploitation of weaker Americans and foreign countries during the Civil War and Mexican-American War. In contrast to the unfeeling and parochial Americans, her Mexican and American protagonists display their sensibility and cosmopolitanism. Ruiz de Burton asserts the injustice of New Englanders' attempts to exploit the virtuous Mexican heroine by entwining her satire of the U.S. nation with elements of a romance narrative. In particular, the novel revises the post-Civil War romance of sectional reunion by depicting the attachment between its Mexican heroine and Northern hero as a model for relations between the United States and Mexico. Even as Ruiz de Burton criticizes the sentimental rhetoric used to justify oppressive U.S. policies in war, she asserts the value of cross-cultural sympathy between her hero and heroine. Yet she suggests as well that her Mexican protagonist, Lola, merits Americans' sympathy because she is a "white,"



wealthy European heroine. In privileging Lola's "whiteness," the novelist refuses compassion to her "darker" African and Native American characters. Ruiz de Burton thus employs sympathy to demarcate racial difference.

By contrast, the turn-of-the-century African American author Pauline Hopkins asserts the need for sympathy that transcends racial divisions and unifies the larger world as a family. In my fourth and final chapter, I examine Hopkins's novel *Of One Blood* (1902-1903), which traces Americans' genealogical ties to Africa in order to destabilize the racial categories employed to justify U.S. imperialism. Hopkins revises the conventions of the imperial romance to contest triumphalist narratives of America's expansion. Instead, she depicts the nation's history of slavery, miscegenation, rape, and incest. Whereas "white" Americans deny their African genealogy and abuse their black brothers, sisters, and mothers, Hopkins imagines African Americans who recover this history to forge empowering international affiliations. She explores America's interracial and international ties through the trope of mesmerism, an occult form of sympathy that she depicts as an inheritance linking white and black, African and American characters. These mesmeric bonds signal her characters' shared heritage; when they employ their occult powers either to exploit or heal one another, this suggests how familial bonds can advance oppression or uplift the race. In depicting Americans' manipulation of their interracial and international ties to perpetuate the enslavement of the darker races, Hopkins cautions against continued U.S. imperialism that affords the nation power over new foreign peoples. While critiquing U.S. imperialism, Hopkins nonetheless evokes hope for the future by imagining that African Americans could draw on their familial and spiritual bonds with the larger world to wrest power from their oppressors.

The four chapters of my dissertation thus trace the representations of foreign feeling that circulated in U.S. literature from 1823 through 1903. American writers from Cooper through Hopkins valued sympathy's role in mediating foreign relations. Further, as my chapter summaries begin to suggest, these authors explored whether shared feeling might be the basis not only for nationalism, but also imperialism and cosmopolitanism. Both ideologies, which can reinforce or compete with one another, offered Americans ways of understanding their connection to diverse peoples; cosmopolitanism sometimes justifies claims of particular cultures' superiority and at other times offers a call for more egalitarian cross-cultural relations. Fiction from the era suggests these ideologies were anchored in the discourse of sympathy. Some U.S. novels drew on sentimental language to depict imperialism or cosmopolitanism as natural, beneficent expressions of sympathy. Other works used the language of feeling to trouble these ideologies, for example by implying that imperialism reflects a failure of feeling or that cosmopolitan attachments threaten the national family. Reading these novels in relation to such theorists as Kwame Anthony Appiah, Amanda Anderson, Ernest Renan, Benedict Anderson, and Amy Kaplan helps to illuminate how nineteenth-century authors critically engaged with political ideals and developed their own distinct takes on cosmopolitanism.

Moreover, the authors' divergent depictions of sympathy suggest that changes to the U.S. economy, territory, and culture affected representations of international affiliations. The periods in which these authors wrote provided the vantage points from which they viewed the country's foreign relations. Each of the writers responds to moments of violent rupture and expansion when the issue of what unites Americans, both to one another and to the larger world, becomes particularly fraught. The concerns that

these conflicts evoke change over the course of the century. Cooper, Cummins, and Hawthorne all address anxieties that foreign empires or cultures would subsume Americans. These writers acknowledge the risks of global sympathy, but reassure readers of Americans' ability to develop foreign attachments while maintaining their republican, Christian identities. With increasing U.S. expansion, however, we see authors such as Ruiz de Burton and Hopkins shift more attention to America's violent relation to foreign peoples. My point here is not that pre-Civil War era authors were unaware that expansion threatened foreign peoples nor that postbellum authors uniformly objected to U.S. imperialism. After all, pre-war expansion was one of many reasons Americans thought national cohesion was at risk, and some postbellum Americans viewed expansion as a means to unite a fragmented nation. Instead, I argue that with U.S. expansion and burgeoning imperialism came a general shift away from an earlier emphasis on depictions of Americans balancing foreign sympathy with U.S. independence to an increasing focus on the connections and disjunctions between conquest and sympathy.

Each of the authors I discuss represents the complex ties between sympathy and foreign relations, presenting distinctive insights on the place of feelings in determining America's role as an actor in the global sphere. In analyzing these representations, I seek to understand how literary form allowed nineteenth-century American authors to depict foreign peoples not as remote outsiders to an isolated U.S. nation, but rather as instrumental in shaping the nation's past, present, and future.

---

<sup>1</sup> Maria Cummins, *El Fureidís*, 236.

<sup>2</sup> While this definition of sympathy resembles our current understanding of empathy, I employ the term sympathy because nineteenth-century authors used it to designate this process of identification and imagination. Further, I explore sympathy's association with

---

sentiments ranging from a sense of pity to one of fellow feeling among equals, as well as its ties to benevolence and even mesmerism.

<sup>3</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 13-14.

<sup>4</sup> Glenn Hendler, *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Julie Ellison, *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*.

<sup>6</sup> Kristin Boudreau, *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses*, 7.

<sup>7</sup> For instance, see Wills's analysis of how Jefferson challenged claims that African Americans and Native Americans lacked moral sense or family feeling, *Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence*, 285.

<sup>8</sup> For a reading of *Agnes of Sorrento* that explores the tendency to overlook or dismiss the novel, in part because of its international focus, see Annamaria Formichella.

<sup>9</sup> Michael Frazer, *The Enlightenment of Sympathy: Justice and the Moral Sentiments in the Eighteenth Century and Today*, 97-100.

<sup>10</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 268-271.

<sup>11</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 271.

<sup>12</sup> Notably, this narrative complicates Julia Stern's influential reading of feeling in late eighteenth-century U.S. literature, which emphasizes Americans' anxiety and grief over power relations and oppression within the new nation. In *The Algerine Captive*, Tyler evokes Americans' concerns about international relations, as well as domestic issues. This international focus may explain why the novel doesn't include some of the tropes, such as incest, that Stern identifies as central to late eighteenth-century novels that focus on Americans' domestic ties.

<sup>13</sup> For instance, shortly after becoming a captive, Underhill encounters an Englishman, who has gained his freedom by converting to Islam. Notably, Underhill expresses pity for this man, thereby demonstrating the influence of religion on his feeling for others and sense of superiority to them, while hinting that he feels for the Englishman, in particular, because of their shared whiteness.

<sup>14</sup> Caleb Crain's Introduction to the novel offers a succinct explanation of the new risks involved in trade and foreign travel for Americans following U.S. independence, xxix-xxx.

<sup>15</sup> My brief analysis of global sympathy in *The Algerine Captive* allows me to rethink criticism on the text. Recent readings of Tyler's novel, which assert that it offers insight into early Americans' views of their country, interpret his depictions of Algeria as a figure for America. For instance, critics argue that the foreign country offers a troubling vision of what the United States might become or that the cosmopolitan affiliations Underhill forges while abroad provide a model for Americans' relations to their diverse fellow citizens. Edward Larkin, "Nation and Empire in the Early United States" and Keri Holt, "'All Parts of the Union I Considered My Home': The Federal Imagination of *The*

---

*Algerine Captive*.” Focusing on the novel’s domestic politics, Ed White states that he is “inclined to read the Algerine captivity narrative less as a matter of engagement with or reflection upon geopolitics than as a means to reflect upon the centrality of slavery” to U.S. politics (8). Ed White, “Divided We Stand: Emergent Conservatism in Royall Tyler’s *The Algerine Captive*.” Malini Schueller’s reading of the novel in relation to Orientalism offers a key exception to this trend, as she argues that *The Algerine Captive* “both resists and mirrors the raced idea of empire based on distinctions between liberty and slavery and between virtue and excess” (55). However, she does not note the profound tensions surrounding expressions of cross-cultural sympathy in the novel. She refers to Underhill as an “expert reporter” and “judge,” defining him through his observation of the peoples he encounters, rather than his feeling for them (51). Further, this analysis overlooks the scenes where Tyler underscores that Underhill is not a trustworthy “judge” or even “reporter,” as he has misread the peoples he encounters, in part because of his sympathy for them.

<sup>16</sup> Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* and Elizabeth Barnes, *Love’s Whipping Boy: Violence and Sentimentality in the American Imagination*.

<sup>17</sup> June Howard offers a useful description of these tendencies in her rethinking of sentimentality.

<sup>18</sup> Kristin Boudreau examines Enlightenment philosophers’ belief that “sympathy reconciles individual and society” by fostering the regulation of private sentiments in service of community cohesion, but that “it cannot do so without threatening both body and subject with invasion by alien selves” (10). *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses*. Michael Frazer explains this threat: “There are two separate but interrelated ways in which sympathy may be said to threaten the separateness of individuals: first by eliminating the distinction between a sympathizer and the individual object of her feeling and second by eliminating the distinction between the multiple objects of a single person’s sympathy” (93). Michael Frazer, *The Enlightenment of Sympathy: Justice and the Moral Sentiments in the Eighteenth Century and Today*.

<sup>19</sup> Kaplan and Barnes both explore how sympathy becomes implicated in imperialism and violence predicated upon the refusal to recognize the autonomy of those racial minorities and foreign cultures for whom a more powerful elite express “compassion” and “benevolence.” Further, Barnes suggests nineteenth-century writers, including Frederick Douglass and Herman Melville, theorized that sympathizing with the oppressed could weaken individuals’ identities by blurring the distinction between them and the subjects of their feeling. Elizabeth Barnes, “Fraternal Melancholies: Manhood and the Limits of Sympathy in Douglass and Melville.” *Frederick Douglass and Herman Melville: Essays in Relation*. 233-256.

<sup>20</sup> Jonathan Lamb argues that sympathy took on all the more significance as eighteenth-century debates over what constituted the self led to competing conceptions of sympathy. These debates, which center on the question of whether people are born with fully formed selves or whether people only develop this interior self through their encounters with the world, clarify why sentiment sometimes appeared as a threat to the stability of

---

individuals' and nations' identities. While those who saw the self as innate and unchanging believed sympathetic identification served largely to reveal one's character, those who thought that individuals' identities developed through their encounters with the world saw sympathetic identification as transformative. Shared feeling held the power to destabilize the distinction between the sympathizer and the subject of his/her feeling. This view complicates the idea that sympathy fosters a sense of cohesion among citizens by raising the possibility that feeling could instead disrupt identity.

<sup>21</sup> Wai Chee Dimock and Lawrence Buell, *Shades of the Planet: American Literature as World Literature*.

<sup>22</sup> Dimock, *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*, 3.

<sup>23</sup> Pauline Hopkins's novel, in particular, offers a more extended consideration of the belief that God has created all races "of one blood," which *The Algerine Captive* briefly invokes.

<sup>24</sup> Anne Goldman, "Beasts in the Jungle: Foreigners and Natives in Boston." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*.

<sup>25</sup> Nina Baym usefully traces the lack of clear consensus among nineteenth-century authors and critics over what constituted a novel, noting both that many critics tended to treat "romance" as roughly synonymous with "novel." She also notes that there were two common competing interpretations for understanding the relation between the novel and romance: the diachronic view that saw the novel as a "modern form of romance" and a synchronic view that saw the romance as a type within the larger genre of the novel (436).

<sup>26</sup> Emily Miller Budick, *Nineteenth-Century American Romance: Genre and the Construction of Democratic Culture*, 6.

<sup>27</sup> Work on genre and form in the 1970s and 1980s by scholars such as Frederic Jameson, George Dekker, and Michael Davitt Bell asserted the significance of the American romance as a means of engaging with social changes attendant on the fall of feudalism and the development of new republican governments.

<sup>28</sup> Michael Davitt Bell, John Engell, and Nina Baym all note the romance's frequent association with fancy (perhaps most famously asserted by Hawthorne in the prefaces to his novels), while complicating the assumption that this association distinguishes the romance from the novel and/or from historical concerns.

<sup>29</sup> For instance, a number of critics argue that Cooper draws on the historical romance in order to naturalize Euro-Americans' displacement of Native Americans. See Leland S. Person, "The Historical Paradoxes of Manhood in Cooper's *The Deerslayer*." Nina Silber analyzes the political significance of the Romance of Reunion as a means of representing the reunification of the North and South following the Civil War, while Amy Kaplan argues that the imperial romance of the 1890s sanctioned U.S. imperialism.

<sup>30</sup> My analysis of how nineteenth-century romances often incorporated both conservative and progressive social and political values responds to a longer history of scholarship on this genre. In a recent essay on the relation between American romance and international

---

romanticism, Paul Gilmore offers a useful overview of studies on the romance. He traces the turn from Richard Chase's romance thesis, which "distinguished the aesthetic distance of the American romance from the engagement typical of romanticism," to the work of New Americanists, who "tended to collapse this distinction in offering accounts of canonical authors' complicity with capitalism and nationalism," and then to more recent "critical recuperation of the canonical American romantics and romancers through scholarly delineations of their nuanced critiques of dominant American ideologies and their attempts to engage in political questions through sophisticated explorations of the relations between society and individual consciousness" (490).

<sup>31</sup> This claim builds on the tendency to read romance as an often allegorical mode, which Emily Miller Budick traces back to Richard Chase's work. However, my focus on novels that are often explicitly concerned with politics challenges the related assumption that the romance is characterized by "its explicit evasion of the sociopolitical and economic world," which Budick likewise rethinks by examining the romance's relation to democracy, *Nineteenth-Century American Romance: Genre and the Construction of Democratic Culture*, 3

<sup>32</sup> Hawthorne's own definition of the romance specifically links it to the "poetic" and by extension to poetry.

<sup>33</sup> Jay Sexton, 115.

<sup>34</sup> On Cummins as valorizing sympathy, see Steven Hamelman. On Hawthorne's more skeptical relation to shared feeling, see Emily Miller Budick, "Perplexity, Sympathy, and the Question of the Human: A Reading of *The Marble Faun*."

## Chapter 1. International Friendships:

### James Fenimore Cooper as Cosmopolitan Patriot

James Fenimore Cooper's novels—famous for their pairings of Indians and Euro-Americans—also represent Americans' affiliations with English, French, Dutch, and African characters, among others. In his Revolutionary War stories, sea tales, and travel narratives, Cooper depicts characters who form strong attachments across national lines. Critics have argued persuasively for the importance of friendship to both Cooper's fiction and the shifting social and political landscape in which he wrote.<sup>1</sup> However, Cooper's emphasis on international friendships remains unexplored. Americans' friendships with foreigners took on particular significance during the early national period when Cooper began his literary career. Following the War of 1812 and the Transcontinental Treaty of 1819, Americans sought to establish new policies regarding the nation's relation to Europe, such as the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, which warned against European interference in North and South America. Cooper proves an important figure for examining America of the 1820s because his work reflects a profound engagement with the interrelation of domestic and foreign politics. In such novels as *The Pilot; A Tale of the Sea* (1824) and *The Prairie: A Tale* (1827), he responds to anxieties about foreign influence by depicting how the United States can negotiate and profit from international affiliations while preserving U.S. independence.

Cooper repeatedly employs friendship as a metonym for international affiliations. In so doing, he revises a popular trope of literature from the early national period, which



writers used to consider what connects the members of a society. For example, Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie, or Early Times in Massachusetts* (1827) represents powerful friendships as a motive for heroic self-sacrifice. She envisions friends so sympathetic that they risk death for one another. Numerous other authors, such as Lydia Maria Child, explored how friendships help incorporate individuals into the nation and motivate them to act in their shared interests.<sup>2</sup> Cooper's portraits of foreign friendships contribute to this broader body of literature by exploring the powerful affinities that link Americans to an international community. In *The Pilot* and *The Prairie*, along with other novels from the 1820s, he portrays international affiliations that help Americans attain independence, expand their territory, develop trade routes, and even forge stronger domestic attachments.

When engaging the trope of friendship, Cooper drew on its well-established political significance, based in its relation to sympathy. Enlightenment philosophers had theorized that ideal friendships were founded in a sense of equality and shared virtue, and that such bonds, like familial ties, fostered individuals' connection to their country.<sup>3</sup> Adam Smith defined friendship as "a natural sympathy, from an involuntary feeling that the persons to whom we attach ourselves are the natural and proper objects of esteem and approbation."<sup>4</sup> While Smith argued that familial sympathy arises from intimacy and familiarity, he suggested friends cannot help but feel for each other because they recognize one another's virtue. In a similar vein, David Hume argued that friendships result from "a certain sympathy which always arises betwixt similar characters."<sup>5</sup> Given that sympathy has long been associated with a sense of difference and can imply an individual's superiority over the subject of his/her sympathy, readers may wonder

whether friendship is actually based in empathy. However, Enlightenment philosophers explicitly drew on the language of sympathy to portray friendship among equals whose virtues foster their identification with and attachment to one another.

Recent historical and literary studies assert that early national Americans likewise understood friendship as based in sympathy stemming from a strong sense of resemblance. Men and women of the same class, education, and faith developed affinities for one another. Such affinities were thought to inspire republican virtue by uniting meritorious citizens and encouraging them to act in the broader national interest.<sup>6</sup> The friend, a double who could not be conflated with the self, served two essential functions: s/he affirmed one's own value and fostered one's sympathetic connection to the larger country.<sup>7</sup> In Cooper's fiction, friendships between characters operate along these lines, but suggest that shared virtues could engender a sense of identification across national divisions as well. His portraits of Euro-Americans' relationships with Native Americans and the British, for instance, presume that these friends possess similar dispositions and virtues. Cooper depicts how his characters' similarities inspire attachments by moving them to share in each other's feelings and act in each other's interests.

Cooper's protagonists offer examples of what Smith described as "the man of most perfect virtue," who combines "command of his own original and selfish feelings" with "the most exquisite sensibility" to others' feelings.<sup>8</sup> One gained this self-command and sensibility by having suffered and felt much. Thus, when I argue that Cooper depicts friendships based in mutual sympathy, what I mean is that his characters draw on their own emotional experiences and perceptiveness so as to enter into one another's feelings. Throughout his novels, Cooper conveys friends' powerful sympathy through descriptions

of their affect and their heroic conduct. We can read his characters' sympathy on their bodies—as they weep for their grieving friends—and in their readiness to risk pain and death, helping friends gain liberty or rescue their lovers. Concern for others guides their emotions and actions, which demonstrate how friendships proved valuable to national and international communities.

Cooper's depictions of friendship further our understanding of the role that sympathy played in defining the U.S. nation. While theorists have explored how feeling helps to connect fellow citizens and create a cohesive nation, Cooper represents international sympathy as equally central to America's development.<sup>9</sup> He imagines that his American characters' feeling for foreign peoples, apparent in their friendships, lets them pursue their common interests. My point here is not that Cooper's emphasis on cross-cultural sympathy is inherently progressive. Critical debates about his representations of relationships between Euro-American and Native American characters remain contentious: scholars interpret these relations either as a failure to acknowledge that Americans violently dispossessed Natives of their lands or a means to decry such appropriation.<sup>10</sup> Portraying Native Americans as "foreign" may imply that Euro-Americans' attachment to America takes precedence over Native Americans' claims to the lands on which the U.S. nation is constructed, as prior critics have argued.<sup>11</sup> Yet by representing these tribes as "foreign," Cooper also acknowledges their autonomous social and political structures, which the United States threatens to subsume. Further, his depictions of friendship counter notions that cross-cultural violence was inevitable by imagining alternatives to such conflict.

Given that a number of Cooper's novels from the 1820s emphasize the benefits of U.S. participation in the global sphere, I suggest we reread his work as that of a "cosmopolitan patriot," to borrow Kwame Anthony Appiah's phrase.<sup>12</sup> Appiah's work asserts that citizens who love and take pride in their country can also value difference and feel at home outside the nation. Reading Cooper through Appiah may seem like an odd choice, as the *Leatherstocking Tales* are often interpreted as "a paean to American empire."<sup>13</sup> However, Cooper's novels from the 1820s depict characters who model mutually beneficial foreign affiliations. In this respect, I build on arguments that Cooper "wanted to develop a global (or at least transatlantic) perspective to surmount the parochial nationalism of his American contemporaries."<sup>14</sup>

*The Pilot* and *The Prairie* are at the center of my analysis in this chapter because they speak to Cooper's cosmopolitan patriotism. While rarely considered in relation to each other, these novels share an engagement with global sympathy; both explore what connects Americans to foreign peoples and what they gain from international affiliations. *The Pilot* represents how the Revolutionary War forged new relations between Britain and America. No longer the children of the British, but rather their friends and equals, Cooper's Americans assert their political independence while retaining an affinity for Europeans. *The Prairie*, set in newly acquired U.S. territories, depicts a network of friendships that emerges as national expansion brings foreign peoples into contact. Cooper imagines how such interactions can cultivate respect for cultural differences, which the novel suggests is important to both national expansion and international relations. Americans' cosmopolitan attitudes help the U.S. nation to subsume some

groups, namely former Spanish colonists, and to form affiliations with other peoples who preserve their difference from Americans, like the Pawnee Loup.

As a point of comparison, I conclude the chapter with a discussion of *The Deerslayer* or, *The First War-Path* (1841). This novel offers a grimmer portrait of cross-cultural encounter during the French and Indian War. While expounding the value of sympathy through the famous friendship between Natty Bumppo and Chingachgook, *The Deerslayer* evinces skepticism that Americans possessed the sympathy to develop cosmopolitan relations. By contrast, the pattern of international friendship in Cooper's earlier texts depict how a history of foreign encounters provides Americans with the basis to continue expanding, build new trade routes, and form military and economic alliances.<sup>15</sup> If we conceive of nations as dependent upon "a rich legacy of memories" and "a heroic past," as Ernest Renan argues, Cooper contributes to the development of the U.S. nation through his representations of Americans successfully navigating global conflicts and alliances in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.<sup>16</sup>

#### *The Pilot: English Affinities in the American Revolution*

Throughout his prolific literary career, James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851) evinced a strong interest in foreign relations. Aside from some traveling in his youth, when he spent a year on a merchant vessel that made stops in England and Gibraltar, Cooper lived predominantly in New York State until his late thirties. Nonetheless, from the publication of his first novel, *Precaution* (1820), his writing reflects his engagement with foreign literature and his sense that the U.S. nation emerged through cross-cultural

exchange. Over the course of his life, he would publish thirty-two novels, many of which consider America's international origins and its place in the world. Recent biographical studies by Leland Person and Wayne Franklin emphasize the writer's personal, political, and professional connections to foreign nations.<sup>17</sup> For instance, Cooper enjoyed friendships with Europeans, invested in international trade, and engaged with diverse cultures in his writing. His work reflects the influence of British fiction, such as Sir Walter Scott's historical romances and Jane Austen's novels of manners, and travel narratives, like the Englishman John Liddiard Nicholas's account of New Zealand and the Maori.<sup>18</sup> In the 1820s, Cooper earned widespread popularity with U.S. and European readers by drawing on these works and revising literary conventions to depict Americans' foreign encounters.

Cooper further developed his own international ties between 1826 and 1833, when he lived in Western Europe. There he had the opportunity to form an acquaintance with well-known writers and political figures, including Sir Walter Scott and the Marquis de Lafayette. In part, Cooper's family traveled to Europe so that in the absence of international copyright law he could develop relationships with foreign publishers and profit from the sale of his books abroad, as Washington Irving had done just a few years earlier. And as was true for Irving, Cooper's European travel raised questions among Americans about whether the ostensibly prototypical American writer had grown too "Europeanized."<sup>19</sup> His life abroad clearly shaped his work: while he continued to write about America in works like *The Prairie* (1827), Europe became the setting for novels such as *The Bravo* (1831) and the subject of his series of travel narratives. He also completed extensive revisions to his earlier novels for their republication in England.<sup>20</sup> In

all of these texts, Cooper links the domestic and foreign, whether by writing about the influence of Europe on America or by depicting Europe in ways that resonate with U.S. political and social concerns.

Cooper's historical romances, in particular, depict how Americans' sympathetic ties to foreign peoples shape the nation. His novels emphasize the important influence of foreign attachments by entwining stories about American victories in warfare and cross-cultural conflicts with courtship plots. This narrative structure encourages readers to understand the origins of the American family and home as dependent not only upon prior generations' military prowess, but also on foreign alliances that help Americans succeed on the battlefield and in their romantic pursuits. In *The Pilot* and *The Prairie*, for instance, foreign alliances enable the American characters' marriages, which benefit the nation; as the epilogues relate, the married couples contribute to U.S. government and culture, while raising the next generation of republicans. Cooper expresses the significance of the cross-cultural, homosocial bonds forged in battle through their influence on this national future, as well as the powerful emotions they elicit from his characters. He punctuates even gory scenes of warfare with effusions of sentiment, which convey the men's affection for America, their countrymen, and their foreign friends.

Cooper's extensive nonfiction writing on Europe, including numerous travel narratives, pamphlets, and letters, likewise expresses his belief that Americans can benefit from and contribute to international alliances.<sup>21</sup> For example, in a pamphlet on the French finance controversy in 1831, Cooper advocates for republican government in France and hazards the attacks of those who believed that republicanism could not be exported to Europe or that America should avoid direct involvement in foreign affairs.<sup>22</sup>

Cooper frames his participation in these debates as an attempt to support the position of his friend General Lafayette, and so demonstrates how personal attachments shape Americans' participation in international political debates. Elsewhere he describes the importance of his transatlantic friendship with Lafayette by writing that it motivated his involvement in the French and Polish revolutions and provided him with insight into foreign cultures, which informed his critiques of the United States.<sup>23</sup> This is not to say that his novels fictionalize his own relationships, but rather that Cooper's interest in how nationalism could go hand-in-hand with foreign affiliations runs throughout his writing.

By the time Cooper returned from Europe to the United States in 1833, his relationship with the American public had become contentious.<sup>24</sup> This shift in his career attests that Cooper's political vision does not represent the sole or even the predominant perspective of U.S. citizens in his time. Rather, his writing provides insight into debates about how America defined itself in relation to the larger world. His view that America and Europe should influence one another's governance and culture remained contested, and he sought to show that developing these relations would bolster U.S. cultural, commercial, and military growth. While Cooper's return to the Leatherstocking Tales with *The Pathfinder* (1840) and *The Deerslayer* (1841) renewed his popularity, his works from the 1840s express heightened uncertainty about America's ability to enact republican ideals at home or through international affiliations.<sup>25</sup>

Written early in Cooper's career, *The Pilot* acknowledges the concerns about the republic's future and the risks of foreign affiliations that his later novels expand on, but emphasizes the value of sympathy that transcends national borders. The novel's plot centers on Barnstable and Griffith, two Americans fighting for independence, as they



court the cousins Katherine and Cecilia. Before the start of the novel, the Revolutionary War has broken out, prompting the young women's guardian, the Tory Colonel Howard, to remove them from America and to forbid the revolutionaries' pursuit of his wards. Barnstable and Griffith follow their lovers to England. There the men are allied with John Paul Jones, the eponymous pilot disguised as "Mr. Gray," who spearheads a mission to capture British lords. Jones, like Barnstable and Griffith, encounters an old flame in England, Alice Dunscombe. However, Jones's participation in the Revolution prevents him from renewing this courtship. Though the military mission fails, Barnstable, Griffith, and Jones overcome Howard's defense of his abbey home and survive British attacks at sea. Howard dies near the end of the novel after blessing his wards' marriages and conceding that the American Revolution may be just. While this narrative is primarily concerned with reconciling divisions between American loyalists and patriots, it simultaneously reconsiders the relationship between England and America. The novel concludes with a sentimental vision of an American-British friendship that evokes their national equality.<sup>26</sup>

Cooper shows that establishing affiliations across national divisions can be quite costly, as Jones's ties to the American Revolution and a British past, including to Alice herself, come into conflict. Lamenting Jones's support for the American Revolution, Alice defines this choice as a betrayal of his nation, family, and God, proclaiming, "Are not the relations of domestic life of God's establishing, and have not the nations grown from families, as branches spread from the stem, till the tree overshadows the land!"<sup>27</sup> Alice expresses an important conception of nationalism, based on the belief that the nation develops from the family, which conveys the centrality of personal relationships to

larger political and religious structures. This becomes a problem when Jones supports the cause of American independence rather than fighting for England. Alice's arguments do not win Jones back to England's side, as British tyranny fosters his sympathy for Americans. Still, Alice's remarks resonate with recurring themes in Cooper's novels, which link the nation to the family by representing happy marriages as the foundation for a flourishing national future. For instance, Barnstable's marriage to Katherine and Griffith's marriage to Cecilia evoke a sense of optimism for America at *The Pilot's* conclusion, as these women support men who are building the new republic and help to make the nation a home.

While Cooper implies that marital ties should be of a piece with one's national loyalties, he takes a different perspective on friendship, suggesting that it should extend beyond national borders. Jones's relationships with the colonial Americans are central to both *The Pilot's* "international" conflict (the Revolutionary War) and to its "domestic" disputes over whether the revolutionaries will marry their love interests. Jones's relationship with the Americans initially appears more distant than, say, Natty Bumppo's relationship with Chingachgook, as Jones's anonymity precludes friendly intimacy between the men. Still, Jones sympathizes with the Americans' challenge to British rule, given his own objections to his country's tyranny. Further, he recognizes Griffith's virtue, evidenced in "the proud and fearless eye of the young man" (82). Acknowledging Griffith's legitimate concerns about following an unknown Englishman, Jones reveals his identity. Over the course of the novel, Jones demonstrates his keen perception of the revolutionaries' feelings and proves that he merits their trust. His sympathy for their

revolution is essential to their independence, as he skillfully guides them through military battles and domestic conflicts that threaten their success.

Although the larger plot centers on conflicts between Americans that arise due to loyalists' ties to England, the revolutionaries' debt to Jones suggests that foreign affiliations help Americans resolve these internal conflicts. When Barnstable and Griffith disagree over how best to serve their country and their lovers, Cooper evokes the difficulties of negotiating between national and personal interests. While conquering Howard's abbey, the revolutionaries fight over whether to bring their lovers home to America as captives. Because the young men disagree over who is in authority and what course of action to take, Colonel Howard deems their conflict the "natural consequences of this rebellion" and its "damnable leveling principles" (344). However, Jones recalls Barnstable and Griffith from their quarrel. Jones derives authority in this scene from his sympathy with the revolutionaries' cause. He deems himself "only an humble follower of the friends of America"—employing "friends" as a synonym for allies—and asserts that the "interests of the Republic must not be neglected" (337; 345). His sympathy with the cause helps him reconcile the conflict by determining that it is in the interests of the republic to take Howard captive; his wards choose to join him, ending the debate (345). While the Revolutionary War is entangled with domestic disputes, America's foreign friends are removed from such conflicts and so can remind the Americans of the republican principles at stake.

The subsequent battle scenes highlight the ideal relation between sympathy, friendship, and foreign alliances: Jones's ability to feel for Griffith and his men allows him to aid his friend and advance America's interests. After Barnstable, Griffith, and

Jones take to their ships with Katharine, Cecilia, and Colonel Howard as prisoners, ships from the British line attack. In this battle, Jones and Griffith play essential roles. The commanding officer, Captain Munson, is killed early in the fight, so that Griffith must assume command. In turn, Jones takes control to guide the ship over dangerous shoals, which halt the British pursuit. The men's alliance and their ability to pass command back and forth between them prove essential to the Americans' cause.

This foreign alliance is particularly valuable because it is based in a strong affective connection. Griffith and Jones save the ship through their sympathetic bond. Jones guides Griffith until the latter can find "the calmness that was so essential to discharge the duties which had thus suddenly and awfully devolved on him" through his commander's death (394). In this scene Jones and Griffith's relationship is at its most intimate, with Griffith relying on his companion's whispered advice. Jones does not simply assume control, as we see when he refuses Griffith's suggestion that he "proclaim [Jones's] name to the men," in order to "quicken their blood" (396). Jones asserts, "They want it not," conveying both the American men's capability and his own understanding of them or what Smith might deem his "exquisite sensibility" (396).<sup>28</sup>

The pivotal victory helps resolve the conflict between the novel's loyalists and patriots, thereby signaling how international alliances not only advance American independence, but also reshape relations among Americans. Wounded in the novel's final battle, Colonel Howard sanctions his nieces' marriages to the revolutionaries before he dies. He even acknowledges that "it seemeth to be the will of God that this rebellion should triumph" (407). Cooper imagines the war converting loyalists to the cause by persuading them that independence was divinely sanctioned. Howard's remark

underscores the importance of the foreign allies who help Americans win these battles, while also emphasizing that loyalists could become supporters of the new republic. We might expect the death of this patriarchal, loyalist figure to signal the severing of Americans' ties to the British and the end of his generation's influence over America's future. However, by analogizing the political conflict to a familial dispute that ends in an amicable reconciliation, *The Pilot* emphasizes the link between colonial Americans, including loyalists, and their republican successors. Cooper evokes a sense of continuity across these eras and roots America's identity firmly in the past. He depicts both loyalists and U.S. ties to England as vital to America's origins, even as independence transforms prior colonial relations.

While assigning Americans' foreign allies importance in the Revolutionary War, though, *The Pilot* registers concerns about the influence of foreign empires on the U.S. nation. Cooper employs the friendship between Griffith and Jones to delimit the sway of the British Empire and express ardent U.S. nationalism. Their affinity proves critical to America's future; as an ally, Jones works toward the larger cause of the Revolution, resolves the conflict between Griffith and Barnstable, and helps promote marriages that represent the nation's future. Surprisingly, though, the British rebel models what Americans should *not* become. Even as he is an important figure of international friendship, Jones is also the subject of criticism based on his motives for supporting the Americans. Griffith's final remarks about Jones attribute his desire for anonymity in the failed mission to his "desire of distinction," a "foible" of character likely shaped by his imperfect education (426). Through Griffith's characterization of Jones, Cooper balances his depiction of foreign contributions to the Revolutionary War with a sense of U.S.

exceptionalism. A more celebratory depiction of the British hero would risk attributing all credit for Americans' independence to him. Instead, Griffith's criticism implies that America possesses a special ability to foster selfless patriotism. This view distinguishes the U.S. nation from Britain and explains how Cooper's American characters resolve the conflicts between their personal and national allegiances, unlike Jones, who remains permanently estranged from Britain.

At the close of *The Pilot*, Cooper offers a different model of international friendship that speaks to America's new independence. Through a friendship between two minor characters, the British Major Borroughcliffe and the American Captain Manual, Cooper also revises the parent-child metaphors so often used to describe the hierarchical relationship between Britain and America in the eighteenth-century.<sup>29</sup> Cooper earlier invokes these parent-child relations by setting the youthful rebels and Jones in opposition to the elderly loyalist Howard. Borroughcliffe and Manual's friendship, by contrast, depicts England and America as linked by amiable equality. Their encounters—in which the Americans' mission is defeated, even as they best the British at sea—suggest that military prowess renders the Americans and British equals. Moreover, these encounters create a shared history. In the words of Borroughcliffe, “we have drank together, and we have fought; surely there is nothing now to prevent our being sworn friends!” (372). Cooper treats the Revolution as the grounds for new affiliations, though the two men meet while fighting on opposing sides. The effect is two-fold: (1) suggesting that the foundations for future Anglo-American relations are laid not just in a history of British imperialism, but also in the meeting of equals on the battlefield, and (2)

establishing that this violent past need not produce anxiety, as its conflicts have been resolved.

The novel's concluding chapters, which function like an epilogue, extend the transatlantic friendship well beyond the Revolution and invite readers to reflect on Anglo-American bonds in Cooper's day. Manual and Borroughcliffe assume adjacent posts at forts along the Saint Lawrence a decade later, where "a log cabin was erected on one of the islands in the river, as a sort of neutral territory, where their feasting and revels might be held without any scandal to the discipline of their respective garrisons" (421). The creation of neutral territory frees their friendship from the formal strictures of their official, national roles. Nevertheless, it also reinforces the sense that these men's similar stations, what Cooper refers to as their "mutual situations," afford them an equality that, along with their shared history, undergirds their relationship (421). Manual and Borroughcliffe can create a neutral space of affiliation because each holds authority in a national military force from which he can separate himself *temporarily*.

This relationship implies that America has overcome earlier uncertainties about their ability to maintain independence, having now established enforceable national borders, though conflicts between England and America do not end with the Revolution. Cooper writes, "In this manner year and year rolled by, the most perfect harmony existing between the two posts, notwithstanding the angry passions that disturbed their respective countries" (422). Despite the unspecified "angry passions," the men's amity expands outward via synecdoche, so that their feelings for each other come to characterize their garrisons without threatening their national loyalties. The scene suggests that such

friendship, though not the predominate feeling between the English and Americans at the turn-of-the-century, could nonetheless prove influential.

Boroughcliffe and Manual's affectionate bond provides a corrective model to the War of 1812, which threatened such affiliation through contestations over national borders, including that between the United States and Canada. The two friends protect this border while participating in simple cultural exchanges, as when they use their national trade routes to share their favorite malts and wines (421). Their affection lasts until Manual's death, which is followed shortly thereafter by Boroughcliffe's. The bachelors are buried side by side, evoking a continuation of their friendship in the afterlife. Cooper's faith in the potential for such affiliation is notable given that many of his contemporaries expressed concerns about America's relation to Europe, and that critics often note Cooper's critical distance from England.<sup>30</sup> Their relationship offers a key example of "Anglo-American camaraderie" in Cooper's novels, which Joseph Rezek notes scholars tend to overlook.<sup>31</sup> Yet Rezek attributes this tendency to a scholarly emphasis on Cooper's nationalism, and so he implicitly situates nationalism and foreign friendship in opposition to one another. *The Pilot's* representation of British-American relations, by contrast, conveys that the nation's development depends upon its foreign ties.

Cooper offers a narrative of how foreign affiliations, which shape national development, also change as a result of such development. In particular, *The Pilot's* two different examples of Anglo-American friendship suggest that the values and concerns linking America to various foreign peoples changed between the Revolutionary Era and the 1820s. Jones's ties to Griffith signal Americans' need for support during the



Revolutionary War. Jones becomes a valuable friend because the rebellious British subject sympathizes with the revolutionaries' sense of injustice and so enters their cause.

By contrast, Borroughcliffe and Manual's affinity for one another, which centers on the men's pleasure-oriented interests in commerce and consumption, models cosmopolitan exchange. The two soldiers sympathize with the joy each takes in his country's goods and trade, and sharing these goods furthers both their national pride and their mutual pleasure. Reading their affectionate interactions as a cosmopolitan encounter helps elucidate the association of cosmopolitanism with sympathy that recurs throughout the texts in this study. Cooper suggests that sympathetic ties facilitate cross-cultural exchange, as the friends' affection leads them to share goods from their own countries and appreciate another's cultural products. Even as Borroughcliffe and Manual's bond fosters commerce, rather than the revolutionary aims that link Jones and Griffith, both transatlantic friendships reassure readers that Americans possess valuable allies who share the U.S. nation's interests. Cooper thus evokes continuity in Americans' attachment to the English, even as he portrays the changing basis for such bonds during and after the Revolution.

Cooper's narrative of strong Anglo-American bonds substantively revises the international vision of early American novelists who preceded him. Authors of the 1780s and 1790s, like Royall Tyler, expressed much less certainty that America would maintain beneficial foreign ties after independence. Eighteenth-century authors viewed cosmopolitanism and nationalism as mutually exclusive, as Edward Larkin argues. For example, he suggests that J. H. St. John de Crèvecoeur resists supporting the American Revolution out of belief that it would render "friendly converse and sympathetic

exchange among enlightened individuals . . . untenable.”<sup>32</sup> Crèvecoeur defines cosmopolitanism against U.S. nationalism, which he associates with violence rather than sympathy. A similar emphasis on the failure of cross-cultural sympathy characterizes Charles Brockden Brown’s novels from the 1790s, which explore how Americans would manage international affiliations in the context of colonial and revolutionary conflict. Brockden Brown evinces skepticism that shared feeling offers a means of either unifying the country or linking it to the larger world. Caleb Crain notes that in *Wieland* (1798), “there is no magic to sympathy,” which does not protect characters or ensure their mutual understanding.<sup>33</sup> Instead, sympathetic ties among countrymen and across national divisions make the characters in all of Brockden Brown’s novels frighteningly vulnerable. Critics offer various interpretations for this dramatic failure of affiliation, but agree that his work conveys anxiety about the early republic’s stability.<sup>34</sup> Brockden Brown rarely moves beyond the sense of instability that characterizes his gothic sensibility to the reconciliation of these problems.

In *The Pilot*, Cooper revisits the Revolution and, like Crèvecoeur, emphasizes the value of Americans’ sympathetic ties to the English during this period. Yet in rewriting the history of the American Revolution from his vantage in the 1820s, Cooper asserts that Americans maintained foreign attachments, along with their nationalist aspirations, during and after the Revolutionary War, as well as the War of 1812. Indeed, he depicts national and cosmopolitan sentiments as mutually reinforcing. My point is not that Cooper’s perspective is more accurate because he writes about this era retrospectively, nor that tensions between America and England were resolved. Rather, his cosmopolitan patriotism suggests that U.S. national and foreign ties appeared easier to reconcile a few

decades after the Revolutionary War when America had begun to develop new international relations, including the trade relations alluded to in *The Pilot*.

In rewriting eighteenth-century representations of foreign affiliation, Cooper suggests how nineteenth-century expansion—which he depicts in *The Prairie*—allayed some of the fears earlier authors evoked. The post-1815 period was a moment of enthusiasm regarding national development. Historian David Walker Howe argues that the Anglo-American Convention of 1818 “was a remarkably favorable agreement from the U.S. point of view” and “signaled the beginning of a new era of accommodation in Anglo-American relations.”<sup>35</sup> In 1823, President Monroe and his cabinet considered crafting a joint declaration with England to oppose the Holy Allies’ potential intervention in Spanish America.<sup>36</sup> For a number of U.S. political leaders, these debates reveal, Anglo-American relations had come to be characterized by “amity.”<sup>37</sup> Nonetheless, Monroe chose to express America’s position on European intervention independently, in what would become known as the Monroe Doctrine, due to continued sectional divisions over whether England constituted a desirable ally.<sup>38</sup> America’s relation to Great Britain would remain a source of debate throughout the 1820s—as Americans sought to reopen trade relations with the British West Indies and to discourage British intervention in Cuba—and indeed across the century.<sup>39</sup> Cooper responds to these ongoing debates by emphasizing Anglo-American affinities. His depictions of foreign friendship suggest that international affiliations constituted a powerful force for U.S. cohesion and development. Notably, his belief in the value of foreign affiliations extends beyond Anglo-American relations. This becomes clear in *The Prairie*, which shifts readers’ attention to early nineteenth-century westward expansion.

## National Expansion in *The Prairie*: New Citizens, New Allies

Set just after the Louisiana Purchase, *The Prairie* (1827) explores the influence of America's territorial growth on the nation's future. Through this setting, Cooper considers America's relations to Native Americans and peoples of the Spanish Empire, whose influence, the Monroe Doctrine reminds us, was as much a source of concern to the early republic as the British Empire. While centered on U.S. domestic development, the novel is nonetheless international insofar as it depicts how expansion and international treaties lead Americans to develop new alliances. Whereas *The Pilot* portrays foreign affinities as necessary to establishing U.S. independence, *The Prairie* conveys the importance of international friendships to growth in U.S. lands and populations. Cooper entwines courtships with a series of violent skirmishes, and foreign friendships again enable Americans to win battles and marry happily, protecting the national future. Like *The Pilot*, this later novel evinces Cooper's cosmopolitan patriotism and depicts Americans who recognize the virtues of "foreign" peoples and forge valuable alliances.

Yet *The Prairie* interweaves its representation of foreign relations with an issue largely unexamined in *The Pilot*: how new peoples will become part of the country. Through the tropes of marriage and friendship, Cooper distinguishes between peoples who can be incorporated into America as it expands and those who should remain distinct from it. In reading Cooper's representations of the international bonds that shape expansion, I build on Ivy Schweitzer's analysis of Euro- and Native American

friendships in Cooper's fiction. Yet while Schweitzer reads scenes of cross-cultural encounter and affinity primarily as a means to "explore the types of affective bonds linking people of different backgrounds in the new nation," I argue that Cooper also employs Native-Anglo encounters to model how Americans negotiate international relations and how such foreign ties shape domestic relations.<sup>40</sup> In *The Prairie*, we see the intermingling of foreign and domestic as Anglo-American characters forge unions with former Spanish colonials, who are then subsumed into the United States. On the other hand, the Euro-Americans become friends and allies with Native Americans who retain their distinct cultures and identities.

Examining the sympathetic attachments that undergird U.S.-foreign alliances invites reflection on the gender relations at work in foreign encounters. In the midst of international conflict, Cooper's female protagonists require rescue. Their survival depends upon their lovers or husbands, and their influence on the national future is tied to their roles as wives who help create American homes. By contrast, Cooper's American men demonstrate strength and virtue in the international sphere by forging foreign affiliations in order to rescue their lovers. Yet the interrelation of foreign and domestic spheres complicates gender divisions, so that they are not quite so neat as this suggests. The women, too, develop cross-cultural friendships that redefine the country's borders, and the Americans' marriages depend upon such friendships.

*The Prairie* emphasizes the importance of affective ties to national growth, as the protagonists rely on their ability to develop networks of friendships that transcend cultural differences in order to survive frontier violence. The novel opens with a general description of settlers' rapid entrance into newly acquired American territories, which is

then exemplified by the Bush family's journey onto the prairie. In this frontier context, individuals' loyalties quickly become suspect, and the novel follows the conflict between three parties: the Bush family of settlers, the Sioux, and an international band that forms around Cooper's famous protagonist, Natty Bumppo. Natty's band includes two young men, Duncan Uncas Middleton and Paul Hover, following the settlers in order to recover their lovers, Inez Middleton and Ellen Wade, from the Bushes. Inez—a Spanish aristocrat—is the captive of Abiram White, brother of the Bush matriarch. Abiram plans to ransom or sell Inez, but she eventually escapes her captors with their niece Ellen. Together, Natty's band flees the violent settler family. The group befriends Hard-Heart, a Pawnee Loup chief, who aids their escape. In their flight and the ensuing battles, the band of friends exemplifies how a diverse, international community can forge sympathetic attachments to one another and advance their common interests.

Cooper conveys the high stakes of these friendships, which involve characters in domestic and international conflicts, when Natty's efforts to help his friends secure the young women's freedom heighten the Bush family's suspicions of him. Conflict intensifies as the Bushes believe that Natty has killed one of their family, who was in reality murdered by one of their own: Abiram. Colluding with the settler family, the Sioux chief Mahtoree takes the band of friends captive. He threatens to kill some of the men and hopes to marry Inez and Ellen. Pawnee warriors intervene, and their alliance with the Anglo-Americans demonstrates the value of cross-cultural affiliations when Hard-Heart kills Mahtoree. Faced with their defeat, the Bush family recognizes Ellen and Inez's right to liberty, and all of the Euro-American characters except Natty return to the settlements. Natty remains on the prairie with the Pawnee tribe until his death. The re-

absorption of characters into the settlements attests that the alliances and conflicts that arise on the frontier influence domestic relations. Ultimately, the novel suggests that these encounters strengthen America, much as Anglo-American encounters do in *The Pilot*.

By pinpointing the Louisiana Purchase as the event that incites the novel's plot, Cooper represents how expansion produced close relations between American citizens and foreign peoples, particularly former Spanish colonists and native tribes. Cooper thereby situates the novel within an international context that is both transatlantic and hemispheric. In so doing, he responds to the fraught subject of how America's relations to European empires and to the Western hemisphere's diverse inhabitants were entangled, so famously raised in the Monroe Doctrine. To explore the value of the new relations that emerged through international treaties and territorial growth, *The Prairie* depicts personal affiliations—particularly marriage and friendship—that arise on the frontier.

In Cooper's novel, cross-cultural bonds prove central to creating national coherence and forging foreign alliances during a period of expansion and exchange. He writes that, "to blend the discrepant elements of society . . . woman was made to perform her accustomed and grateful office. The barriers of Prejudice and religion were broken through by the irresistible power of the Master Passion, and family unions, ere long, began to cement the political tie."<sup>41</sup> Here Cooper describes how marriages of Euro-Americans, like that between the Protestant Middleton and Catholic Inez, foster national unity. Significantly, the international band of friends facilitates this marriage. Cooper thus interweaves his account of Americans' foreign relations with hopes for their domestic future such that international ties appear pivotal to America's cohesion. Further,

the international band protects Inez against the unsought advances of the Sioux chief Mahtoree. Cooper insists that the U.S. nation is expansive enough to incorporate the Spanish/Creole woman through marriage, as well as to acquire Native allies like Hard-Heart through friendship, but rejects the possibility of a Euro-American's marriage to a Native American.<sup>42</sup>

Though prior studies of male friendship on the frontier in Cooper's fiction have argued that he situates homosocial bonds in opposition to heterosexual relations, Cooper's early novels depict a productive connection between friendship and marriage that speaks to contemporaneous understandings of these relationships.<sup>43</sup> Crain and Richard Godbeer assert that for nineteenth-century American men, friendships could co-exist with marriage. Young men might help their friends court wives, and their sympathy for one another led them to share in each other's joy at marriage. By a kind of transitive property, marriages inspired friends to sympathize with one another's husbands or wives. This vision of friendship resonates with Smith's argument that the man of "perfect virtue" would share both his friend's "original and sympathetic feelings."<sup>44</sup> Friendships could expand outward into a sympathetic network and foster a broader sense of community.<sup>45</sup> Drawing on this conception of heterosexual and homosocial relations as mutually reinforcing, Cooper entwines international friendships and domestic romance in *The Prairie*.<sup>46</sup>

*The Prairie* depicts a number of friendships—between Ellen and Inez, Paul and Middleton, and Natty and Hard-Heart—that connect all of these characters to one other and the country. Though Cooper is known for his depictions of male friendships, Ellen and Inez develop a friendship based in mutual sympathy that transcends the cultural



differences between the Anglo-American and Spanish colonial women. Their relationship is significant because the Bush family threatens Inez's national incorporation by kidnapping her at the moment of her marriage. They disrupt her relation to the nation at the very point when Cooper suggests that former Spanish colonials will be absorbed into America, along with their wealth and land. Her captors move her outside of the settlements, aligning her with the slaves Abiram White has stolen.<sup>47</sup> By contrast, friendship with Ellen connects Inez to inhabitants of the settlements and reaffirms her social standing. Inez describes Ellen as "having shown so much commiseration and friendship" (173). Further, Ellen has promised to live with Inez should the two escape. Through this promise, Cooper conveys their shared feeling. In turn, this affective connection sanctions Inez's marriage to Middleton. The women's bond demonstrates that Inez fits into an American community, despite the Creole heritage and Catholicism that distinguish her from the Anglo-American characters.

Cooper portrays these women's attachments to one another and to their lovers by focusing on their affect in two pivotal scenes leading up to Inez and Ellen's escape. In the first of these scenes, the Bush patriarch has fired a shot in his niece Ellen's direction, and Inez appears to protest her captors' violence against her friend. Standing on a crag above the plains, Inez presents an imposing image to the Bushes who observe her from below. Deep sympathy for Ellen is legible on Inez's body: "One small and exquisitely molded hand was pressed on her heart, while with the other she made an impressive gesture" that seemed to signal "if further violence was mediated, to direct it against her bosom" (91). By offering herself in her friend's place, Inez suggests their interchangeability and conveys the selflessness that moves her to act.

In this scene, the Creole woman epitomizes an ideal of feminine beauty and feeling. She is both literally and figuratively elevated: “Her person, was of the smallest size that is believed to comport with beauty, and which poets and artists have chosen as the beau ideal of female loveliness. . . . The elevation at which she stood prevented a close examination of the lineaments of a countenance, which, however . . . [was] eloquent with feeling” (91). Inez’s display of her beauty and compassion establishes that she fits within American ideals of femininity and thus belongs to the U.S. nation. Moreover, her appearance prompts the eldest Bush son to denigrate his uncle Abiram for kidnapping a “white” woman (92). The sight of Inez’s distant form removes any ambiguity about her racial identity, and she appears a compassionate, beautiful white woman. Cooper highlights how sensibility, racial identity, and gender roles help differentiate proper U.S. subjects, including Spanish colonials, from the novel’s Native Americans. Notably, sensibility would remain a key marker for cultural, national, and racial difference across the century.<sup>48</sup>

Cooper again asserts Ellen and Inez’s national belonging through their affect when the band of friends arrives to rescue the young women. Natty desists from hastening the young couples along as Middleton’s desire to “look upon the face” of Inez is “natur, and ’tis wiser to give way a little before [his] feelings than to try to stop a current that will have its course” (173). The scene’s displays of emotion convey not only the men and women’s heterosexual love, but also the women’s sympathy for each other. Ellen is “nearly choked” by emotion at the sight of Inez and Middleton united and planning their escape, and the two women “seize” one another with “heart-felt warmth”

(173). These “natural” bonds transcend cultural distinctions and advance national expansion by uniting America’s newer and older citizens.

We can see the success of the cross-cultural friendship at integrating new citizens into the country when Inez’s bond to Ellen ceases to be necessary as a sign of Inez’s American belonging. Once reunited with their lovers, the women cast off the servility and enslavement that characterize their lives with the Bushes and instead serve as representatives of the nation’s happy domestic future. Their marital relationships, rather than their friendship, become their primary connection to the nation. Following Ellen’s marriage to Paul, she need not live with Inez and Duncan in order to escape the Bush family and return to the settlements. This alteration to the women’s earlier plans prevents Ellen from appearing as a dependent of the wealthy Inez, which might undermine Cooper’s depiction of Creoles as Anglo-Americans’ equals. While Cooper curtails the women’s relationship, it is nonetheless vital in establishing Inez’s relation to the nation.

Cooper depicts how the frontier engenders friendships that profoundly influence U.S. domestic life, though these same relations cannot exist within American society. Even the affinity between the two American men, Paul and Duncan, is international in the sense that their friendship develops on the frontier as they navigate cross-cultural alliances and violence. Collaborating in pursuit of their heterosexual relationships brings Duncan and Paul together and eventually helps draw Paul, a denizen of the frontier, into a “civilized” community. Paul and Duncan’s friendship parallels that between Barnstable and Griffith in *The Pilot*, as Cooper again explores how the pursuit of romantic relations dovetails with the pursuit of national interests in the global sphere. Moreover, both novels

depict how participating in the international sphere unites fellow citizens in pursuit of their shared goals.

Though such friendships benefit America by protecting its reproductive future, these bonds are altered by a return to the settlements. The frontier creates a temporary sense of equality where the men display their merit in their pursuit of Ellen and Inez and their combat against various national enemies and outlaws. Once the characters return to American settlements, Paul and Duncan's class standings differentiate their futures.<sup>49</sup> They share a continued sense of goodwill, but it is marked by inequality as Duncan confers "patronage" on Paul (376). Much as the American revolutionaries Griffith and Barnstable assume different spheres at the close of *The Pilot*, when the former inherits an estate and the latter becomes a captain in the newly formed navy, so too do Paul and Duncan develop their careers, in this case in different branches of government. In both novels, after the virtuous friends collaborate to protect their lovers and their nation, each man finds his own sphere based on his merits, as well as his education and class. Cooper implies that U.S. expansion fosters powerful affiliations, but also that the republican government can distinguish individuals' particular merits without creating the chaotic leveling of distinction that *The Pilot's* Tory Colonel Howard fears.

Perhaps the most significant frontier friendship in *The Prairie*—and the one that most clearly evokes the importance of cross-cultural attachments—is that between Natty and Hard-Heart. The two men play pivotal roles in protecting their band from danger; their affinity for each other prompts their collaboration in the interests of the larger group. When the band of friends encounters Hard-Heart, he is painted in "all the hues of the rainbow," so as to blend in with the landscape. While other characters initially

mistake the disguised Hard-Heart for a “monster” or “reptile,” Natty quickly identifies him as a human (182-3). At the surface this signals Natty’s familiarity with Native American customs, in this case what he refers to as “Indian paints and Indian deviltries” (183). Figuratively, the scene also conveys how Natty’s understanding of Native Americans leads him to recognize their humanity. Though his allusion to “Indian deviltries” seems derogatory, he addresses Hard-Heart affably. Natty invites the young man to “Come, forth from your cover, friend” (184). Speaking in Hard-Heart’s language, Natty renders his words all the warmer. In his ensuing friendship with Hard-Heart, Natty displays appreciation for his friend’s culture while retaining his own Euro-American identity. Schweitzer might read this bond as a commentary on the relations among diverse Americans, in light of Native tribes’ later incorporation as domestic dependent nations. Yet Hard-Heart and Natty’s friendship speaks to issues in U.S.-foreign relations, given that the Pawnee remain outside the settled nation and, in the novel, forge alliances with Euro-Americans at the tribe’s discretion.

As a model of foreign affiliations, Natty and Hard-Heart’s bond illustrates the importance of sympathy in fostering such international alliances. Their friendship resembles the Anglo-American bond between Manual and Borroughcliffe in *The Pilot*, insofar as both relationships reflect the men’s respect for one another’s shared capability in warfare and suggest that Americans’ military strength will help them gain allies. Yet it is not merely military prowess that unites Natty and Hard-Heart, but also their affective response to such conflict. When the Sioux capture the protagonists and Hard-Heart shows himself undaunted by physical pain, Natty declares, “my heart yearns to you, boy, and gladly would I do you good” (278). Natty’s remarks evoke Enlightenment arguments

about the power of stoicism to inspire sympathy.<sup>50</sup> Natty and Hard-Heart's ability to exercise self command over their own feelings while responding to others' suffering allows them to admire and sympathize with one another.

While Cooper offers a model for international affiliations through Natty and Hard-Heart's friendship, the novel also explores how this bond might exceed the trope of friendship. Their growing affinity eventually culminates in Hard-Heart's choice of Natty as his adoptive father (278; 313). Why transform the model foreign friendship into a familial bond? In part, this transformation attests to the strength of their elective affinity by associating it with natural, powerful bonds of kinship. Their bond becomes so strong that it exceeds the terms of friendship. This attachment suggests a positive outcome of U.S. expansion amidst the more violent effects that *The Prairie* portrays, including the kidnapping of Inez and the deaths of the eldest Bush son, his killer and uncle Abiram White, and the Sioux chief Mahtoree. While Natty and Hard-Heart's friendship is unusually strong, as evidenced by Cooper's familial language and Natty's choice to live with the Pawnee, their attachment constitutes a key link in a larger network of friendships and serves as a point of contrast to the text's more disturbing cross-cultural encounters.

Turning the men's foreign friendship into a familial bond conveys Cooper's optimism regarding America's foreign affinities, in part by creating a foil for the novel's more troubling blood-based relations. Even as he likens the men's relationship to that of a father and son, Cooper portrays elective affinities as more beneficial than the novel's blood-based family ties. Members of the Bush clan, the novel's central family, prove threatening not only to their ostensible enemies, like Natty, but also to one another. The matriarch's brother, Abiram, draws the family into his illicit kidnapping scheme. He

eventually murders his nephew, and his brother-in-law kills him for this sin, despite Abiram's ironic protestation that, "A man is surely safe among his kinsmen!" (359). The patriarch and matriarch exercise an oppressive influence over their family. For instance, they lead their niece Ellen onto the prairie in hopes of marrying her to their son, despite her desire to live in the settlements (144; 348). Cooper does not always represent family members as threatening to one another. By the novel's conclusion even the Bushes concede to Ellen's preference for Paul (349). Nonetheless, the troubling aspects of this family highlight the value of adoptive relations and friendships, which are elective and based on shared values and virtues that foster sympathy. Ellen is tied to the Bushes by compunction because they are the "nearest kin" of the "fatherless and motherless" girl (173). The risky act of forging foreign affiliations in the midst of U.S. expansion appears more secure by contrast to Americans' entanglement in a national family whose members do not share the same ideals.

When we read Natty and Hard-Heart's bond within the context of foreign relations, Natty's choice to live among the Pawnee epitomizes Appiah's description of a cosmopolitan patriot: someone who can be at home outside of the nation. Crucially, the men's bond persists even as they also maintain their different religious faiths. In his dying wishes, Natty insists he is distinct from the Pawnee by refusing their funerary customs in preference to Christian rites. His reflections on religion elucidate his cosmopolitan perspective: "There is much to be said in favor of both religions, for each seems suited to its own people, and no doubt it was so intended" (382). Natty's comparison of Pawnee and Euro-American cultures reveals his detachment from Christianity as he assesses how its social function compares to that of Pawnee faith and

acknowledges the value of both belief systems. As in *The Prairie*, foreign encounters engender sympathetic bonds, which in turn foster a cosmopolitan appreciation for diverse cultures.

Cooper emphasizes the relation between such cosmopolitan bonds and domestic ties by suggesting that the same mutual respect acquired through and essential to foreign affiliation becomes useful to domestic relations in the context of expansion. As a result, Natty and Hard-Heart's cross-cultural friendship resembles the marriage between Inez and Middleton. Though Cooper depicts the husband's Protestantism more sympathetically than the wife's Catholicism, Middleton comes to appreciate that he cannot undermine his wife's faith.<sup>51</sup> Indeed, her desire to convert him strengthens her initial attachment to him (159). While refusing the possibility that Middleton—an embodiment of the country's future—will become Catholic, Cooper nevertheless lauds the affection that her faith fosters. Through his marriage to Inez, Middleton unites his “personal merit” to her wealth, thereby gaining local and national influence and advancing his career (376). Despite their cultural differences, they possess strong affection that offers a counterpoint to the tyrannical family ties of the Bush clan. While the couple's differences create obstacles to their marriage, their elective bond is stronger and more egalitarian than the Bushes' blood-based bond, and implies that Spanish colonials gladly united with Anglo-Americans. Cooper thus raises questions about how Americans could bridge their religious differences that would resurface as the U.S. nation repeatedly incorporated former Spanish colonial populations and subsumed new lands. In particular, we see a resurgent interest in the difficulties and benefits of marriages between Catholic Creoles and Protestant Anglo-Americans in María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's



novels from the 1870s and 1880s, the subject of my third chapter. Ruiz de Burton's novels attest that authors returned to ideals of sympathy and cosmopolitanism, which Cooper draws on, when exploring how to unify American citizens across such cultural differences.

In creating a parallel between international relations and cross-cultural domestic ties, though, Cooper does not collapse the distinction between these two distinct sympathetic bonds. In fact, Natty and Hard-Heart's relationship offers a key point of contrast to Inez and Middleton's marriage. The greater difference between Natty's and Hard-Heart's faiths lessens the apparent difference within the Catholic and Protestant marriage and provides reassurance of the strength of this union. In *The Prairie*, tension emerges between the desirability of preserving cultural differences and fostering national cohesion while incorporating new territory and peoples. Nonetheless, by creating characters who possess both a sense of connection to one another and a respect for differences that distinguish them from each other, Cooper suggests that forging international affiliations is as important to America as the incorporation of new citizens.

Reading the friendships between Euro- and Native American characters within this international framework allows us to link these bonds to the friendships Cooper depicts among Africans and Euro-Americans in novels like *The Red Rover: A Tale* (1827).<sup>52</sup> By representing Euro-Americans' friendships with both Native Americans and Africans, he evokes Americans' capacity to forge relationships with dispossessed and oppressed peoples. These relationships emphasize particular groups' racial and cultural "foreignness," even as Cooper asserts their centrality to early American life. Such representations may reflect a troubling desire to deny African Americans and Native

Americans citizenship and national belonging. Yet Cooper's representations of international, interracial friendships are also more nuanced than this suggests. For example, scenes where his "foreign" characters save the American protagonists demonstrate how the nation's welfare depends upon foreign peoples. By depicting cross-cultural affiliations as essential to America, his work implies the need for cosmopolitan patriotism.

Drawing on Appiah's conception of cosmopolitanism to reconsider Cooper's novels does not recover these texts from their association with imperial expansion and racial hierarchy. Cosmopolitanism has, after all, come under criticism for conferring authority on Western elites who possess the mobility to travel and acquire knowledge of other cultures. As David Simpson argues, there is a paradox in this philosophy; while it is often understood "as respect for and interest in the other, the unknown," this definition "runs against the sense that what marks the cosmopolitan person is *already knowing* what needs to be known."<sup>53</sup> When the cosmopolitan presumes that he possesses greater knowledge than the foreign peoples he observes, this affords him a sense of authority to judge others' customs and values, reinforcing cultural hierarchies.

This problem of authority surfaces in Cooper's vision of cosmopolitan exchange, as it is entangled with his desire to spread republicanism. While Cooper lauds other countries' cultural advancement, he suggests that Americans have a better understanding of government than the peoples he hopes to influence. He argues for U.S. involvement in foreign affairs in order to spread republicanism, and this raises questions about how intervention might threaten foreign peoples' autonomy, particularly given Cooper's interest in territorial expansion in novels like *The Prairie*. Likewise, *The Pilot's*

representation of America as England's military equal asserts America's independence from the British Empire, but also likens the republic to an empire.<sup>54</sup> Tension between cosmopolitanism's emphasis on valuing foreign cultures and on asserting particular individuals' and cultures' authority over others recurred throughout nineteenth-century literature, as we see in the next chapter's analysis of how Maria Cummins deploys ideals of cosmopolitan sympathy to valorize Americans who spread Christianity abroad. Reading Cooper in relation to cosmopolitanism thus underscores the troubling aspects of his internationalism. Through his personal relationships, his political advocacy for U.S. involvement in European reform, and his fictional narratives of friendship, Cooper expressed complex interests in emulating, influencing, and competing with other nations and peoples.

### *The Deerslayer*: Cosmopolitan Despair in Antebellum America

Turning to Cooper's fiction from the 1840s highlights the power and value that he assigns to cross-cultural sympathy in his novels of the 1820s, while revealing his growing concern that such sympathy was absent from U.S. culture and foreign relations. In particular, *The Deerslayer* presents a destructive, dehumanizing vision of international encounter.<sup>55</sup> This novel offers a useful point of contrast because, as a historical romance, it shares a variety of formal elements with *The Pilot* and *The Prairie*. *The Deerslayer*, too, tells a story about America's origins by interweaving courtship plots with scenes of international warfare. Yet whereas Cooper's earlier novels imply that the battles they depict foster cross-cultural amity, *The Deerslayer* emphasizes that warfare simply

engenders further violence. This later romance ends without a successful Euro-American marriage, which in earlier novels promises a happy national future. Instead of portraying how early Americans fostered the country's development through their foreign affiliations, *The Deerslayer* depicts the degenerative effects of colonial warfare among the British, French, American colonists, and Native Americans. The novel's conflicts suggest that Cooper had altered his views on the nation's global role in response to America's violent expansion during the Age of Jackson and, on a personal level, the vitriolic, politically motivated reviews of his work. Through a brief analysis of *The Deerslayer*, we can consider how Cooper's representation of foreign affiliations had changed by the 1840s, as well as how antebellum novelists more broadly portrayed U.S.-foreign relations, which is the subject of the next chapter.

Whereas Cooper's novels from the 1820s evoke cosmopolitan patriotism, his novels from the early 1840s express what Hsuan Hsu calls "cosmopolitan despair." Hsu employs this phrase to describe how Herman Melville "exposes the inequalities and cultural violence that underlie the dissolution of national boundaries."<sup>56</sup> Writing just a few years before Melville, Cooper likewise emphasizes the potential for cross-cultural encounters to foster disturbing violence. Cooper's representation of American violence also resonates with Crèvecoeur's much earlier depictions of American violence and instability. Yet where Crèvecoeur's *Letters From an American Farmer* depicts the Revolutionary War as disrupting America's cosmopolitan ties to Europe, Cooper's *The Deerslayer* asserts that America's colonial origins were already rife with cross-cultural violence. Notably, both Melville and Cooper convey the problems of foreign encounters, in part, through their representations of international friendship.<sup>57</sup> Their novels

demonstrate how nineteenth-century writers drew on the trope of friendship not only to convey the value of foreign affiliations, as Cooper does in *The Pilot* and *The Prairie*, but also to criticize a lack of compassion for foreign peoples. In *The Deerslayer*, Cooper continues to value friendships, like Natty and Chingachgook's, that are based in a strong sense of sympathy. As Natty insists, "fri'ndship counts for something."<sup>58</sup> However their connection appears exceptional and so by contrast to the novel's other relationships emphasizes the difficulty of developing the sympathetic attachments that many antebellum novels laud.

At the same time that Melville and Cooper criticize Americans' failure of feeling, they highlight the possibility for cross-cultural attachments. In particular, Cooper's recurring scenes of self-sacrificing friendship promise that there are alternatives to the nation's history of violence. While his novels depict foreign friendships that develop outside of settlements in border spaces and foreign territories, these relationships nonetheless influence America's future. Therefore, it is worth considering both how Cooper's perspective changes over the course of his career and how he consistently represents the possibility of cross-cultural sympathy. *The Deerslayer's* mordant narrative refuses to reconcile tensions between international friendships and national loyalties; yet it nonetheless has much in common with his earlier novels.

Set on Lake Glimmerglass during the French and Indian War, *The Deerslayer* follows Natty in his efforts to help his Delaware friend Chingachgook free his love interest Wah-ta!-Wah from the "Hurons" or Wyandots who have captured her. Because the Native tribes and colonial settlers are entangled in England and France's imperial conflict, Natty and Chingachgook's personal mission involves them in international

warfare. While traveling with his acquaintance Harry March, Natty becomes involved in protecting the Hutter family—the father Thomas and his ostensible daughters Judith and Hetty—from Wyandot attacks. In a series of skirmishes, Natty kills a Wyandot. He acquits himself so well that the tribe condescends to offer him what is in their view “the honor” of marrying the man’s widow (473). However, Natty refuses to “take a wife, under red-skin forms” (472).<sup>59</sup> The conflict escalates as Harry kills a Wyandot woman and the Wyandots kill Thomas Hutter, who reveals on his deathbed that his daughters are adopted and illegitimate. At the novel’s close, British troops arrive to defeat the Wyandots, releasing Natty from his captivity. His aid inspires Judith Hutter’s romantic interest. Faced with his impending departure, she proposes and is refused. Natty’s choice of his “constant friend” over marriage to the allegedly promiscuous Judith conveys his well-known desire for purity (546). Yet through this refusal, Cooper also critiques the lack of sympathy endemic to American society, which manifests itself in the novel’s seductions and murders.<sup>60</sup>

*The Deerslayer* evokes the threat that, in the absence of compassion, foreign alliances will prove degenerative, rather than spreading cultural accomplishments. We see such degradation, for instance, in the dissolution of the Hutter family. By the close of the novel, Judith loses her sister Hetty and adoptive father Hutter. Further, in reading her deceased mother’s letters, Judith discovers that her birth father was a wealthy European who seduced her mother, a young colonial woman (411). Like so many early American seduction novels, this backstory explores how transatlantic relations make young women vulnerable.<sup>61</sup> Entwining this story with Hutter’s history as a pirate suggests that in colonial America, morality and law fail to provide a check on self-interest and illicit

desires. Cooper hints that Judith has compromised her reputation through her relationships with members of the British regiment; her downfall implies that the younger characters inherit and perpetuate the prior generation's degeneracy.

Cooper's concerns about the effects of international encounters are most apparent in his depictions of warfare. In particular, Cooper interrogates patterns of cultural influence through the question of who should scalp, which surfaces repeatedly in the *Leatherstocking Tales*.<sup>62</sup> Because scalping is associated with profiting from another's death, it seems diametrically opposed to sympathy. Indeed, Natty objects to the inhumanity of Harry and Hutter's plans to attack the Wyandot camp at night in hopes of finding ready victims for scalping. The callous treatment of human life and indiscriminate attacks on vulnerable members of the enemy tribe stand in sharp contrast to the sentiment Natty displays when he comforts the first man he kills as the Wyandot warrior dies (123-5).

Nonetheless, Natty expresses a desire to scalp his enemy that—contrary to his white companions' disregard for Native lives—reveals Natty's sympathetic identification with the Delaware. After killing his enemy, Natty admits it is a struggle not to participate in the Delaware tradition of scalping because, “I *should* like Chingachgook to know that I have'n't discredited the Delawares, or my training!” (126). We can see that Natty's impulse to scalp is not based in indifference toward Native Americans' lives, because this death moves him. Rather, his monologue demonstrates his ties to the Delaware, while his resistance to this desire reflects his belief that what is acceptable for Native Americans is not for white men. He attempts to justify Native scalping practices by drawing on the language of “gifts” and offers several confusing and conflicting explanations of racial

difference.<sup>63</sup> Still, Natty consistently asserts that some differences between distinct races or cultures should be accepted. He simultaneously reinforces notions of savage natives and articulates the stance of a cultural relativist.

By labeling scalping a Native American custom, Cooper initially appears to suggest that frontier life infects American colonists with “savage” practices. Indeed, according to Natty, the cultural exchanges surrounding the practice of scalping threaten white men’s identities. He explains his choice not to scalp his enemy by declaring “White I was born, and white will I die; clinging to colour to the last, even though the King’s Majesty, his governors, and all his councils, both at home and in the colonies, forget from what they come, and where they hope to go, and all for a little advantage in warfare” (125).<sup>64</sup> Here, Natty distinguishes between races based on the forms of violence they practice. By linking scalping to Native Americans and guns to Euro-Americans, he may seem to assert that the latter are more advanced.<sup>65</sup>

However, these racial definitions crumble under the weight of white men’s behavior in international warfare. This is not because Natty’s sympathy links him to Native Americans, though his monologue about scalping raises the possibility that his feeling might compromise his racial identity. Rather, the problem is that the other Euro-Americans and Europeans lack sympathy for Native Americans. Harry and Hutter are cavalier in their readiness to kill any one who is not white. Hutter’s eventual scalping and death demonstrate that Euro-Americans’ perpetuation of unfeeling violence against others is their own undoing. Even Hutter’s loving “daughter” Hetty proclaims, “Father went for scalps, himself, and now where is his own? The bible might have foretold this



dreadful punishment” (356). His wound exemplifies the culture of violence that European colonists, soldiers, and imperial governments have created.

The British and French use of scalping to advance the French and Indian War not only exacerbates cross-cultural and international violence, but also alters the practice of scalping. *The Deerslayer* assigns the European governors and kings responsibility for promoting this ostensibly native custom by repeatedly noting that they pay for scalps. For instance, when the Wyandots take Hutter and Harry captive, Natty is surprised to learn that they will be scalped rather than returned to the Wyandot lodges. A Wyandot boy explains, “Wigwam full, and scalps sell high. Small scalp, much gold” (231). In this example, cultural exchange is threatening because it inspires mercenary violence. The Europeans’ destructive war policy threatens to turn human bodies into money and makes a lack of compassion financially expedient. Within this context, we might view scalping as a grotesque result of cosmopolitanism, as it develops from Europeans’ and colonial Americans’ appropriation of what is ostensibly another people’s cultural practice. The novel’s disturbing violence sheds light on why Natty struggles to distinguish which behaviors or customs ought to belong to particular peoples: he has seen the bloody outcome of cross-cultural influence. More broadly, Cooper suggests that America’s history of cross-cultural violence constitutes a detrimental influence on the country. Nineteenth-century foreign encounters that were likewise based in mercenary desires and a disregard for foreign cultures and lives would stymie national development, rather than advancing it.

The depictions of Euro-Americans’ attempts to scalp Native women, in particular, offers an incisive criticism of Americans and foreshadows the novel’s final, gory battle.

When a British regiment arrives to defeat the Wyandots, the soldiers only save Cooper's protagonists at the price of accidentally killing Hetty, whose status as a "*non compis mentis*," or someone with limited mental development, has ensured her safety from the Wyandots throughout the novel. During the nineteenth-century, the treatment of women served as a measure of how "civilized" different peoples were. Hetty's death undermines Euro-American claims to "civilization" and cultural superiority.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, Cooper writes, "The scene that succeeded was one of those, of which so many have occurred in our own times, in which neither age nor sex forms an exemption to the lot of a savage warfare" (522). The phrase "savage warfare" here describes both British practices of warfare in the novel and Americans' violence in Cooper's own day. European and American savagery fosters indifference toward vulnerable women. This constitutes a substantial shift from Cooper's earlier emphasis on how Anglo-American men collaborate to protect women and ensure their participation in the national future, as seen in *The Prairie*. Further, this "savagery" disrupts Cooper's vision of American friendship expanding outward to encompass new peoples.<sup>67</sup> *The Deerslayer* evinces little hope that Euro-Americans' international genealogy equips them either to create happy homes or to forge foreign affiliations, and so breaks from Cooper's romances of the 1820s.

In the context of unfeeling violence that pervades *The Deerslayer*, Natty's sympathy for Native Americans becomes the standard against which other characters may be measured. Early in the novel, he claims that, "In a state of lawful warfare . . . it is a duty to keep down all compassionate feelin's" (50). However, Natty appears remarkable less for his ability to repress his compassion than for the fact that he possesses any compassion to repress. His friendships, particularly with Chingachgook,

provide him insight into the alterations that cultural contact creates and give the lie to Harry's claims that scalping Indians is equivalent to killing animals (85).<sup>68</sup> By contrast, Natty's argument for preserving racial difference offers a way to make sense of cultural/racial differences without conceding to arguments that Native Americans are a lesser species. His convoluted explanations of difference are radically limited in their persuasive appeal: he cannot stop his companions' various attempts on the lives of the Wyandots, alter their perceptions of Native Americans, or protect the Euro-American women from friendly fire. Still, while *The Deerslayer* complicates the more optimistic representation of cross-cultural affiliation in Cooper's earlier writing, it continues to treat sympathy as an ideal. Natty demonstrates the importance of cross-cultural affinities to domestic unions by helping Chingachgook rescue Wah-ta!-Wah. In turn, the couple insists upon rescuing Natty when he is taken captive. Cooper is far from certain that amicable, reciprocal relations are representative of America's past or present; nevertheless, he depicts them as essential to creating a "civilized" future.<sup>69</sup>

The differences between *The Deerslayer* and earlier novels like *The Prairie* and *The Pilot* speak to a number of changes in federal policies and foreign relations that occurred during the 1830s. The Supreme Court and state law had consolidated the designation of Native American tribes as "domestic dependent nations," radically curtailing, if not entirely eliminating, their sovereignty and seemingly foreclosing the possibility of Native American assimilation. Though Cooper addressed the ongoing encroachment of Euro-Americans onto Native lands in *The Prairie* and other works from the 1820s, the Indian Removal Act—which formally sanctioned breaking a number of treaties with tribes—was not passed until 1830.<sup>70</sup> The Age of Jackson became known for

its violence, including the forcible dispossession of Native American tribes. During the 1830s, Cooper had also observed the United States limiting its involvement in international alliances following France's July Revolution. Americans resisted supporting or interfering in France's attempts at republican reform, despite the two nations' history of affiliation and affinity expressed in agreements such as the 1778 Treaty of Alliance and Treaty of Amity and Commerce. The Indian Removal Act and the American reaction to the July Revolution might seem quite disparate if we view the former as an act of aggression and the latter as an expression of neutrality. Nonetheless, in both instances Americans refused to participate in the forms of international and cross-cultural affiliation that Cooper's novels laud. *The Deerslayer* provides a genealogy for this failure of compassion and affiliation, by depicting French, British, and colonial Americans' troubling encounters in the eighteenth century.<sup>71</sup>

Despite the differences among Cooper's novels, though, all of these texts illuminate sympathy's relationship to social and political change. As Jonathan Lamb argues, "sympathy thrives in situations of comparative powerlessness in which the function and tendency of social roles is no longer directly apparent to those who fill them."<sup>72</sup> By centering *The Pilot*, *The Prairie*, *The Deerslayer*, and other novels on moments of warfare and revolution, Cooper explores how such moments create an opportunity for Americans to redefine their relations to the world by forging new affiliations. The U.S. nation was long deemed an "experiment" in republican government. As Americans' political relations still appeared unstable and changeable in Cooper's own day, fellow-feeling remained an important influence on Americans' relations to one another and to other countries. Cooper participates in the larger process of re-

conceptualizing these relationships by representing Americans' friendships with an array of foreign peoples. Even novels like *The Deerslayer*, in which sympathy and friendship are rare, value such affiliations. Through the trope of foreign friendship, Cooper's work speaks to Americans' aspirations and anxieties regarding their nation's ties to and influence on the world.

Like Cooper, a number of antebellum novelists also drew on narratives of American origins and sympathetic tropes in order to assert the importance of U.S.-foreign affiliations. Attempts to redefine America's relation to the global sphere became particularly fraught as revolutions swept throughout Europe in the late 1840s. Rebellions among the French, Hungarians, Polish, Swiss, and Italians, among others, created conditions of instability in which, as Lamb argues, sympathy took on heightened importance. Much as Cooper had supported republican reform and revolution in France and Poland in the 1820s and early 1830s, a number of antebellum writers advocated U.S. intervention in the international sphere during the late 1840s. Some Americans rallied behind the Hungarians' rebellion against the Austrian government, and others asserted the need to support Italian revolutionaries' efforts to unify the states into a republic. For instance, Margaret Fuller pled for European reform and revolution through her dispatches to the *New-York Tribune* from 1846 to 1850. She called on Americans to support the Italian states in their efforts to secure independence from Austria without falling under Napoleon III's rule. While her letters concede that the U.S. government should not get involved in European politics directly, she asserts that American citizens should send donations and do anything "brotherly" they can for the Italians.<sup>73</sup> Fuller, like Cooper, draws on cosmopolitan patriotism to argue that foreign ties can strengthen the nation's

identity. Her dispatches trace how her affinity for Italians, like the revolutionary Giuseppe Mazzini, inspires a greater sense of patriotism: “The American in Europe, if a thinking mind, can only become more American.”<sup>74</sup> For Fuller and Cooper, close observation of foreign empires could inspire stronger attachment to U.S. republican ideals.

Nonetheless, Cooper was hardly alone in expressing concern that Americans’ participation in the international sphere led to exploitation and violence, rather than beneficial foreign affiliations. Indeed, Fuller critiqued America by asserting the need to advance women’s rights and enable their intellectual contributions to U.S. culture, as well as lamenting Americans’ “boundless lust for gain” and the “horrible cancer of slavery.”<sup>75</sup> While Cooper’s and Fuller’s work reminds us that the ideal of cosmopolitan patriotism proved important to early national and antebellum literature, both writers at times despaired over the slow course of revolution abroad and Americans’ failure to embody republican ideals.

Despite this sense of despair, antebellum writers would continue to explore Americans’ ability to forge valuable foreign alliances by writing on the value and limits of international affiliations. At times, these writers even argue that Americans are morally obligated to participate in the global sphere. Novelists such as Maria Susanna Cummins and Nathaniel Hawthorne express concerns that foreign entanglements render the country vulnerable or disrupt its cultural ideals, as well as considering how such ties might instead strengthen America.<sup>76</sup> Yet whereas Cooper explores how Americans could develop foreign friendships while maintaining their patriotism, Cummins and Hawthorne, as I discuss in the next chapter, place less emphasis on how nationalist sentiments shape

foreign ties. Instead, their novels represent how religious faith, specifically notions of Christian sisterhood, could offer a basis for Americans' foreign affiliations.

Chapter Two examines antebellum novels that assert Christianity's profound influence on America's global role. I consider how Cummins and Hawthorne portray the influence of religious faith on the cross-cultural attachments that their American characters form in Syria and Italy, respectively. These novelists' representations of religion resonate with *The Pilot* and *The Prairie*, which consider how diverse peoples can forge strong attachments, either because or in spite of their faiths.<sup>77</sup> Yet Cummins and Hawthorne offer more extensive meditations on questions such as how religion links Americans to the world and when differences of belief disrupt Americans' foreign affinities. Both writers suggest that—in the midst of foreign revolutions, imperial conflicts, and America's increasing sectional divisions—spiritual faith provides a guide to U.S. international relations. Cummins and Hawthorne face many of the same challenges as Cooper in envisioning global sympathy; their novels raise concerns about the degree to which feeling bridges cultural differences or reifies cultural and racial hierarchies. Yet like Cooper, these novelists depict how Americans, whose sympathetic bonds transcend the nation, are already immersed in global attachments and politics.

---

<sup>1</sup> Leslie Fiedler, *Love and Death in the American Novel*; Ivy Schweitzer, *Perfecting Friendship: Politics and Affiliation in Early American Literature*.

<sup>2</sup> Lydia Maria Child's *Hobomok* (1824). This theme remains important to later works, such as Susan Warner's *The Wide, Wide World* (1850) and Frederick Douglass's *The Heroic Slave* (1853).

<sup>3</sup> This analogy of the bonds of citizenship to those of friendship did not do away with the conception of the nation as a family, but rather paralleled the shift in understandings of the ties between family members and fellow citizens from more tyrannical to more egalitarian relations, which Jay Fliegelman explores. In other words, in the eighteenth

---

and nineteenth centuries both friendship and family offered more egalitarian models of relations among citizens than did older models of familial bonds.

<sup>4</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), 265.

<sup>5</sup> David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1740), 403.

<sup>6</sup> Caleb Crain's *American Sympathy: Men, Friendship, and Literature in the New Nation*; Richard Godbeer's *The Overflowing of Friendship: Love Between Men and the Creation of the American Republic*; and Ivy Schweitzer's *Perfecting Friendship*.

<sup>7</sup> Schweitzer, *Perfecting Friendship*.

<sup>8</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 175.

<sup>9</sup> For example, Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* is often cited for its exploration of the relation between sympathy and the nation (though he briefly considers the extent to which sympathy can exist between nations). Centuries later, theorists of nationalism remain interested in the mechanisms that inspire a sense of fellow-feeling among citizens, as we see in Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.

<sup>10</sup> Ivy Schweitzer, for instance, reads Cooper's narratives of amicable relationships as justifying Euro-American land appropriation, arguing that the novelist imagines these lands as a kind of inheritance bequeathed by a dying people to a more advanced civilization, *Perfecting Friendship*. In contrast, Barbara Alice Mann challenges the association of Cooper with racism by emphasizing that many of his contemporaries criticized his fiction as overly sympathetic to Native Americans, "Race Traitor: Cooper, His Critics, and Nineteenth-Century Literary Politics."

<sup>11</sup> Mark Rifkin argues that settlers' "feeling of connection to [America] as citizens of the state actively efface[s] ongoing histories of imperial expropriation and contribute[s] to the continuing justification of the settler state's authority to superintend Native peoples" (342).

<sup>12</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, "Cosmopolitan Patriots."

<sup>13</sup> Sandra Gustafson, "Histories of Democracy and Empire," 124. Gustafson notes this traditional reading of *The Leatherstocking Tales* in making the argument that the novels actually depict how democracy and imperialism are at odds with one another. Notably, she suggests that Cooper's travels to Europe influenced his ideas about democracy and his representations of them in his fiction.

<sup>14</sup> J. Gerald Kennedy, "Cooper's Quarrel with America," 92.

<sup>15</sup> Cooper's novels anticipate recent arguments of scholars such as Karen Ordahl Kupperman, who writes that "American history was . . . international before it was national." "International at the Creation: Early Modern American History," 106.

<sup>16</sup> Ernest Renan, "What is a nation?" 19.



---

<sup>17</sup> Leland S. Person, “James Fenimore Cooper, 1789-1851: A Brief Biography” in *A Historical Guide to James Fenimore Cooper*; Wayne Franklin's *James Fenimore Cooper: The Early Years*.

<sup>18</sup> Cooper's role as the American Sir Walter Scott was established even in his own day; see Wayne Franklin's “A Brief Biography.” On Cooper's debt to Jane Austen, see Barbara Alice Mann. On the influence of John Liddiard Nicholas's depiction of the Maori on Cooper's representations of Native Americans, see Geoffrey Sanborn.

<sup>19</sup> William L. Hedges, Ed, “Introduction” to *The Legend of Sleepy Hollow and Other Stories: The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent.* By Washington Irving; J. Gerald Kennedy “Cooper's Quarrel with America” in *A Historical Guide to James Fenimore Cooper*.

<sup>20</sup> Joseph Rezek provides a more detailed account of Cooper's revisions to the London editions of his earlier novels, “Cooper and Scott in the Anglophone Literary Field: *The Pioneers*, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and the Effects of Provinciality.”

<sup>21</sup> James Fenimore Cooper, *Gleanings in Europe: England* (1837) and *Notions of the Americans* (1824).

<sup>22</sup> James Fenimore Cooper, “Letter to General Lafayette.” Anne C. Loveland discusses the tension between Cooper's vision of American influence in spreading democracy and contemporaneous views that democracy was particularly suited to America, “James Fenimore Cooper and the American Mission.” The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 also speaks to the arguments against American intervention in Europe. As Daniel Walker Howe writes, “in a gesture of reciprocal isolationism the United States resolved that it would not intervene in European wars or ‘internal concerns,’” *What Hath God Wrought?: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*, 115.

<sup>23</sup> James Fenimore Cooper, *Gleanings in Europe: France* (1837).

<sup>24</sup> Critics offer several different arguments for why Cooper's popularity waned in the 1830s. For instance, Robert Zoellner asserts that Cooper's American readers could perceive his alienation from the country. Meanwhile, Anne Loveland asserts that Cooper's understanding of the “American mission,” differed fundamentally from that of his critics, but also notes that Cooper believed the conflict to be the result of his critics' “aristocratic tendencies” (Loveland 247).

<sup>25</sup> On Cooper's grim response to the nation in fiction from the 1840s, including *The Deerslayer* and his dystopian novel *The Crater* (1847), see Robert S. Levine's *Conspiracy and Romance: Studies in Brockden Brown, Cooper, Hawthorne, and Melville*.

<sup>26</sup> James Crane briefly comments on Borroughcliffe and Manual's friendship in “Love and Merit in the Maritime Historical Novel: Cooper and Scott.” However, he interprets the Anglo-American relationship as part of Cooper's larger emphasis on the value of the U.S. republic, which he suggests wins out over the Old World traditions. By contrast, I suggest Cooper establishes Americans as the equals of the British, with whom Americans can engage in productive exchange.

---

<sup>27</sup> James Fenimore Cooper, *The Pilot: A Tale of the Sea*, 151. Subsequent references to this edition will appear parenthetically in the text.

<sup>28</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 175.

<sup>29</sup> For a discussion of the paternal metaphors used to describe Britain's relation to England, as well as how early American authors revised these metaphors, see Michael Gilmore.

<sup>30</sup> Leland Person, "James Fenimore Cooper, 1789-1851: A Brief Biography"; Wayne Franklin, *James Fenimore Cooper: The Early Years*.

<sup>31</sup> Joseph Rezek, "Cooper and Scott in the Anglophone Literary Field: *The Pioneers*, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and the Effects of Provinciality," 893. For example, Rezek focuses on *The Pioneers; or, The Sources of the Susquehanna* (1823). Rezek also calls attention to "the transatlantic address" of the London editions of Cooper's novels, which he analyzes in order to show Cooper's strong interest in developing his British readership and the influence of this interest on his novels.

<sup>32</sup> Edward Larkin, "The Cosmopolitan Revolution: Loyalism and the Fiction of an American Nation," 58.

<sup>33</sup> Caleb Crain, *American Sympathy: Men, Friendship, and Literature in the New Nation*, 103.

<sup>34</sup> For instance, Jared Gardner reads Charles Brockden Brown's writing in relation to the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 and tensions over how to define the emergent republic, whereas Janie Hinds emphasizes the relation between the novel and continued anxiety over how national borders could be shored against Native Americans. Also, Caleb Crain's *American Sympathy* presents an extended explanation of Charles Brockden Brown's suspicion of sympathy. Jared Gardner's "Alien Nation: *Edgar Huntly's* Savage Awakening"; Janie Hinds's "Deb's Dogs: Animals, Indians, and Postcolonial Desire in Charles Brockden Brown's *Edgar Huntly*."

<sup>35</sup> This treaty addressed a variety of territorial conflicts, for instance over fishing rights, the Canada/Louisiana Purchase boundary, and the rights to Oregon Country, as well as "the issue of British payment for persons rescued from American slavery during the War of 1812" (97). David Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought?: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*.

<sup>36</sup> The Holy Allies were "an association of the reactionary powers of continental Europe under the nominal leadership of the Russian tsar," which threatened to help Bourbon Spain resume its power in Spanish America (111-112). David Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought?: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*.

<sup>37</sup> Jay Sexton, *The Monroe Doctrine: Empire and Nation in Nineteenth-Century America*. Specifically, Sexton notes that when the British foreign secretary, George Canning, proposed a joint declaration against the Holy Allies, the "Massachusetts diplomat Alexander Hill Everett went so far as to contend that Anglo-American relations had evolved 'into a situation of virtual alliance and amity,'" and that similar thinking

---

underlay the responses of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and John C. Calhoun, amongst others (50).

<sup>38</sup> Sexton notes that, “It is perhaps not a coincidence that those most in favor of accepting Secretary Canning’s proposal were all Southerners (Monroe, Calhoun, and Jefferson) who viewed Britain as a potential export market, whereas the man opposed to the joint declaration (Adams) came from the mercantile and industrial center of New England, which increasingly regarded Britain as a great commercial and industrial rival” (76). *The Monroe Doctrine: Empire and Nation in Nineteenth-Century America*

<sup>39</sup> Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought?*, 258-259.

<sup>40</sup> Schweitzer, *Perfecting Friendship: Politics and Affiliation in Early American Literature*, 144.

<sup>41</sup> James Fenimore Cooper, *The Prairie*, 156. Subsequent references to this edition will appear parenthetically in the text.

<sup>42</sup> Rebecca Lush offers an extended analysis of how Inez functions as a site of desire through which Cooper can define the nation’s racial and cultural borders. Lush also notes that while Cooper does not always deny the possibility of intermarriage, neither does he imagine a happy and productive union between Euro-Americans and Native Americans in his novels, “‘Louisianian Lady’: Racial Ambiguity, Gender, and National Identity in Cooper’s *The Prairie*.”

<sup>43</sup> Leslie Fiedler describes Natty and Chingachgook’s friendship as “the pure marriage of males—sexless and holy, a kind of counter-matrimony, in which the white refugee from society and the dark-skinned primitive are joined till death do them part” (211). *Love and Death in the American Novel*.

<sup>44</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 175.

<sup>45</sup> Adam Smith expounds on the expansiveness of friendship: “Such friendships [among men of virtue] . . . may safely embrace all the wise and virtuous . . . Those who would confine friendship to two persons, seem to confound the wise security of friendship with the jealousy and folly of love.” (265-66).

<sup>46</sup> Caleb Crain, *American Sympathy*; Richard Godbeer, *The Overflowing of Friendship*. Barbara Alice Mann’s examination of Jane Austen’s influence on Cooper has also pointed the way for this analysis, attesting that his fiction likewise affords considerable importance to sisterly relationships, including female friendships. Mann thereby challenges the misconception that Cooper’s most significant writing is about men’s relationships that are predicated upon the exclusion of women. “Aunt Jane and Father Fenimore: The Influence of Jane Austen on James Fenimore Cooper.”

<sup>47</sup> Cooper foregrounds the connection between Inez and slaves by depicting how a criminal who steals slaves to resell them as also selling Middleton knowledge of Inez’s whereabouts (165-7). In effect, she has become part of the system of slave trade and theft.

<sup>48</sup> This continuity is apparent in the work of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, the subject of my third chapter, which draws on the association of Spanish heritage with whiteness and

---

a refined sensibility to contest racism against Spanish-descended Mexicans and to assert Mexican Americans' ability to become part of the U.S. nation.

<sup>49</sup> Dana Nelson reads the absence of white male friendship in Cooper's fiction as a reflection of the economic pressures placing men in competition, "Cooper's Leatherstocking Conversations: Identity, Friendship, and Democracy in the New Nation." Here, though, the frontier permits new relations through an escape not from intra-class competition, but from class divisions.

<sup>50</sup> Jonathan Lamb notes that stoicism . . . was "a topos in primitivism," used by Montaigne and Leibniz, as well as by Smith, and that for Smith in particular "such stoicism in the face of painful death is the primary qualification for sympathy among civilized people" (71). *The Evolution of Sympathy in the Long Eighteenth Century*.

<sup>51</sup> Specifically, Cooper appears critical of Catholicism when he suggests that Inez's priest opportunistically uses her disappearance "in the impending warfare of faith," rather than responding sympathetically and heroically, as does Middleton (162).

<sup>52</sup> Among other novels, Cooper also includes African characters in *The Water-Witch; or, The Skimmer of the Seas* (1830), his one romance to be set in the seventeenth century. However, this novel focuses more closely on the alliances that New York's Dutch settlers forged with other colonial Euro-Americans, while depicting Africans as slaves, rather than friends to the white characters.

<sup>53</sup> David Simpson, "The Limits of Cosmopolitanism and the Case for Translation," 54.

<sup>54</sup> Some critics contest the association of Cooper's work with inclusiveness and respect for difference, instead arguing that he naturalizes the displacement of Native Americans and that he expresses nativist fears about immigration. Leland S. Person, "The Historical Paradoxes of Manhood in Cooper's *The Deerslayer*"; Thomas Gladsky, "James Fenimore Cooper and American Nativism."

<sup>55</sup> Critics who argue that Cooper presents a bleak vision of America often draw on his later works, including the last two volumes of the Leatherstocking Tales. It is the considerable attention to this series and Natty's role within it that has led scholars like Fiedler to argue that Cooper depicts ideal friendship as something that can only exist in an escape from society and marriage. Meanwhile, scholars such as Robert S. Levine trace a trajectory across Cooper's work, arguing that his later works evince a greater sense of despair over America than his earlier novels.

<sup>56</sup> Hsuan Hsu, *Geography and The Production of Space in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*, 155.

<sup>57</sup> Critics have analyzed how Melville's depictions of cross-cultural and interracial relations in novels like *Moby-Dick* (1851) and *Typee* (1846) offer a means to critique U.S. culture, even including the sympathy that his white American protagonists display for foreign peoples of color. For a discussion of "false sympathy" in Melville's fiction, see Mitchel Breitwieser.

<sup>58</sup> James Fenimore Cooper, *The Deerslayer or, The First War-Path*, 273. Subsequent references to this edition will appear parenthetically in the text.

---

<sup>59</sup> Cooper acknowledges that the practice of allowing a captive and enemy to marry into the tribe was “by no means unusual among the Indians.” However, he suggests that the Wyandots view this instance of the practice as conferring an honor on Natty because he is “a pale face” (473).

<sup>60</sup> In “Savage and Scottish Masculinity in *The Last of the Mohicans* and *The Prairie*: James Fenimore Cooper and the Diasporic Origins of American Identity,” Juliet Shields reads Natty’s refusal of Judith as reflecting his lack of sentiment. However, it is more appropriate to attribute the failure of feeling to those men who attempt to seduce Judith. They fail to show any concern for their effect on her. Indeed, her lover, Captain Warley, remarks near the close of the novel, “I do suppose there *are* women in the colonies, that a captain of Light Infantry need not disdain,” his supposition attesting that he disdains every colonial woman whom he has met thus far (525). Therefore, I argue that Cooper represents a lack of sympathy as a problem not particular to the frontier, but rather characteristic of Euro-American civilization.

<sup>61</sup> The quintessential example of an American seduction novel is Susanna Rowson’s *Charlotte Temple* (1791), in which a young British woman is persuaded to receive illicit love letters and is forcibly taken aboard a ship to America, where she is seduced and abandoned with an illegitimate child.

<sup>62</sup> For instance, see Leland Person, “The Historical Paradox of Manhood in Cooper’s *The Deerslayer*,” which comments on the longer history of readers’ and critics’ responses to Natty and Judith’s relationship.

<sup>63</sup> Employing the unstable term “gifts,” Natty alternately attributes differences that he observes between various peoples to nature and habits or to learned customs. For instance, he refers to the “gifts” belonging to his “religion and colour” as opposed to “ways that God intended for another race,” but later asserts that “gifts come of sarcumstances” (85-6; 439).

<sup>64</sup> Barbara Alice Mann offers an overview of British and American policies regarding scalping both during and after the French and Indian War that suggests Natty’s criticism of the governors and kings echoes eighteenth-century responses to policies and practices. Mann writes of British Lieutenant-Governor Henry Hamilton (“The Famous Hair Buyer General”) that, “Hamilton was widely reviled by Americans for offering scalp bounties, and he did collect and forward scalps to headquarters, but it was Governor Frederick Haldiman who authorized paying scalp bounties and the Crown that ultimately authorized the policy of providing scalp bounties,” *George Washington’s War on Native America*, (115). Cooper reminds us, through Natty’s protest, that the highest levels of European government were implicated in the violence of scalping.

<sup>65</sup> Such divisions can advance what Anthony Pagden describes as a stadial theory of civilization, which presumes that Europeans and Euro-Americans have reached a more advanced and superior stage of development than various peoples of color and which often served as a justification for colonial practices as a mean of civilizing these ostensibly undeveloped or “backward” peoples. Anthony Pagden’s *European Encounters with the New World: from Renaissance to Romanticism*.

---

<sup>66</sup> Juliet Shields, "Savage and Scottish Masculinity," 145.

<sup>67</sup> For instance, while *The Last of the Mohicans: A Narrative of 1757* (1826), contains a number of parallels to *The Deerslayer*, this earlier novel in the Leatherstocking Tales emphasizes the moral failings of the French and their Native allies above and beyond those of the British. The novel's villain, Magua, does criticize the British treatment of Native Americans; specifically, he condemns them for their role in encouraging Native Americans' use of alcohol and deems the British leader Colonel Munro a hypocrite for punishing the drunkenness that his own culture fosters. This punishment comes in the form of a whipping (administered before the start of the novel), which proves both psychologically and physically scarring; yet despite the damage it causes, the whipping does not evoke the same blurring of Native and white racial identities and cultural practices as scalping in *The Deerslayer*. Further, we do not see the same degree of British participation in violence against undefended women as in *The Deerslayer*.

<sup>68</sup> Various accounts of Euro-American raids on Native Americans record the persistence of the racist views Harry expresses well into the nineteenth century. For example, John Heckwelder's *Narrative of the Mission of the United Brethren* (1820) describes the violence enacted on Indians by settlers around the Ohio River (130). Heckwelder demonstrates how a collapse of the distinctions between the human and animal, in the minds of some Euro-American settlers, became grounds for casual acts of violence, i.e. murders that simply happened "by the way" and did not require particular deliberation or provocation. Both Heckwelder and Cooper condemn this attitude as inhumane.

<sup>69</sup> While Dana Nelson similarly argues that Cooper depicts interracial friendships as an important site of fellow-feeling, she suggests that, "For Cooper, there is seemingly no such public agenda [as there is for Harriet Beecher Stowe]: for him, interracial feeling does certainly change and define individual people, but he does not explicitly engage it to change national destiny by showing us characters using it to influence political outcomes," "Cooper's Leatherstocking Conversations" (143). I build on this assertion to argue that Cooper is demonstrating the limits of friendship's ability to effect change in an unfeeling culture.

<sup>70</sup> Indian Removal, as Daniel Howe argues, constituted a more formal, federal stance on the long held debates about whether or not Native American tribes could remain sovereign or assimilate into the nation by denying federal protection to those who remained and thereby refusing them access to the vast bulk of rights afforded white citizens in places such as Georgia, *What Hath God Wrought?*, 348.

<sup>71</sup> Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought?*, 411.

<sup>72</sup> Jonathan Lamb, *The Evolution of Sympathy*, 1.

<sup>73</sup> Margaret Fuller, *These Sad But Glorious Days": Dispatches from Europe, 1846-1850*, 161.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> Margaret Fuller, *These Sad But Glorious Days": Dispatches from Europe, 1846-1850*, 165.

---

<sup>76</sup> For instance, Jay Sexton traces how Americans used the Monroe Doctrine across the nineteenth century to make conflicting arguments about the degree to which America ought to participate in foreign affairs or remain neutral and uninvolved.

<sup>77</sup> In *The Pilot*, Cooper's villain, Kit Dillon, creates a brief stir when reveals himself to be not only a cowardly opportunist, but also an atheist. The other characters readily condemn his godlessness, and his lack of faith becomes one more way in which he serves as a foil to the virtuous revolutionaries. By contrast, the patriarchal and loyalist figure, Colonel Howard shares faith in God with the revolutionaries; when he suggests that God seems to sanction the Revolution, given its success, he implies both that the nation's independence is divinely ordained and that Christian faith continues to link the American patriots to the loyalists and the British. Meanwhile, in *The Prairie*, the discrepancies between Duncan's Protestant faith and Inez's Catholicism are readily resolved. The couple's conversations regarding their faith serve largely to downplay the distinctions between their beliefs.

## Chapter 2. Christian Sisters:

### American Sympathy Abroad in Maria Cummins & Nathaniel Hawthorne

Studies of antebellum literature have long underscored the importance of sympathy to domestic fiction. However, recent scholarship on the relation between U.S. literature and imperialism raises new questions about how antebellum writers drew on the language of sympathy to depict America's role in the global sphere.<sup>1</sup> Authors such as the sentimental novelist Maria Susanna Cummins (1827-1866) and the more canonical Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-1864) explored the value of foreign affiliations through their representations of Americans' relationships with diverse peoples. A number of recent readings of both Cummins and Hawthorne consider whether their visions of international relations are conservative or progressive and whether they naturalize racial and cultural hierarchies.<sup>2</sup> Yet while recent criticism analyzes these authors within the same framework, scholars define their novels in opposition to one another by arguing that Cummins valorizes sentiment, whereas Hawthorne's ambivalence precludes the expression of sincere sympathy. Such analysis reinforces the ostensible divisions between sentimental and canonical literature and obscures the fact that both authors portray the appeal of international attachments, as well as the risks of identifying with foreign peoples. This chapter questions the association of Hawthorne with the refusal of compassion and Cummins with its unadulterated celebration.<sup>3</sup> Reading Cummins's *El Fureidís* (1860) and Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun* (1860) together illuminates the



similarities of these texts, which were published just a few months apart, and helps us to develop a more nuanced understanding of how antebellum American writers viewed their international ties.

*El Fureidîs* and *The Marble Faun* share a profound interest in Americans' connections to foreign peoples and cultures.<sup>4</sup> Set in Syria and Italy, respectively, these novels depict complex networks of international relations that emerge through global trade, imperial conquest, missionary work, and cosmopolitan travel. The texts consider how foreign encounters might threaten their characters' identities or even their lives. Yet Cummins and Hawthorne both create female characters—Havilah and Hilda—who become metaphorical sisters, or what I will call Christian sisters, to foreign peoples. While critics tend to define these characters, like their authors, in disparate terms, both Havilah and Hilda possess religious faith that guides their relations to their international “families” by helping these women assess who merits their compassion.<sup>5</sup> Through the trope of the Christian sister, Cummins envisions Westerners benevolently reforming the world, whereas Hawthorne suggests that the Christian sister retreats from the world's sins when they threaten to disrupt her faith. Despite their differences, though, these depictions of sisterhood highlight the importance of Christianity to both writers' beliefs about the threats and promises of foreign affinities.<sup>6</sup>

Cummins's and Hawthorne's novels prove significant to the study of global sympathy because they demonstrate that sympathy involves both judgment and identification, though these two elements may seem to conflict with one another.<sup>7</sup> The Christian sister's feeling for her international “family” depends upon both her assessment of foreign peoples' merit and her ability to imagine herself in their place. Havilah and

Hilda model what Paula Bennet refers to as “high sentimentalism,” an “epistemologically based discourse” wherein sensibility provides “a trustworthy guide to moral and spiritual truth.”<sup>8</sup> According to sentimental epistemology, an individual’s ability to feel for others demonstrates her authority and insight. Cummins and Hawthorne attribute this refined sensibility to the figure of the Christian sister, and in doing so they confer authority on her to discriminate between those who do and do not deserve sympathy. The writers thus reinforce the association of Americans with refined sensibility, and of foreign peoples and racial others with unruly passion in need of reform. Cummins and Hawthorne thereby risk justifying imperialism as a “civilizing” mission. Further, the novelists suggest that their characters must refuse compassion to violent foreign peoples. Havilah and Hilda must distinguish between worthy and unworthy subjects of sympathy to protect themselves and benefit their “families.”<sup>9</sup>

The depictions of Havilah and Hilda resonate with representations of adoptive sisters that recur throughout antebellum sentimental fiction. In works like Cummins’s *The Lamplighter* (1854) and Susan Warner’s *The Wide, Wide World* (1850), this figure proves important as a spiritual preceptor, or Christian sister, to the heroine.<sup>10</sup> Though the sister lacks formal authority, her community’s love for her grants her powerful influence.<sup>11</sup> The Christian sister’s spiritual knowledge allows her to play a key role in shaping the U.S. nation’s identity; she draws on her insight to assess others’ merits and to promote moral reform.<sup>12</sup> While antebellum depictions of sisterhood emphasize the belief that deep affection unites “God’s children,” these texts also imply that individuals must embrace Protestant ideals to merit compassion. The novelists thereby elevate Protestantism above Catholicism, Judaism, and Islam.<sup>13</sup>

Like their counterparts in domestic novels, Havilah and Hilda draw on their Christian feeling to foster a sense of community. However, these heroines forge familial attachments to a broad array of foreign peoples. By depicting the Christian sisters' lives in the East and Europe, Cummins and Hawthorne respond to pervasive U.S. anxieties about religious and cultural difference. Early Americans had demonized Muslims and Catholics as the "Eastern and Western manifestation" of the Antichrist, and anti-Catholic sentiments fueled violent riots in antebellum America.<sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, the novelists imply that Americans cannot help but form potentially disruptive connections to those outside their faith and nation. The Christian heroines' foreign encounters evoke sympathy's power, but also highlight how shifting international affiliations complicate Westerners' attempts to develop stable relations within the global sphere. While some characters form strong affinities only to watch them wither, others find their sense of difference from those around them diminishes as they develop powerful international bonds. In order to navigate these long-standing tensions and changeable relations, Havilah and Hilda draw on their Christian faith. *El Fureidís* portrays religion as a means by which Christian Americans may quell violence and foster reform, while in *The Marble Faun* religious belief helps the American characters preserve their distinct identities in cosmopolitan encounters.<sup>15</sup> Notably, the Protestant heroines of both novels balance capacious affinities with a willingness to refuse fellow-feeling to those who stray too far from Christian precepts.

Cummins and Hawthorne evoke greater confidence in antebellum Americans' ability to navigate and carefully delimit foreign affiliations than contemporaries like Herman Melville. Melville's "domestic" novel, *Pierre* (1852), hints that a hidden

genealogy of foreign ties and miscegenation may resurface and destabilize the American home. In *Pierre*, the “foreign” sister is a highly ambiguous figure who disturbs the American characters’ family and faith. The eponymous protagonist, Pierre, renounces his family estate and engagement to his cousin when he meets a mysterious French stranger, Isabel, who is ostensibly his unacknowledged half-sister. Perversely, Pierre decides to pose as her husband. Her powerful influence disrupts his life and fosters a sense of nihilism, which leads to his suicide. Melville’s novel raises questions about how tropes of illegitimate children and incest, which go largely unexplored in *El Fureidís* and *The Marble Faun*, speak to U.S. culture.<sup>16</sup> Nonetheless, Melville’s portrait of tumultuous, blood-based relations offers a useful point of contrast to Cummins’s and Hawthorne’s depictions of metaphoric sisterhood. Though Havilah’s and Hilda’s foreign affinities prove risky, their sisterly bonds suggest that religious faith can protect Americans from the dissolution Melville portrays.

To preface my readings of how Cummins and Hawthorne depict the influence of faith on America’s international relations, I want to highlight two similar scenes that represent religious worship as uniting the larger world. In these scenes, Cummins and Hawthorne attribute considerable power to faith in bringing together diverse peoples through shared feeling, while reminding us of the obstacles that elsewhere interrupt this sense of connection. Near the start of *El Fureidís*, Cummins presents a scene of worship in a small Syrian village: “Side by side on the marble pavement the Greek and Armenian, the Turk and the native Syrian, offered up a like petition to the common Father of them all; each head bowed and each knee bent in the same reverent posture” (16). Shared devotion to “the common Father” draws the worshippers from different countries

together into a family. Their “reverent posture” evinces their sentiment, which transforms their bodies into identical forms. Yet despite this early promise of unity, the novel explores how conflicts arise due to characters’ disparate cultures and beliefs.

*The Marble Faun* likewise suggests the unifying influence of spiritual belief in a description of St. Peter’s Cathedral near the end of the novel: “In this vast and hospitable Cathedral, worthy to be the religious heart of the whole world, there was room for all nations; there was access to the Divine Grace for every Christian soul; there was an ear for what the overburthened heart might have to murmur, speak in what native tongue it would” (356).<sup>17</sup> The Cathedral unites Christian peoples metonymically: they all become “overburthened heart[s]” who seek succor at St. Peter’s, which Hawthorne links to the worshippers through metaphor, as the “religious heart of the whole world.” Reducing the worshippers to hearts, ears, and tongues, this scene underscores the equivalence of their bodies, as well as their emotions, despite their differences of nation and language. The congregation—which Hawthorne describes as Christian, rather than Catholic—includes room for the Protestant Hilda, who visits the cathedral in an hour of need. Hilda approaches a stranger who is “so thoroughly softened” by confessing, “that she [feels] as if Hilda were her younger sister” (356). Worship shapes individuals’ feelings for one another. Yet this familial connection glosses over the particularities of characters’ suffering, which elsewhere disrupt Hilda’s sisterly attachment to her foreign friends.

Both Cummins and Hawthorne evoke the possibility that faith-based sentiment could create a global community, but also depict how differences of faith and nation inhibit shared feeling and foreign affinities. The parallels between *El Fureidís* and *The Marble Faun* in these and other scenes suggest the value of reading the novels in relation

to one another. By doing so, we can understand the importance antebellum writers assign to international alliances and their reservations about such ties.

My reading of Cummins and Hawthorne revises critical narratives about the relation between the two writers and their literary styles. Scholars frequently link them because of Hawthorne's infamous 1855 letter to William Ticknor, his publisher, deriding sentimental novels and the "d—d mob of scribbling women" who write them. Notably, Hawthorne cites Cummins's first novel, *The Lamplighter*, as the epitome of such work.<sup>18</sup> While early twentieth-century literary critics affirm the distinction that Hawthorne posits between his own romances and the work of sentimental novelists, more recent scholarship challenges this claim.<sup>19</sup> For instance, by considering how Hawthorne engages with domestic themes and how the antebellum literary market shaped his work, Jane Tompkins has interrogated literary canonization and likened his fiction to that of his female contemporaries.<sup>20</sup> However, critics have yet to develop in-depth readings of Cummins's and Hawthorne's novels in relation to one another. Comparative readings would allow us to move beyond noting the prevalence of familiar sentimental themes in canonical works. Instead, we can recognize less familiar tropes, such as the Christian sister, that recur across Cummins's and Hawthorne's writing. Crucially, this trope emerges from antebellum depictions of global sympathy. Rather than making an argument for Hawthorne's influence on Cummins, I emphasize that their novels—published in quick succession—engage with closely related cultural issues and draw on conventions of sentimentalism that both writers had helped to shape through their earlier work. The next section examines how the trope of the Christian sister functions in Cummins's novel; the association of sentimental novelists with religious faith makes it

easier to recognize the influential role she assigns to her Christian heroine in mediating foreign relations. I begin with Cummins's novel because her Protestant heroine—who is at home in Syria—appears even more thoroughly immersed in the international sphere than Hawthorne's American protagonists. Through her heroine's intimate bonds with British, French, and Syrian characters, Cummins underscores the centrality of Christian sympathy to Americans' foreign affiliations. In analyzing *El Fureidís*, I also explore its parallels to *The Marble Faun* and discuss connections between these authors who were so long defined against one another.

#### *El Fureidís*: Cross-Cultural Violence and Christian Reform

Alongside novels such as Susan Warner's *The Wide, Wide World* (1850) and Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852), Maria Cummins's writing has grown increasingly central to cultural analyses of nineteenth-century American sentimentalism. Since the reprinting of *The Lamplighter* as part of the American Women Writers Series in 1988, Cummins's work has come to exemplify the popular fiction of antebellum women writers, and to be read largely in relation to these writers.<sup>21</sup> We know Cummins, like many of her contemporaries, for her idealization of domesticity, didactic expressions of religious faith, and popular reception. While we possess few details of her life, she inhabited many of the same communities as Hawthorne and a number of other antebellum novelists. Born in Salem, Massachusetts to a well-to-do family, she lived in Boston for some time and received an extensive education from her father and then at Mrs. Charles Sedgwick's Young Ladies School in Lenox, Massachusetts. While studying

there, she likely met her teacher's sister-in-law, the New England writer Catharine Maria Sedgwick. Both Sedgwick and Cummins remained unmarried and pursued literary careers, creating bold female protagonists whose faith shapes their domestic lives and foreign affinities.<sup>22</sup> Like Hawthorne, Cummins published four novels in the 1850s and 1860s—*The Lamplighter* (1854), *Mabel Vaughn* (1857), *El Fureidís* (1860), and *Haunted Hearts* (1864)—that adapt sentimentalism, rewrite history, and imagine Americans' cross-cultural encounters.

Cummins situated her writing in larger literary networks. She placed her novels with prominent Boston publishers, including John P. Jewett, who first published *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in novel form, and Ticknor & Fields, who published Hawthorne's work. She also engaged with popular literature of the day, from domestic fiction and historical romances to travel writing and missionary narratives, by revising these genres and their tropes. We can see her immersion in antebellum culture through Nina Baym's cataloguing of *The Lamplighter's* epigraphs.<sup>23</sup> The novel quotes an array of contemporary U.S. writers, including William Gilmore Simms and Nathaniel Parker Willis, as well as British writers, like William Wordsworth and Felicia Hemans, then popular among American readers. These connections invite us to consider how Cummins's work, including her depictions of foreign sympathy, speaks to major concerns of antebellum culture.

While cursory responses to Cummins's novels define them as derivative of Susan Warner's work, closer reading reveals that Cummins (like Hawthorne) reshaped sentimental conventions.<sup>24</sup> As Nina Baym writes, Cummins insists "that women and men alike had work to do in God's good world."<sup>25</sup> In particular, she asserts U.S. women's



importance as Christians who advance the welfare not only of the home and nation, but also of foreign peoples. In her third novel, *El Fureidís*, Cummins relocates the sentimental plot to the Middle East, depicting scenes in Beirut, Mount Lebanon, and Damascus.<sup>26</sup> The heroine, Havilah, spreads her Christian faith by forging sympathetic familial bonds. Cummins links Havilah to the United States through her American father and her Protestant faith, while her international origins—she was born in India to a Greek mother—and her “foreign” home in Lebanon evoke America’s complex global ties.

*El Fureidís* explores the importance of sympathy in an international context; the novel suggests that foreign encounters are potentially volatile and that sentiment plays a key role in determining the outcome of these encounters. By depicting the risks of cross-cultural exchange and affiliation, Cummins affirms the Orientalist association of Arabs with violence, even as she criticizes Westerners for inflaming this passion. *El Fureidís* follows the young Englishman, Lord Meredith, on his travels in the Middle East. Determined to “imbibe [the] spirit of [the Eastern lands],” Meredith hires the Arab prince Abdoul as his dragoman, or guide and interpreter (4). However, Meredith’s initial journey attests to the dangers of foreign travel: he is caught in a storm, nearly has an altercation with his guide Abdoul, and only makes it as far as the eponymous village El Fureidís (or Paradise) in the mountains of Syria before falling ill. He gradually recovers in the village, where he forges attachments to Westerners who head the local industry and religious community. Father Lapierre, a French Protestant, cares for the nobleman in his convalescence, and later introduces him to the Franco-American M. Trefoil, who runs the village’s silk mill; Trefoil’s Greek wife, Ianthe; and their daughter, Havilah. Notably, the American figures Meredith encounters—M. Trefoil, who was born in the United States

and later adopted by French parents, and Havilah, who possesses both American and Greek heritage—are closely tied to foreign countries and appear more at home in Syria than Meredith, the representative of British imperialism. The Trefoils, along with Lapierre become Meredith's guides, and their insights fundamentally reshape his views of the region.

Nonetheless, Cummins continues to emphasize the divisions and tensions between Easterners and Westerners through the novel's love triangle. Meredith and Abdoul love Havilah, though Cummins critiques both British and Arab culture by suggesting that neither man is suitable for her devout Christian heroine. While Meredith questions whether Havilah possesses the appropriate background to marry into his noble family, she rejects his proposal because he lacks her faith, privileging empirical knowledge and aesthetic beauty over belief. Religion likewise separates Havilah from Abdoul; while she asserts that Christianity teaches peacefulness, he hopes to serve Allah through violence and suffering. Both courtships demonstrate the difficulty of forging attachments within a diverse cultural milieu, while exploring how affection for Havilah may prompt these men to enact the sympathy and benevolence she models.

Over the course of the novel, Cummins asserts the value of Christian faith by depicting how Meredith subdues his pride and accepts Providence in the face of hardship; he undergoes the self-reform characteristic of sentimental novels. Spurned by Havilah, Meredith contemplates returning home to England. However, he learns that his father and sister have died of "a fierce distemper" in his absence (182). Meanwhile, M. Trefoil mourns the death of his wife. This series of deaths raises the question of whether the characters can set aside personal loss to attend to the good of the community. When an

earthquake strikes, the village almost floods because the grieving Trefoil has neglected his mill. His daughter, Havilah, risks her life for the villagers: she nearly drowns to open the water gates, redirecting the flood onto her own home, and then pulls young children from a collapsing house. Nonetheless, the earthquake devastates the community, and the villagers' material losses prompt a crisis of faith. Some villagers migrate and others fall prey to Ben Hadad, an Armenian Jew and notorious usurer. At this point, cross-cultural affiliations seem harmful, as Trefoil's investment projects fail, Father Lapierre loses influence, and Hadad exploits the villagers. Yet Meredith intervenes by providing financial support for the community. Read against the anti-Semitic portrait of Hadad, Meredith becomes a model of benevolence as he alleviates his grief by devoting himself to the village. The young Englishman's development implies that Westerners can advance their spiritual reform by participating in benevolent projects abroad.

In *El Fureidis*, travel and cross-cultural encounter encourage Westerners to shift their attention from themselves to their roles as members of an international community by fostering their identification with foreign peoples. When Cummins's characters visit Trefoil's old Muslim friend, Mustapha Osman, in Damascus, the grief-stricken men shake their sense of isolation by forming sympathetic connections. Cummins underscores the value of foreign affinities through the compassionate Mustapha, who has lost his own wife; Mustapha's friendship moves Trefoil to imitate him by again taking an interest in the villagers who depend upon Trefoil's mill. The journey to Damascus also extends the heroine Havilah's influence to the elite inhabitants of the trading center. She converts Mustapha's daughter, Maysunah, from Islam to Christianity. Witnessing this conversion in turn fosters Meredith's faith. Through these cross-cultural encounters, Meredith and

Trefoil learn to turn to God with their pain and devote themselves to benevolence; their foreign attachments and faith in God reinforce each other.

While Cummins values foreign affinities, though, she elevates Westerners and Christianity at the expense of Middle Easterners. This cultural hierarchy is most explicit when Cummins depicts how Meredith's reform and Havilah's ensuing affection for him trigger Abdoul's "Arab" desire for vengeance. Havilah visits Abdoul's tribe with her family and friends, where Abdoul's attack on the Englishman demonstrates the danger of affiliations with "unreformed" Easterners. But Havilah intercedes and shames Abdoul for violating his cultural codes; Cummins suggests that her heroine's sympathetic understanding of Abdoul affords her authority to judge his failings. Havilah then acknowledges her love for Meredith and her Eastern lover flees. The hero and heroine marry and plan to divide each year between Britain and Syria. As they depart, Abdoul reappears seeking forgiveness and acquiesces to Havilah's command that he will henceforth "*protect the stranger*" (376). His reform—qualified by the fact that he remains a Muslim—requires him to relinquish his jealous passion. Crucially, this reconciliation promises Western travelers safety in the region.

*El Fureidis* addresses familiar sentimental subjects, such as the loss of family, the difficulty of accepting God's will, the need for self-reform, and the value of sympathetic bonds that foster individuals' devotion to their community. However, Cummins breaks from antebellum conventions by depicting how her characters navigate these experiences and their relationships within a culturally and racially diverse Syrian village, much as *The Marble Faun*'s characters negotiate their ties to a cosmopolitan community of Rome. Havilah finds her Christian sympathy essential because—in the midst of unstable foreign

encounters—it helps her impart her values to others and maintain autonomy from those who refuse her beliefs. Her sensibility gives her the insight to prevent violence. In both *The Marble Faun* and *El Fureidis*, faith guides characters' affective connections; yet the latter novel assigns faith a more powerful influence, as Havilah fosters Middle Easterners' and Westerners' affectionate ties to God and one another through her anti-Calvinist Protestantism.<sup>27</sup>

As Cummins's novel reflects both desire for imperial conquest and anxiety about how to control religious and racial difference within colonies, we can usefully read *El Fureidis* in relation to Amy Kaplan's work on "manifest domesticity."<sup>28</sup> Yet whereas the texts that Kaplan analyzes, including *The Lamplighter*, define the orderly nation against a chaotic foreign world in need of reform, *El Fureidis* locates domestic order and Christian faith in the Middle East. Through Havilah, who is both at home in and foreign to Syria, Cummins suggests how cosmopolitan affiliations reshape the family and complicate notions of national belonging. Blurring the distinction between domestic and foreign, Cummins justifies her Protestant heroine's authority over the foreign peoples she reforms through her sisterly attachments.<sup>29</sup>

Nonetheless, Cummins expresses ambivalence about how members of different religions may be divided by sentiment, even as she posits that it can foster reform and stabilize international relations. The novelist suggests that characters who lack Christian sympathy may misread and refuse sympathy to the people they encounter, thereby engendering enmity. By contrast, as characters develop their relationships with God, they strengthen their connection to a larger community. They learn to treat one another as brothers and sisters in God by expressing fellow-feeling for their equals and pity for

subjects who lack their faith. The progressive thrust of this narrative becomes all the more striking when read against *The Marble Faun*, which can be interpreted as an allegory for the Fall of man; yet this comparison highlights not only Cummins's assertions that Christian Westerners are equipped to reform the larger world, but also the various interruptions to this progress, from Meredith's lack of faith to Abdoul's violence.

Cummins emphasizes the Western elites' need for reform by depicting Meredith's troubling detachment early in the novel. On arriving in the Middle East, he is unable to identify with those around him. Approaching Beirut by ship, Meredith is swept into "the raptures of the poet's enthusiasm" for the scenery (2). Yet to go ashore, he must encounter the Arab boatmen, "a swarm of savages" who cause "his flattering visions of the romance of Eastern life [to subside]" (3, 4). Just as he contemplates returning home, he encounters British friends who have completed a conventional tour of the Holy land. Their company "bring[s] about a fresh revulsion in his feelings," so that he decides to continue with his trip and to travel off the beaten path (5). Both foreign and familiar cultures repulse Meredith. While he expresses a cosmopolitan desire to understand and enjoy the Middle East, this quick series of reversals reveals that he lacks a sense of "life motive" or spiritual purpose and so remains too detached (71). Through him, Cummins critiques an older model of cosmopolitanism based in observation, rather than attachment and cross-cultural exchange.

In *El Fureidís*, individuals cannot develop a strong sense of community or understanding of foreign cultures unless they possess religious faith. Without faith and the insight that it confers, Meredith is unable to perceive the virtues and weaknesses of the peoples he encounters. Instead, he evinces disgust and fear that leads him to misread

the young Arab prince Abdoul. As Abdoul guides Meredith toward El Fureidîs, the Englishman grows confused by the precarious trail and stormy night, and he suspects Abdoul of purposely leading him into danger. When a flash of lightning illuminates the trail, Meredith realizes his error. Yet “the lightning flash had revealed to [Abdoul] a countenance, every line of which was darkened with distrust. It was for a moment only, but Abdoul never forgot it” (12). This exchange resembles a moment in *The Marble Faun* when a glance likewise inspires murderous passion. Both scenes depict the disturbing power of an unspoken affective exchange. While Hawthorne’s scene suggests the risks of unchecked passion and sympathy, in Cummins’s novel, problems arise from a failure of understanding. Even as Cummins faults Meredith for his ungenerous misreading of Abdoul, though, she draws on Orientalist stereotypes to portray Abdoul. Abdoul is so volatile and sensitive to slight that Meredith’s impression of him remakes him in that image. Cummins emphasizes that Westerners’ must develop the familiarity with Arabs to reform rather than incite them.

Cummins attributes Meredith’s failure of insight and sympathy to his lack of faith, which likewise disrupts his relationships with other Westerners. Havilah appears so foreign to Meredith that critics occasionally mistake her for “a Christian Arab.”<sup>30</sup> Yet in fact, it is Meredith’s skepticism that divides him from the devout heroine. Meredith finds himself unable to understand Havilah’s spiritual meditations: “there were moments when . . . the sympathetic chain seemed broken, and he could no longer comprehend the emotions veiled beneath Havilah’s countenance” (97). While Meredith assumes his own superiority over Havilah, based on his noble birth and scientific and artistic acumen, Cummins highlights Havilah’s greater insight: “she had probed the depths of his

unsatisfied soul, and had beheld the void within” (97). So long as Meredith appreciates Syria only for its physical beauty and history, he remains disconnected from Havilah, whose faith structures her relation to the region and its peoples.

In the absence of faith and insight into others’ feelings, Meredith’s sympathy does little good. While out hunting with Abdoul, he wounds a gazelle, but begins to associate his prey with Havilah’s pet gazelle and then with Havilah herself: “Meredith’s sympathies were now fully awakened in favor of the animal . . . There was no resisting those melting orbs, so like Havilah’s own” (143). When the gazelle dies despite Meredith’s intervention, this bodes ill for the sympathy he could bestow on the gazelle’s human doppelganger, Havilah. His impulsive expression of feeling for an animal that he quickly forgets challenges the critical tendency to assume that sentimental novelists simply idealize compassion. This assumption underlies Steven Hamelman’s argument that the hunting scene presents an Orientalist critique of Arabs, as Abdoul lacks Meredith’s sympathy for the injured animal.<sup>31</sup> Rather than just faulting Arabs for a lack of pity, Cummins also suggests that Westerners’ sympathy can be futile, unless grounded in religious faith and community ties that foster a deeper sense of connection and responsibility.

Cummins conjoins compassion and careful judgment in her Christian heroine to suggest that sympathy need not engender violence or ineffectual pity, but rather can benefit the characters by guarding them against unstable alliances. Havilah, the embodiment of high sentimentalism, recognizes that she and Meredith would be like the banks of a river, divided by “the cold stream, the dark gulf” of their disparate beliefs (126). Havilah insists, “I wrong him not, for I judge him not,” perhaps to diffuse



accusations of mercilessness (like those that Hawthorne's Hilda faces). Yet Havilah clearly takes Meredith's measure (126). By refusing the British nobleman, she challenges the patriarchal aristocracy from which he draws his authority. This shift in power relations becomes apparent through Havilah's ensuing pity for Meredith.

Cummins underscores the power relations implicit in pity by depicting how it wounds Meredith's pride (157). Notably, when Abdoul attempts to woo Havilah by declaring his willingness to suffer for Allah, he also becomes a subject of "gentle pity" (162). This pity reflects her judgment of his faith; she regrets that "heroic submission which might well have become a Christian" instead serves Islam. Much like Hawthorne, Cummins depicts how her heroine refuses to display the affect that other characters seek from her and represents the pain that this causes (162). Nonetheless, Havilah's sorrow at inflicting pain on her lovers implies that she would prefer not to harm them, were it possible, and thus establishes the necessity of her refusals and the need for judgment to guide sympathy.

Cummins insists that her heroine's sensibility and the faith that undergirds it benefit her and her community. For instance, when Abdoul expresses the desire for violent conquest over his enemies, Havilah is not surprised to find his violent nature at odds with her "religion of forgiveness and peace" (166). Nor does his pretense that "his recent tempest of passion had been only feigned" deceive her (166). Her understanding of Abdoul's sentiments allows the Christian heroine to recognize that he would make an unsuitable husband, and even to anticipate his later attempt on Meredith's life.

Though this stereotyped representation of Abdoul could disrupt *El Fureidîs*'s emphasis on sympathy by asserting Arabs' fundamental difference from Westerners and

impeding cross-cultural identification, the novel's Orientalism and vision of global sympathy are closely entwined.<sup>32</sup> Cummins draws on Middle Easterners' stereotypical association with violence in order to assert that her heroine understands the character of her Arab companions. Whereas Meredith inflames Abdoul's desire for vengeance, Havilah recognizes and diffuses this passion. By suggesting that Arabs' passions are threatening, but can also be managed, Cummins justifies Western intervention in the Middle East. Their proclivity for violence appears predictable enough that her heroine can safely navigate her relationship with Arabs and enact reform.

Moreover, Cummins suggests that Westerners can acquire the cross-cultural insight that Havilah possesses. By developing faith and learning to identify with Middle Easterners, Meredith becomes Havilah's partner in her benevolent reform projects. Meredith finds his faith and experiences this sense of identification in the same moment; the novel implies both that individuals' sympathetic bonds to one another shape their belief in God and that faith, in turn, strengthens connections between diverse peoples. Havilah enables Meredith's reform through her role as a Christian sister, who fosters other characters' ties to God by asserting that they can be as affectionate as their relationships with her. In a pivotal scene, her sisterly bond with her Arab friend Maysunah prompts Maysunah's conversion from Islam to Christianity and transforms Meredith from a skeptic to a believer. Having found that "Mohammed . . . had no welcome and no promise for a weak, ignorant child," Maysunah entreats Havilah to teach her how to worship the Christian God (297). Havilah reassures her: "Be comforted, Maysunah, sweet sister in the Lord . . . the Good Shepherd will take thee in his arms, and bear thee in his bosom" (296). The two "sister[s] in the Lord," model the affectionate

intimacy that Cummins suggests should also characterize individuals' relations to God (297). Meredith overhears the women's discussion and identifies with Maysunah's childlike state, and he too turns to God for comfort. No longer "haughty-souled," he becomes like "the child that is lost" listening "to the voice that calls him home" (299). In this and other scenes, the novel attributes remarkable affective power to Christianity.

By representing both the British nobleman and young Arab woman as childlike figures who seek God's love, Cummins temporarily disrupts hierarchies of nation, race, and culture. Yet she also celebrates Christian conversion, elevating Protestant faith above Islam. Further, Cummins naturalizes Meredith's power over Middle Easterners by portraying the Syrians' appreciation for his benevolence. As one villager remarks to Havilah, Meredith is no longer simply "a prince," because "the peasants have found in him a brother" (253). Despite his increasing familiarity with the villagers, though, Meredith maintains a lofty position that distinguishes the Westerner from Middle Easterners.

Given that Cummins attributes considerable authority to Meredith, we might ask why she describes him as a brother, rather than a father.<sup>33</sup> This emphasis on Meredith's fraternal role—which critics overlook when commenting on his paternalistic authority—sets him apart from the novel's patriarchs, whose leadership proves futile. The father figures consistently fail the community because they lack intimacy with those they seek to influence. Molly Robey reads Trefoil's failure to protect the village during and after the earthquake as a critique of U.S. economic intervention and argument for Christian benevolence. Yet as she notes, Cummins also raises concerns about the novel's religious leaders. Indeed, the pattern of paternal failure encompasses religious and economic

authorities. Consider the Catholic priests who live nearby, but remain isolated from the villagers and so hold no influence over them.<sup>34</sup> Meanwhile when Trefoil retreats into his grief, Cummins writes that, “the little village had felt itself orphaned” (249-250). Father Lapierre loses his spiritual influence after these disasters, as he is an outsider who has relied upon Trefoil’s protection of him from “persecution and threats [that] had ripened into danger” (57-58). In contrast, Meredith and Havilah strengthen their connections to the village by creating ties of mutual obligation and affection.

Nonetheless, Cummins acknowledges that even the Christian sister may contribute to the region’s conflict in exercising authority over Middle Easterners. The possibility that Havilah’s presence will incite violence becomes apparent when she and her family and friends visit Abdoul’s tribe. Here Abdoul is at his most threatening. However, when he attempts to attack Meredith, Havilah exercises her powerful influence over her Arab “brother.” Her insight triumphs over the threat of his violence, which has been building across the novel. Specifically, Havilah’s understanding of Abdoul allows her to anticipate the attack and disarm him. Her sensibility prompts her not to pity, but rather to censure Abdoul. She faults him for violating Christian principles and his own tribe’s codes, asking, “Has my brother become a beast?” (353). Initially, Havilah’s intervention inflames his passion: “her taunting question well-nigh maddened him into the thing she likened him to” (353-4). Yet once she confesses her love for a “worthier” object and chastises Abdoul for his “selfish passions,” he drops “upon the earth” defeated (359). Havilah’s power over Abdoul, which stems from her Christian faith and her familiarity with Arab culture, affirms her authority to distinguish between those who do and do not merit her compassionate affection.

Through Havilah, Cummins affirms the ability of Christian Westerners to mediate fraught foreign encounters. Crucially, Havilah's injunction that Abdoul must "drive out the enemy that wars against [his] better self" prompts his reform (360). This reformation justifies Havilah's power, implying that her intervention becomes necessary when Abdoul's violent nature leads him to violate their familial ties. Or more simply, Cummins employs Orientalist stereotypes to argue for Christian authority. Abdoul's apology to Havilah, just as she departs for England, allows the reader to imagine that she will later return "home" to Syria with Meredith. More broadly, the conclusion suggests Westerners would be safe visiting the Middle East. Given Abdoul's role as a guide, his reform is central to ensuring that the Middle East feels like home to Western Christians.<sup>35</sup> Cummins acknowledges that Westerners' presence and influence in the region depends upon their relations with Muslims. Still, she emphasizes Christianity's importance in enacting reform to make such cross-cultural relations safe and beneficial.

Notably, Cummins published her portrait of peaceful reform in the Middle East mere months before violence erupted in Syria. As Eugene Rogan writes, "On July 9 1860 a riot broke out in Damascus that led to the death of several thousand Christians and the wholesale destruction of the Christian quarters of the city at the hands of a Muslim mob. The events in Damascus took place in the immediate aftermath of sectarian violence in Mount Lebanon and were the culmination of a series of attacks on Christians across Greater Syria" in the 1850s.<sup>36</sup> Cummins's novel may seem out of touch with the region, given that she depicts cross-cultural harmony and emphasizes Protestant Christians' influence, rather than the tensions between Catholics and Muslims.<sup>37</sup> However, her work strives to imagine idyllic solutions to the problems of sectarian divisions and imperial

influence. For Cummins, Christians' sensibility is a valuable corrective to both imperialism and Arab violence, which threaten to disrupt cross-cultural affiliations.<sup>38</sup>

Thus *El Fureidis* addresses contemporary foreign relations in troubling ways.

By depicting Arabs' so-called unruly passion as a reason for foreign intervention, Cummins's novel anticipates European and Ottoman leaders' response to the events of 1860. International and local political figures drew on stereotypes of Arabs as violent and regressive to argue that international involvement, whether by the Ottoman Empire, European nations, or even America, was necessary in order to advance religious tolerance.<sup>39</sup> Rogan notes that scholars have long attributed the events of 1860 to sectarian tensions that erupted into violence when Ottoman authorities gave equal standing to members of all religions in Mount Lebanon. However, recent scholarship has turned to "more political and economic interpretations" that suggest these events resulted from "the expansion of informal European hegemony over the Eastern Mediterranean and the impact of the region's incorporation in the world economy."<sup>40</sup> Nineteenth-century explanations of these events likewise include competing interpretations of whether the violence reflected problems inherent to the region or outside influences. Even Cummins's novel, composed before the riots, raises concerns about how Westerners interrupt the region's way of life, while emphasizing the benefits of Western Christians' influence on the Middle East. *El Fureidis* entwines arguments for and against foreign intervention. Critics are not mistaken to consider Cummins's complicity in imperialism. Yet, I seek to show that Cummins also expresses ambivalence about Western intervention. This contributes to the difficulty scholars face in classifying the novel as progressive or

conservative, and allows us to understand its complex relation to the region's political conflicts.

Though foreign intervention may well have prompted the violence of the Damascus riots by inflaming regional tensions, international involvement would only increase in their wake. Not only did the Ottoman imperial government oversee the trials of those accused of rioting, but several European nations also responded by forming an International Commission, and Napoleon III deployed 6,000 French soldiers to the region for nearly a year.<sup>41</sup> Leila Fawaz suggests imperialist influence further complicated sectarian conflicts, as both European support of the Christians and Ottoman rulers' severe punishment of Muslims accused of involvement exacerbated tensions between Christians and Muslims.<sup>42</sup> Yet, Rogan notes that some contemporary Arab Christian intellectuals argued for intervention out of concern that the Ottoman government had failed to prevent (or had even fomented) violence in the region.<sup>43</sup>

Cummins's celebration of Western benevolence in Syria resonates with these debates about who should regulate volatile cross-cultural encounters in the Middle East. By depicting Arabs' lack of sensibility and Westerners' lack of sincere faith as causes of cross-cultural conflict, Cummins suggests that Christian conversion and benevolence, rather than military involvement, could resolve ongoing conflicts. She imagines that her protagonists' sentiments enable them to transcend tensions between the disparate local cultures, imperial influences, and rival churches in order to help the villagers advance materially and spiritually. While Syria would shortly become the site of violent attacks on Christian Damascenes, and Cummins recognizes that foreign encounters could erupt into

violence, she portrays sympathy as powerful enough to ensure the protection of friends and strangers alike in Syria.<sup>44</sup>

In *El Fureidis*, Cummins evinces concern that cultural and faith-based differences may prove divisive and foster conflict. Much like Hawthorne, she depicts scenes wherein her characters fail to understand one another and refuse to bestow or accept compassion. While acknowledging the limits of sympathy, though, *El Fureidis* depicts Christian feeling as a means of fostering foreign affiliations that advance reform. The transformative power that Cummins ascribes to sympathy becomes all the more apparent when we turn from her narrative of proselytizing in the Middle East to Hawthorne's portrait of Protestant artists in Rome. Unlike Cummins, Hawthorne does not suggest that Americans ameliorate social ills through their benevolence. Rather, he portrays how Christian sympathy helps protect Americans' identity abroad. Still, reading *The Marble Faun* in relation to *El Fureidis* reveals how both novels explore the influence of faith in guiding Americans' judgments of which foreign peoples merit their sympathy.

### *The Marble Faun: Sympathy's Limits & Excesses*

In *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne's American heroine Hilda, like Havilah, possesses devout Christian faith that structures her relation to the world. Yet Hilda's faith does not prevent violence, nor does she enact reform by converting the diverse peoples she encounters. Through Hilda, Hawthorne presents a different version of the Christian sister, one whose need to guard herself against foreign attachments that threaten her identity evokes greater trepidation about America's international ties. Nonetheless, she



and her American companion Kenyon develop strong affinities for foreign peoples, and the novel thoroughly immerses both characters in Roman culture.<sup>45</sup> In examining these affinities, I build on prior readings of *The Marble Faun* that analyze how the novel's foreign encounters and violent conflict speak to Hawthorne's views on U.S. involvement in the Italian Risorgimento, and on U.S. sectional and racial strife.<sup>46</sup> However, rather than explicating Hawthorne's opinions on foreign revolutions or the threat of a domestic war, I focus on how he conveys the high stakes of sympathy. Hawthorne explores how foreign affinities and unchecked passions destabilize individuals' identities and religious beliefs. In response to these concerns, he draws on the trope of the Christian sister to consider how Americans' faith shapes their affiliations and protects their identities. My point here is not to assert Hawthorne's belief in Christianity, or Cummins's for that matter, but rather to consider how both authors portray Christianity as mediating foreign relations. Earlier readings of religion in *The Marble Faun* tend to focus on Catholicism's threat and appeal or on the purported failure of Hilda's sympathy. By contrast, rereading Hawthorne in relation to Cummins highlights his interest in how Protestantism lets Hilda distinguish between proper and improper subjects of sympathy, which in turn helps preserve her religious faith.

While Hawthorne's interest in foreign cultures and how they affect America is perhaps most apparent in *The Marble Faun*, these themes run throughout his short stories, essays, and novels. He often depicts the intermingling of foreign peoples, as well as the various forms of cross-cultural exchange that he witnessed as a customs agent in Massachusetts, as U.S. consul to Liverpool, and as a tourist in France and Italy.<sup>47</sup> Not only does he portray the effects of immigration and America's European origins on the

U.S. nation, but his form and style also reflect the influence of foreign artists on his work. Following his move to Liverpool in 1853, his travel journals remind us of his immersion in European cultures, for instance as he details his reactions to Italy's famous sites and artworks. In *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne draws on his travels to reflect on the relation between the foreign and domestic. He evinces concern about how Americans will respond to the influences of Roman art and Catholicism, as well as Italy's revolution. Nonetheless, the bonds among his American and Italian characters suggest that Americans can forge strong ties with foreign peoples.

Known for its Italian setting and descriptions of Roman art and architecture, *The Marble Faun* explores the possibility that foreign cultures and peoples could transform Americans. In particular, Hawthorne reflects on U.S.-foreign relations through his characters' friendships. His American characters forge sororal and fraternal bonds with Italians based on artistic fellowship and shared compassion. However, the Americans' affinity for their Italian companions eventually involves them in a violent intrigue and conflict with the Catholic Church. Hawthorne raises the threat that foreign entanglement will cause the Americans to succumb to Papal authority and lose their republican, Protestant identity. Nonetheless, he ultimately contains this threat.<sup>48</sup> Although the foreign characters evince unruly passions that render their American friends susceptible to the tyrannical institution, Protestant faith provides a bulwark against such oppression.

Hawthorne's depiction of Rome resonates with a number of works by early American writers who expressed interest in Italy's turbulent attempts at revolution and reform. For instance, James Fenimore Cooper's *The Bravo* (1831) offers a fictional narrative of European political intrigue set in Venice, and Margaret Fuller's newspaper

dispatches from Italy during the late 1840s describe the region's ongoing military conflicts and revolutionary aspirations. As mentioned in the prior chapter, Fuller argued for American support of the Italian revolutionaries because they espoused republican values. Yet whereas Fuller emphasizes how involvement in Italy would reaffirm Americans' commitment to U.S. political ideals, Hawthorne offers a more ambivalent portrait of America's ties to Italy. This ambivalence is evident when he portrays Protestantism as a potentially valuable check on disruptive foreign influences.

*The Marble Faun* centers on a small network of friendships among characters who struggle to reconcile the social codes of their cosmopolitan community with their own values. Hawthorne depicts the relationships among the New England copyist and "daughter of Puritans" Hilda, the American sculptor Kenyon, the painter Miriam (whose racial and national identity are indeterminate for much of the novel), and their faunlike Italian companion, Donatello (54). According to rumor, Miriam may be "the daughter and heiress of a great Jewish banker," a "German princess," the "offspring of a Southern American planter," or "the lady of an English nobleman," and she has "a certain rich Oriental character in her face" and may possess "one burning drop of African blood in her veins," or may simply be the daughter of a bankrupted "merchant or financier" (22-23). Despite differences of nation, race, and religion, these characters possess strong attachments to one another. Their shared interest in art and detachment from their respective homes unite them. As Kenyon notes, it is only in Rome that Miriam could "hold a place in society, without giving some clue to her past life" (109).

Even as Rome makes new affinities possible, though, the characters' disparate identities resurface and threaten their attachments. While the friends perfect their art and

go sightseeing together, a mysterious figure referred to as the Model haunts Miriam. The two share a dark secret, which she hopes to bury and he employs to assert power over her. Miriam considers unburdening herself by revealing her past to Kenyon, but finds him uncomfortable with the prospect of her confession. The Model's presence grows increasingly oppressive to Miriam, until Donatello's love for her prompts him to murder the Model—apparently under the command of Miriam's gaze—by throwing him from a small courtyard near the Piazza del Campidoglio over the Tarpeian Rock. Shortly thereafter, the friends are horrified to see the Model's corpse in the Church of the Capuchins, where they learn he was a monk. His ambiguous identity and connection to the Church heighten the characters' anxiety about the murder and its repercussions.

Hawthorne depicts the effects of the Model's death on the friends' relations to one another, thereby exploring how violence and sin can either foster or diminish compassion. As Donatello transforms from the light-hearted "faun" of the novel's early chapters to a somber, guilt-stricken man, Kenyon's and Miriam's sympathetic ties to him deepen. Kenyon counsels his friend in managing his grief and guilt, and Miriam becomes Donatello's partner, connected to him by their shared guilt and understanding. This marks a shift from the start of the novel, when Miriam thought of Donatello largely as a distraction from her sorrow. The murder that brings Miriam closer to Donatello also estranges her from Hilda, who observes the Model's death. Despite their sisterly bond, Hilda finds the crime so disturbing that she resists Miriam's pleas for sympathy. Their subsequent separation reveals the constraints on the American heroine's willingness to share in Miriam's feeling.

Yet sympathy persists in the face of such divisions. The New England woman is deeply affected by the murder, which attests that her feeling for Miriam remains potent. Lingering in Rome after her friends leave for Donatello's family estate, Hilda visits St. Peter's Cathedral and finds herself moved to confess her knowledge of the crime. Kenyon views this confession as a troubling sign of Catholicism's influence over Hilda, yet she refuses to convert. Hilda again acknowledges her ties to Miriam by fulfilling a promise to deliver an envelope to the Palazzo Cenci, where she is apparently taken captive by the Papal authorities. In the novel's final chapters, Hilda's captivity leads Miriam to reveal her history to Kenyon; she describes herself as "springing from English parentage, on the mother's side, but with a vein, likewise, of Jewish blood, yet connected, through her father, with one of those few princely families of southern Italy, which still retain a great wealth and influence" (430). When Miriam and Donatello turn themselves in, Hilda is freed and reunites with Kenyon amidst the Roman Carnival. At the conclusion, the characters pair off into heterosexual couples along national lines, or as closely as is possible given Miriam's international heritage. Kenyon wins Hilda's hand, and they return home to America, while Donatello and Miriam face their judgment together in Rome.

Despite the divisions that emerge, I contend that the characters remain committed to sympathy. Here I diverge from the critical consensus that the characters ultimately discard their cosmopolitan sympathy in favor of domestic romances at the novel's close. For instance, Emily Miller Budick describes Hilda as "disappointing" because she "falls furthest from the ideal of sympathy the novel is setting up."<sup>49</sup> Given sympathy's potential to unite individuals, what is the significance of Hilda's refusing compassion to her

anguished friend? Blythe Ann Tellefsen argues that Hilda's lack of sympathy signifies a desire to exclude racial and religious minorities, represented by Miriam, from the U.S. nation. Emily Schiller contends that Hilda's break with Miriam represents a problematic American desire to erase history in order to lay claim to innocence and purity. Either interpretation implies that Hawthorne invites criticism of Hilda.

Situating Hilda's response to Miriam in relation to contemporary understandings of sympathy, however, challenges the assumption that Hilda violates sentimental ideals. Rather, she acts in keeping with the conception of sympathy at work in *El Fureidis*, which likewise depicts how the Christian sister must assess her friends' and family's feelings before sharing these sentiments or expressing compassion for them. These novels remind us that judgment constitutes part of the process of sympathy. Hilda assesses her companions on the basis of her Christian faith and refuses compassion to Miriam when it would require her to share in her friend's complex feelings toward a murder she has arguably helped perpetrate. Hilda's response signals her friend's powerful influence over her feelings and fate, which creates the need for her to limit her foreign attachments. In this context, the shift from a network of friendships to more insular heterosexual marriages constitutes a self-protective gesture that acknowledges the powerful influence these friends exercise over one another.

Though Hawthorne emphasizes Miriam's sway over Hilda, he also suggests that the Christian sister influences her cosmopolitan community. Early in the novel, he describes how Hilda's sensibility makes her work as a copyist transformative. Hawthorne writes that "even her silent sympathy was so powerful that it drew you along with it, endowing you with a second-sight that enabled you to see excellencies with almost the

depth and delicacy of her own perceptions” (62). He again highlights the importance of feeling to her work when describing the process she employs in order to copy Guido Reni’s painting *Beatrice of Cenci*: she “sit[s] down before the picture, day after day, and let[s] it sink into [her] heart” (65). Hilda’s artistic practice is an affective practice, as she enters into and amplifies others’ emotions. Hilda is part of a “class of spectators whose sympathy will help them to see the Perfect” as they look beyond the artwork to its “suggestiveness” (379). Hilda’s copies attest to her sensibility, while her devotion to the “Great Masters” shows her capacity for affectionate worship, and these traits mark her as a model Christian sister. This depiction of Hilda emphasizes her ability to reveal not just artistic beauty, but an ideal (“the Perfect”) to the larger world, and so resembles Cummins’s portrait of Havilah bringing a new understanding of God to her community.

However, while Hilda’s power to recognize and enter into others’ feelings is a boon to her art, this capacity proves trickier to manage in personal relationships. Hawthorne’s characters remain divided over who or what constitutes an appropriate sympathetic subject; in particular, they debate whether sin should elicit or foreclose sympathy. Hilda relies on her spiritual faith to regulate her feeling for others. Because she adopts her friends’ guilt and suffering, she distances herself from Miriam. By contrast, Miriam forges close affinities to fellow sinners, identifying with them and expressing powerful feeling for them. Consider, for instance, the friends’ discussion of *Beatrice Cenci*. Whereas Hilda asserts that Beatrice has committed “an inexpressible crime,” Miriam identifies closely with Beatrice and declares her “still a woman . . . still a sister be her sin or sorrow what they might” (66, 68). *The Marble Faun* explores the costs of both Hilda’s restricted and Miriam’s capacious willingness to identify with and feel for others.

Miriam's desire for more expansive sympathy entails troubling sacrifices, which remain largely unexamined by critics. Notably, Hawthorne leaves her past unclear and Miriam herself evinces uncertainty about her ties to the larger world; this ambiguity makes her deep feelings hard to read and even threatening. We see this when Hilda expresses her faith in God, and Miriam responds by asking, "You really think, then, that He sees and cares for us?" (166). Hilda draws back from Miriam's doubt in fear, and Miriam acknowledges that, "Just now, [God's Providence] is very dark to me" (167). In this exchange, belief in God promises the same sense of protection and affection as in *El Fureidîs*. Miriam's desire for faith would seem to make her, like Cummins's young Muslim character Maysunah, a likely subject for Christian compassion and conversion, but Hawthorne instead emphasizes how Miriam's inability to believe in this promise raises questions about Hilda's relation to God. Sympathizing with Miriam provokes fear because it requires Hilda to share in her unsettling doubts.

The characters respond to the difficulty of sympathizing with one another by analogizing their friendships to familial ties, and thus associating their precarious affiliations with the presumed intimacy and stability of a family. When Miriam asks if she might confess her secret, Kenyon invites her to "speak freely, as to a brother" (128). In turn, Miriam proclaims to Hilda, "You were to me as a younger sister; yes, dearer than sisters of the same blood" (207). Asserting that her tie to Hilda resembles and even surpasses that of a blood-relative, Miriam implies that their relationship should be based not in judgment of one another but in concern for each other's feelings: "have I sinned against God and Man, and deeply sinned? Then be more my friend than ever, for I need



you more!” (208). The titles of brother and sister help characters justify their claims on one another’s compassion and acknowledge their friends’ claims on their sympathy.

Nonetheless, the novel’s familial language does not guarantee compassion and, at times, even underscores its absence. For instance, Kenyon’s remark that Miriam should treat him as a brother belies how discomfited he is by the prospect of her confession: “In his secret soul, to say the truth, the sculptor doubted whether it were well for this poor, suffering girl to speak what she so yearned to say, or for him to listen. . . . Unless he could give her all the sympathy, and just the kind of sympathy, that the occasion required, Miriam would hate him, by-and-by, and herself still more” (128-129). Miriam’s ambiguous identity leaves Kenyon uncertain that he can understand her and express the proper form of feeling, and this uncertainty undermines his offer to serve as her brother. This scene presents a corollary to Adam Smith’s argument that we associate families with sympathy because family members’ intimate familiarity with one another fosters their identification and fellow-feeling. The absence of such familiarity stymies the friends’ attempts to construct a cosmopolitan family in *The Marble Faun*.<sup>50</sup> Familial intimacy proves elusive because the foreign characters’ opaque past inhibits Americans’ ability to understand them, and this past threatens to erupt violently into the present, as it does with the Model’s murder. Americans must be careful of foreign affiliations, just as in *El Fureidîs*, while striving to understand and assess their foreign friends.

In the pivotal scene of the Model’s murder, we can observe that Miriam’s lack of insight, even into her own feelings, complicates expressions of sympathy and makes them all the more dangerous. After Donatello kills the Model by throwing him from a parapet, Miriam feels uncertain of her own role in these events. Although both Donatello and

Hilda believe that he has acted on Miriam's unspoken command, this surprises Miriam. She wonders, "Could it be so? Had her eyes provoked, or assented to this deed? She had not known it. But, alas! Looking back into the frenzy and turmoil of the scene just acted, she could not deny—she was not sure whether it might be so, or no—that a wild joy had flamed up in her heart, when she beheld her persecutor in his mortal peril. Was it horror?—or ecstasy?—or both in one?" (172-3). Through the syntax of Miriam's thoughts—the series of questions, repeated use of "or," and negations—Hawthorne presents competing descriptions of her role in the murder. Her inability to identify her emotions sharply contrasts with Hilda's sensibility and insight and, more broadly, the qualities of self-reflection and emotional repression that antebellum sentimental novels value. Miriam's feelings are troubling because Donatello commits murder, ostensibly out of sympathy for her. Her apparently unconscious sanction of this murder attests to the destructive power of unregulated feeling, much like Abdoul's impassioned attack on Meredith in *El Fureidis*.

The problems of ambiguous emotion and unchecked sympathy become all the more pressing when Donatello threatens to kill himself. Recognizing Miriam's uncertainty as to her culpability in the murder, Donatello begins to wonder whether he has mistaken her desires and commands her: "Say that I have slain him against your will—say that he died without your whole consent—and, in another breath, you shall see me lying beside him!" (173). Though Donatello sympathizes with Miriam, her uncertain feelings make it difficult for him to know whether he has read her correctly and acted in her interests. Their exchange attests to the value of high sentimentalism, wherein feeling reflects morality and spirituality, in contrast to the impulsive, indiscriminating feeling

that these characters display. While Miriam staves off Donatello's threat of suicide by asserting her culpability for the murder, this choice has consequences. Hawthorne describes how the "terrible contractile power" of their "deed" "was closer than a marriage-bond. So intimate, in those first few moments, was the union, that it seemed as if their new sympathy annihilated all other ties" (174). Throughout the rest of the novel, Miriam's relation to Donatello shapes her feeling: she shares in his emotions, from his grief when he realizes how the murder has altered his character, to his gaiety during the Roman Carnival. Her loss of personal identity resonates with prevalent nineteenth-century concerns about how sympathy threatened the distinctions between individuals. Indeed, Miriam's and Donatello's bond evokes the costs of unruly passions and sympathy.

These ungoverned sentiments also suggest the risks of foreign attachments, as Hilda's and Kenyon's affinity for their Italian friends threatens to entangle them in the murder's repercussions. Hilda explains her break from Miriam by telling her friend, "Your powerful magnetism would be too much for me. The pure, white atmosphere, in which I try to discern what things are good and true, would be discoloured" (208). Augustus Kolich posits that "For Hawthorne, Miriam's glance evokes the sort of sympathetic involvement in social and political issues in Italy from which Americans must escape: its enticement must be resisted at all costs."<sup>51</sup> Indeed, Hilda's response reminds us of the potent influence Miriam exerts, an influence that has ostensibly already prompted a murder. Kolich's argument might seem to undermine my reading of Hilda as a Christian sister; she does, after all, refuse compassion to Miriam. However, even as

Hilda acts on the belief that judgment is an essential part of the process of sympathy, her continued concern for Miriam complicates Kolich's claim.

While scholars tend to echo Miriam's critique of Hilda as unfeeling, Hawthorne portrays the Christian sister's strong sentiments. Faced with Hilda's refusal of friendship and compassion, Miriam initially responds in critical terms: "I always said, Hilda, that you were merciless . . . you need a sin to soften you" (209). From this perspective, Hilda's refusal reveals what she lacks—mercy—rather than highlighting her insight or discerning judgment. Nonetheless, the novel does not simply affirm Miriam's perspective of Hilda or of sympathy. Hawthorne goes on to suggest that Hilda, too, struggles with a deep sense of oppression. She does not lack feeling; rather, feeling overwhelms her. Ironically, she is unable to extend compassion at this moment because she identifies closely with Miriam and feels deeply troubled by guilt over the crime. Hawthorne describes Hilda's horror as so powerful that her affective response to Miriam precedes conscious thought; she responds to her "with an involuntary repellent gesture" (207). Though Hawthorne asserts that "It was as if Hilda or Miriam were dead," Hilda pleads for Miriam's advice in managing her own pain, which "deeply comfort[s] the poor criminal, by proving to her that the bond between Hilda and herself [is] vital yet" (207; 211). The murder's powerful effect on Hilda, evinced even in Hawthorne's comparison of their separation to a death, undermines any neat division between them by expressing the persistence of their bond.

The strength of the women's connection to one another appears threatening because the murder interrupts Hilda's religious belief. Hilda worries that she will lose her faith through her close identification with Miriam, who questions both God's Providence

and the sinfulness of the Model's murder. Miriam and Hilda's attachment primes Hilda to enter into her friend's feelings, to participate vicariously in the murder, and thus to share in Miriam's break from the moral values that Hilda holds dear. Explaining her desire to confess, Hilda tells a priest at St. Peter's that "the terrible, terrible crime, which I have revealed to you, thrust itself between Him and me; so that I groped for Him in the darkness, as it were, and found Him not" (359). Her remarks resonate with Miriam's earlier comment that God's Providence is "dark" to her. Only once Hilda relates the murder to a priest can she gain a sense of detachment from the crime; she then shares the priest's concern over the sin she recounts, rather than Miriam's ambivalence about the murder and her relation to God (359). Though Hilda's trip to St. Peter's leaves Kenyon "deeply disturbed by his idea of her Catholic propensities," confessing helps her to regain her Protestant faith (368).

*The Marble Faun* implies that the Protestant heroine's capacity to feel for others paradoxically requires her to limit her sympathy. Otherwise, she may compromise the Protestantism on which her compassion is based by identifying with those who lack her beliefs. The women's separation ultimately allows Hilda both to regain her faith *and* to retain a sense of connection to Miriam. Late in the novel, following her confession and debate with Kenyon about whether her judgment of Miriam is too severe, Hilda remembers that she agreed to deliver a packet of letters to the Palazzo Cenci for Miriam. Hilda's detachment heightens her sense of responsibility to her friend: "since we are separated forever, [my promise] has all the sacredness of an injunction from a dead friend" (387). There is a perversity to Hilda imagining her friend dead. Yet this scene further complicates Kolich's claim that, through Hilda, Hawthorne expresses a desire to

isolate Americans from foreign affairs. When Papal authorities detain her for Miriam and Donatello's crime, we see that Miriam and Hilda's connection continues to shape their lives. Indeed, Hilda's captivity in the place of Miriam suggests that their affinity makes them nearly interchangeable. However, this bond also ensures Hilda's liberty and autonomy, as their connection moves Miriam to turn herself in and procure Hilda's release. Through these scenes, Hawthorne imagines Americans participating in cosmopolitan affiliations, limiting, but not refusing such connections. After all, her tie to Miriam does as much to secure Hilda's freedom as to cause her captivity.

Regardless of the dangers of foreign affiliation, both Hawthorne and Cummins suggest that Americans are already enmeshed in these relations by opening their novels with their female protagonists immersed in life abroad. At the start of *The Marble Faun*, Hilda and Miriam are already "sisters," whose existing international attachments raise perplexing questions about what obligations Americans' foreign affinities confer upon them. Whereas earlier readers argue that Hilda's refusal of feeling constitutes a failure to uphold sympathetic ideals, I contend that within the novel, judgment is presented as a central element of sympathy. Hawthorne considers how religion could provide the basis for Americans' attachments outside the nation, as we see in the image of St. Peter's diverse worshippers united through their faith. Yet he also explores how faith might limit particular alliances, as we see when Hilda distances herself from Miriam in order to regain her connection to God. Hawthorne emphasizes his foreign characters' influence on Americans, and both he and Cummins express ambivalence that resonates with contemporary Americans' uncertainty as to how to negotiate differences of religion, race, and culture. Reading *The Marble Faun* in relation to *El Fureidís* reveals that both novels

respond to such uncertainty through the trope of the Christian sister. This key figure models how Americans could navigate foreign relations by drawing on the ideals of high sentimentalism.

### Conclusions: National Crises and International Communities

This chapter addresses two interrelated questions: how does reading Cummins's and Hawthorne's works together illuminate new aspects of their novels and, more specifically, what are we to make of their choices to shift from the domestic settings of their earlier novels to the foreign locales of *The Marble Faun* and *El Fureidîs*? Prior readings of these texts offer a variety of explanations for why the novelists and their readers were interested in Italy or Syria. For instance, critics note that antebellum Americans were fascinated with Rome and the Middle East as despotic foils for the United States, even as Americans considered themselves the inheritors of Rome's republican tradition and viewed Mount Lebanon as a spiritual home.<sup>52</sup> Not only did these places possess figurative significance for Americans, but both were also popular sites for U.S. tourism during the nineteenth century. Wealthy Americans' desire to visit Italy helped ensure a readership for Hawthorne's last novel.<sup>53</sup> And though Cummins never visited the Middle East, by the 1860s men and women were traveling there as tourists and Christian missionaries.<sup>54</sup> Cummins cites numerous travel volumes that offered inspiration for her novels; situating her work in relation to these texts, she suggests that *El Fureidîs* participates in a cultural project of defining the Middle East for Western readers (iiv-iv). While reminding us of U.S. cultural and political ties to particular regions, these novels

also highlight Americans' interest in how faith-based sympathy would guide foreign relations as a whole.

Cummins and Hawthorne portray close-knit domestic and foreign relations. Whereas domestic antebellum novels focus on sentiment's importance in shaping the nation by strengthening citizens' ties to one another, in *The Marble Faun* and *El Fureidīs* the American characters' identities emerge in foreign settings and through cross-cultural encounters. Prior readings of these texts note that Cummins's and Hawthorne's depictions of foreign encounters nonetheless speak to domestic conflicts over slavery and religious difference. After all, the novelists characterize Americans' international ties in the familial terms often used to define Americans' relations to one another.<sup>55</sup> Much as these novelists portray their white Protestant American characters as sisters and brothers to racial others, so too did debates over slavery emphasize the familial relations between Anglo and African Americans. Further, Hawthorne and Cummins employ troubling animalistic language to describe their "foreign" characters that, as Nancy Bentley argues in her reading of *The Marble Faun*, resembles racist depictions of African Americans.<sup>56</sup> At the same time, both novels raise questions about how Protestants' encounters with Catholics and Muslims might shape Americans' identities. This emphasis on interfaith relations resonated with contemporary anxieties about religious difference in the United States. Elizabeth Fenton notes that nineteenth-century Americans' republican ideals, including that of secularism, were entwined with Protestant values.<sup>57</sup> Antebellum Protestants feared that Catholic citizens constituted a threat to U.S. democracy, and these fears took violent form in the era's Nativist riots.



By asserting that Cummins's and Hawthorne's fiction relates to long-standing religious divisions and the impending Civil War, my purpose is not to imply that their depictions of international encounters are mere allegories for conflicts over the "foreign" populations within the U.S. nation. Rather, I want to suggest that *The Marble Faun* and *El Fureidîs* speak to contemporary debates over domestic relations because they draw on notions of sympathy to explore Americans' identification with and difference from Syrians and Italians. Using the pervasive discourse of sympathy to depict Americans' foreign affinities, Hawthorne and Cummins make these affinities seem familiar and suggest that international relations are intimately connected to ongoing debates over national belonging. Moreover, by drawing on tropes of sisterhood to depict the metaphoric family ties between Americans and foreign peoples, Hawthorne and Cummins suggest that Americans are closely linked to foreign peoples.

What then should we make of the marriages that conclude *The Marble Faun* and *El Fureidîs* and seem to circumscribe Americans' foreign ties? When Hawthorne unites Hilda to Kenyon and returns them to the United States, he ostensibly removes the Christian sister from the international sphere. Both this union and Havilah's marriage to Meredith seem to limit the Christian sister's ability to influence her foreign "family," and vice versa. Early in *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne suggests that Hilda's devotion to her art precludes a romantic attachment to Kenyon; she lacks room for him in her heart (111). In turn, her attachment to Kenyon seems to develop at the expense of her artwork and participation in a cosmopolitan community of artists. Instead, Hilda will be "enshrined and worshipped as a household Saint," or, in other words, contained in her new domestic setting (461). Havilah's marriage likewise removes her from Syria, where she has

exercised considerable influence thanks to her spiritual strength. Notably, both of these unions follow scenes wherein cross-cultural encounters prove threatening: Havilah marries after Abdoul's violent attack, and Hilda marries after her imprisonment by the Catholic Church. The marriages might afford protection against similar dangers. Yet in these scenes of danger, Havilah quells Abdoul's attack and Hilda resists conversion. Such encounters not only pose threats, but also create opportunities for the young women to demonstrate their strength and sensibility. Removing the female characters from their cosmopolitan communities prompts us to wonder whether they will have such opportunities once they marry.

The concluding marriages take on further significance, given the influence that the novelists attribute to their female characters in mediating international encounters and in modeling how faith might guide foreign attachments. Marrying these characters off and relocating them has the potential to limit the sphere not only of women's influence, but also that of America more broadly. We might consider the shift out of Italy and Syria to be progressive, particularly in Cummins's novel, where, as Schueller has argued, the heroine's power emerges through her troubling authority over others. Yet critics also note that by relocating the heroines, the conclusions reassert the differences between the domestic and foreign or West and East; these relocations affirm cultural and racial hierarchies, whether in the interests of advancing isolationism or colonialism. In both narratives, the geographic shifts hint that the novelists remain concerned about Americans' ability to manage foreign affiliations and perhaps ambivalent about the effect of U.S. influence on foreign peoples. However, *El Fureidîs* and *The Marble Faun* offer us little space in which to determine whether the characters' marriages serve progressive

or oppressive ends because their foreign ties quickly resurface. Cummins and Hawthorne suggest the domestic/foreign division is unsustainable.

While the concluding marriages seem to establish boundaries between the foreign and national, asserting that Christian women's roles are predominantly domestic, the characters' international ties reemerge in the final pages of both *El Fureidîs* and *The Marble Faun*. The Christian sister's connections to her foreign friends persist, as do the novels' tensions over just how closely sympathy can unite diverse peoples. Consider, for instance, the postscript Hawthorne appended to his novel just a month after publishing the first edition. His response to readers' "demand for further elucidations respecting the mysteries of the story" suggests their continued interest in the narratives of Donatello and Miriam (463). The postscript returns Hawthorne's American characters to the top of Saint Peter's in Rome, where their discussion of their friends signals that the characters' cosmopolitan bonds and attachment to Rome itself remain vital. Meanwhile, in *El Fureidîs*, Cummins depicts the continued influence of the Middle Eastern and Western characters on one another as her Christian hero and heroine, Meredith and Havilah, prepare to sail from Syria to Britain. The Arab Abdoul hops aboard their ship to make amends with Havilah. Having already married Havilah to Meredith, Cummins has foreclosed the possibility of a cross-cultural romance with Abdoul. Nonetheless, his re-emergence attests that Muslims remain both attached to and independent from Westerners.

In these endings, the sisterly and brotherly relations between Americans and foreign peoples exercise a strong, potentially unruly influence. Both Cummins and Hawthorne depict characters who refuse Christian faith and fail to adhere to Christian

virtues, and they portray communities that remain fundamentally divided on questions of faith. The novelists grapple with the limits of Christianity as a foundation for global sympathy, recognizing how it may also foster exclusion, much as contemporary Lebanese, Italians, and Americans struggled to reconcile the differences both between and within the faiths that shape these countries. Further, by depicting how the characters' international ties resurface, the novelists suggest that the characters' faith and foreign bonds will persist into the future, as will the challenge of reconciling these beliefs and attachments.<sup>58</sup> Hilda and Kenyon return to Rome, and Havilah hopes for a continued friendship with Abdoul. While the novels portray how foreign sins and violence create anxiety over America's future in the international sphere, these concerns establish the Christian sister's continued importance. She models sensibility and authoritative judgment, even through her circumscribed ties to foreign peoples and places.

Tensions between the appeal of faith-based sympathy as a means of uniting diverse peoples and concern that faith will divide these peoples from each other, which run throughout these novels, become particularly apparent if we consider parallel scenes in *El Fureidîs* and *The Marble Faun*. In both scenes, the characters ascend to a higher elevation and, as they reflect on the world below, reveal their spiritual beliefs to readers. Much like the depictions of worship that I discussed at the start of the chapter, these scenes evoke the possibility of religious communion; however, the conversations between the characters highlight their differences in belief, which limit their connections to one another. In *The Marble Faun*, Kenyon and Donatello stand atop a tower at Donatello's family estate, looking out over Italy's landscape, and compare their understandings of the world and of God. The view moves Kenyon to proclaim, "How it

strengthens the poor human spirit in its reliance on His Providence, to ascend but this little way above the common level, and so attain a somewhat wider glimpse of His dealings with mankind! He doeth all things right!” (258). Kenyon assumes his own emotions are universal, and so he describes how “*the* poor human spirit” responds to such a view (emphasis added). Believing that this scene would elicit the same “sensation of gratitude” in any observer, Kenyon feels reassured that God’s goodness unites the widely varied scenes he sees below him (258).

However, Hawthorne immediately questions this claim of universality. Donatello objects to Kenyon’s assertions: “You discern something that is hidden from me . . . I see sunshine on one spot, and cloud in another, and no reason for it in either case. The sun on you; the cloud on me! What comfort can I draw from this?” (258). Donatello suggests that the assurance of unity and divinity that Kenyon locates within the landscape is particular to him and reflects the “sunshine” of his position. Faced with their discrepant perspectives, Kenyon insists that he cannot articulate his feelings: “Nay; I cannot preach . . . with a page of heaven and a page of earth spread wide open before us! Only begin to read it, and you will find it interpreting itself without the aid of words. It is a great mistake to put our best thoughts into human language” (258). By refusing dialogue, Kenyon leaves the two men at an impasse; he insists he can only refer his friend back to the view, advising him to “read” it, as the view will “interpret itself.” Kenyon promises a transcendent experience: if Donatello only begins right, he will see past the barrier of his individual perspective and the world will reveal its meaning to him.

The description of the view that precedes this exchange—focalized predominantly through Kenyon’s perspective—likewise disrupts his efforts to assert universal meaning:

“It seemed as if all Italy lay under his eyes, in that one picture. For there was the broad, sunny smile of God, which we fancy to be spread over that favoured land more abundantly than on other regions, and, beneath it, glowed a most rich and varied fertility” (257). The allusions to fancy and to what *seemed* to be (rather than what is) indicate the influence of Kenyon’s American perspective on his reverent response to the landscape. Thus the description of the landscape, mediated through language and perspective, cannot unite the two men’s views. Rather, this scene links Kenyon to Hilda, whom he hears psychically calling to him. His elevated perspective resembles the view from her Roman tower, and both Americans perceive the world below them through the lens of Christian faith. Kenyon’s inability to spread his faith to Donatello suggests that the Americans remain divided from their foreign friends, though Kenyon continues to exercise influence over Donatello. For instance Kenyon advises Donatello that “Miriam is one whom Providence marks out as intimately connected with your destiny” (321). Like Cummins’s Western protagonists, Kenyon acquires authority through his faith, which simultaneously distinguishes him from his friends and becomes the basis for his continued connection to them.

In *El Fureidîs*, Cummins presents a similar scene, wherein Meredith, Havilah, and Father Lapierre ascend to a mountain peak. Upon reaching a beautiful summit at sunset, Meredith and Father Lapierre quote Scripture. However, Meredith’s quote reflects his “artistic and poetical enthusiasm,” which merely “imprese[s]” Havilah (101; 102). Cummins contrasts the Englishman’s feelings to those of Father Lapierre, who “struck a deeper sympathetic chord . . . as the saintly priest rose above the worship of nature, and poured out his soul in gladness to the Lord” (102). As in *The Marble Faun*, characters

reveal the influence of faith on their understanding of the larger world by responding to the expansive view of the earth beneath them. Differences in characters' responses attest to differences in their faith. These discrepancies leave Meredith unable to comprehend Havilah: "that look was on Havilah's face which he had vainly tried to understand" (103). Her inscrutable expression reminds us of the difficulty of conveying what Kenyon calls "the higher regions of emotion and spiritual enjoyment" (258). Only the faithful can understand the ineffable feelings evoked through worship and sympathize with other devout people.

The two novels present different resolutions to the tensions between religion's unifying and divisive effects. Cummins places her cliff scene relatively early in *El Fureidîs*; through this scene, she signals Meredith's need for spiritual reform, while leaving plenty of time in the narrative for him to experience conversion and share in Havilah's reverence for God. This thread of the narrative suggests that the value of cross-cultural encounters lies in their potential to bring new individuals and peoples within the folds of Christianity. Hawthorne, on the other hand, locates his tower scene further along in *The Marble Faun*; Donatello has already undergone his major transformation from the sprightly faun to the melancholy man, and he does not experience a conversion like Meredith's.<sup>59</sup> Thus while both novelists suggest that faith can confer moral and spiritual authority on individuals, Cummins emphasizes sympathy's power to foster faith in God and unite diverse peoples, whereas Hawthorne emphasizes how cross-cultural differences persist and limit international affinities. Overall, these scenes represent how Protestant Americans' faith provides them with a sense of global unity, because they believe that

God's Providence encompasses everyone. At the same time, the two texts depict how faith becomes a barrier to characters' fellow-feeling and reinforces differences of power.

Questions of how faith should shape U.S.-foreign encounters remained fraught and persisted well after the Civil War, as we see in María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's novels, *Who Would Have Thought It?* (1872) and *The Squatter and the Don* (1886), which are the subject of the next chapter. Writing in the 1870s and 1880s, Ruiz de Burton expresses concerns that religion limits Americans' capacity to feel for fellow citizens and foreign peoples, especially those Mexicans absorbed into the U.S. nation through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Like Cummins and Hawthorne, she depicts Protestantism as central to U.S. culture and foreign relations. However, Ruiz de Burton's first novel in particular critiques Protestants as unfeeling hypocrites. She suggests that by judging "foreign" peoples and those outside their own faith, New England's religious leaders sanction Americans' exploitation of one another and of the larger world. After all, Christian missionary work and economic imperialism were often closely tied together, and the desire to spread Christianity remained a key argument for U.S. foreign intervention throughout the nineteenth century.<sup>60</sup> Whereas Cummins and Hawthorne consider how Protestant faith unites diverse peoples, Ruiz de Burton depicts Protestants predominantly as tyrannical foils for her sympathetic Mexican Catholic heroine. Her work reminds us that Hawthorne and Cummins participated in widespread debates over Protestantism's role in U.S.-foreign relations.

---

<sup>1</sup> This similarity of recent scholarship on Cummins and Hawthorne marks a shift, as critics have traditionally treated the authors' work disparately. *The Marble Faun* has received considerably more critical attention than *El Fureidís*, particularly in terms of formal or aesthetic readings. For example, see Jonathan Auerbach's reading of *The Marble Faun*.



---

<sup>2</sup> Nancy Bentley provided a foundational reading of Africanist figures in *The Marble Faun*. Molly Robey explores how *El Fureidís* relates to issues of race and U.S. slavery. See Mark Kemp on Hawthorne and postcolonialism. On Cummins and imperialism, see Etsuko Taketani.

<sup>3</sup> By attending to the complexities of Hawthorne's and Cummins's engagement with sympathy, I draw on prior readings of Hawthorne's aesthetic complexity and political ambiguity. For instance, while David Greven acknowledges the conservative aspects of Hawthorne's writing, he argues that prior condemnations of his work mistake his "ideological gumbo full of diverse ingredients that each add to an overall consistency yet remain distinct" for "a uniform ideological sludge" (979).

<sup>4</sup> Notably, Ticknor and Field published the American editions of these texts within months of each other: *The Marble Faun* was released in March and *El Fureidís* in May of 1860.

<sup>5</sup> Readings of *The Marble Faun* criticize the novel's Protestant American heroine, Hilda, for refusing to sympathize with her friend Miriam. Scholars suggest that Hilda embodies a failure of feeling, whether they argue that this refusal signifies Americans' lack of compassion for enslaved Africans or a self-interested desire to avoid foreign entanglements. Meanwhile, scholars critique how Cummins's heroine, Havilah, displays her affinity for Syrian villagers through Christian benevolence, which reifies racial, cultural, and national hierarchies. See Blythe Ann Tellefsen on Hilda's role in *The Marble Faun* and Malini Schueller on *El Fureidís*'s Havilah.

<sup>6</sup> Both novelists associate the Christian sister with America; where Hawthorne effectively conflates Hilda's national and religious heritage by making his American figure the "daughter" of Puritans, Cummins assigns Havilah a hybrid identity (Greek and American), while suggesting she is centrally defined by her Christianity (95).

<sup>7</sup> Adam Smith's theory suggests that individuals' sympathy depends upon their judgment that the subject of their feeling merits compassion. Emily Budick and other critics overlook this part of the process of sympathy when they assume that Hilda's refusal to feel for Miriam in *The Marble Faun* constitutes a failure of feeling.

<sup>8</sup> Paula Bennett, 593, 606. Bennett argues that by the late 1850s, American women poets had begun to critique and move away from the high sentimentalism that ostensibly afforded women strong sway within the domestic sphere. By contrast, I argue that Hawthorne and Cummins revise the sentimental ideal by situating their female characters in the international sphere.

<sup>9</sup> Here I challenge Steven Hamelman's argument that Cummins's Orientalism interrupts the expression of sympathy in *El Fureidís*. The relation between sympathy and Orientalism in Cummins's work is all the more troubling because she folds her view of Arabs as a violent people into her argument for sympathy as a means of reforming foreign peoples.

<sup>10</sup> Specifically, I am referring to Maria Cummins's character Emily Grant and Susan Warner's Alice Humphreys.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Christian sister stands in contrast to the figure of the “Republican Sister” from early American literature. As described by Judith Fetterley, this figure emerged as writers like Catharine Maria Sedgwick sought to establish that American women were the equals of their “brothers,” likewise capable of advancing the nation. This figure of the Republican Sister challenged earlier notions of Republican Motherhood that, as Linda Kerber argues, characterized women’s contributions to the nation primarily in terms of their domestic roles as mothers.

<sup>12</sup> This is a key distinction between the Christian sister and the Republican sister. Whereas Cummins emphasizes the influence that elective sisters exercise over others’ spiritual faith, in Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie*, the female friends and elective sisters each adhere to a different form of spiritual/moral authority. Esther Downing models obedience to Protestant forms of prayer and authority; Hope Leslie acts on her conscience, rather than in accordance with the Protestant law; and Magawisca asserts her faith in the Great Spirit, rather than the Christian God. None of these characters alters the others’ religious convictions. We see this not only in Esther’s inability to quell Hope’s rebellion against Governor Winthrop, but also in Hope’s inability to persuade Magawisca that she should remain in Boston and convert to Christianity.

<sup>13</sup> In other words, the trope of Christian sisterhood remains enmeshed with the problems of sympathy and difference that Glenn Hendler defines: “To critics writing from a variety of perspectives—but especially to those concerned with questions of race and imperialism—the politics of sympathy is fatally flawed by sentimentalism’s drive to turn all differences into equivalences. The limits of such a politics become apparent when it comes up against any significant cultural or experiential difference between the subject and object of its paradigmatic act of sympathetic identification: if I have to *be* like you and *feel* like you in order for you to feel *for* me, sympathy reaches its limits at the moment you recognize that I am not quite like you” (147).

<sup>14</sup> Timothy Marr, 91. Further, Marr argues that from “the earliest years of the Reformation . . . prophecies about the reign of antichristian forces enabled Protestants to link Islam and Catholicism as a connected system of corruption and subversion” (91). Cummins’s and Hawthorne’s depictions of their American characters’ ties to Muslims and Catholics break from these earlier narratives, while nonetheless exploring Protestantism’s value.

<sup>15</sup> Though Havilah’s international heritage disrupts clear notions of national belonging, her association with America through her father allows her to embody U.S.-foreign relations.

<sup>16</sup> Notably, these tropes in *Pierre* resonate more closely with Pauline Hopkins’s *Of One Blood* (1902), discussed in my fourth chapter.

<sup>17</sup> As Robert Levine notes, this scene draws on Hawthorne’s similar reflections regarding St. Peter’s in his Italian notebook. This connection reminds us that Hawthorne’s interest in foreign cultures and cross-cultural ties, in this case the international appeal of St. Peter’s and its confessionals, shaped his novel (Levine 21; Hawthorne 59). “‘Antebellum Rome’ in *The Marble Faun*.”

---

<sup>18</sup> For instance, Elaine Showalter quotes Hawthorne's 1855 letter to Ticknor to highlight both women writers' increasing popularity in the era and male writers' and editors' resentment of this competition for readers, 83. Jane Tompkins also draws on Hawthorne's work as a case study to argue that the aesthetic value of work by (male) "masters" of American literature and their lesser-known contemporaries should be read in relation to their cultural context.

<sup>19</sup> F. O. Matthiessen also quotes Hawthorne's letter to Ticknor, but employs it uncritically as part of his argument that writers need not have been popular in their own day to be great artists. Further, he claims that while the more popular women writers may be useful as "a fertile field for the sociologist and for the historian of our taste," we should read the great writers first (x-xi).

<sup>20</sup> Jane Tompkins. In particular, see Chapter One, "Masterpiece Theater: The Politics of Hawthorne's Literary Reputation."

<sup>21</sup> Even work like Amy Kaplan's, which analyzes Cummins's fiction in relation to U.S. imperialism, does so by reading it alongside Susan Warner's domestic fiction.

<sup>22</sup> Nina Baym, Introduction to *The Lamplighter*.

<sup>23</sup> Nina Baym, Appendix: The Epigraphs to *The Lamplighter*.

<sup>24</sup> For instance, Elaine Showalter's synopsis of antebellum domestic fiction and the mass market states that Cummins "retold the story [of Susan Warner's *The Wide, Wide World*] in her best sellers" (99).

<sup>25</sup> Nina Baym, xvii.

<sup>26</sup> Cummins had not traveled to the Middle East, as she acknowledges in the preface to her novel, and so incorporates descriptions of the region based on her reading in popular travel guides of the era. The novelist did finally travel abroad, in Western Europe, just around the time that Ticknor and Fields was completing the publication of *El Fureidis*. Heidi Jacobs has recently republished some of the letters Cummins wrote home from London and writes that Cummins's passport indicates that she may have also traveled to Germany, France, and Switzerland (243).

<sup>27</sup> Nina Baym's introduction notes that Cummins's *The Lamplighter* challenges Calvinism: "Holding out the possibility that enlightenment exists in everyone, even an abused and abandoned child, [the novel] rejects the Calvinism still strong in New England; declaring that enlightenment is a gradual educative process, it rejects the Evangelicism increasingly prominent in American religious life. Everyone has an inner light, but all need confirmation and strengthening through social relations" (xix). I argue that we can see the same anti-Calvinist tendencies within *El Fureidis*, particularly in Cummins's choice to depict Havilah as an embodiment of Protestant faith, though she is just a young girl on the verge of womanhood.

<sup>28</sup> Cummins's relation to imperialism lies at the center of much of the existing criticism on *El Fureidis*. Malini Schueller argues that the novel critiques aspects of imperialism, both through its emphasis on hybridity and its revision of more conventional gender roles, but ultimately transforms the novel's hero into a figure of "appropriate colonial

---

paternalism” (104). Etsuko Taketani builds on this reading while emphasizing that the novel shows us how alliances among Western colonial powers are forged through the white heroine, who is “conscripted into the formation of Western male bonding” as the novel “dissolves into an ill-disguised allegory of Western colonization of the opulent Orient” (185). Molly Robey shifts our attention to the central role of Christianity within the novel by arguing that Cummins reinforces the racial otherness of non-Christians and fails to imagine “true pluralism” (496). And finally, Steven Hamelman considers the importance of sympathy to the novel, but contends that Cummins’s Orientalism remains in tension with and undercuts expressions of connection across difference.

<sup>29</sup> For more discussion of how Cummins complicates notions of home and national belonging, see Taketani and Robey.

<sup>30</sup> Nina Baym “Introduction” to *The Lamplighter*, xxix.

<sup>31</sup> Hamelman argues that, “The implication that only a Bedouin would murder an injured gazelle is paralleled by an implication that bloodthirsty Bedouins need to learn sympathy from the master race” (74). Hamelman’s critique of the Orientalist depiction of Abdoul as “bloodthirsty” is apt, but the argument becomes reductive when it ignores how Meredith’s intervention here fails to do any good. This scene highlights that Meredith needs to be reformed, as well, and evinces ambivalence about Westerners’ foreign interventions.

<sup>32</sup> Here I challenge Steven Hamelman’s argument that Cummins’s Orientalism undermines her attempts to convey the value of foreign sympathy.

<sup>33</sup> Schueller and other critics argue that Meredith develops “an appropriate colonial paternalism,” which ultimately contains the novel’s earlier challenges to the “phallogocentric basis of imperialism” (104; 97).

<sup>34</sup> Catholicism appears both less appealing and less threatening than in *The Marble Faun*, because in *El Fureidîs* the fathers are powerless.

<sup>35</sup> Molly Robey notes that Western women’s Holy Land writings often envisioned their trips to the Holy Land as a return home, to a site of religious origins, and that maintaining this sense of home in the face of the “material tensions,” such as sectarian violence, required the “continued subordination of religious and racial others” (495).

<sup>36</sup> Eugene Rogan, 493.

<sup>37</sup> Steven Hamelman reads Cummins as disregarding the region’s violence and religious tensions.

<sup>38</sup> Here I build on Molly Robey’s argument that Cummins “ostensibly offered an alternative ending to the brutality unfolding in the Near East, a resolution in which U.S. women mediated and diffused conflict” (476).

<sup>39</sup> For an understanding of the competing perspectives regarding international intervention, particularly those of Ottomanists as compared to Syrian and Lebanese nationalists, see Ussama Makdisi.

<sup>40</sup> Eugene Rogan, 493.

---

<sup>41</sup> The International Commission was “a war-crimes tribunal of sorts made up of representatives from Britain, France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia” (Makdisi 603).

<sup>42</sup> Leila Fawaz, 494.

<sup>43</sup> Rogan offers a case study focused, in part, on Arab Christian intellectuals’ responses to these events. Rogan notes that while in 1860, some Arab Christians appealed for Western intervention, they also changed their views in the early 1870s when the Ottoman government had re-established its power and was working toward enforcing the Tanzīmāt reforms that conferred equal status on Syrian inhabitants, regardless of their religious faith.

<sup>44</sup> Eugene Rogan, 507.

<sup>45</sup> *The Marble Faun* and its characters are so thoroughly engaged with Italian culture that, as Nancy Bentley and other critics note, nineteenth-century readers treated the text as both novel and travel guide.

<sup>46</sup> For a discussion of how *The Marble Faun* speaks to the French Intervention into Italy and sectional conflict within the United States, see Robert Levine, “‘Antebellum Rome’ in *The Marble Faun*”; on tensions among Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant groups, see Augustus Kolich; on Hawthorne’s figuration of U.S. racial tensions through the “Africanist” figures, see Nancy Bentley.

<sup>47</sup> Luther Luedtke, among other critics, has discussed how Hawthorne’s writing engages with a variety of international influences, including notions of Orientalism.

<sup>48</sup> Here I build on Robert Levine’s argument that through the novel’s central conflict, Hawthorne both highlights the appeal of Rome’s “‘artistic’ Catholicism,” which offers a source of moral authority following the novel’s violence, and expresses anxiety “about Catholicism’s tendencies toward despotism” (21-23). “‘Antebellum Rome’ in *The Marble Faun*.”

<sup>49</sup> Emily Miller Budick, “Perplexity, Sympathy, and the Question of the Human: A Reading of *The Marble Faun*,” 235. Further, Joel Pfister takes up the idea, raised in the novel, that sin might foster human development (177-178). By contrast, a few critics have challenged the tendency to assume that Hilda ought to sympathize with Miriam. In particular, Arthur Riis notes that when Kenyon encourages Hilda to show more mercy toward Miriam and perhaps even consider the good that may emerge through Donatello’s “fall” and subsequent development, Kenyon is, in effect, asking her to sanction a murder.

<sup>50</sup> See Smith’s *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 260.

<sup>51</sup> More specifically, Kolich reads Hilda’s refusal of sympathy to Miriam as Hawthorne’s assertion that Americans need to avoid intervening or involving themselves in Roman Catholic oppression of the Jews in Italy (440). By contrast, Brook Thomas argues that the novel conveys a sense that “feelings of sympathy also need to be measured by considerations of justice” (180). I build on Thomas’s argument by asserting that judgment is part of the process of sympathy.

<sup>52</sup> On antebellum Americans’ interest in Rome, see Robert Levine, “‘Antebellum Rome’ in *The Marble Faun*.” On Americans’ interest in the Holy Lands, see Molly Robey.

---

<sup>53</sup> Mark A. R. Kemp, 210.

<sup>54</sup> Malini Schueller, 79.

<sup>55</sup> My fourth chapter discusses the trope of the national family in more detail.

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion of Hawthorne's representation of Donatello as a faun, see Nancy Bentley. As noted earlier, Cummins repeatedly refers to Abdoul as a "beast." While animal imagery runs throughout *El Fureidís*, offering a means to characterize both Western and Eastern characters, describing Abdoul as beast defines him in opposition to that which is human. Cummins's depiction of Abdoul as a "beast" resonates with justifications for slavery that denied Africans' humanity. By contrast, the other animal analogies highlight particular, valuable traits of a specific species, as when Meredith is likened to a swallow and Havilah to a gazelle.

<sup>57</sup> Elizabeth Fenton, see the Introduction.

<sup>58</sup> Prior readings, particularly of *The Marble Faun*, refer to the resurgence of such ties as a "haunting" that disrupts the nation and any attempt to exclude "foreign" peoples or racial others. Yet this seems an over-reading. For instance, see Kemp.

<sup>59</sup> Even when Donatello begins to feel that he might be blessed, rather than relegated to the shadows (as in the tower scene), he attributes this blessing to the statue of a Pope, rather than newfound Protestant faith (314-15).

<sup>60</sup> As Jay Sexton writes of the 1840s, "Whigs believed that commercial expansion and the spread of Christianity went hand in hand. . . . Whig imperialism manifested itself in imposing upon others their commerce, culture, and religion" (115).

### Chapter 3. María Amparo Ruiz's Anti-Reunion Novel:

#### Marriage & the Failure of American Sympathy

In the postbellum era, U.S. writers crafted narratives of Westward expansion, the Civil War, and Reconstruction that sought to characterize how these events had influenced the nation and would continue to shape its future. In so doing, American authors commonly situated these “national” events within a global context, as recent scholarship in New South Studies attests.<sup>1</sup> The work of Mexican American author María Amparo Ruiz de Burton (1832-1895) offers a rich example of how postbellum writers employed an international framework to define America and explore its internal conflicts. By depicting U.S. ties to the larger world, she underscores the blurred divisions between the foreign and domestic central to her own national identity. As a Mexican citizen absorbed into the United States through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, she had become an American, but one still marked as “foreign.” Her two novels, *Who Would Have Thought It?* (1872) and *The Squatter and the Don* (1886), represent America’s connections to Europe, Africa, and Mexico. She considers how expansion, voluntary and forced immigration, and civil wars all shaped international affiliations. Rather than implying that American participation in the global sphere would spread democracy or Christianity, as Cooper and Cummins had, Ruiz de Burton depicts U.S. expansion as predicated upon the exploitation of foreign and American peoples. In response, she asserts America’s need for a new sympathetic, cosmopolitan approach to domestic and foreign relations.<sup>2</sup>

In particular, Ruiz de Burton's first novel—the focus of this chapter—characterizes America's government and culture as permeated by self-interest and a dearth of fellow-feeling. *Who Would Have Thought It?* refutes assertions of U.S. exceptionalism and benevolence by satirizing New England Protestantism, the Civil War, and American democracy. Conjoining her critique of U.S. nationalism with an international romance, Ruiz de Burton raises questions about how unfeeling and prejudiced Americans affect foreign peoples. She weaves her satire through a courtship narrative centered on her young Mexican heroine, Lola Medina. Notably, the novel's model New Englanders—particularly Mrs. Norval—express disdain toward Lola and unabashed xenophobia, warning their fellow citizens against any “fondness for foreigners” (18).<sup>3</sup> Whereas Mrs. Norval's provincial life insulates her from compassion for other peoples, the novel's virtuous characters form sympathetic ties that transcend the nation. The novel celebrates these cosmopolitan bonds, which help characters escape New England's unfeeling petticoat government and the similarly tyrannical federal government.

In portraying Americans' relations to one another and to foreign peoples, Ruiz de Burton evinces a belief expressed by Enlightenment philosophers and her nineteenth-century literary predecessors that sympathy is vital to the welfare of the nation and the world. However, she breaks from Cooper, Cummins, and Hawthorne, who imagine American sympathy expanding outward to encompass the globe. Most Americans in *Who Would Have Thought It?* lack two attributes essential to foreign sympathy: the ability to recognize foreign peoples as equals and the willingness to share imaginatively in others' experiences. Ruiz de Burton marks both absences as problematic by depicting the



ideological conflicts that arise between unfeeling New Englanders, who become U.S. leaders, and the nation's few compassionate citizens.

Looking back from the 1870s to the antebellum and Civil War, Ruiz de Burton's first novel suggests that Americans often failed to feel genuine concern for fellow citizens, slaves, and foreigners. The author thereby contests laudatory depictions, typical of antebellum sentimental novels, of Americans as benevolent Christians. She likewise questions the value of U.S. democracy by depicting corrupt politicians who ignore their constituents' interests. U.S. nationalism, she implies, masks the lack of national unity and fellow-feeling, while sanctioning the persecution of citizens and foreigners in Americans' pursuit of their self-interest.

The failure of U.S. ideals causes the sympathetic American characters, namely Dr. Norval and his son Julian, to develop transgressive foreign attachments. Alienated from their country, the cosmopolitan Norval men form stronger bonds with privileged Mexicans than with provincial Americans or, for that matter, with Africans or Native Americans. Through her characters' international affinities, Ruiz de Burton disputes contemporary depictions of Mexicans as racially inferior to Euro-Americans.<sup>4</sup> Yet, rather than arguing that Americans should recognize the humanity of all peoples, she implies that only elite, white cosmopolitans possess a refined sensibility and merit others' sympathy, thereby emphasizing the racial and cultural boundaries of sympathy. She reclassifies Mexicans, like her heroine Lola, as members of a wealthy, refined, white elite with direct ties to Spain. Positing that her Mexican protagonists derive their cultural value and refinement from their Western European origins, Ruiz de Burton contests U.S. oppression of Mexicans and extols cosmopolitans who view Mexican culture as

“civilized.” Further, she casts Mexicans and white Southerners as innocent victims of Northerners’ hunger for power, while ignoring the suffering of Native Americans and African Americans.<sup>5</sup>

In exploring how *Who Would Have Thought It?* depicts America’s relation to the world, this chapter takes up Gretchen Murphy’s call to move beyond the hemispheric focus of recent criticism on Ruiz de Burton’s fiction. While the author’s interest in the United States’ relation with Mexico has made her work an apt subject for hemispheric studies, such analysis overlooks the importance of her recurring references to Europe and Africa. As Murphy argues, the novel “depicts the United States as a space enmeshed in transatlantic cultural influences, caught in an inferior relation to Europe which one escapes only through genteel improvement.”<sup>6</sup> Notably Ruiz de Burton attributes a key role to sympathy (or the lack thereof) in shaping the violent civil wars and rebellions that had erupted during this era in the United States, Mexico, and Europe, while also underscoring how feeling mediates the relations among these countries.

Linking emotion and politics, prior scholars read particular characters’ excessive, illicit desires as figures for the problems of corruption and imperialism.<sup>7</sup> I build on this by calling attention to the larger pattern of emotions in Ruiz de Burton’s first novel. Much as cultural critics today strive to define the national mood and analyze how feeling influences national and global politics, Ruiz de Burton diagnoses the unruly emotions, such as greed and lust, that she sees at work in nineteenth-century America and its foreign policy.<sup>8</sup> She depicts how these emotions, rather than fortitude or self-sacrifice, drive the Civil War and so deflates northern mythologies of the war. Her narrative redefines Americans’ place in the world by asserting that they behave like the novel’s

“savage” Native Americans and Africans. In contrast, cosmopolitan American and Mexican characters develop sympathy for one another and “deserving” foreign peoples. While noting that foreign ties can increase the nation’s wealth, Ruiz de Burton emphasizes that their true importance lies in modeling affectionate relations. She suggests that the paucity of such relations within U.S. culture fosters Americans’ violent exploitation of one another and of foreign peoples.

Through her appraisal of America, Ruiz de Burton illuminates the connections between global sympathy and Gilded Age concerns regarding the failure of U.S. political structures to enact democratic ideals. Literary critiques from this era—wherein American writers lament the rise of monopolists or the flaws of Reconstruction policies—may appear primarily domestic in their focus. For instance, Walt Whitman’s *Democratic Vistas* (1870-71) and Mark Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885) advance national critique through their portraits of American manners, commerce, and politics. Yet Ruiz de Burton calls our attention to the imbrication of national feeling and foreign relations, linking the foreign and domestic by asserting that the same obsessive self-interest shaping U.S. policies at home also inflected America’s affairs abroad. Her work anticipates later depictions of the South by Northern and Southern intellectuals who, Harilaos Stecopoulos writes, understood that “emphasiz[ing] the South’s alien status” raises “questions of how ‘Uncle Sam’ has managed the challenge of his ‘other provinces’”<sup>9</sup> Ruiz de Burton connects Northern “tyranny” in the Civil War to expansion and economic imperialism. Yet she elides the violence of both Southern slavery and European imperialism, as this would complicate her critique of the U.S. North.

To explore the link between national sentiments and foreign affairs during and after the Civil War, I situate Ruiz de Burton's first novel in relation to literature of the same era. She shares her contemporaries' concerns regarding the hypocrisy of Christianity and Americans' failure of feeling, while emphasizing how these issues also affect foreign peoples. I then analyze her use of a courtship narrative, specifically conventions from the romance of reunion, to contest U.S. exceptionalism and imperialism. In particular, I trace how Ruiz de Burton links a troubling absence of sympathy in the American home to the creation of unfeeling citizens and an oppressive federal government. In *Who Would Have Thought It?*, Ruiz de Burton imagines an alternative mode of international relations based in sympathy and cosmopolitanism, but offers little hope for national reform, instead emphasizing how U.S. politics continues to threaten both citizens and foreign peoples. The final section of this chapter considers how Ruiz de Burton revisits sympathy in her second novel, *The Squatter and the Don*. Here she evokes optimism that Americans' cross-cultural bonds can reform the nation and alter its foreign relations.

### Insider Critique and International Context

As a Californio, María Amparo Ruiz de Burton possessed a deep familiarity with Mexico, America, and the close ties between the two nations. Born in Mexico in 1832, she witnessed the Mexican-American War and subsequent Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In 1848, she was one of approximately 500 Californians who became U.S. citizens by moving from Baja, which had yet to be incorporated into America, to San Francisco. The

next year, María Amparo Ruiz married Henry S. Burton, a captain in the U.S. Army, whom she had met while the army was occupying Mexican territory. The couple spent much of the 1850s living in San Francisco and San Diego. These cities would become the subject of her second novel, which depicts the effects of railroad monopolies on the growth of the West. When Captain Burton was stationed on the East Coast in the 1860s, he and his wife lived in Rhode Island, Washington, D.C., Delaware, and Virginia. Here the novelist gained familiarity with the communities that she satirizes in *Who Would Have Thought It?* By the time she published her first novel, she was widowed and had returned to California where she pursued her claims to land grants through the courts. Scholars remain fascinated by the relation between Ruiz de Burton's identity—as a Mexican and American, a U.S. military wife and dispossessed Californio—and her work.

Ruiz de Burton's writing, which became the subject of some popular attention, helps us to think through her relation to U.S. culture, rather than relying too heavily on assumptions about her status as an ethnic minority and ostensible "outsider." As Jesse Alemán writes, she possessed enough "cultural capital" that "Philadelphia publisher J. P. Lippincott issued Ruiz de Burton's first novel," which *Lippincott's Magazine* favorably reviewed.<sup>10</sup> While the reception of her novels begins to suggest her participation in American culture, the texts themselves address a wide array of U.S. literary, political, and cultural concerns. Scholars note the variety of aesthetic influences on her writing, which appropriates elements of sentimental and sensational literature, theatre, and melodrama. Ruiz de Burton's novels present commentary on subjects ranging from recent legislation, Civil War battles, and President Lincoln, to Americans' religious practices, tourist spots, and balls that demonstrates her knowledge of U.S. culture on the East and West Coasts.

To address the rich allusiveness of her work, recent critical introductions to her novels offer compendiums on central controversies of the day, from U.S. expansion, to women's sexuality, and the rise of Boss Tweed and Butlerism.<sup>11</sup> Ruiz de Burton also wrote a play, *Don Quixote de la Mancha: A Comedy in Five Acts* (1876), which draws on Miguel de Cervantes's novel to satirize U.S. culture and California land politics.<sup>12</sup> As this work attests, her attention to local and national politics was entwined with her interest in international cultural networks.

On reissuing her novels in the 1990s through the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage Project, Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita asserted the value of Ruiz de Burton's work by arguing that her Californio identity and political engagement make her a predecessor to the 20<sup>th</sup> century Chicano/a movement. In response, other critics contend that her political perspective is far removed from the Chicano movement's positions on race and class, given her assertions of Californios' whiteness and her own social privilege. Ruiz de Burton was a woman who successfully petitioned President Lincoln to promote her husband to the rank of colonel.<sup>13</sup> The racial, class, and ethnic politics of Ruiz de Burton's writing demonstrate the problem of making "ethnic" authors' literary value contingent upon their progressive views.

Reading Ruiz de Burton's writing as the work of an outsider to nineteenth-century U.S. culture or a precursor to twentieth-century ethnic writing sets up the false expectation that she could transcend America's troubling racial and national politics. Instead, recognizing her intimate knowledge of U.S. political, economic, and social structures lets us read her novels as a form of "insider's critique," to borrow Anne Goldman's phrase.<sup>14</sup> Without denying the importance of Ruiz de Burton's racial, cultural,

and gender identity, the concept of insider's critique offers a way of thinking about her participation in nineteenth-century culture. She contributes to Reconstruction and Gilded Age literature's diverse depictions of U.S. government and society. *Who Would Have Thought It?* speaks to social commentary authored by an array of canonical and understudied writers of the era—including Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, William Dean Howells, Constance Fenimore Woolson, and Helen Hunt Jackson—despite clear differences in their politics and use of form.<sup>15</sup>

Re-situating Ruiz de Burton in relation to these writers, we can see that her views on U.S. politics and culture were not marginal. Her criticisms of the nation were both anticipated and echoed by her contemporaries. At times, her writing also intersects with dominant racial and imperial ideologies. Ruiz de Burton's personal history involved her in ongoing debates over U.S. expansion, though her experiences did not always lead her to espouse progressive views. Limiting our study of her work to its progressive elements, i.e. her challenge to U.S. exceptionalism and the oppression of Mexicans, would prevent us from recognizing the extent of Ruiz de Burton's global interests. Her critique of the Civil War and of America more broadly depends, in part, upon her conservative or even regressive depictions of Europe and Africa. Exploring how she represents the Civil War's international significance lets us see how her views of the global sphere resonate with those of her contemporaries; these connections, in turn, deepen our understanding of how postbellum writers portrayed the troubling relations among U.S. citizens, as well as between the nation and foreign countries.

We can see that Ruiz de Burton engaged with widespread concerns about U.S. government following the Civil War, for instance, through the similarities between her

first novel and Whitman's *Democratic Vistas*. His essays are known for their optimism regarding America's future greatness as a democracy. However, in assessing the state of the nation in the wake of the Civil War, Whitman acknowledges that America has yet to become truly democratic; the government does not represent the nation's diverse peoples.<sup>16</sup> He and Ruiz de Burton evince similar concerns that the failures of representative government and the nation's continued divisions reflect a lack of feeling and of principle. Whitman declares "the [nation's] moral conscience" to be "either entirely lacking or seriously enfeebled or ungrown" (11). Ruiz de Burton's caricatures of U.S. politicians speak to similar concerns over U.S. ethics.

Re-reading Whitman alongside Ruiz de Burton reveals that both were troubled by the implications that the failure of democracy held for national expansion. The two authors asserted that America's lack of, in Whitman's words, "grand religious, moral, literary, and esthetic results" left the nation ill-equipped to govern new lands and peoples (12). He argues that as "we annex Texas, California, Alaska, and reach north for Canada and south for Cuba," "it is as if we were somehow being endowed with a vast and more and more thoroughly-appointed body, and then left with little or no soul" (12). While he implies that territorial growth ought to be matched by moral growth, Ruiz de Burton offers an even more forceful critique of national expansion. She reminds us that America was not simply "being endowed" with a larger body, but rather was forcibly claiming lands and resources through unconscionable violence.

Twain's writing offers another useful point of comparison as he shares Whitman's and Ruiz de Burton's concerns about the country's cultural and moral development. In *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, written in the years between Ruiz de Burton's two



novels, Twain explores how America's rampant immorality had led to the Civil War. His darkly comic scenes of slavery, feuding families, and lynch mobs underscore that Americans act on violent, selfish desires. His satire of antebellum American culture emphasizes the hypocrisy of U.S. Christianity, along with Americans' parochialism and bastardization of European cultures. Consider the figures of the Duke and Dauphin. Their performances suggest that U.S. missionary work is just that, a performance based in economic motives rather than foreign sympathy. Americans' lack of sincere foreign sympathy is matched by their ignorance of foreign cultures, as conveyed by the Duke and Dauphin's absurd impersonations of European royalty.

Ruiz de Burton similarly satirizes U.S. Protestants as unfeeling and provincial. However, she directs her criticism not at foreign missionaries or U.S. slaveholders (as Twain does elsewhere in his novel), but rather at New England abolitionists. She claims they are too racist and miserly to aid escaped slaves, too bloodthirsty to compromise before the Civil War, and too power hungry to advance fair policies in Reconstruction. For Ruiz de Burton, it is New Englanders who are too parochial to understand foreign cultures or develop cross-cultural sympathy. *Huckleberry Finn* and *Who Would Have Thought It?* differ in key ways: while Twain examines slavery and its legacy, Ruiz de Burton criticizes the North's treatment of white U.S. Southerners and Mexicans. Yet these authors share the sense that U.S. Christian sympathy is entwined with provincialism, which impedes Americans' compassion for foreign peoples. The comparison usefully calls attention to both Ruiz de Burton's engagement with pervasive concerns about the nation and her racially conservative perspective on these issues.

William Dean Howells's *A Hazard of New Fortunes* (1889) takes up these same concerns over America's lack of sympathy and the failure of U.S. ideals, exploring how such problems persist following Reconstruction. More specifically, his realist novel represents the rise of new members of the middle and upper classes who, in light of class divisions, struggle to reconcile their acquisition of wealth with belief in their own moral virtue. For instance, Howells represents Mr. and Mrs. March touring New York City; the middle class New Englanders insist that "the wretched creatures" who inhabit lower-class neighborhoods "can manage somehow," though Mr. March admits "I don't know how, and I'm afraid I don't want to" (66). March notes the limits of his virtue, but justifies it by insisting that "humane sentiments" would produce no real good (66). Howells further underscores Americans' failings by contrasting their complacency with a foreign figure's more critical perspective. The German immigrant Lindau has fought in the Civil War in hopes of advancing ideals of justice and equality, and he is heartbroken by the war's failure to rekindle such ideals. Read together, *A Hazard of New Fortunes* and *Who Would Have Thought It?* suggest that the war has not shored up the national future. Rather, the post-war years have revealed the breakdown of U.S. democracy and sympathy to everyone from Americans to Germans and Mexicans.<sup>17</sup>

*Who Would Have Thought It?* suggests that America's inability to live up to republican and Christian ideals has far-reaching effects that extend beyond the nation. Bringing the problem of U.S. expansion to the fore, Ruiz de Burton's novel asks readers to engage more closely with an undercurrent of concern regarding the nation's foreign relations that runs throughout literature of the 1870s and 1880s. Authors of this period generally fail to identify a clear means for addressing America's provincialism or failure

of democratic principles. In this respect, we might understand Ruiz de Burton as articulating both the problems of foreign relations and the difficulty of envisioning effective national reform with which so many Gilded Age writers grappled.<sup>18</sup>

While Ruiz de Burton criticizes America in terms similar to Whitman, Twain, and Howells, the aesthetic strategies that she employs differ considerably. In particular, she draws on the conventions of the romance of reunion.<sup>19</sup> As Nina Silber argues, numerous stories from late nineteenth-century periodicals depict the courtship of a former Union soldier and a Southern woman so as to imagine a happy ending to sectional divisions. Within this narrative logic, a story's concluding marriage implies that political tensions have already been resolved; the romantic resolution displaces national conflict, so that it appears Southern culture has been re-integrated with the Northern economy.<sup>20</sup> The romance of reunion naturalizes the North's power by conflating the South's submission with the bride's obedience to her husband's patriarchal authority. These narratives attribute considerable importance to personal attachment in advancing national unity.

Ruiz de Burton's fiction also builds on the premise that the nation's history of violent conflicts has created the need for new affiliations. However, she and a few of her contemporaries rewrite these conventions to insist that the nation remains highly divided following the Civil War and that the government continues to oppress minority groups. For instance, in Constance Fenimore Woolson's *Rodman the Keeper* (1880), the collection's title story initially seems to promise a romance of reunion. Woolson portrays a Northern soldier who, while he tends a Union cemetery in Florida after the war, develops sympathy for a young Southern woman struggling to care for her elderly Confederate relative. Though they nurse the Confederate together, Rodman and the

young woman focus on preserving the past and remain divided by it; they never court, let alone marry. When Rodman claims to understand the young woman at the story's conclusion, what he knows is that she cannot change. Woolson implies that contact between the North and South inspires familiarity, but not unity.<sup>21</sup>

Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona* (1884) more closely conforms to the romance of reunion's conventions, as the popular novel unites disparate groups through marriage. However, Jackson focuses not on re-establishing white Southerners' connections to the North, but rather on expressing how Mexican Americans and Native Americans suffer from political and social inequalities based in racism. Moreover, *Ramona* qualifies the romance's promise of a happy national future by representing the death of the eponymous heroine's first husband, a Native American who has been repeatedly dispossessed by federal policies and eventually driven mad by the loss of his family and homes. Following his death, Ramona chooses to leave the United States for Mexico with her second husband. While individual characters in Jackson's novel overcome differences of race and class, their personal attachments fail to generate a broader sense of affinity among Americans or to protect them from unjust laws.

Situating Ruiz de Burton's work in relation to that of Woolson and Jackson highlights a pattern in how these texts resist the romance of reunion's conventions; the writers refuse the expectation that their characters' sentiments will resolve national political problems. Woolson's characters remain single, whereas Jackson's and Ruiz de Burton's protagonists flee the nation to seek a haven elsewhere. Even as they laud affectionate relations, these authors characterize unfeeling encounters as typical within

America. To resist brutal conquest, their female protagonists avoid alliances with characters who represent the U.S. nation's oppressive authority.

While these writers employed the romance of reunion to depict America's lack of domestic unity following the Civil War, other postbellum authors drew on an international framework to emphasize the nation's divisions. Jennifer Rae Greeson analyzes how Northern writers depicted the U.S. South as a colony, so as to assert America's global power and pave the way for further U.S. expansion. Stecopoulos notes that virulently pro-Southern writers, including Thomas Dixon, also emphasized these divisions, in order "to accuse the North of colonization," even as they sought to "claim a part of the nation's imperial success" (26). *Who Would Have Thought It?* anticipates elements of Jackson's and Dixon's widely divergent depictions of America as Ruiz de Burton censures U.S. violence and expansionism while evincing troubling racist and imperialist attitudes. For instance, she links the experiences of "colonized" white Southerners to the experiences of foreign peoples who have been oppressed by an unfeeling U.S. government without acknowledging how Southerners have exploited African Americans.

Turning from broad assessments of Ruiz de Burton's relation to Gilded Age and Reconstruction literature to a closer analysis of her first novel will help to illuminate potential global implications of the national problems that she and her contemporaries identify. Sánchez and Pita persuasively argue that Ruiz de Burton's "reappraisal of the Civil War in light of the long shadow cast by the war with Mexico . . . juxtaposes virtually contemporaneous conflicts that remain segregated in American studies."<sup>22</sup> Yet her first novel never directly mentions the Mexican-American War. Rather than focusing

on the relation between these two wars, Ruiz de Burton evokes the network of relations that emerge not only through U.S. economic and military involvement in Mexico, but also through the French Intervention in Mexico, European immigration and participation in the Civil War, expeditions to Africa, and Americans' travels in Europe. She considers how Americans treat the "foreigners" within their own nation, as well as how Northern parochialism spurs urbane Americans to depart for other parts of the world. Over the course of her novel, Ruiz de Burton traces the influence of New England's character, which she deems cold and calculating, on the U.S. nation and on the international ties forged through national expansion, immigration, and cosmopolitan travel. She implies that ideals of both sympathy and cosmopolitanism are valuable, but nonetheless repressed. Her depiction of the nation furthers our understanding of global sympathy's significance even to writers who resisted the belief that Americans were, as a rule, cosmopolitan patriots or benevolent Christians.

"Affect Aliens": Escaping U.S. Sentiments in *Who Would Have Thought It?*

Ruiz de Burton's first novel depicts how the U.S. family fragments into factions as the "republican mother" fails to inculcate the values of democracy and liberty in her children and quashes any signs of their affection.<sup>23</sup> The narrative represents Americans' perverse, unsympathetic feelings as destructive to three interrelated sites—the home, nation, and larger world—around which I organize my analysis. The American family, epitomized by the New England Norvals and their neighbors the Cackles, evinces a profoundly divisive self-interest and acquisitiveness, which extends to the nation as a

whole. This domestic portrait deflates romanticized narratives of both the U.S. home and the Civil War. Further, Ruiz de Burton refuses to depict a national reunion following the War, which would mask the still fraught sectional and racial divisions. In challenging triumphalist narratives of the Civil War and national reunion, Ruiz de Burton also disrupts the idealized vision of America as spreading civilization and democracy that was used to justify U.S.-foreign relations during this era, including military campaigns against Native Americans, treaties with Europe, interventions in the Western hemisphere, and even U.S. trade missions to Asia.<sup>24</sup> By contrast, she raises concerns about the greed shaping foreign policy, and she portrays Americans as unqualified to spread “civilization.”

The early chapters of *Who Would Have Thought It?* define the cold, parochial New Englanders, exemplified by Mrs. Norval, against more cosmopolitan and compassionate characters, including her husband, Dr. Norval. Their differences erupt into conflict when the doctor returns from a geological expedition in the West to his home in Massachusetts, along with his “foreign” ward Lola. Just before dying, Doña Theresa Medina, a Mexican woman kidnapped by Native Americans while she was pregnant with Lola, has entrusted her daughter and the wealth of gems and gold she has acquired during captivity to the doctor. On arriving in the North, Lola becomes a lightning rod for debates over how Americans treat foreigners. We might expect her to evoke sympathy as a young orphan, a familiar subject of antebellum sentimentalism. Instead, New England’s Christian “pillars,” including Mrs. Norval, greet her with animosity that reflects their xenophobia and racism.<sup>25</sup> The Norval daughters, Ruth and Mattie, and Mrs. Norval’s sister Lavinia are generally indifferent to Lola.<sup>26</sup> In contrast, Dr. Norval and his son

Julian recognize the girl's cultural refinement and strive to protect her. Julian marries Lola, and the young couple serves as the novel's primary example of a sympathetic foreign attachment. The compassion and cosmopolitanism that link the Norval men to Lola also alienate them from their communities. They become what Sara Ahmed deems "affect aliens": individuals or groups who fail to experience emotions deemed normal and appropriate by their culture.<sup>27</sup> Their minority position leaves them without influence to reform the nation.

Ruiz de Burton interweaves her family portrait with a narrative of U.S. democracy in which Northerners exercise a troubling influence over the nation. Ruiz de Burton suggests that the government empowers America's most self-interested citizens, and that the Civil War strengthens their power without redressing social ills. The Yankee Cackles rise to power, even as they fly from battle and persistently place personal interest above the national good. By contrast, the virtuous and compassionate Norval men suffer throughout the war. Northern warmongers treat Dr. Norval's sympathy for the South as a threat. The self-sacrificing Julian is falsely accused of speaking against his president and nearly dishonorably discharged from the Union Army before he can finagle a reprieve from Lincoln. Confederate soldiers capture Mrs. Norval's brother, Isaac Sprig, and his personal enemies ensure that the Union fails to exchange for him. Through these scenes, Ruiz de Burton depicts the war as a failure of U.S. democracy.<sup>28</sup>

Ruiz de Burton's antiheroic vision of the Civil War conveys America's failure to serve as an international beacon of liberty. Nobler characters, persecuted by their government, flee the country. Dr. Norval joins an expedition to Abyssinia, where for much of the novel he is believed to have died, and near the novel's end Julian gladly



follows Lola to Mexico. Meanwhile, Ruiz de Burton's minor character Albino Skroo, a Hungarian immigrant, suggests that America has become a magnet for opportunists. Skroo enthusiastically joins in the villains' war profiteering, and so offers a commentary on the type of immigrant the U.S. nation attracts.

The greedy violence that spreads outward from the U.S. home to the nation in turn comes back to haunt the domestic sphere. By drawing virtuous men into battle or causing their exile, the Civil War leaves the Norval family vulnerable to the machinations of rogues. The minister Hackwell secretly marries Mrs. Norval to improve his access to Lola and her money. He then attempts to coerce Lola into marriage and is only stymied when her father, Don Luis Medina, is located and removes Lola to Mexico. By the novel's end, Dr. Norval returns alive, ending his wife's illicit marriage to Hackwell and leading to her nervous breakdown. Yet opportunistic Yankees, namely the Cackles, remain a threat to the nation and world. Estranged from America, the hero and heroine plan to remain in Mexico. This conclusion breaks from the romance of reunion and earlier romances like Cooper's *The Pilot* and Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*, by refusing to make Lola and Julian's marriage the symbol of a promising national future.

While my analysis starts, like the novel, with the representation of domesticity and then moves outward to the nation and globe, Ruiz de Burton's choice to situate her foreign heroine in the midst of the New England home foregrounds how this domestic space affects the world. Ruiz de Burton characterizes New Englanders as xenophobic. Her novel evokes concerns about Yankee coldness that recur in sentimental novels, perhaps most famously expressed through the figure of Ophelia in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852). Yet whereas Stowe imagines how Ophelia could

learn to feel sympathy for slaves, Ruiz de Buton satirizes Yankees' stubborn refusal to feel for others. For instance, when Lola's initially "black" skin becomes spotted, Mrs. Norval insists that these "ugly white spots" are a sign Lola either has a "cutaneous disease" or else is a "Pinto Indian" (79). The matron displays a willful ignorance of and disdain for foreign peoples in denying Lola's explanation of her heritage. Mrs. Norval believes the spots make manifest her fear that foreigners are diseased and that contact with them will prove infectious, and so she attempts to isolate the girl (79). She despises Lola not only for her alleged inferiority but also for her affluence, which challenges Mrs. Norval's belief that she is more deserving than her "dark" ward.

By contrast, Ruiz de Burton imagines how cosmopolitanism fosters cross-cultural insight and so allows characters to develop more capacious sympathy. Dr. Norval and Julian interpret Lola's so-called cutaneous disease correctly. Her spots are the effect of a dye that Native Americans have used to prevent Euro-Americans from realizing Lola is "white," so she appears like the nation's slaves, another "dark" captive. Yet the cosmopolitan doctor penetrates this disguise and rescues Lola. The disguise fools only those characters who privilege Lola's "dark" exterior over her demeanor and account of her life. Though Lola's "spots" and her ambiguous identity could destabilize racial hierarchy, Ruiz de Burton instead uses the disguise to reveal the underlying "truth" of her heroine's "whiteness" and to elevate Mexicans as deserving subjects of sympathy, at the expense of Native Americans, whom she deems racially and culturally inferior.

While contesting claims that Mexicans are members of a degenerate race, the novel also portrays the powerful prejudices against them. Mrs. Norval makes Lola an alien in the Norval home—her refuge from "savage" captivity—and deploys stereotypes

to justify stealing Lola's wealth. All the more troubling is how "the madam" perpetuates her bigotry through her social influence. She censures her sister's brief display of concern for Lola, and as a result, "none of the Cackles dared to venture upon any show of commiseration for the orphan, and all remained silent" (78). Much as she strives to contain the threat of contagion, so too does Mrs. Norval try to halt the spread of compassion for Lola. Throughout the novel, Lola's treatment exemplifies how provincialism and nationalism stunt the United States, fostering a culture of self-interest that limits Americans' bonds to one another and to foreign peoples.

Xenophobia serves not to protect, but rather to disrupt the domestic sphere. Notably, the intolerance that underlies Mrs. Norval's disturbing nationalism and hatred for Lola engenders her illicit love for Reverend Hackwell: "he said he hated foreigners and all things foreign, 'as every good American should,' and this was the first point of sympathetic contact between him and herself" (136).<sup>29</sup> Ruiz de Burton deploys the language of sympathy ironically to emphasize that Mrs. Norval's "dark bigotry and blind prejudices" are at the root of her unseemly passion, which transforms her into "a Clytemnestra, a Medea, a Sappho," fostering vice that unsettles the home, nation, and world (136, 177).<sup>30</sup> The couple shows how xenophobic nationalism becomes paired with imperialist ideology, as the villainous Reverend develops a desire for Lola. He strives to entrap her into marriage, believing "It was 'all fair in love and war'" (253). As this cliché signals, Hackwell fails to identify with Lola, instead objectifying her as "that radiant, magnificent creature" and thereby justifying his attempts to conquer her (252).

Here the novel aligns with Amy Kaplan's thesis that in nineteenth-century American literature we can see how arguments for U.S. imperialism relied on making a

distinction between the domestic and the foreign, which imperialism threatened to destabilize.<sup>31</sup> Hackwell and Mrs. Norval demean foreign peoples to justify theft and oppression. Yet their imperialist desires to possess Lola and/or her wealth render the Norval home a site of scheming and polygamy. Their behavior undermines the alleged distinctions between the orderly domestic sphere and chaotic foreign world, which Americans employed to legitimate foreign intervention. Ruiz de Burton thereby challenges sentimental narratives that associated the U.S. home with morality and sympathy. Further, she portrays how U.S. imperialist desires disrupt foreign homes, as the novel's villains strive to separate Lola from her father and her fiancé.

Americans' coldness is learned from an early age, as we see when Dr. Norval remarks upon Lola's demonstrative nature. Her sincere affection reminds him of how his children behaved "before their mother had scolded them, with cold dignity and great propriety, into learning to curb all emotion" (83-84). Ruiz de Burton depicts New Englanders' dignity not as a useful restraint on excessive emotion, but rather as a means of killing affection. Ruth Norval, her mother's best student in cold propriety, maintains this ideal as she ascends to social prominence after Mrs. Norval falls from authority. The figure of the repressed and oppressive New England woman remains troublingly powerful.

Sánchez and Pita explore the political significance of Mrs. Norval's disorderly emotion, which erupts from this repression, arguing that "Mrs. Norval's willingness to compromise all her presumed family values and to yield with slavish submission is constructed as akin to the nation's consent to its own subordination before blackguards like the Cackles and Hackwells" during the war.<sup>32</sup> Indeed, we might read the conflict

within the Norval home as an analogue for the Civil War, as both “domestic” disputes signal how Northern greed threatens Americans and foreigners alike. Yet the novel assigns even more importance to feeling than Sánchez and Pita suggest. Ruiz de Burton depicts the American family’s coldness and misplaced attachments not merely as *akin to* national corruption and foreign exploitation, but rather as key conditions that *allow for* these political failings, much as Mrs. Norval’s xenophobia and illicit love for Hackwell drive her abuse of Lola.

\* \* \*

In *Who Would Have Thought It?*, the lack of sympathy spreads outward from the U.S. home. This dearth of fellow-feeling causes not only the disintegration of families, but also the failure of democracy, as we see in depictions of how the federal government functions. Attending to the absence of sympathy in the political sphere reveals how Ruiz de Burton challenges U.S. exceptionalism and claims to international authority, instead portraying the nation as a threat to the world. Whereas the romance of reunion addresses politics elliptically via characters who represent the North and South, Ruiz de Burton breaks from these conventions by interweaving her narrative of characters’ relations to one another with depictions of politicians at work. Juxtaposing the narrative of Julian and Lola’s courtship with political scenes prevents readers from interpreting the protagonists’ marriage as a sign of reconciliation between the United States and Mexico. Unlike Julian, U.S. political leaders prove oppressive and unresponsive, as the hegemonic New England culture suppresses sympathy. Yankee opportunists govern the nation, pursuing their self-

interest at the expense of democracy, liberty, and equality, while alienating virtuous U.S. citizens and their Mexican neighbors.

Early in the novel, Ruiz de Burton introduces the U.S. government's association with a break down in communication and sympathetic connection by incorporating a seemingly minor depiction of the federal postal service, specifically the dead letters office. Familiar to scholars of U.S. literature for its role in Herman Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" (1853), the dead letters office in Ruiz de Burton's novel likewise evokes a sense that something is impeding hope and succor from reaching those in need. This office becomes significant when a manuscript about Doña Theresa Medina's captivity with information on Lola's family goes missing. The political appointee Isaac briefly works in the dead letters office and recovers the manuscript. He traces the narrative back to Lola's father and facilitates his reunion with Lola, but only after Isaac's prolonged captivity in the South during the Civil War. The dead letters office functions as a plot device to explain why Lola is separated from her family and how they are reunited.

This role within the plot, though, also marks the office as a sign of America's failings, wherein the absence of effective infrastructure cuts Lola off from her family. The government disrupts Americans' and Mexicans' lives. The postal service's failure to facilitate communication enables Mrs. Norval to persist in mistaking Lola's class standing and racial heritage. In effect, the government reinforces parochial ignorance, here by preventing the circulation of knowledge across the nation and the globe. Without access to this manuscript, Lola finds it difficult to prove her elite Spanish bloodline and assert her racial equality, and without knowledge of her family, she remains vulnerable to the Yankees' schemes to acquire her wealth and her person. Misdirected and undelivered

mail, along with inaccurate newspaper reports, also leads to the false assumption that Dr. Norval has died on his expedition to Abyssinia. These interruptions to the exchange of knowledge undermine a sense of national or international community. Whereas theorists such as Benedict Anderson have traced how print circulation could evoke a sense of unity even among citizens who have never met, creating an imagined community that strengthened nationalism, Ruiz de Burton depicts the postal service and newspapers obstructing even the most intimate familial bonds.<sup>33</sup>

Shifting our attention from small government departments to the Civil War, *Who Would Have Thought It?* traces how the nation's lack of cohesion and compassion, as well as Americans' self-interest, perpetuates violent conflict. In particular, the novel conveys how captive Union soldiers, including Isaac, suffer alongside Southern rebels. As both insiders and outsiders to the nation, these captives speak to the pain that the U.S. government inflicts on citizens and foreign peoples alike. Through their stories, the novel contributes to the broader body of Civil War and postbellum writing that sought to express the nation's suffering and locate meaning in it. Released prisoners relate how, in captivity, they watched as friends froze to death and how their own starvation led them to kill and eat a Confederate soldier's dog (164-4). Judging from their experiences, the Civil War was inimical to civilization; it fostered barbarism and madness among Union soldiers who fought to preserve the nation. For Ruiz de Burton, the significance of such agony is that it exposes U.S. leaders' indifference and inadequacy.

Ruiz de Burton attributes the suffering of these soldiers not to their Southern captors, but to the Northern elite and their imperialist desire for power. Northerners help perpetuate the war because they profit from it. When the New Englander Mrs. Cackle

“deliver[s] a lecture to the sick and maimed men,” the narrator interrupts to call it “a parody.” Mrs. Cackle’s words are, Ruiz de Burton writes, the “effusions of comfortable patriotism,” motivated by the knowledge that, “A long war was good for the Cackle family” (164). The Cackles’ political influence demonstrates how the cold self-interest learned in the New England home controls America. The soldiers’ suffering and the Northerners’ unflinching desire to continue the war offer a gruesome warning of what happens when a country lacks sympathy.

The novel underscores the brutality and coldness of Northerners by lauding expressions of sympathy for Southerners, which Ruiz de Burton asserts are all too rare. The narrator praises Ulysses S. Grant for “the soldierly courtesy, the gentlemanly consideration, of General Grant towards the vanquished enemy,” which she contrasts with the country’s “spirit of vengeance and unforgiveness” (294, 295). Ruiz de Burton’s sympathy for Southerners suggests she sees parallels between elite white Southerners’ defeat and Mexican Americans’ disenfranchisement. In criticizing Northerners’ lack of feeling for their countrymen, Ruiz de Burton evokes concern that the subjugation of the South in the Civil War demonstrates how America will treat foreign peoples in pursuit of new land and influence, and perhaps recalls Americans’ bloody conquest in the Mexican-American War.

Whereas some narratives of the Civil War depict its violence as a necessary means to ensure emancipation and protect democracy, Ruiz de Burton dismisses these views by asserting that Northerners lack sympathy not only for Southerners, but also for African Americans. While the novel offers little discussion of African Americans’ relation to the nation, one key exception lies in Beau Cackle’s indignation that Grant “did



not invite Mr. Fred. Douglass to a diplomatic dinner” and “did not order to be destroyed the steamer in which Mr. Douglass was refused a seat at the dinner table” (298). Given Beau’s association with opportunism, his hyperbole, and his overly familiar reference to “Fred,” this moment implies that Northerners only evince concern for African Americans’ welfare when it is politically advantageous. Further, the brief scene makes light of the challenges facing African Americans in Reconstruction by objecting to Douglass’s social reception without depicting his political work.<sup>34</sup> In effect, Ruiz de Burton denies the importance of battles over African American rights, and implies that the North’s aggression was motivated not by humanitarianism, but rather by the U.S. desire for power.

Ruiz de Burton conveys just how powerful and troubling the nation’s failure of feeling is by suggesting that it extends to President Lincoln, as we see in his encounter with the novel’s hero. Her “insider’s critique” is at work in her caricature of Lincoln, which deflates heroic portraits of the president and the progressive narrative of America they helped sustain. When Julian, accused of treason, travels to the capital, he finds the president unwilling to see the numerous care-worn Americans who wait to petition him. The young soldier learns Lincoln is not “*the servant of the American people,*” but rather evades his constituents (209). Julian forces his presence upon Lincoln as he listens to the Marine Band while “his leg [hangs] over the arm of his chair and dangle[s] regularly, like a ballistic pendulum also keeping time” (214). The president explains that he simply wants “to have some rest along with every body else” (214). Even when at work, he would rather be “tell[ing] a funny anecdote” than making political decisions (216). Lincoln’s casual, apparently callous attitude disillusioned Julian.

Ruiz de Burton's derisive portrait resonates with Nathaniel Hawthorne's depiction of Lincoln in "Chiefly About War Matters" (1862), as both authors drew on their brief access to the president in order to mock his demeanor and satirize the democratic process. In this essay, anonymously published in *the Atlantic Monthly*, Hawthorne engages more explicitly with U.S. politics than in *The Marble Faun*. The article describes Lincoln as "unlooked for, unselected by any intelligible process that could be based upon his genuine qualities, [and] unknown to those who chose him."<sup>35</sup> Hawthorne largely directs his criticism at the election process (the President is "unselected") and qualifies his remarks with the assertion that he "would as lief have Uncle Abe for a ruler as any man whom it would have been practicable to put in his place."<sup>36</sup> Still the essay offers a parochial image of "Uncle Abe," imagining how upon "fling[ing] his lank personality into the chair of state," it would have been "his first impulse to throw his legs on the council-table, and tell the Cabinet Ministers a story."<sup>37</sup> The passage was controversial enough to be excised by *the Atlantic's* editor before publication. Indeed, both Hawthorne and Ruiz de Burton employ portraits of the President to criticize the government's inner workings and offer a corrective to the opacity of government policies and procedures that they depict.

The domestic themes that these authors engage with through their caricatures of Lincoln and U.S. democracy have international implications, as *Who Would Have Thought It?* reminds us. Assertions of the president's parochialism imply he is ill suited to forging cosmopolitan affiliations, and the workings of U.S. government appear too murky to offer a successful model of republicanism. Hawthorne describes the nation as lacking an "intelligible" democratic process, and Ruiz de Burton similarly asserts that

elected officials are obfuscating and their policies are indecipherable. Her minor character Congressman Blower claims that, “our leading men do not lay before the people all new great measures, some of which the unthinking multitude could not grasp at once” (116).<sup>38</sup> By mocking the populace, the politician inadvertently demonstrates that he is unfit to lead them. So much for exceptionalist visions of U.S. leaders spreading democracy far and wide.

Americans who express outrage at the failure of democracy and mourn the loss of love in their homes, become affect aliens, to return to Ahmed’s phrase.<sup>39</sup> For instance, consider how New Englanders react when Dr. Norval expresses sympathy for the seceding Southerners:

There was no doubt that the mind of New England was greatly exasperated by the doctor. . . . [who] was in the Senate when the Southern senators delivered their farewell addresses . . . The doctor wept as each stately senator, with sad but resolute mien, arose, and, bidding farewell to his colleagues and fellow citizens, bowed a head grown gray in the service of a common country, and then departed, as he thought, forever. (64)

The monolithic “mind of New England” takes umbrage at the doctor’s display of sentiment. As an “affect alien” who is ostracized for his feelings—which signal that he views Southerners as his countrymen, rather than as a colonized people—Dr. Norval’s sentiments take on political significance.

New Englanders would do well to emulate Dr. Norval’s sympathy for Southerners, the novel implies, but fail to embrace this ideal.<sup>40</sup> Ruiz de Burton employs free indirect discourse to describe the “mind of New England,” which believed that “if

the doctor had not felt too strong a partiality for the wicked South he would have stayed quietly at home, and then have gone and thrashed [the Southerners] back if they rebelled” (64) She contrasts the Northerners’ brutish desire to “thrash” Southerners with the Southerners’ grave choice to secede, described in more formal language (64). This aesthetic distinction elevates the doctor and the South above the North. Further, Ruiz de Burton avoids discussing the reasons for secession or the possibility that Southerners, too, are motivated by self-interest. Through the discourse of sensibility, she emphasizes that they merit sympathy for their “sacrifice” and that the doctor models beneficial, compassionate relations to those within and outside the nation.

The novel’s few affect aliens, who retain a sense of sympathy, underscore that New Englanders have created an “emotional regime,” wherein feelings of greed, vengeance, and indifference to others’ suffering are integral to the nation.<sup>41</sup> These emotional propensities not only characterize the novel’s New England communities, but also shape political patronage and lobbying and undergird the Civil War. As a dearth of sympathy spreads outward from the family to the nation, America’s oppressive emotional regime costs the country the devotion of its virtuous citizens, who “voluntarily exil[e]” themselves (84).<sup>42</sup>

Ruiz de Burton’s scenes of U.S. politics demonstrate how the corruption of the family influences America, as greed or indifference comes to define everyone from the republican mother to the president. The author’s depiction of a country that ignores and tyrannizes Southern senators, loyal Northerners, and even war widows conveys why foreign peoples would fear U.S. influence in the global sphere. She implies that U.S. leaders’ readiness to ignore and even exploit their fellow citizens’ suffering during the

Civil War shapes how foreign peoples perceive America. Turning to the text's depiction of Americans' relations to Mexicans and Hungarians in the next section further clarifies the potential value that Ruiz de Burton attributes to foreign sympathy, while underscoring the absence of such feeling under America's emotional regime.

\* \* \*

*Who Would Have Thought It?* asks us to consider how America's identity emerged not only through the relations among citizens, but also between the nation and the world. Ruiz de Burton challenges mid-nineteenth-century Americans who defined the nation against the imperial powers of Europe. U.S. Northerners, in particular, expressed sympathy for Italian and Hungarian revolutionaries and noted parallels between abolitionism and revolutionary movements against the Austrian and French Empires.<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, the French Intervention into Mexico, which put the Austrian Archduke Maximilian on the throne, troubled Americans as a sign of European imperialism threatening political liberalism in the Western hemisphere. From this perspective, U.S. democracy modeled a valuable alternative to European imperialism. By contrast, Ruiz de Burton imagines America as the more opportunistic, less cultured counterpart to Europe and contests the claim that U.S. objections to France and Austria arose from republican sentiments and sympathy for the oppressed. Instead, she asserts that such objections reflect U.S. desires for expansion, which may make European empires better allies for Mexico.

Ruiz de Burton questions America's ostensible role as an international figure for liberty, in part by caricaturing the figure of the Hungarian immigrant, Skroo. Skroo claims to have played a central role in the movement for Hungarian independence from Austria and to be "the bosom friend" of the statesman Lajos Kossuth (154). He attributes his immigration to America to the same love of liberty that led him to fight for Hungarians. However, Ruiz de Burton hints that his real reason for leaving Europe was that he had received a caning, perhaps at the Turkish Sultan's hands (154). Ruiz de Burton's pithy remark that, "Mr. Skroo liked freedom," conveys that what he values is the "freedom" to advance his own interests as a war profiteer. He conspires with the Cackles and Hackwell, who, among other things, sell "rotten blankets and . . . shoes made of burnt leather . . . to the *best of governments*" (290). The description of shoddy goods signifies the degraded state of the Union and undercuts the claim of U.S. superiority, while the italics call attention to the author's ironic tone. Skroo's opportunism alters prior narratives about what draws immigrants to the U.S. nation.

Ruiz de Burton implies that America attracts not the oppressed seeking justice, but the unfeeling and dishonest. She thereby invokes the long-standing belief that, as Andrew Burstein writes, the U.S. nation's "future greatness, its attractiveness to like-minded European emigrants, required that the existing population raise its voice and act to secure liberty at the first sign of oppression."<sup>44</sup> Yet whereas Howells's *A Hazard of New Fortunes* imagines immigrants who enter the Civil War to advance liberty, Ruiz de Burton depicts the U.S. nation as so corrupt that it attracts immoral immigrants.<sup>45</sup> This proves a problem when Skroo absconds to Europe with federal funds (289).<sup>46</sup> For nineteenth-century readers, Skroo's flight with his wife may have evoked the Hungarian

freedom fighter Kossuth's tour of America in 1852. His efforts to raise funds from ostensibly sympathetic Americans were such a failure that he and his wife left the country under assumed names to escape debts they had incurred.<sup>47</sup> This resonance reinforces the idea that Northerners and Hungarians are both unfeeling and duplicitous. While the Union employed a variety of ideological arguments to elicit European support during the war, Skroo's Union allegiance signifies that the world is interested neither in America's Enlightenment ideals of political equality, nor its Christian ideals of sympathy, but rather its financial opportunities.<sup>48</sup>

Satirizing Hungarian revolutionaries allows Ruiz de Burton to celebrate the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian. Readers today might be inclined to see a similarity between the French Intervention in Mexico and the Mexican-American War as the incursions of competing empires. However, Ruiz de Burton portrays Maximilian's ascension to power in Mexico as a foil to U.S. expansion and imperialist influence. She avoids any direct depiction of Mexico's liberal party and Benito Juárez's efforts to ally himself with the Union. Instead, she naturalizes Mexico's ties to Austria and France by representing elite Mexican characters whose European heritage fosters their affinity for Maximilian. The characters question U.S. power over Mexico, claiming this relationship lacks a basis in historic and genealogical ties.

Ruiz de Burton underscores that Americans' assertions of their superiority and authority in the Western hemisphere provoke Mexicans' resistance through a conversation between Lola's father and grandfather. Don Luis and Don Felipe assert that establishing the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian as Mexico's emperor would better help the country than supporting a U.S.-influenced republican government. Don

Felipe reasons that, “If it were not for this terrible, this fatal influence [of the United States]—*which will eventually destroy us*—the Mexicans . . . would be proud to hail a prince who, after all, has some sort of a claim to this land, and who will cut us loose from the leading strings of the United States” (198). Rather than reading Don Felipe’s political remarks as a sign that Ruiz de Burton is arguing for monarchy, scholars assert that she is primarily concerned with contesting U.S. influence and expansion.<sup>49</sup>

The claim that Ruiz de Burton is less interested in celebrating monarchy than in challenging the United States is persuasive given that, by the publication of her first novel in 1872, Napoleon had already withdrawn the French troops that had instated Maximilian, who was subsequently executed.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, Maximilian did not end U.S. influence over Mexico. Both his government and the liberal government that succeeded him entered into financial negotiations with the U.S. government and private U.S. citizens, who were interested in developing Mexican mines and railroads.<sup>51</sup> Negotiations between the two countries perpetuated the possibility for Americans’ financial exploitation of Mexico and for U.S. expansion. Yet Ruiz de Burton closes her first novel without acknowledging the failure of European intervention to protect Mexican interests; nor does she mention Napoleon’s withdrawal of French troops or Maximilian’s execution. Depicting these events might have underscored U.S. dominance in the Western hemisphere, whereas by omitting them, Ruiz de Burton maintains her emphasis on how opportunism weakens the U.S. nation. She suggests that Americans’ greed and lack of sympathy foster Mexicans’ resistance to U.S. influence and create international tensions, just as these troubling sentiments create rifts between Northerners and Southerners.<sup>52</sup>



Throughout the novel, Ruiz de Burton criticizes Americans' failure of foreign feeling and suggests that they would benefit if they could reconcile their nationalism with cosmopolitan sympathy for foreign peoples. We see such cosmopolitan relations at work in Julian's marriage to Lola. Their relationship demonstrates how the recognition of foreign peoples' humanity engenders an appreciation for their culture and fosters strong attachments. Through the couple, Ruiz de Burton not only challenges arguments for hemispheric isolation and "myths of New World difference," as Gretchen Murphy notes, but also valorizes international connections based in ostensibly universal cultural values.<sup>53</sup> Yet the novelist offers little sense that such attitudes will transform the nation. Instead she emphasizes how Americans perpetuate their nation's cold emotional regime, foreclosing the possibility of change, as only a small elite enacts cosmopolitan ideals.

While cosmopolitanism typically depends upon individuals' detachment from their nation, which allows them to recognize the value of foreign cultures, Ruiz de Burton heightens this emphasis on detachment. Earlier writers, particularly Cooper, had sought to explore how cosmopolitanism could actually complement U.S. patriotism. By contrast, Ruiz de Burton depicts how the country's pervasive xenophobia weakens cosmopolitan Americans' patriotic sentiments.<sup>54</sup> Her hero's critical distance from America, appreciation for Western European cultures, and refined sensibility become the basis of his affinities for foreigners, namely Lola. At the start of the novel, Julian and Lola have recently arrived in New England from distant regions. Like Lola, Julian stands apart from the Yankees; he has come home from Europe at his mother's behest, but disagrees with her belief that Boston is "where every New Englander should be educated" (17). Julian

and Lola's affection for each other emerges as they resist the cultural dictates of New England, which they find not only parochial, but also immoral.

Julian's ability to recognize the value of foreign peoples moves him to protect Lola from New Englanders' exploitation, evoking the conception of cosmopolitanism as an "ethical stance."<sup>55</sup> Like the cosmopolitan sympathy in Cummins's and Hawthorne's novel, this sympathetic attachment suggests that Lola merits Julian's sympathy, protection, and affection. The young couple's reciprocal love and care offers a model of equitable, mutually beneficial relations. For instance, Lola is moved by "the tenderest pity and sympathy" for Julian when he is injured in battle (147). The lovers demonstrate how cross-cultural affinities offer a source of resilience, helping Julian recover the strength he has sacrificed to his nation. When Julian later travels to Mexico to nurse Lola, his affectionate treatment is as successful as hers: "A few days after he arrived, the roses and dimples which had fled when she went to Mexico returned with the Yankee lover" (286-7). Ruiz de Burton reminds us of her characters' disparate nationalities by referring to Julian as a "Yankee" at the moment he arrives in Mexico. The distinctions between the two lovers evoke the potential for an affectionate relationship between their nations that would render both cultures as beautiful and joyous as these characters. As in a romance of reunion, the central couple transcends political divisions, here between America and Mexico. Yet whereas the romance of reunion naturalizes the North's control over the South, Ruiz de Burton resists sanctioning U.S. authority over Mexico. Lola and Julian's happy reunion signals the benefits of equitable relationships, in contrast to the troubling influence America exerted over Mexico in the postbellum era.

While Julian and Lola flee America, their departure neither dissolves their countries' links to one another nor resolves the political crises these ties create. Notably, their marriage suggests that the foreign sympathy they evince is more narrowly circumscribed than the figures of friendship and kinship examined in the prior chapters. Unlike the foreign friendships of Cooper's novels or the global sisterhood Cummins depicts, this cosmopolitan marriage does not produce a larger network of relations; the marriage is not in service to nationalism, nor does it help enact reform.<sup>56</sup> Don Luis articulates the primacy and exclusivity of the lovers' bond when he thinks "how much he would have loved to have found his child before she had so entirely given her heart away!" (285).

The couple's inability to inspire broader cultural change reflects that cosmopolitanism, which can foster a sense of community, is also associated with individualism. As Amanda Anderson argues, "while cosmopolitanism places a value on reciprocal and transformative encounters between strangers variously construed, it simultaneously has strongly individualist elements, in its advocacy of detachment from shared identities, its emphasis on affiliation as voluntary, and its appeal to self-cultivation."<sup>57</sup> While the earlier texts in this study emphasize how cosmopolitanism fosters sympathy and helps characters forge a sense of community, we see the individualism Anderson describes at work in Ruiz de Burton's depiction of cosmopolitans as exceptional figures at odds with "the New England mind" (64). Further, Ruiz de Burton ascribes cross-cultural understanding and sympathy only to the novel's wealthy elite, who possess the means and inclination to travel abroad and pursue their "self-cultivation."

Employing an elitist vision of cosmopolitanism as the basis for U.S.-Mexico relations allows Ruiz de Burton to imagine an alternative to the postbellum focus on U.S. economic investment in Mexico. The precious gems and metals that Doña Theresa Medina has acquired during her captivity evoke the profit that U.S. investors sought from mining in Mexico and Western territories recently annexed from Mexico. New Englanders' attempts to steal Lola's wealth allegorize U.S. territorial expansion and economic imperialism. In contrast, Julian and Lola readily relinquish this wealth, placing greater value on their escape from U.S. oppression and attachment to each other. By marking her virtuous characters as wealthy, well-educated cosmopolitans, Ruiz de Burton can more easily distinguish between them and their mercenary countrymen; the former appreciate the "foreign" without threatening its integrity to gain profit.<sup>58</sup>

Nonetheless, Ruiz de Burton's novel radically limits the peoples who can participate in productive international affiliations by defining cosmopolitans not only in terms of their class and education, but also their race. Where Dr. Norval's and Julian's respective relationships with Lola reveal the strong affinities cosmopolitan Americans can develop for elite Mexicans, the doctor also encounters "foreign" peoples on his scientific expeditions to the American West and to Africa for whom he feels no affinity. Dr. Norval seeks to order the West by distinguishing and protecting "civilized" whites like Lola from "savages." His brief narrative of this expedition reinforces racist stereotypes of Native Americans often used to legitimate colonialism, and Ruiz de Burton does not acknowledge the destructive effects of U.S. expansion on their tribes. To do so might call attention to the longer history of Spanish conquest in the Western hemisphere,

and Europe and Mexico's implication in the forms of tyranny she attributes to Northerners.

The doctor's pursuit of geographic and geological knowledge aligns his travels with the numerous nineteenth-century explorations of Africa and Southeast Asia, which were crucial to European colonization and U.S. expansion. Strikingly, the novel's references to his expedition anticipate key scenes in Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood* and raise troubling questions about U.S. imperialism explored in the next chapter. However, Dr. Norval's experiences of Africa are not passed along to the readers, and the continent functions as a blank space where the doctor disappears until the plot requires his return. This refusal to represent Africa or Africans in detail elides the possibility for sympathetic understanding of and connection to African peoples. Newspapers report that Dr. Norval has been killed "by the Blacks in Abyssinia, with all his party" (120). While the reports are eventually revealed to be false, his survival attests to his worldliness and does not contest the association of Africans with barbarism.<sup>59</sup> Ruiz de Burton employs the civilized-savage dichotomy to reinforce her claim for Lola's elevated status as "white," European, and refined, as well as to strengthen her critique of unfeeling, "savage" Americans. Dr. Norval turns first to the West and then to Abyssinia as an escape from America not because these spaces are ideal sites for productive international encounters, but rather because his home is so barbaric as to make distant and even violent lands preferable.

Ruiz de Burton does not depict "global sympathy" spreading equitably around the world to encompass all of humanity. Rather, she designates which lands and peoples share a capacity for fellow-feeling based on their association with Western European

cultures and whiteness. Whereas earlier authors including Cooper, Cummins, and Hawthorne imagine Americans as immersed in cosmopolitan bonds to the foreign world, Ruiz de Burton clearly bars the majority of her American characters from the category of “cosmopolitan,” and these Americans render productive attachments unsustainable within the United States. Ultimately, even the model relationship Ruiz de Burton envisions between Lola and Julian, which benefits these two characters, lacks the power to influence their communities. The very basis for this affinity—the cosmopolitan values that engender their marriage—signals their distance and detachment from U.S. culture, which prevents them from altering it. While satirizing America’s nationalist ideology and emotional regime, *Who Would Have Thought It?* registers the power of its target and depicts the racial, cultural, and class-based limits of cosmopolitan sympathy.

#### Turning Inward: *The Squatter and the Don*

Published over a decade after *Who Would Have Thought It?*, Ruiz de Burton’s second novel, *The Squatter and the Don*, returns readers to the early 1870s. The novelist again employs conventions from the romance of reunion, and her second novel shares her first novel’s emphasis on sentiment, celebration of Mexico’s European-inflected culture, and critique of U.S. corruption and hypocrisy. However, her later novel—which focuses on tensions that emerge from Westward expansion—differs substantially in its depiction of cross-cultural sympathy. *The Squatter and the Don* evokes a greater sense of optimism for the nation’s future by representing a series of inter-regional and cross-cultural marriages. The novelist’s turn from a narrower focus on the development of Julian and

Lola's courtship to a series of interwoven marriages constitutes a significant shift, as the latter structure suggests that virtuous American characters are more numerous. In her second novel, Americans often resist the oppressive government's persistent failure of feeling and can turn to fellow citizens for support. This distinction illuminates how pervasive the nation's "emotional regime" appears in Ruiz de Burton's first novel. By contrast, *The Squatter and the Don* depicts Americans who recognize injustices, such as Mexican Americans' disenfranchisement, and seek redress. Overall, Ruiz de Burton's second novel devotes much less space to satirizing the U.S. nation and more to imagining its reform. The text does not imagine reconciliation between the United States and Mexico, but does envision how Mexican Americans could become an integral part of U.S. culture, perhaps in response to these citizens' additional years in the country or Ruiz de Burton's desire to secure her own land claims.

Read together, Ruiz de Burton's novels reveal the disparate political and cultural implications associated with the trope of marriage when it is situated within distinct narrative and political frameworks. Whereas her first novel turns to international romance both to highlight and offer an alternative to the U.S. nation's failure of feeling, her second novel employs marriage to reconcile the nation's disparate ethnic groups and regions through domestic attachments. The distinction between literature about international and domestic affairs can be quite fine, as these texts attest. Nonetheless, her two novels take markedly different approaches to address the historic oppression of Mexicans and Mexican Americans, as well as the threat that U.S. expansion could lead to further exploitation. Her first novel locates the ideal culture outside of the nation, whereas her second novel explores how the country's virtuous citizens contribute to national progress

and culture. Rather than depict a Mexican heroine striving to return home, Ruiz de Burton's second novel asserts that Mexican Americans have a claim to U.S. homes and land. These key thematic differences speak to the two texts' distinct aesthetic projects of satire and reform and disparate moods of hopelessness and hope for the nation's future. Whereas *Who Would Have Thought It?* resonates with the often satirical fiction of Twain and Howells, *The Squatter and the Don* responds to antebellum sentimental literature and anticipates the literary emphasis on reform in the Progressive Era.

*The Squatter and the Don* depicts a series of marriages between the Darrell, Alamar, and Michelin families, who represent white American settlers, landed Californios, and the wealthy Northeastern elite, respectively. Members of these families' younger generation befriend one another and intermarry, thereby uniting the cross section of American classes, regions, and ethnic groups that their families embody. Yet conflicts arise within the older generation when the Darrell patriarch aligns himself with squatters who attempt to claim the Alamars' land for themselves and profit from the U.S. government's refusal to protect the rights of Mexican Americans. The ensuing land battles offer an occasion to criticize America for failing to protect the legal interests of its new citizens and for favoring monopolists over the common national interests, particularly in the development of railroads and other economic infrastructure. Whereas the novel's younger generation conveys the potential for a happily united nation in which wealthy, well-educated families join together to advance the public good, prejudiced members of the older generation obstruct these unions. They impede national progress by worshipping U.S. law, which has codified racism and exploitation, and refusing to sympathize with Mexican Americans.



Ruiz de Burton's second novel again asserts that Americans' greed and failure of feeling constitute significant problems. She depicts squatters who demean Californios as "greasers" in order to deny their status as U.S. citizens and their rights to the land they owned before the United States annexed it. Late in the novel, when the young couple Lizzie and Gabriel Alamar become impoverished, Lizzie recognizes that her wealthy, former friends refuse to aid her because of Gabriel's racial and national identity: "the fact that Gabriel was a *native Spaniard* . . . plainly mitigated against them. If he had been rich, his nationality could have been forgiven, but no one will willingly tolerate a *poor native Californian*" (350). Ruiz de Burton draws readers' attention to how interrelated factors of race, national origins, and class prevent white squatters and the upper class from recognizing particular Americans as citizens worthy of sympathy. While depicting how this failure engenders Lizzie and Gabriel's suffering, she implies that Gabriel's identity as a "native Spaniard" should instead establish his value as a U.S. citizen, who is effectively as much a civilized "Euro-American" as other elite white characters.

To elevate Californios, Ruiz de Burton's second novel perpetuates the racial hierarchies that she invoked in her first novel. In particular, she depicts Native Americans as natural servants and repeatedly characterizes them as lazy. Much as in *Who Would Have Thought It?*, they become a foil for mercenary Americans. Don Alamar asserts, "The Indians kill my cattle to eat them, whereas the squatters did so to ruin me" (309). Here Ruiz de Burton employs the Indians' alleged degeneracy to reveal the greater villainy of the lawless Euro-Americans. Ruiz de Burton's racist representations of Native Americans in both novels are a troubling aspect of her efforts to disprove stereotypes of Mexicans, justify the history of Spanish conquest in the Southwest, and thereby

naturalize Mexican Americans' land claims over those of both Native and Anglo Americans.

Yet while her second novel continues to disparage both “white” Americans and “darker” races for their failure of feeling and refusal to think beyond their own desires, Ruiz de Burton no longer defines America in terms of a cold “emotional regime.” Rather, she portrays how outrage at the nation’s political injustices links the inhabitants of America’s different regions into a broader sympathetic network. In *The Squatter and the Don*, the younger generation normalizes cross-cultural relationships. Mexican Americans here appear to be an integral part of the nation, tied to Euro-Americans by affection. The young characters’ cross-cultural bonds seem less exceptional than Julian and Lola’s marriage and convey optimism that Americans will reform U.S. legislation and governance.

In *The Squatter and the Don*, the Euro-American families come to sympathize with the Alamars by recognizing their virtue and cultural value and by acknowledging that the dispossession of Californios constitutes a legitimate cause for distress. Whereas *Who Would Have Thought It?* lacks direct allusion to the Mexican-American War and its fallout, Ruiz de Burton’s second novel explicitly engages with the ensuing land battles to explore how Euro-Americans’ historic ties to Californios could foster fellow-feeling. The novel’s Northerners and even the former squatters, the Darrells, feel an affiliation to the Alamars, and so can recognize the Californios’ mistreatment and share in moral indignation at the abuse of their rights. While some of the minor characters like the squatter William Matthews maintain violent feelings against the “foreigners,” their destructive passions eventually drive them mad. Other squatters, who initially deny both

the Californios' worth as a people and their claim to U.S. rights, are subsequently reformed. William Darrell, the family patriarch, comes to recognize the Alamars' virtue. At the close of the novel when Don Mariano dies from illness and grief brought on by the land disputes, Mr. Darrell weeps for the loss of "a just and noble soul" (359). Darrell insists on his culpability in his neighbor's demise, thereby emphasizing Euro-Americans' agency in shaping the fate of their new fellow citizens (359). Darrell's affective display attests that even those Americans who profit from Californios' dispossession may develop compassionate attachments to them and act in their shared interests.

Ruiz de Burton evokes further hope for reform by imagining that her Euro-American characters have a history of bridging over their own differences with affection. Near the start of the novel, we learn that Mr. and Mrs. Darrell were initially divided by their religious faith and their emotions. The Protestant Mr. Darrell won over his Catholic lover by swearing he would never "coerce or influence his wife to change her religion" (11). Moreover, he promises to master his "violent temper" (10). This backstory establishes Mr. Darrell's potential to forge attachments across cultural divides and to reform his feelings. His relationship with Mrs. Darrell situates him in opposition to villains, like Mrs. Norval in *Who Would Have Thought It?* and William Matthews in *The Squatter and the Don*, who persist in their vituperation toward "foreigners" and are driven mad by excessive passions.

In the face of U.S. greed and prejudice, one of the most sympathetic Americans, the hero Clarence Darrell, is tempted to go into exile from America, much as Dr. Norval and Julian do. When Clarence finds himself at odds with his as of yet unreformed father, the son escapes by traveling to Mexico, then through South America and Western

Europe, ultimately reuniting with his friends in Paris before returning to his family in California. Through Clarence's descriptions, Mexico is presented to the reader as a land rich in natural beauty and archaeological sites (298-299). He characterizes the country as a destination on par with Western Europe, much as Ruiz de Burton's earlier novel insists on the ties between European and Mexican cultures. In tracing Clarence's route, Ruiz de Burton links America to former Spanish colonies in the Western hemisphere and Western Europe; she thereby establishes the continuities among these places, the similarity between Euro-Americans and Mexican Americans, and the possibility that the two groups will integrate. The potential for domestic reform ensures the protagonist's eventual return to the United States. Whereas Julian's flight from America is presented as necessary to escape devious Americans' schemes, Clarence calls his flight from the nation misguided. In Ruiz de Burton's second novel, self-exile is no longer appealing. Her characters leave San Diego because corruption and greed stunt its development, but they make a new home nearby in San Francisco.

Clarence's return to America is crucial to making this new home possible because he possesses independent wealth. His wealth is needed as the Alamars and Michelins, along with countless other unnamed families, suffer at the hands of a corrupt government in cahoots with cutthroat monopolists. By the close of the novel, Ruiz de Burton has rewritten the central conflict so that the threat to U.S. stability and the happy American family is no longer lower class squatters, but rather wealthy businessmen and political leaders. After the struggle over land rights ceases, her protagonists still face a troubling failure of democracy.

While modeling the possibility for a conversion of Americans' attitudes towards Californios, Ruiz de Burton also strives to educate her readers about the injustices of U.S. law and its manipulation in the hands of judges and politicians. To do so, she employs direct address, for instance, asserting "Is not this 'aggravation of excess'? Excess of defiance? Excess of lawlessness? How insidiously these monopolists began their work of accumulation, which has culminated in a power that not only eludes the law of the land, but defies, derides it!" (367). In the context of her second novel, U.S. commerce and law provoke outrage, rather than the cynicism they invite in her first novel. Her characters seek to redress these problems as they are moved by their sense of compassion for others and their own suffering from injustice.

We can see the shift in Ruiz de Burton's approach to the problems of corruption and self-interest through the disparate roles that foreign nations play in her two novels: in the first text, they serve as places to escape from the nation and in the second as models for domestic reform. Throughout *The Squatter and the Don* she refers to Europe as a place to be emulated. Characters compare California to Europe, propounding the state's merits as a potential site for the production of wine and fine foods and the need to develop these industries. Mexico also appears as a potential trading partner, should the development of a railroad through the South to San Diego and then Mexico ever succeed. Here Ruiz de Burton's vision of cosmopolitanism shifts from that of her earlier novel, where she had elevated Europe in order to denigrate America. The latter novel's celebration of both America and Europe begins to sound more like Cooper's cosmopolitan patriotism, insofar as Ruiz de Burton imagines how Americans could develop their country and pride in it by emulating aspects of European civilization. Ruiz

de Burton's allusions to foreign countries evince hope that national development could redefine America's relation to the world. Not only does she valorize the attachments that fellow citizens form as compassionate responses to the nation's injustices, but she also hints that such attachments could facilitate more productive international relations.

In its emphasis on reforming the nation, Ruiz de Burton's second novel speaks to antebellum sentimental literature that invoked sympathy to spur national progress. In particular, *The Squatter and the Don* resonates with John Greenleaf Whittier's "The Crisis" (1848). Whittier's poem—written in response to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo—opens with a sense of anxiety about the consequences of the Mexican-American War and warns that "the pale land-seekers come, with eager eyes of gain." The poem speaks to the threat of squatters dispossessing those Mexicans subsumed into the United States, the main conflict in Ruiz de Burton's second novel. The poet asks, "Shall Justice, Truth, and Freedom turn the poised and trembling scale? / Or shall the Evil triumph, and robber Wrong prevail?" Whittier employs a series of abstractions in order to convey the profound consequences of America's treatment of its new citizens on the nation's ideals. The resemblance between Whittier's and Ruiz de Burton's works reminds us that the association of expansion with exploitation, which Whittier depicts in 1848, remained a problem in the 1880s, when Ruiz de Burton wrote her second novel.

"The Crisis" offers a sense of optimism for the national future only through the figure of marriage in its final lines, as Kirsten Silva Gruesz argues.<sup>60</sup> Whittier writes:

So shall the Northern pioneer go joyful on his way;  
To wed Penobscot's waters to San Francisco's bay;  
To make the rugged places smooth, and sow the vales with grain;

And bear, with Liberty and Law, the Bible in his train:

The mighty West shall bless the East, and sea shall answer sea,

And mountain unto mountain call, Praise God for we are free!

His representation of the pioneer wedding the two sides of the continent via settlement, agricultural development, and the spread of U.S. law and Christian faith serves as a kind of romance of (re)union. It is this possibility—of the East and West affectionately uniting through projects of development—that Ruiz de Burton explores at greater length in *The Squatter and the Don*, particularly through the union of Clarence Darrell and Mercedes Alamar. By returning to familiar nationalist literary tropes, Ruiz de Burton insists that Whittier's aspirations for U.S. unity and progress remain unfulfilled, but perhaps still attainable.

Both of Ruiz de Burton's novels develop representations of marital unions to respond to U.S. exploitation and corruption. Her characters' affection for one another comes to represent the benefits of affiliation, and their suffering attests to the grave failure of U.S. ideals. Her figures of "the Northern pioneer" and "the mighty West" show how personal affection between Easterners and Westerners, Northerners and Southerners, can result in cultural development and challenge mercenary Americans with "eager eyes of gain." Yet in writing about the need to reform the federal government, Ruiz de Burton does not merely reiterate antebellum concerns, she also anticipates the ongoing battles in U.S. culture over monopolies, including railroads.<sup>61</sup> She articulates concerns that remain central to literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Writers such as Frank Norris, Upton Sinclair, Jacob Riis, and Jane Addams employed an array of literary and aesthetic strategies—from naturalist fiction to "muckraking journalism," the

stereopticon and photography, and the use of memoir—to represent the problems of capitalism, corporate monopolies, and widespread poverty. Beyond seeking forms in which to depict such problems, these writers explore how representation could inspire reform. They highlight the role that the government plays in perpetuating these problems and/or argue for new forms of government intervention and social programs to foster progress.

From our vantage of looking back at Ruiz de Burton's work, we can understand both of her novels as part of a longer nineteenth-century literary project wherein writers experimented with new artistic modes and strategies to assess the current state of the nation and imagine alternatives that would alleviate the suffering of various groups. Ruiz de Burton's novels illuminate the divergent roles Americans saw the broader world playing in this process. Further, she evokes the potential effects of America's failure of feeling on foreign peoples, particularly those "white," "civilized" peoples she deems most deserving of sympathy.

Pauline Hopkins's fiction, the subject of the next chapter, continues such formal innovation, revising familiar conventions to explore how late nineteenth-century America's dearth of fellow-feeling affected the nation and foreign peoples, while focusing on the oppression of the "darker races." Notably, the recovery of Hopkins's writing in the 1980s generated many of the same critical responses as the recovery of Ruiz de Burton's work in the 1990s: scholars have moved from celebrating the political and cultural significance of Hopkins's fiction to critiquing her representations of race. Like Ruiz de Burton's novels, Hopkins's work includes elements of an insider's critique; her engagement with pervasive scientific and political discourses of the day has led



critics to question her complicity in troubling racial and national ideologies. However, her novels offer a compelling counterpoint to those of Ruiz de Burton. Hopkins presents a vision of the world as family wherein Africans and African Americans—who were excluded from sympathy in *Who Would Have Thought It?* and numerous other texts—instead appear as deserving subjects of such feeling. The next chapter explores Hopkins’s controversial efforts to alter sympathy’s relation to race, which differ from Ruiz de Burton’s attempts to foster sympathy for Mexicans and Mexican Americans. Whereas Ruiz de Burton seeks to expand the category of whiteness, Hopkins deconstructs the very category of race.

---

<sup>1</sup> Literature of the era links the foreign and domestic, for instance, by representing the U.S. South as an American colony or depicting European participation in the Civil War. Scholars such as Amy Kaplan, Jennifer Rae Greeson, and Harilaos Stecopoulos explore how Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, Charles Chesnutt, James Russell Lowell, and Thomas Dixon, among many other authors, depicted the relation between the Civil War, Reconstruction, and U.S. overseas expansion.

<sup>2</sup> To borrow Amanda Anderson’s terms, Ruiz de Burton defines cosmopolitanism in opposition to “those parochialisms emanating from extreme allegiances to nation, race, and ethnos.” “The Divided Legacies of Modernity,” 267.

<sup>3</sup> María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, *Who Would Have Thought It?* Subsequent references to this edition appear parenthetically.

<sup>4</sup> John-Michael Rivera offers a useful analysis of Ruiz de Burton’s assertions that Mexicans are “white” and the political stakes underlying these claims: “Many landed-class Mexican Americans, such as Ruiz de Burton, distinguished themselves from southern blacks in order to create their own bailiwick of political power and maintain land rights in a U.S. culture that privileged whiteness and disdained blackness. . . . When the California constitution was being written . . . the citizenship status of Mexicans came down to an embodied discourse that classified Mexicans as ‘semi-civilized’ whites in order to exclude the African races of the south from full participation in California laws. In these debates, both elite Mexicans and Anglos had much to gain by defining Mexicans as semicivilized whites and not black” (459).

<sup>5</sup> Her Mexican characters’ sensibility, which serves as a key marker of “advanced civilization” within eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary discourse, underscores their “whiteness” and claims to sympathy. Here I draw on David Luis-Brown’s definition of sensibility as a sense of ethical obligation to act on sympathy in protecting others against exploitation and injustice. *Waves of Decolonization*, 42.

---

<sup>6</sup> Gretchen Murphy, “A Europeanized New World: Colonialism and Cosmopolitanism in *Who Would Have Thought It?*” 142.

<sup>7</sup> Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, “Introduction,” to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton’s *Who Would Have Thought It?*

<sup>8</sup> Consider, for instance, Lauren Berlant’s collection on *Compassion* and her work on “Cruel Optimism.”

<sup>9</sup> Harilaos Stecopoulos, *Reconstructing the World: Southern Fictions and U.S. Imperialisms, 1898-1976*, 3.

<sup>10</sup> This review appeared in the November 1872 issue of *Lippincott’s Magazine*. Jesse Alemán, “Historical Amnesia and the Vanishing Mestiza: The Problem of Race in *The Squatter and the Don* and *Ramona*,” 60. Amelia María de la Luz Montes argues that the number of reviews was relatively small and largely negative, but did also include mentions in *Godey’s Lady’s Book* and *Literary World*, as well as a very positive review in San Francisco’s *Daily Alta California*. “Introduction.”

<sup>11</sup> Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, “Introduction,” to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton’s *Who Would Have Thought It?*

<sup>12</sup> Amelia María de la Luz Montes offers a reading of Ruiz de Burton’s re-purposing of Cervantes’s work in “‘Mine is the Mission to Redress’: The New Order of Knight-Errantry in *Don Quixote de la Mancha: A Comedy in Five Acts*,” 208.

<sup>13</sup> Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, *Conflicts of Interest: The letters of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton*, 189.

<sup>14</sup> Anne Goldman, “Beasts in the Jungle: Foreigners and Natives in Boston.”

<sup>15</sup> For Goldman, recognizing Ruiz de Burton’s use of insider’s critique offers an important way to rethink notions of regionalism by highlighting similarities between the Californio writer’s depiction of New England and depictions by better known U.S. Easterners, like Henry James. Beth Fisher also works to situate Ruiz de Burton in relation to her more well-known contemporaries by reading her work in relation to Gilded Age social comedies. Beth Fisher, “Precarious Performances: Ruiz de Burton’s Theatrical Vision of the Gilded Age Female Consumer.”

<sup>16</sup> Ed Folsom’s “The Vistas of *Democratic Vistas: An Introduction*” notes the balance of optimism with critique in Whitman’s essays.

<sup>17</sup> For overviews on recent critical assessments of Whitman and Howells, respectively, that debate the conservative and progressive aspects of their writing on U.S. democracy, see Thomas Haddox’s “Whitman’s End of History: ‘As I sat Alone by Blue Ontario’s Shore,’ *Democratic Vistas*, and the Postbellum Politics of Nostalgia” and Sophia Forster’s “Americanist Literary Realism: Howells, Historicism, and American Exceptionalism.”

<sup>18</sup> Jesse Aléman’s essay on the gothic in representations of the U.S.-Mexico border illuminates the powerful and profoundly uneasy connections between Mexico and

---

America that emerge from their closely entwined histories, disrupting neat national divisions. “The Other Country: Mexico, the United States, and the Gothic Conquest.”

<sup>19</sup> John-Michael Rivera also notes that Ruiz de Burton’s novel resonates with the romance of reunion. My reading builds on and differs from this claim by comparing Ruiz de Burton to contemporaries who likewise revised the genre’s convention so as to avoid naturalizing the U.S. North’s oppressive power.

<sup>20</sup> Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*.

<sup>21</sup> For a more extended discussion of how Woolson’s short stories express “discomfort with the effects of imperialism” and “challenge her northern readers’ presumed cultural superiority in the wake of the Civil War and Reconstruction,” see Anne E. Boyd’s “Tourism, Imperialism, and Hybridity in the Reconstruction South: Constance Fenimore Woolson’s *Rodman the Keeper: Southern Sketches*,” 12-13.

<sup>22</sup> Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman, “Introduction” to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives, 2. Anne Goldman makes a similar argument in *Continental Divides: Revisioning American Literature*, 66.

<sup>23</sup> Linda Kerber’s work on “republican motherhood,” details the significant role early Americans envisioned middle-class women playing in instructing their families in republican values.

<sup>24</sup> While Ruiz de Burton does not explicitly engage with U.S. relations to Asia, her challenge to notions of America as highly civilized and advancing civilization directly challenges the rhetoric used to justify U.S. expansion of trade and territory. For instance, Gordon H. Chang’s work on the U.S.-Korean War of 1871 traces how Americans’ views of themselves as advancing civilization shaped these events, which he argues are often forgotten now, but were well known and much written about at the time. “Whose ‘Barbarism’? Whose ‘Treachery’?: Race and Civilization in the Unknown United States-Korea War of 1871.”

<sup>25</sup> While Lola is later reunited with her father, at this point of the novel his existence and whereabouts are unknown and so Lola is described as an orphan.

<sup>26</sup> Of all these characters, Mattie Norval comes the closest to expressing sympathy for Lola and, in doing so, registers Lola’s beauty and whiteness. However, even Mattie shows little personal attachment to the young woman.

<sup>27</sup> Sara Ahmed, *The Promise of Happiness*, 171.

<sup>28</sup> Here she differs from authors, including Whitman, who asserted the heroism of Union soldiers and viewed the battles as evidence that the democracy was comprised of selfless citizens who would advance the nation. Whitman specifically describes the soldiers as “hollow-bellied from hunger, but sinewy with unconquerable resolution,” *Democratic Vistas*, 20.

<sup>29</sup> Other critics have read Mrs. Norval’s lust as a subversive expression of women’s sexuality. Yet, her behavior seems less to subvert patriarchy than to foster her participation in white Americans’ oppression of foreign peoples. Her lust renders her all the more willing to exploit others so as to fulfill her own and Hackwell’s desires. See, for

---

instance, Beth Fisher's "Precarious Performances: Ruiz de Burton's Theatrical Vision of the Gilded Age Female Consumer" and Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita's "Introduction," to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *Who Would Have Thought It?*

<sup>30</sup> Ruiz de Burton indirectly challenges Adam Smith's theorization of how sympathy will bring coherence to a republic in the absence of older, feudal ties.

<sup>31</sup> Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*.

<sup>32</sup> Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, "Introduction," to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *Who Would Have Thought It?* xxxviii.

<sup>33</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*.

<sup>34</sup> Here I challenge John-Michael Rivera's claim that Ruiz de Burton "represents African Americans, strategically, with a guarded sympathy" (457). Rivera cites Beau's reference to Douglass as evidence for this argument. However, Beau is a subject of the novel's satire, whose remarks read as an insincere attempt to score political points against Grant. Rivera himself goes on to note that Ruiz de Burton elevates Mexican Americans by distinguishing them from less "civilized" peoples.

<sup>35</sup> Nathaniel Hawthorne's "Chiefly About War Matters," in Frederick Finseth's *The American Civil War: An Anthology of Essential Writings*, 395.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*, 395.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*, 395.

<sup>38</sup> For Ruiz de Burton, the real threat to the North's war strategy is not that Americans are too foolish to understand it, but rather that those Americans who still possess sympathy may reject these policies and the cold indifference to others that enables them. Blower grows "uneasy" as Lavinia sobs "convulsively" and questions him (116). When her teary response to his pet project affects him, he flees from her. His behavior resembles Lincoln's refusal to meet with war widows. Both scenes imply that the government resists compassion when it would impede the pursuit of power, here through the rapid conquest of the South. In pursuit of national power, the novel's elected leaders evade citizens' expressions of pain and protest.

<sup>39</sup> Sara Ahmed, *The Promise of Happiness*.

<sup>40</sup> In valorizing affect aliens, Ruiz de Burton's novel differs from the texts that Ahmed explicates to develop her theory, wherein the affect alien must adapt to the dominant mode of feeling to allow for a happy ending.

<sup>41</sup> William Reddy defines an emotional regime as "The set of normative emotions and the official rituals, practices, and 'emotives' that express and inculcate them; a necessary underpinning of any stable political regime." As quoted in Jan Plamper's "The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns." This concept is explained in greater depth in Reddy's *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, 55-56

---

<sup>42</sup> Anne Goldman persuasively argues that, “It is this kind of regionally defined prejudice [against all that is foreign] which makes honorable soldiers like Julian and Isaac expatriates in twin removals that leave the American political field open to the misappropriations of Bostonian philistines like the Cackles” (92). “Beasts in the Jungle: Foreigners and Natives in Boston.” I add that the absence of feeling for Julian’s and Isaac’s suffering is likewise a central cause of their departure. Together, the prejudice and lack of concern speak to the problem of failed sympathy.

<sup>43</sup> African American writers such as James M. Whitfield emphasized connections between U.S. slavery and the tyranny exercised against the Hungarian Revolution of 1848-49 in order to argue for abolition. See Whitfield’s “How Long,” (1853) in *The Works of James M. Whitfield: America and Other Writings by a Nineteenth-Century African American Poet*. Steven Béla Vardy notes that other abolitionists hoped to persuade Hungarian revolutionaries, like Lajos Kossuth, to support abolition.

<sup>44</sup> Andrew Burstein, *Sentimental Democracy: The Evolution of America’s Romantic Self-Image*, 54.

<sup>45</sup> The other immigrant figures in *Who Would Have Thought It?* include the Irish servants in the Norvals’ New England home. While Ruiz de Burton belittles these characters for the racism they display in their disdain toward Lola—again challenging notions of New England as a space of liberty and equality—the novelist presents a troubling caricature of Irishwomen through her depictions of them as filthy and “repulsive” (31). Deploying such stereotypes allows her to advance her larger claim that America attracts troubling immigrants who share New Englanders’ prejudice and/or opportunism.

<sup>46</sup> Skroo’s later return serves less to ameliorate this problem than to imply that foreign opportunists remain a pernicious influence in U.S. politics.

<sup>47</sup> For more on Kossuth’s tour, see Michael Morrison, “American Reaction to European Revolutions, 1848-1852: Sectionalism, Memory, and the Revolutionary Heritage.”

<sup>48</sup> For a discussion of how the Union and Confederacy drew on ideological and financial appeals in an effort to garner support from England and France, see Amanda Foreman’s *A World on Fire*.

<sup>49</sup> Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, “Introduction,” to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton’s *Who Would Have Thought It?* By contrast, Jesse Alemán describes Ruiz de Burton’s voice as “border[ing] on monarchist sentiment” (63). “Wars of Rebellion: U.S. Hispanic Writers and Their American Civil Wars.”

<sup>50</sup> A number of readings seem not to take this into account. For instance, Julie Ruiz argues that “Ruiz de Burton . . . connects the unified Mexico to its future, which she believes lies in its rule by an Austrian prince, Maximilian. So too does Ruiz de Burton repossession of Spain’s dispossessed lands through Maximilian, a descendant of the Hapsburgs” (130). “Captive Identities: The Gendered Conquest of Mexico in *Who Would Have Thought It?*”

<sup>51</sup> See Thomas Schoonover on U.S. economic interests in Mexico throughout the 1860s and Robert May on American interests in expanding in the Pacific from the antebellum through Reconstruction.

---

<sup>52</sup> Ruiz de Burton's novel offers an interesting departure from and response to earlier Americans who had worried that Southern sympathizers would prove disloyal to the Union. For an analysis of Americans' anxieties about sympathy during the Civil War, see Elizabeth Duquette, *Loyal Subjects: Bonds of Nation, Race, and Allegiance in Nineteenth-Century America*.

<sup>53</sup> Gretchen Murphy, *Hemispheric Imaginings: The Monroe Doctrine and Narratives of U.S. Empire*, 103.

<sup>54</sup> As Amanda Anderson writes, "cosmopolitanism endorses reflective distance from one's cultural affiliations" along with "a broad understanding of other cultures and customs, and a belief in universal humanity," though "the relative weight assigned to these three constitutive elements can vary" (268). "The Divided Legacies of Modernity."

<sup>55</sup> Amanda Anderson, *The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment*, 31. For an example of Julian's sympathy for and desire to protect Lola, see the scene where Mrs. Norval's persistently mocks Lola's spots, until Lola's "soul was up in revolt, and was grandly shining in her glorious eyes, making eloquent speeches" (91). Notably, Lola's pain and her determined response to it foster Julian's affection here, as in a few other scenes, by allowing him to recognize the injustice perpetuated against Lola and her own sense of her worth. Ruiz de Burton evokes sympathy for Lola's oppression without depicting her as too weak to be Julian's equal.

<sup>56</sup> As Julian and Lola's relationship develops, Lavinia Sprig and Mattie Norval briefly become involved in defeating Hackwell's plots against the couple. This shift suggests that the young couple's relationship may have some larger influence. Yet even Lavy and Mattie's assistance serves to highlight the continued divisions within the American family, which never unites as a whole to protect its members, and the inability of the two characters to provide Lola support throughout the rest of the novel, given the U.S. emotional regime and the highly repressive Norval home.

<sup>57</sup> Amanda Anderson, *The Powers of Distance*, 31-2.

<sup>58</sup> Ruiz de Burton aligns disinterestedness with the European cultures and cosmopolitanism that she juxtaposes to American parochialism. However, Kristine Ibsen notes that the French intervention in Mexico—which Ruiz de Burton depicts as more natural and beneficent than U.S. involvement—was likely motivated in part by "economic interests," as "official French press accounts as well as several books published immediately preceding and during the intervention continually focused on the material resources of the country" (2). This history undermines the opposition Ruiz de Burton creates between U.S. influence and European involvement in Mexico.

<sup>59</sup> Critics have noted racist undertones in Ruiz de Burton's quite limited representations of African Americans in the novel, particularly in Julian's expression of frustration that the Civil War requires him to fight for "Sambo's liberty" (241) while the government fails to recognize Julian's rights. Gretchen Murphy, "A Europeanized New World: Colonialism and Cosmopolitanism in *Who Would Have Thought It?*" 148.

<sup>60</sup> Kirsten Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*.

---

<sup>61</sup> In particular, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 attempted to address issues of competition created by monopolies, but would continue to cause further debate and controversy over these subjects in its application to unions during the Pullman Strike of 1894.

Chapter 4. The Global Family:  
Sympathy, Mesmerism, & Empire in Pauline Hopkins

Throughout her literary career, the African American and native of New England Pauline Hopkins (1859-1930) explored how America's foreign ties shaped and were shaped by nineteenth-century race relations. In so doing, she expressed concern with white Americans' lack of sympathy for the "darker races" at home and abroad.<sup>1</sup> Her novels depict U.S. colonization and the slave trade and criticize how America's history of racial violence continued to influence domestic race relations and burgeoning U.S. imperialism. By portraying this history, Hopkins asserts African Americans' connection to the nation and presses readers to rethink the nation's relation to the world.

Hopkins explores Americans' interracial and international ties through representations of global families, which resonate with Maria Cummins's and Nathaniel Hawthorne's descriptions of the sororal and fraternal bonds that unite Americans to diverse peoples. Yet whereas they and other writers in this study suggest that Americans are tied to the world by sympathy based in faith and cosmopolitanism, Hopkins emphasizes that the bonds uniting the global family are also historically rooted in the slave trade and European colonialism. In so doing, she foregrounds the complex relation between global sympathy and racial identity that inflects literature from across the century. Whereas the earlier writers in this study at times express concern that Americans deny sympathy to those who are not "white," Hopkins challenges the fundamental distinction between white and black to argue for more expansive sympathy. Her familial



images underscore how “white” Americans’ recognition of their connections to African Americans can engender interracial sympathy. Further, she asks what happens when Americans view the world as united by shared genealogies originating in Europe *and* Africa.

Hopkins’s four turn-of-the-century novels—*Contending Forces* (1900), *Hagar’s Daughter* (1901-1902), *Winona* (1902), and *Of One Blood* (1902-1903)—suggest that white Americans maintain a false sense of racial and national superiority by disavowing their nation’s history of cross-cultural and interracial relations. However, she portrays how African Americans can challenge racial oppression at home and abroad by recovering this shared history and developing relationships with their “foreign” families. While exploring how imperial conquest has created violent global relations, Hopkins also imagines more peaceful kinds of international encounters. Foreign locales, specifically England and Ethiopia, model racial equality and provide her characters an escape from U.S. tyranny. The novel on which this chapter centers, *Of One Blood*, evokes hope that developing foreign affiliations can help Americans to halt racial oppression. The novel traces America’s ties to Africa and implies that genealogical and spiritual connections link the broader world as a family. Americans have violated these global bonds through slavery and imperialism, but locating an honest, sympathetic understanding of America’s past can foster a sense of familial sympathy that transcends race and nation.

The deep interest in international relations evident in Hopkins’s writing speaks to her own family history.<sup>2</sup> Her genealogy links her to the West Indies, Africa, and England, reminding us how America’s foreign ties had long shaped African Americans’ lives. The slave trade forcibly carried earlier generations of Hopkins’s family to America and

propelled later generations abroad, as her Boston ancestors traveled internationally and forged foreign alliances to spread Christianity and advance the anti-slavery cause. Her mother was a descendant of Thomas Paul, a missionary whose work took him to Haiti, and whose brother, Nathaniel Paul, traveled to England with William Lloyd Garrison to garner support for abolition.<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, Hopkins's granduncle James M. Whitfield, the mid-nineteenth century African American poet, belonged to a tradition of African American authors writing on issues of race and internationalism.<sup>4</sup> He critiqued U.S. racial oppression by representing America in relation to foreign countries and ancient cultures, much as Hopkins would later do. Her family tree thus offers examples of African Americans, like those she writes about in her novels and nonfiction, who influenced both U.S culture and the global sphere.

Hopkins, in turn, sought to contribute to American culture and employed a variety of art forms to elevate African Americans. During the 1870s and 1880s, she was a singer, performer, and playwright, going on to develop her career as a writer and editor in the 1890s and early 1900s.<sup>5</sup> Her literary work explores the intersection of domestic race relations and international affiliations. As an editor for *The Colored American Magazine* (1900-1904), she printed pieces on domestic injustices, including segregation, rape, and lynching, alongside essays about African history and contemporary politics in Cuba and the Philippines. In so doing, she linked issues facing African Americans to the concerns of international communities. Further, her writing explores how foreign encounters shaped U.S. race relations, as well as how domestic race relations affected the nation's new role as an empire.<sup>6</sup>

Hopkins addresses the enduring influence of slavery on both domestic race relations and U.S. imperialism by rewriting familiar representations of the nation as a family. American authors had long employed the nation-as-family trope in order to define what united fellow citizens.<sup>7</sup> The metaphor, which can be traced back to Enlightenment philosophy, implies that relations among national subjects resemble those among family members. This figure of the nation emphasizes how Americans are bound together by a shared home and genealogy, which foster sympathetic ties and commitment to national interests.<sup>8</sup> Such representations proved troubling when they defined the ideal citizen as white and asserted that America's white forefathers had bequeathed a racial inheritance to later generations that must remain "pure" to preserve the nation.<sup>9</sup> This conception of the nation denied compassion to those deemed foreign and racially inferior. Taken to its extreme, the nation-as-family metaphor justified the conquest of foreign, nonwhite peoples.

In revising this metaphor, Hopkins builds on the work of earlier authors, white and black alike, who sought to dislodge conceptions of America as an exclusively white family. Harriet Wilson, Frank J. Webb, Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Wells Brown, and Frances E. W. Harper, among many others, challenged African Americans' enslavement and exclusion from the American family by reappropriating the metaphoric language used to justify their oppression. To contest the treatment of blacks as nonhuman, their work asserts that strong family feeling existed among slaves.<sup>10</sup> These writers argued slavery was immoral because it prohibited African Americans from participating in Western family structures by allowing, or encouraging, rape, incest, bastardry, and the forcible separation of families.<sup>11</sup> Hopkins and her contemporaries,

including Charles Chesnutt and Sutton E. Griggs, likewise drew on America's history of miscegenation to offer an insider's critique of U.S. racial hierarchies that underscores their arbitrariness.<sup>12</sup> For instance, much as Brown had imagined African Americans as the descendants of the nation's founding fathers in *Clotel* (1853), Griggs depicted his African American protagonist as the unacknowledged son of a white statesman in *Imperium in Imperio* (1899).<sup>13</sup> All of these writers suggest that while white and black Americans share a common heritage, which should engender interracial sympathy, slavery and segregation have instead denied African Americans' national belonging.

In *Of One Blood*, Hopkins develops this theme by representing American genealogies as the basis for sympathetic bonds not only within the nation, but also between Americans and foreign peoples. In so doing, she revises representations of the world as family that elevated whites above other races. As U.S. imperialism took shape, authors such as Rudyard Kipling and Richard Harding Davis employed the world-as-family metaphor to define America as the parent or elder brother to "childish" foreign peoples in need of reform. Both turn-of-the-century writers drew on notions of family and sympathy to legitimize imperialism. Kipling, in particular, portrayed U.S. conquest as a form of paternal benevolence that would alleviate the suffering of "uncivilized" peoples of color.<sup>14</sup>

In contrast, Hopkins depicts Americans as descendants of Africans to whom she attributes remarkable cultural achievements. Due to the sexual exploitation of slaves, her "white" and "black" American characters share Ethiopian and Anglo American lineage. Hopkins asserts that Americans should acknowledge this heritage and forge sympathetic bonds based not in paternalism, but rather in recognition of Africans as Americans'

equals.<sup>15</sup> She describes African cultures that merit cosmopolitan appreciation, thereby breaking from Euro-centric versions of cosmopolitanism, such as those we see in María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's novels, to invoke "black cosmopolitanism."<sup>16</sup> By recovering their genealogical connections to and forging cosmopolitan affiliations with a Pan-African community, Hopkins's African American characters begin to redress U.S. racial oppression.<sup>17</sup>

Through her portrait of Americans' international families and foreign affiliations, Hopkins enters into the late-nineteenth century's contentious debates over U.S. imperialism and the Spanish-American War. The nation had expanded during the nineteenth-century at great cost to "foreign" peoples, through Indian Removal policies, the Mexican-American War, and growing economic imperialism. The Spanish-American War signaled America's new position as a global empire and fed long-standing concerns about its place in the global sphere. Popular writers, such as Richard Harding Davis and Mark Twain, offered competing commentary on overseas expansion that revealed how U.S. imperialism threatened to destabilize the nation.<sup>18</sup> Hopkins likewise addressed the threat of imperialism while engaging in debates over its effect on African Americans' advancement. Her writing resonates with W. E. B. Du Bois's assertion that America needed to be guided by "deepest sympathy" as it grew to include new colonies and "dark peoples."<sup>19</sup> Hopkins, meanwhile, maintains that colonization and slavery had *already* created interracial, international families, which offer a basis for foreign sympathy.<sup>20</sup>

While earlier scholarship on Hopkins establishes the centrality of race and internationalism to her work, reading her novels in relation to global sympathy lets us consider why the turn-of-the-century writer drew on the discourse of sympathy to address

these subjects. Her realist contemporaries had broken sharply from the sentimental conventions with which sympathy was long associated. Hopkins herself acknowledges the limits on sentimentalism's ability to represent the complex emotional and political ties linking late nineteenth-century Americans, as well as the psychological difficulty of understanding and feeling for another person. Nonetheless, she suggests that *sympathy* remains vitally important. In part, sympathy offers an ideal against which she can measure U.S. treatment of the "darker races," who Americans continued to oppress at home and abroad. Hopkins explores how familial bonds might inspire sympathy that would disrupt U.S. oppression.<sup>21</sup> Nowhere does she suggest that simply recovering Americans' entangled genealogies offers an easy route to fostering familial sympathy and undoing the racism that powers U.S. domestic and foreign relations. Rather, *Of One Blood* presents the most ambivalent depiction of Americans' attachments to one another and to foreign peoples of all the central texts in this study. Hopkins de-familiarizes sympathy through allusions to mesmerism, discussed in the next section, that speak to Americans' exploitation of their "foreign" families. In response to this history of abuse, she asserts the need for African Americans to develop new international affiliations to address the seemingly intractable problems of race and empire.

### Mesmeric Sympathy as Interracial Bond

Hopkins conveys Americans' intricate interracial and international relations by employing mesmerism as a recurring trope in her fiction. Given mesmerism's complex historic and cultural associations, it requires some contextualization if we are to

understand its role in Hopkins's last novel where it takes on particular thematic and narrative importance. Founded in the work of Franz Anton Mesmer (1734-1815), mesmerism from its outset was deemed a form of sympathy, or more specifically "a phenomenon that understood electricity as a vital life force capable of being passed between sympathetic bodies."<sup>22</sup> Mesmerism amplified the sense of connection associated with Enlightenment notions of sympathy by linking it with a *physical* process; this amplification made mesmerism a particularly rich figure for the interracial bonds in Hopkins's last novel.

Hopkins signals the centrality of mesmerism to *Of One Blood* by taking the title of William James's essay on mysticism, "The Hidden Self" (1890), as her own novel's subtitle.<sup>23</sup> In so doing, she not only evokes the cultural relevance of the occult at the turn of the century, but also invites readers to reflect on its significance to a novel that is profoundly concerned with race. When she quotes James's description of mesmeric phenomena as "broadcast over the surface of history" and yet dismissed, we can see a parallel between mesmerism and the interracial sex and miscegenation that Hopkins portrays as both common and occluded in U.S. culture (442). Moreover, *Of One Blood* draws on mesmerism to represent this history of interracial relations; specifically, Hopkins portrays Americans as members of an interracial, international family, whose strong ties to one another are evident in their mesmeric connections.

By employing mesmerism to convey her characters' powerful family bonds, Hopkins raises questions about how these links will shape family members' treatment of one another. Mesmerists hypothesized that people were united by an electrical connection. Though this connection was described as a "sympathetic" force, mesmerists

did not necessarily share their subjects' feelings. Thus, mesmeric sympathy is distinct from "sympathy" in the Enlightenment sense of shared feeling and affective connection.<sup>24</sup> Drawing on this distinction, Hopkins explores what happens when Americans possess close physiological and genealogical bonds, but fail to sympathize with one another. Specifically, *Of One Blood* deploys mesmerism to address how white Americans had forged close connections to the "darker races" through slavery and imperialism, but refused sympathy to their "foreign" family and instead exploited them.

Mesmerism offered Hopkins a resonant figure for the influence of Americans' interracial and international ties because the occult science relied on the belief in a universal bond linking humanity. Mesmerists theorized that a magnetic fluid or substance connects all people. While this aspect of mesmeric theory was increasingly challenged in the postbellum era by new scientific findings, it nonetheless proved useful for Hopkins as she sought to assert Americans' global attachments.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, the notion of a fluid uniting all mankind parallels the Biblical vision of all mankind as being "of one blood," which she likewise invokes in her last novel to destabilize racial and national divisions. Hopkins thus interweaves occult science's and Christianity's efforts to understand what unites humanity (621).<sup>26</sup>

Beyond simply emphasizing the intimate connections among her characters, Hopkins draws on mesmerism to explore how such bonds prove both valuable and harmful. She takes up theories that mesmerism could cure ailments, recover lost memory, make the subject a conduit to the deceased, and render the subject obedient to the practitioner's will. While some Americans viewed this practice as bringing relief from pain and illness, others thought it a form of enslavement. Mesmerism could entail violent



mastery that reified hierarchies of gender, class, and race.<sup>27</sup> Yet the practice could also disrupt social hierarchies, as when mesmerists asserted control over their “social betters.” Mesmerism’s different cultural roles—as a form of compassion or exploitation, oppression or rebellion—allow Hopkins to convey how Americans could draw on their historic international ties either to spread the racial oppression that many of her contemporaries justified as a form of “sympathy,” or instead to advance equality.

Hopkins’s use of mesmerism fits with her thematic emphasis on how the past continues to shape the present. Mesmerism saw its heyday in America during the antebellum era, becoming widely popular after Charles Poyen St. Sauveur toured New England in the mid-1830s to demonstrate the occult science.<sup>28</sup> By the time Hopkins wrote, mesmerism was largely out of date, as hypnotism had become a more popular means for explaining many of phenomena previously attributed to mesmerism.<sup>29</sup> Thus when she depicts mesmerism in late nineteenth-century America, she signals the antebellum era’s effects on her own day.<sup>30</sup> In particular, her representation of mesmerism resonates with Nathaniel Hawthorne’s use of the trope in *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851). Hawthorne portrays how alleged crimes of theft and murder, along with the mesmeric violence that functions as a metaphoric rape, link the upper-class Pyncheon family and lower-class Maules.<sup>31</sup> Both Hawthorne and Hopkins draw on mesmerism to show how Americans must choose whether to perpetuate the violence that entwined earlier generations. Whereas Hawthorne employs mesmerism to consider how different classes fit within the national family, Hopkins reworks this trope to establish how different races fit into both an American and a global family.

Crucially, mesmerism's history intersects with Hopkins's concern with race relations because the occult science was developed and practiced, in part, on slave plantations. Before popularizing mesmerism in New England, Poyen studied the subject for over a year in the West Indies.<sup>32</sup> There he witnessed experiments performed on black slaves, which provided him with a basis for his American lectures. His experiences on his parents' plantation in the West Indies interested him in abolition. This history suggests the progressive potential of mesmerism, and Alan Gauld notes mesmerism's association with antebellum progressive movements.<sup>33</sup> Yet Russ Castronovo characterizes Poyen as concerned with the effects of slavery and abolitionism on white New Englanders, rather than on slaves. Overall, Poyen's work highlights mesmerism's relation to compassion and exploitation, as well as its imbrication with issues of race.

Writing decades later, Hopkins returns to mesmerism's association with both healing and racial oppression. Yet unlike Poyen, she foregrounds mesmerists' history of manipulating black bodies. She interrogates how white doctors exploited the bodies of slaves and uses scenes of mesmerism to critique postbellum African Americans' exploitation. At the same time, she asserts that Africans and African Americans were not merely passive subjects of mesmerism, but rather contributed to its development it. She calls for their recognition as contributors to this science and, by implication, U.S. culture more broadly.<sup>34</sup>

Hopkins gradually developed her representation of mesmerism as a figure for Americans' interracial relations over the course of her first three novels, which each include brief allusions to occult practices. *Contending Forces* draws on mesmerism to signal racial difference, namely the association of occult traditions with black Americans,

even as she suggests that white Americans' growing interest in mesmerism renders this distinction tenuous.<sup>35</sup> *Hagar's Daughter* likewise briefly refers to mesmerism to comment on racial difference, using mesmerism as a figure for white patriarchal power and the vulnerability of African American women within late nineteenth-century U.S. culture.<sup>36</sup> In *Winona*, by contrast, hypnotism serves as a figure for Native Americans' and African Americans' power.<sup>37</sup> All three texts employ different aspects of occult powers to explore the history of white oppression and black resistance, as well as contemporary racial tensions. Further, Hopkins repeatedly associates mesmerism with the past, whether that involves linking it to cultural traditions or associating it with a history of oppression.

Hopkins's last novel builds on her earlier depictions of mesmerism, emphasizing its ambivalent cultural associations to construct her fraught family narrative. *Of One Blood* deploys the trope to convey how white Americans exploit their power over minority groups within and beyond the nation, as well as how mesmeric bonds based in affective sympathy can disrupt the racial, gender, and national hierarchies that undergird oppression. Through mesmerism's divergent effects, Hopkins explores how Americans' domestic and foreign ties have proven deeply destructive, but still have the potential to benefit the nation and the world. The occult science allows her to address the troubling histories of slavery and sexual exploitation that link white and black, African and American characters. After all, mesmerism presumes that the dead can reach out from the grave, or, in less gothic terms, that the past continues to shape the world.

*Of One Blood: Interracial Inheritance & International Family*

In *Of One Blood*, Hopkins reconstructs America's history of interracial and international encounters in an effort to understand the nation's troubling race relations at a time of growing U.S. imperialism. She opens the story in postbellum Boston and returns to the antebellum as characters piece together their genealogies. The serialized novel presents a sensational tale about the violent conflict that erupts between the siblings Aubrey Livingston, Jr., Reuel Briggs, and Dianthe Lusk, whose familial relationships have been obscured by slavery and racial oppression. The seemingly white Aubrey and his black brother Reuel both pursue and marry Dianthe, whom they fail to realize is their sister. Plot twists reveal that all three are tied to one another by blood and descended from a royal African family. The novel proves intricate at the level of plot, as well as in its use of discourse and form. Hopkins alludes to an array of spiritual and scientific debates that shaped contemporary conceptions of race and nation. Moreover, the text shifts from a realist mode in the early chapters to incorporate fantastic elements, including mesmerism.

Through this story of violence and incest, Hopkins asks readers to think anew about family, race, and empire. Family becomes the site where we can see the troubling effects of U.S. race relations and foreign relations. While Hopkins invokes Enlightenment conceptions of the family as a valuable source of sympathy, she contrasts this ideal with the fact that Americans' family ties have been occluded through slavery and racism. Further, she portrays the genealogical bonds that link white and black Americans and serve as a basis for oppression or sympathy. Within the novel, recovering these

connections proves risky and does not undo the violence attendant on their occlusion; yet the very persistence of this violence advances Hopkins's critique of U.S. racism and imperialism.

Central to this critique and her depiction of the global family is the trope of mesmerism. Hopkins suggests that her characters acquire mesmeric powers through their shared international and interracial genealogy. She portrays mesmerism as a genealogical inheritance that comments on what prior generations have passed on to the next. The inheritance of mesmeric powers—through which characters extend, withhold, or abuse sympathy—signals that shared heritage has created powerful bonds among black and white, African and American characters.<sup>38</sup> Further, Hopkins deploys mesmerism's association with both enslavement and sympathy to represent how Americans' family bonds threaten *and* empower them. As a figure for these interracial and international family ties, mesmerism plays a key role in her interrogation of race relations and U.S. imperialism. To understand Hopkins's political critique, I analyze three closely related aspects of her last novel: (1) her use of mesmerism as a sign of the genealogical bonds among white and black Americans, (2) her representation of Americans' African heritage as a basis for foreign sympathy and cosmopolitan affiliations, and (3) her vision of international alliances as a means to contest racial oppression at home and abroad.

Before turning to this analysis, though, a brief discussion of the plot clarifies how Hopkins connects the figures of global family and mesmerism to the issue of racial oppression. She establishes that Americans are part of an international family by tracing the transformation of her hero, Reuel Briggs, from an isolated American to an Ethiopian leader as he uncovers his genealogy. At the novel's start, he lives alone studying

medicine in Boston. Without revealing his heritage, the early chapters imply that racism has led him to pass as white. The novel's opening chapters use realism to establish Hopkins's insider's critique of race relations in Boston and America more broadly, before turning to increasingly fantastic scenes that defamiliarize and disrupt these troubling patterns. Hopkins's hero begins to act on his sympathy for African Americans and gain recognition for his scientific acumen, when he revives Dianthe Lusk, a Fisk Jubilee singer, from apparent death. Reuel finds that her injury stemmed from a mesmeric trance, the work of a traveling "magnetic physician," and he cures her through his own use of magnetism. Dianthe's illness and treatment establish the dual nature of mesmerism, used either to exploit or to heal. It can suppress an individual's memory and will, or preserve life and forge new bonds, as evidenced by Reuel's marriage to Dianthe. Despite her treatment, however, Dianthe cannot recall her past. Though Reuel knows of her heritage from her earlier performance with the Fisk Jubilee Singers, he is unable to see what she might gain from recovering her African American heritage, and so chooses not to reveal it.

While acknowledging the pressures that lead African Americans to deny their heritage, Hopkins also asserts the value of this heritage. Characters' genealogies confer occult powers on them and provide the basis for her hero's international affiliations. Such foreign affiliations become essential when racism prevents Reuel from finding work in America and prompts his departure for Africa. Aubrey Livingston Jr., Reuel's professed friend, betrays Reuel's racial identity to force Reuel's departure from America and gain access to Dianthe. Reuel and his friend Charlie Vance join a British archaeologist's expedition to Meroe in Ethiopia. U.S. racial violence America follows the men abroad as

Aubrey hires his African American “foster brother,” Jim Titus, to join the expedition and kill Reuel.

Reuel’s journey to Africa conveys how the recovery of foreign ties can entrap and empower African Americans. Aubrey murders his fiancée, Molly Vance, and tricks Reuel and Dianthe into believing each other dead. Through mesmerism, Aubrey forces Dianthe into marriage. While these scenes emphasize African Americans’ vulnerability, Reuel discovers a source of strength in Africa: the hidden city of Telassar where Meroe’s ancient civilization still flourishes. Ai, Telassar’s leader, divulges Reuel’s royal African ancestry to him. Reuel is triumphantly reborn as the African prince Ergamenes and marries Telassar’s Queen Candace. He acquires new supernatural powers, which reveal that Dianthe is alive and suffering, and his would-be assassin, Jim Titus, informs him that Dianthe and Aubrey are his siblings. Underscoring Africans’ and Americans’ familial links, these insights prompt Reuel to return to America with Ai.

The novel’s final chapters imagine how the recovery of African heritage alters Americans’ complexly interwoven racial and international relations. During Reuel’s absence, Dianthe discovers that she is a sister to both of her husbands. First an apparition of her mother, Mira, visits Dianthe, hinting at the family secrets. Then Dianthe encounters her maternal grandmother, Aunt Hannah, who relates the family’s history. When Dianthe attempts to poison Aubrey, he uses mesmerism to force the lethal dose on her. Acting alone, the African American woman cannot end her enslavement. Rather, the protagonists’ foreign ally, the African Ai, enacts justice; using mesmerism, he compels Aubrey to take his own life. Ai and Reuel then return to Africa with Reuel’s grandmother Hannah. The novel’s final pages anticipate the re-emergence of an African empire headed

by Reuel, while evoking the threat of foreign empires to Africa. The conclusion is arguably optimistic, in light of the novel's devastating violence, and yet this ending reflects profound concern about Americans' continued pursuit of foreign conquest and disregard for their connections to the peoples they subjugate.

Hopkins underscores the troubling erasure of history and genealogy that shapes this narrative through two key formal elements: the divergent versions of the Livingston family history that characters relate and the trope of mesmerism. *Of One Blood* draws on the characters' family narratives to demonstrate how their shared genealogies have been violently obscured. Two descriptions of their parents' relationship as slave master and slave explain the connections among Aubrey, Dianthe, and Reuel. Aubrey offers the first version as he recounts how his father mesmerized his slave, Mira, who prophesied the coming Civil War (486). Near the novel's close, Aunt Hannah provides a fuller version of this history, revealing to Dianthe that Mira was her mother, and that Aubrey and Reuel are her brothers (606). The discrepancies between these stories, which give different reasons for and times of Mira's sale, reflect Aubrey's ignorance of his mother's identity. According to Hannah, her daughter Mira was sold because of her sexual relationship with Aubrey Livingston, Sr., her master and half-brother. Livingston sold Mira about a week after Aubrey Jr.'s birth, just after Hannah switched him for the Livingstons' dead infant. In contrast, Aubrey believes Mira was sold later because of her bloody war prophecy.

These discrepancies may be the result of Hopkins's writing for serial publication, but they nonetheless reflect a significant aspect of the text: its recursive structure. While *Of One Blood* begins in the postbellum era and returns to the antebellum, the novel refuses any omniscient narrative of this past.<sup>39</sup> Hopkins's narrative strategy emphasizes



history as told through characters' memories and family myths. The conflict between Aubrey's and Hannah's narratives, in particular, reveals the selective nature of the history recounted by those in power. Whereas Aunt Hannah's rendition of history conveys how slavery corrupted familial relationships by creating and then repudiating two generations of incest, Aubrey emphasizes the trauma of the Civil War for Southern whites. As a slave master's heir, Aubrey's knowledge is riddled with gaps that allow the Livingstons to deny racial intermingling, preserve their "whiteness," and maintain power. The narrative is recursive on two levels: characters' family histories are recounted from different perspectives and events in these histories—mesmerism, sexual exploitation, and incest—are repeated by multiple generations.

By depicting the bonds that link her characters to their long-lost families, Hopkins rethinks earlier Enlightenment theories about the limits on sympathy. In particular, she offers a rejoinder to Adam Smith's assertion that "blood" alone cannot engender familial sympathy. Smith argues that family feeling arises from the intimacy of sharing a home, and that blood possesses the "force" to foster sympathy among long lost brothers "nowhere but in tragedies and romances" (262). Hopkins draws on the trope of long-lost brothers to call to light the asymmetric sexual relations that emerged in the system of slavery, entwining white and black families, even as racism led white Americans to deny these bonds. She recognizes that what Smith calls the "force of blood" may not move white Americans to sympathize with their long-lost African American siblings. Nonetheless, Hopkins asserts that these family ties are strong bonds, figured through her characters' mesmeric powers. Americans' troubling tendency to ignore or exploit their

interracial bonds, she insists, creates the need to recover family genealogies and foster sympathy for the “darker races.”

The novel’s genealogical narratives suggest mesmerism’s significance to the novel as a trope that evokes the history of racial subjugation, signals Americans’ interracial heritage, and challenges ongoing oppression. Aubrey becomes a doctor who abuses his mesmeric power, just as he saw his father do. Both father and son employ this practice as a form of psychological imperialism to shore up white Americans’ power over black subjects. In these scenes, mesmerism offers a figure for U.S. slavery that conveys how the system denied slaves knowledge of their history and control over their bodies and minds. Further, by imitating his father’s use of mesmerism, Aubrey Jr. demonstrates how the late nineteenth-century American elite perpetuated slavery’s abuses of African Americans.

Yet Hopkins creates tension between exploitative uses of mesmerism and the more benevolent ends that mesmerism serves when characters employ their powers compassionately. We see the beneficial connections among characters who feel both electric *and* affective sympathy for one another when Reuel cures Dianthe. Her recovery is preceded by a spiritual encounter that signals their electrical connection, itself a result of their shared genealogy. Dianthe visits Reuel as an apparition and sanctions his later treatment, by telling him, “You can help me, but not now; tomorrow” (461). Their mesmeric bond fosters an affective connection. Reuel’s sympathy registers on his physiological reaction to seeing her in the hospital: “every nerve quivered, every pulse of his body throbbed. . . . His whole heart went out to her” (464). The other doctors who help treat Dianthe likewise develop an attachment to her, and she becomes “the dear

adopted daughter of the medical profession” (489). The sympathy underlying Reuel’s treatment flows like a current through the medical community, modeling the spread of family feeling. Reuel and Dianthe’s connection to one another, which heals her and relieves him of his isolation, demonstrates the regenerative power of genealogical ties.

Family history, however, proves difficult and risky to recover within the context of a deeply racist culture. Reuel’s repression of his own and Dianthe’s African American heritage prevents them from recognizing that they are siblings and allow for their marriage. Further, Aubrey, who is a “petted idol of a beautiful world” and heir to plantation wealth, demonstrates how white supremacy disrupts the association of sympathy with family (479). For instance, when Dianthe pleads for his help, Aubrey declares he “cannot pity” her (503). In ruthless pursuit of his desires, he violates his fraternal bonds. His possible ignorance of his family history does not excuse him. Indeed, for Hopkins, all racial oppression constitutes a failure to realize that humankind is “of one blood” and to express sympathy for one’s global family.

While the novel gradually fills in the historical narrative and reveals characters’ family ties, this process of recovery alone does not liberate them. Dianthe’s response to discovering her genealogy—a failed attempt to kill Aubrey that leads to her death at his command—reinforces the sense that concealing America’s past leads to tragedy. Dianthe’s fate gives voice to concerns that the U.S. nation’s history of racial violence is too resistant to change. A pattern of oppression recurs across generations, potentially making it impossible for African Americans to gain freedom within America.

If knowledge of past violence cannot undo its effects, however, recovering this history can at least undermine justifications for such racial oppression. The novel’s

family history disrupts the association of the American family with whiteness. We can trace the destabilizing of racial divisions and power relations through a shift in Hopkins's depiction of mesmerism. Mesmeric powers initially seem to mark the divisions of "black" and "white," "male" and "female." The white male characters mesmerize those with less power, and the black female characters serve as the subjects of mesmerism. Even Reuel's treatment of Dianthe initially appears to be the work of a "white" physician. But these divisions collapse. Hopkins's characters acquire their occult powers as an inheritance passed down *both* by their Anglo father, a mesmerist, *and* by their African American mother, a prophet or medium. White patriarchal authority crumbles as the characters' genealogy surfaces. The revelation of Reuel's racial heritage attests that mesmeric powers are of African provenance, as well. Further, we start to see women's power when Dianthe and Mira exercise influence as apparitions. The change in power dynamics is most dramatic when Aubrey takes his own life under the Ethiopian leader Ai's mesmeric influence as punishment for the murders Aubrey has committed. Locating the American characters' heritage leads to a foreign intervention that finally interrupts the novel's pattern of racial oppression.

\* \* \*

Through Reuel's journey to Africa in the second half of the novel, Hopkins shifts her emphasis to the value of global affiliations in contrast to the oppressive relations within the "national family." Tracing her characters' genealogy to Africa, she explores how African Americans' heritage was not merely a burden, but also a means to forge new

alliances. Her characters' international ties revive familial affections weakened by imperialism and the transportation of enslaved Africans to the Americas. Hopkins suggests that cosmopolitan values help her hero Reuel develop sympathetic relations with Telassar's descendants, who share his genealogy. She conveys the mutually beneficial influence of such attachments, which strengthen the characters' spiritualism and help contest claims of white Americans' racial superiority to "dark" peoples used to legitimate oppression at home and abroad.

In describing Reuel's arrival in Telassar and subsequent rebirth as an African prince, Hopkins draws on Ethiopianism—an African American ideology based in Christian scripture and sympathy—to critique U.S. racism and imperialism.<sup>40</sup> Much as Hopkins uses mesmerism to convey her characters' shared interracial and international heritage and the power it confers upon them, she deploys Ethiopianism to reconstruct "white" and "black" Americans' relations to Africa. Notably, she alludes to the prophecy in Psalms on which Ethiopianism was based: "Princes shall come out of Egypt. Ethiopia shall soon stretch forth her hand unto God" (68:31; Hopkins 573). This ideology asserts that Ethiopia was once great, is now fallen, but will return to power when African Americans convert Africans to Christianity.<sup>41</sup> Ethiopianism was part of a long intellectual tradition, wherein African Americans drew authority from their religious faith, particularly the ideal of Christian sympathy, which sanctioned them to spread their beliefs abroad to uplift Africans.<sup>42</sup>

*Of One Blood's* allusions to Ethiopianism insist that creating an international community benefits both African Americans and Africans. For African Americans, these bonds link them to a history of scientific and cultural achievements. Reuel and the head

of the expedition to Meroe, British archaeologist Dr. Stone, agree that locating evidence of an ancient African empire can advance racial equality, as “the theories of prejudice are swept away by the great tide of facts” (520-1). When Ai reveals that Reuel is a royal descendant of Meroe, this signals his connection to the civilization’s achievements. Whereas his “African” blood hindered him in America, in Telassar it fuels his spectacular rise. Reuel’s subjects embrace him as their king, hailing him as Ergamenes (554). It takes this new “foreign” family to convince him of his own powerful role in advancing a sophisticated African nation’s return to power.

Hopkins suggests that her African American hero’s rise to power benefits Africans because Reuel brings Christian faith to them. This emphasis on conversion may be troubling given that Christian missionary work at times depended on and even advanced imperialism. Like Maria Cummins’s depiction of Syrians converting to Christianity in *El Fureidis*, Hopkins’s portrait of African conversion raises the question of whether Christian proselytizing demeans other cultures. Yet Hopkins links Christianity closely to Africa. Her hero Reuel suffers an existential crisis in America, and only after his encounters with the people of Meroe foster his faith and inspire his feeling for them, does he pronounce his belief in Christ.

Hopkins emphasizes Christianity’s historic ties to Africa and the value of cross-cultural sympathy by re-imagining the story of Philip the Evangelist told in Acts. One of Christ’s disciples, Philip brings Christianity to the Ethiopians by converting a eunuch who is a court official to Candace, queen of the Ethiopians (Acts 8). In keeping with Scripture, Reuel’s first act as king is to convert the prime minister Ai, thereby re-enacting Philip’s role as an evangelist. This parallel invokes the Ethiopianist notion that history is

cyclical and thus when Christianity returns to Ethiopia, so too will the nation's former power. Whereas the repetition of the past in America perpetuates African Americans' enslavement through mesmerism, the text's shift to Africa suggests how recovering the past can strengthen African Americans' spiritual bonds to the larger world and establish their capacity for greatness.

Hopkins balances her emphasis on Reuel's spiritual authority with her depictions of how he learns from Africans. This process of exchange leads me to read the novel's cross-cultural affiliations in relation to black cosmopolitanism. The encounters between Africans and African Americans resonate with Amanda Anderson's definition of cosmopolitanism as "endors[ing] reflective distance from one's cultural affiliations, a broad understanding of other cultures and customs, and a belief in universal humanity."<sup>43</sup> The Ethiopians' cosmopolitan study of other cultures ensures that they are already well versed in Christianity.<sup>44</sup> In turn, Reuel displays a cosmopolitan readiness to learn from the Africans, who teach him about spirituality and thereby demonstrate their own cultural value. Where Ai embraces Reuel's teachings about the Holy Trinity, Reuel learns new mesmeric skills from Ai. Overlooking this cosmopolitan exchange, Yogita Goyal argues that Reuel "assumes the role of the patriarchal father in Africa," and asserts that, "Reuel does not need to be educated in African history, knowledge, or science."<sup>45</sup> In fact, Reuel "humbly" requests Ai's tutelage in these very subjects. This acknowledgement of Ethiopians' intellectual authority is crucial to understanding Hopkins's vision of Pan-African affiliation based in equality, as well as to recognizing that she expands contemporary definitions of cosmopolitanism to include Africans and African Americans (572).

The scenes of Reuel's education contribute to Hopkins's argument that Americans can acquire power by recovering their African genealogy and drawing on this heritage to develop cosmopolitan bonds. Ai's instruction includes teaching Reuel how to employ two occult objects: a disc that shows Reuel the past and a baptismal font that reveals the future (575). Ai then helps Reuel to learn of his American family's history and to anticipate future conflicts. In broader terms, these devices help Reuel enact global sympathy by granting him the ability to understand and share in others' feelings despite the vast geographical distances that separate them. Further, Reuel's spiritual ties to Dianthe signal that African Americans' foreign attachments need not undermine their bonds to America, as these domestic and foreign relations are entwined.

Hopkins emphasizes the value of cosmopolitan exchange by contrasting it to imperial conquest. To do so, she invokes the conventions of imperial romances from the 1890s. While the romance of reunion, which her earlier novels draw from, centers on unifying the nation following the Civil War, turn-of-the-century imperial romances turn outward from the nation. These novels depict Americans who leave the United States following the close of the Western frontier to enact the narrative of the self-made man in foreign arenas.<sup>46</sup> For instance, in Richard Harding Davis's *Soldiers of Fortune* (1897), Robert Clay employs his knowledge of engineering to develop the novel's fictional Latin American nation, Olancho. The foreign setting provides a site where Americans can demonstrate the value of the U.S. national character. Clay is vital to the mining of Olancho because the locals, uneducated and volatile, are as incapable of accessing these natural resources as they are of enacting republican principles. When Olancho's rulers solicit a higher percentage of the wealth Clay produces, they appear corrupt; their claims



reflect greed, rather than devotion to national interests. Davis heightens the novel's drama by situating the mining project in the midst of both European and local attempts to establish a dictatorship so that Clay must quell a revolt. The novel and others like it mark professional expertise, wealth, and republicanism as the purview of Americans.

Prior scholars have suggested that Hopkins's novel justifies imperialism, and she does indeed adopt imperialist conventions.<sup>47</sup> She represents Reuel as an intrepid explorer, eager to claim Ethiopia's resources in order to prove himself. Hopkins highlights the nationalism underlying such international projects by referring to Reuel as "the American man" when he discovers the hidden city of Telassar (544).<sup>48</sup> His exploration of foreign lands suggests he is a representative American ready to participate in economic imperialism.

As the journey to Meroe continues, however, Hopkins deploys the conventions of an imperial romance to critique, rather than legitimate imperialism. The mission resonates with Dr. Norval's expedition to Africa in *Who Would Have Thought It?*, but unlike Ruiz de Burton, Hopkins questions Americans' desire to appropriate African wealth and insists on representing the peoples who inhabit this continent. She emphasizes the expedition's troubling imperialist overtones when Reuel and his companions first visit the site of ancient Meroe, where his friend Charlie Vance quotes Napoleon's line: "From the heights of yonder Pyramids forty centuries are contemplating you" (539).<sup>49</sup> Her characters imagine themselves the successors to Napoleon's 1798 campaign in Egypt and thereby remind readers how archaeological expeditions help colonial invaders claim control of another country's past to assert their own authority in the present.<sup>50</sup> By giving Napoleon's speech to Charlie, who is unwilling to believe that Africans could have built

a great empire, Hopkins links the imperialist aspects of the archaeological mission with the racism Charlie evinces. Through his presence, Hopkins explores how Americans' racism shapes their encounters with foreign cultures. More broadly, Charlie's allusion to Napoleon reminds readers that Americans had likewise developed colonization plans, such as those supported by the American Colonization Society. While these schemes, which proposed to relocate African Americans to Africa, differed radically from Napoleon's campaign, they likewise reflected a failure to recognize Africans' autonomy.

Hopkins challenges various U.S. and European attempts to claim authority over Africa and its past by depicting Meroe as a thriving city. Its inhabitants are the explorers' equals, better suited to educate them in African history than to be colonized by foreigners who hope to claim African wealth. Where Charlie deems the Ethiopian leader Ai "a fossilized piece of antiquity," the novel undermines his claims by emphasizing Ai's youthfulness and cosmopolitan familiarity with contemporary cultures (585). Emphasizing the vitality of Meroe and challenging imperialist attempts to claim Ethiopian wealth, Hopkins asserts that Americans must learn to develop egalitarian foreign relations.<sup>51</sup>

\* \* \*

In *Of One Blood*, international encounters create the opportunity for Americans to rethink their relation to race, nation, and world. These encounters are transformative because they de-familiarize racist attitudes that had become naturalized in America, foster cross-cultural identification, and grant characters new knowledge of their cultural

past. Hopkins's characters benefit from these encounters when they forge cosmopolitan bonds with their African contemporaries, as modeled by Reuel's relationship with the Ethiopian leader Ai. Reuel demonstrates how such cosmopolitan bonds alter Americans' global role, as he commits himself to advancing African civilization.

While her African American characters' critical distance from the U.S. nation fosters their cosmopolitanism, Hopkins also suggests that foreign affinities strengthen Americans' ties to their U.S. home and family. Scholars have critiqued Hopkins's use of Ethiopianism by arguing that her protagonist identifies only with those who offer him power; yet this reading overlooks how Reuel's newly assumed power fosters his connections to African Americans who still lack power within the United States.<sup>52</sup> This signals a marked shift from Reuel's earlier attitudes, when he passed as white and refused to discuss "the woes of unfortunates, tramps, stray dogs and cats and Negroes" (449). Although he was moved by the Fisk Jubilee Singers' expression of African American suffering, Reuel dehumanized African Americans and resisted identifying with them, as he believed this association would weaken him (454, 449).<sup>53</sup> Only after his "discovery" of Telassar transforms his perception of "Negroes" as "unfortunates," does Reuel lament his earlier choice to pass. Through this shift, Hopkins asserts that cosmopolitan exchange has the power to alter Americans' views on race relations by demonstrating Africans' achievements and persuading Americans of their obligation to act upon their sympathy.

While foreign encounters transform U.S. race relations, Hopkins suggests that the reverse is not necessarily true. Americans' interracial affiliations may not change their exploitative foreign relations. She explores this issue through a friendship between her minor characters Jim and Charlie. Charlie, a figure of white privilege, forges a strong

attachment to the African American servant Jim, whom Charlie comes to view as an embodiment of America (581). Their relationship, which stems from a sense of shared nationalism, grows stronger when both men are trapped in Telassar while searching for Reuel. Charlie wonders, “Where was the color line now? Jim was a brother; the nearness of their desolation in this uncanny land left nothing but a feeling of brotherhood” (590). The terrifying unfamiliarity of Telassar compels Charlie to recognize his similarity to Jim as an American. Much as Smith had theorized, their shared country fosters a sense of “nearness” and familial sympathy. When Charlie elects to call Jim a “brother,” we see how foreign encounters can foster a more expansive sense of sympathy and racial equality.

While this “brotherhood” signals Charlie’s increasingly liberal racial views, however, both Charlie and Jim demonstrate the problems that emerge when Americans lack foreign sympathy. Because the men’s sympathetic attachment is based in their shared nationalism, their interracial sympathy does not expand to include Ethiopians. When the two are ensnared in Telassar and stumble onto gems and gold, they never question their desire to steal these treasures. Though they find a way to escape, Jim falls victim to poisonous serpents as he searches for yet more treasure (590). He dies in Africa, “gone to atone for the deeds done in the flesh” (593). Hopkins thus conveys the problem posed by U.S. imperialist desires and a lack of foreign feeling, which threaten to harm Americans and foreign peoples alike.

In contrast to Jim and Charlie’s attachment, Reuel and Ai’s relationship models sympathetic international relations. Such encounters promise to alter Americans’ place in the world, as we see in Hopkins’s use of familial language to describe Reuel and Ai’s

bond. When Ai first speaks to Reuel, it is “with all the benevolence of a father,” and he addresses Reuel as “my son” (545; 546). This metaphoric father-son relationship, which stands in for the relationship Reuel lacks with his own father/slave master, exemplifies the importance of familial and international bonds as it fosters his understanding of his heritage and of race relations. Overall, Hopkins conveys how cosmopolitan ties not only increase Americans’ familiarity with the foreign peoples, but also deepen their self-knowledge and knowledge of their nation.

*Of One Blood* undermines claims of U.S. exceptionalism, which assert Americans’ difference from other countries in order to justify imperialism. By describing Reuel and Ai’s relationship as a paternal bond, Hopkins subsumes the metaphor of nation-as-family into the world-as-family metaphor. While they come from different nations, the two men recognize their connection as people “of one blood” (607). Through their affection for one another, she contests the belief that “foreign” people are so distant and different that Americans cannot feel for them. Writing against exceptionalism, Hopkins represents Americans’ identification with foreign peoples as the basis for cosmopolitan bonds and reciprocal sympathy.

Hopkins’s conclusion offers a dramatic depiction of how Americans’ foreign family could advance racial justice when Ai travels to America. By mesmerizing Aubrey and compelling him to take his own life, Ai not only deprives the novel’s villain of the control he had exercised over others, but also disrupts the racial distinctions through which he acquired dominance. In explaining this death sentence, Ai establishes Aubrey’s Ethiopian heritage: “according to the ancient laws of the inhabitants of Telassar . . . Members of the royal family in direct line to the throne became their own executioners

when guilty of the crime of murder” (620). Whereas Aubrey employed mesmerism to maintain his power as a member of the white elite, here an Ethiopian turns this power against him and undermines his racial claims to authority. Ai is justified in invoking this foreign law, he explains, because of Aubrey’s heritage. Hopkins thereby insists on Americans’ accountability to those beyond their borders, and prevents Reuel from having to kill his brother, thus halting the novel’s cycle of familial violence.

Yet even as the hero’s cosmopolitan bonds help bring the novel’s villain to justice, Hopkins suggests that Aubrey’s death does not defuse the threat of U.S. violence. She writes of Reuel: “United to Candace, his great days glide peacefully by in good works; but the shadows of great sins darken his life, and the memory of past joys is ever with him. He views, too, with serious apprehension, the advance of mighty nations penetrating the dark, mysterious forests of his native land” (621). The novel’s final paragraphs move from the past to the present tense, suggesting Hopkins has arrived at her own day and highlighting her ambiguous vision of the future. Reuel’s ambivalence in regard to the “advance of mighty nations” evokes uncertainty about turn-of-the-century U.S. imperialism. Perpetually reminded of his past, he has good reason to fear the future given white Europe’s and America’s vexed relation to people of color.

These fraught but powerful connections between races are most forcefully expressed in Hopkins’s assertion that “No man can draw the dividing line between the two races, for they are both of one blood” (607). The Biblical allusion directly challenges ostensibly stable racial and national differences. Hopkins insists that the world can be understood as a family, united across national and racial divisions by their blood. Over the course of the novel, she charts these connections through her characters’ family

lineage. In so doing, she illustrates how America's history of interracial and international relations, of enslavement and coercion, haunts the nation. By depicting Africans and African Americans' close ties to the U.S. nation, Hopkins asserts that it is in Americans' interests to halt their imperial conquests. Otherwise, Americans will experience the bloody consequences of such aggression for generations to come.

### The Spanish-American War: Hopkins, Kipling, and Norris

As my reading seeks to show, *Of One Blood* offers a sensational narrative of Americans' history that incorporates the occult while nevertheless remaining firmly grounded in contemporary issues of transnational race relations. Hopkins explores Americans' involvement in imperialism and addresses her contemporaries' responses to the Spanish-American War. At the turn-of-the-century, African Americans struggled to weigh attachment to the U.S. nation against moral obligation to people of color around the world. Hopkins's novel contributes to both this particular conversation regarding African Americans' roles in the war and the broader cultural discourse around foreign politics. Like Hopkins, many contemporary authors sought to articulate America's place in the global sphere and responded to U.S. imperialism by emphasizing the need for international sympathy. Reading *Of One Blood* in relation to works by both African American authors and canonical British and Euro-American authors, particularly Rudyard Kipling and Frank Norris, illuminates the aesthetic and social significance of Hopkins's writing and reveals how her representation of a global family differed from her contemporaries' uses of this trope.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Americans, especially African Americans, expressed ambivalence regarding the growth of a U.S. empire in the Pacific and Caribbean. While African Americans' reactions to the Spanish-American War varied widely, racial identity nonetheless influenced their concerns regarding overseas expansion. They articulated views ranging from faith that war would provide African American soldiers an opportunity to prove their patriotism and earn an improved position for their race within America, to belief that America should devote resources to addressing domestic racial problems rather than focusing on international relations, to concern that through expansion Americans would enact racial oppression in new territories.<sup>54</sup> These disparate reactions informed debates among political leaders, including Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois, over the degree to which African Americans should ally themselves with the nation or an international community. For some, African Americans' long history of contributions to the U.S. nation made their sense of connection to America stronger than that to foreign peoples, and America was an increasingly powerful site of allegiance. Representations of foreign peoples, including Cubans and Filipinos, as savages circulated in periodicals. Such portrayals worked to preclude sympathy, while ironically deploying the same racist language used to denigrate U.S. blacks.<sup>55</sup> Arguments for U.S. imperialism pitted nationalism against the autonomy of foreign peoples and pressed African Americans to choose between cosmopolitan and national allegiances.

Whereas African Americans' participation in the Spanish-American War suggests the pressure they faced to ally themselves with the nation and limit their international affiliations, *Of One Blood* presents an alternative vision in which foreign affiliations help



African Americans more fully understand their obligations to the nation and the world. Through Reuel's genealogy, Hopkins suggests the links among white and black, Americans and Africans. The Livingston/Briggs/Luske family and the mesmeric power associated with it offer a way of understanding Reuel's ties to multiple nations and peoples as closely related, rather than in competition. His international heritage underscores both the appeal and threat of foreign encounters to African Americans. Such encounters had historically resulted in enslavement and other forms of oppression. Yet recovering this shared history could undermine justifications for imperialist and racist violence, allowing Americans to draw on their international heritage as the basis for mutually beneficial foreign alliances.

As with many other nineteenth-century African American writers who expressed a commitment to international coalition, Hopkins's engagement with these themes has prompted scholars to ask which of her affiliations—to America or to a Pan-African community—ultimately won out.<sup>56</sup> Some have read *Of One Blood's* conclusion as expressing a loss of hope for social reform within the United States and arguing for emigration to Africa.<sup>57</sup> Yet to suggest that Hopkins's turn to Africa constitutes a break from her engagement with U.S. race relations is to overlook the tenuousness of the novel's ending. The conclusion leaves readers uncertain whether Africa will conquer or be conquered and, by extension, whether emigration to Africa could actually provide an escape from U.S. empire. Indeed, her emphasis on how U.S. racial violence affects the global sphere suggests that cosmopolitan ties offer not a means to evade American violence, but rather a source of strength in challenging and perhaps reforming the nation.

Hopkins's writing thus demonstrates how African American authors remained invested in America while exploring international affiliations.

Hopkins was hardly the sole writer to depict Americans' affective attachment to the larger world at this moment, and texts such as Rudyard Kipling's "The White Man's Burden: The United States and the Philippine Islands" (1899) remind us that U.S. expansion had become a subject of international interest. While Kipling likewise evokes a sense of ambivalence about the burgeoning U.S. empire, his assertion that it possesses obligations to its "new caught, sullen peoples" differs significantly from the perspectives expressed by African American writers. His widely read poem has become a touchstone for studies of U.S. imperialism; in just a few lines it signals the nation's emergence as a world power. The litany of critical responses to "The White Man's Burden"—including many from African American writers—illuminates how controversial America's foreign role and representations thereof were at the turn of the century.

Kipling's poem proves particularly relevant to my argument because it describes imperialism as a form of benevolent sympathy, based in compassion intended "to serve [Americans'] captives' need." His vision of the relationship between colonizer and colonized is bleak, however, promising that Americans will only be rewarded with unfulfilled hopes, plentiful dead, ungrateful colonies, and "dear-bought wisdom." Yet America must become an empire to fulfill its development, to "have done with [its own] childish days." In other words, the United States cannot arrive at maturity without acting as a colonial power.

Particularly striking is Kipling's use of familial tropes in his representation of U.S. imperialism. While he was not alone in employing familial language to justify U.S.

conquest of the Philippines, his work offers a forceful and widely read example of this rhetorical strategy.<sup>58</sup> Characterizing inhabitants of the southern hemisphere as “half-devil and half-child,” the poem makes a paternalistic analogy between colonizer and colonized, parent and child. Kipling relies on readers’ assumptions about parents’ attachment and obligations to their children in order to assert the need for U.S. intervention in foreign lands. In short, he naturalizes imperialism. “The White Man’s Burden” thus differs markedly from Hopkins’s portrait of Africans and African Americans as the parents of “white” America, which critiques white paternalism and U.S. imperialism. Kipling does not go so far as to identify America as the parent of the Philippines; that could complicate the metaphor by inviting questions about what role Spain plays in this analogy or what imagining America as the parent of these “darker races” suggests about U.S. racial identity. Rather, Kipling’s figurative language asserts America’s duty to establish itself as a global power despite the objections of those colonized peoples whose (re)conquest offers the occasion for this poem. The conquered people will not embrace their conquerors; Americans will instead receive “The blame of those ye better” and “The hate of those ye guard.” Though Americans will hear “the cry of hosts ye humor,” Kipling neither expresses nor affirms Filipinos’ complaints, but only implies that they stem from ungrateful children who ought to be more affectionate toward their paternal conquerors.

By drawing on familial relationships to represent imperialism, “The White Man’s Burden” speaks to the intersection of sympathy and international relations that is the crux of my project. Kipling’s work attests that feeling remained an important means for understanding and representing Americans’ connections to the world at the turn-of-the-century. Hopkins’s novel, in turn, participates in the larger cultural challenge to Kipling’s

poem. As Gretchen Murphy notes, contemporary Americans responded to Kipling in an array of forms, including a number of poems that parodied the self-serving description of imperial expansion as a “burden” (24).<sup>59</sup> African Americans criticized Kipling’s language for disguising the fact that much of the labor of colonization was carried out not by the titular “white man,” but by people of color. Further, African American readers recognized that U.S. imperialism replicated its violent treatment of African Americans in foreign colonies. While Kipling’s representation of imperialism arguably expresses concern for foreign peoples in asserting the need to civilize them, as Willard Gatewood notes, “the black citizens’ concern for the darker races of these islands bore little resemblance to the views of whites who spoke in terms of ‘the white man’s burden’ and ‘our little brown brothers’” (20).

Hopkins’s vision of global family stands in sharp contrast to that of Kipling, particularly her efforts to establish genealogical links between America and Africa that make their familial relations not only metaphorical, but also historical. Yet if we triangulate Hopkins’s and Kipling’s texts with Frank Norris’s work, we begin to see how these three writers’ understandings of U.S. international relations are more closely related than we might expect. Norris’s “The Frontier Gone At Last” (1902) offers a particularly useful point of comparison to Hopkins’s writing. Though Hopkins and Norris are typically read in distinct literary and cultural traditions, they wrote at the same time and responded to contemporary issues of imperialism by drawing on the world-as-family metaphor. Norris’s essay is a narrative of perpetual expansion that treats Manifest Destiny as the most recent, inevitable manifestation of a larger westward surge of energy without acknowledging the costs of imperial oppression. What makes his narrative of

Western civilization worth considering in relation to Hopkins's novel is that he envisions a future beyond the rise of U.S. empire in which national divisions collapse. To advance this claim, Norris asserts that, "At the very first, the seed of the future nation was the regard of family; the ties of common birth held men together, and the first feeling of patriotism was the love of family" (79). From there, he argues, the family extended into the clan, then the city, state, and nation, while patriotism grew into "the devotion to the clan," "civic pride," and then nationalism (79-80). Like many nationalist arguments and literary representations of the nation, including James Fenimore Cooper's historical romances, Norris's essay draws on the idea that the nation grows out of the family.

Norris suggests, though, that just as the history of civilization has not halted with the end of westward expansion, neither will the idea of patriotism cease with nationalism: "Every century the boundaries are widening, patriotism widens with the expansion, and our countrymen are those of different races, even different nations" (80-81). Like Hopkins, Norris insists that expansion cannot be delimited by the nation. He asks, "Will it not go on, this epic of civilization, this destiny of the races, until . . . we who now arrogantly boast ourselves as Americans, supreme in the conquest, whether of battle-ship or of bridge-building, may realize that the true patriotism is the brotherhood of man and know that the whole world is our nation and simple humanity our countrymen?" (81). Norris here returns to the language of the family to redefine "true patriotism" as global. If all men are brothers, then in this future no one can conflate nation and family to justify confining sympathy within national borders.

How different is Norris's vision of global patriotism from Hopkins's conception that all people are "of one blood" or Kipling's argument that the colonization of the

“darker races” is the “white man’s burden”? Like Kipling, Norris treats Manifest Destiny and U.S. imperialism as natural and inevitable processes, as progress. Castronovo argues that while Norris’s globalized vision is one of peace brought about through expansion, it is nonetheless an image of a utopia that no one can opt out of, as it is all-inclusive; the totalizing power Norris imagines is ominous.<sup>60</sup> Consider how his depiction of the nation “widening” differs from Hopkins’s characterization of men and women forging affinities. The form of the novel allows her both to imagine individuals who choose to build such relations and to express the psychological and or bodily costs of imperialism. By contrast, Norris describes these changes in such broad terms that his essay lacks any sense of the individual agents advancing expansion or those protesting against it.

Nonetheless, Norris is critical of America’s “arrogance” in conquest. Further, whereas Kipling presents America’s imperial role as the key to casting off its “childishness,” ostensibly in favor of adulthood, Norris challenges the notion that empire constitutes a fully developed stage of civilization. Like Hopkins, Norris imagines the world’s diverse peoples as fundamentally connected by shared feeling. To assert these connections, both writers draw on historical narratives: Hopkins on that of enslavement and Norris on that of westward expansion. Hopkins, Norris, and Kipling thus articulate a spectrum of responses to imperialism that all emphasize how such international encounters can lead to a productive set of relations, but differ substantially in the degree to which they acknowledge imperialist oppression. To simplify a bit, for Kipling, imperialism is a sign of the nation’s maturing; Norris treats it as a stage on the way to grander progress; and Hopkins uses the connections forged by the historic violence of imperialism to argue for future international affiliations.

I compare Hopkins to Kipling and Norris neither to create a reductive opposition between the African American writer and her white British and American contemporaries nor to conflate them. Rather, I maintain that there is nothing inherently progressive or anti-racist about expanding the nation-as-family metaphor to portray the world as family. Hopkins's novel engages pervasive issues of imperialism and global exchange to re-conceptualize African Americans' relation to both the nation and the world. Through comparison of her work to Kipling's and Norris's, we can see why Hopkins and other intellectuals found images of African empire appealing as a counterpoint to a vision of U.S. empire, which threatened to perpetuate global racial hierarchies, like that evoked in Kipling's poem. Hopkins's novel concludes with the possibility of resistance to violation, colonization, and the erasure of sympathy, but without a guarantee that this will come to fruition. Though protesting the encroachment of empires on foreign countries by imagining an African-led civilization, *Of One Blood* depicts the future as uncertain.

Hopkins imagines an alternative to colonization through the connections among Africans and Americans. To conclude, let us consider how the novel's small sign of the lotus lily birthmark encapsulates the intricate relations among her characters and the nations they represent. This physical sign of Reuel's identity attests to his royal genealogy, even as it serves as evidence of his connection to his siblings, who share the mark. Thus the lotus lily, on one hand, signifies inherited, racial distinctiveness; it certifies Reuel's royal African identity. On the other hand, it levels Anglo Americans' claims to difference by revealing that even the ostensible representative of Anglo America, Aubrey, shares Reuel's African heritage. The birthmark brings together the novel's seemingly paradoxical desires to assert African Americans' capacity to lead the

world through evidence of Africans' history of achievement and to reveal the indeterminacy of race by rendering Americans' African heritage visible. Though these meanings, which speak to Reuel's ties to Anglo America and royal Africa, may seem to conflict with each other, his family history is expansive enough to contain both narratives. Hopkins's response to racism and imperialism in her representation of Reuel's family is, to state it simply, complex and ambivalent. The interracial and international family is a site of both violence and sympathy; it represents histories of national and global violence, and a future of new affections and alliances. Most of all, this complexity insists that Hopkins's protagonist and African Americans as a whole must recover their histories and cultivate their connections to multiple peoples and places.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the chapter I use the phrase Hopkins and some of her contemporaries employed to refer to people of color from around the world, or nonwhites.

<sup>2</sup> For a much more thorough discussion of Hopkins's family history and its relation to her literary career, see Lois Brown's *Pauline Elizabeth Hopkins: Black Daughter of the Revolution*.

<sup>3</sup> Lois Brown describes Thomas Paul as "a successful missionary, whose travels to Haiti resulted in numerous conversions to Christianity and included several audiences with the Haitian president and government officials." Nathaniel Paul, she writes, "traveled to England in the 1830s with Garrison, raised funds for Negro settlements in Canada, addressed members of Parliament about American antislavery work, and completed a successful lecture tour in the United Kingdom" (13).

<sup>4</sup> See Edward Whitley's work on James M. Whitfield, and the recent republication of Whitfield's poetry, edited by Robert S. Levine and Ivy G. Wilson.

<sup>5</sup> As Lois Brown writes, "The vocal and politically astute black Boston community in which Pauline Hopkins came of age had long regarded the arts as a vital resource for community rejuvenation, education, and mobilization" (161). For more on Hopkins's early career as a performer and singer, see Lois Brown's biography.

<sup>6</sup> Hopkins's belief in the importance of global networks proved controversial during her tenure as an editor at *The Colored American Magazine*. In 1904 Hopkins had a falling out with its new editor, Frederick Moore, and backer, John C. Freund. Hopkins's correspondence with journalist William Monroe Trotter suggests Moore ousted her for violating new policies that, in keeping with Booker T. Washington's uplift plans, discouraged the publication of pieces on the "'international aspect' of the Negro



---

question.” Without a regular venue, her publications became infrequent and later fell into critical neglect. The neglect of Hopkins’s novels resonates with her own representations of how difficult it can be to access African American history. The reissue of her novels as part of the Schomburg Library of Nineteenth-Century Black Women Writers series in the 1980s prompted celebrations of her political critique as “a testimony to a black presence in history” and a “cathartic response to black oppression” (xlvii-xlviii). Hazel V. Carby, “Introduction,” *The Magazine Novels of Pauline Hopkins*. Hopkins’s letter to Trotter is reprinted in Ira Dworkin’s *Daughter of the Revolution: the major nonfiction works of Pauline E. Hopkins*. For more on the magazine’s political conflicts, see Dworkin’s “Introduction” and Lois Brown.

<sup>7</sup> A number of scholars of early American culture have traced the important role of familial metaphors in defining the connections among citizens and fostering national devotion. Michael Gilmore analyzes how early American statesmen employed the idea of nation-as-family to establish a new national authority. He argues that the shift from depictions of the founders as the justly rebellious sons of Britain to the fathers of America was essential in these men’s efforts to foster loyalty and prevent future rebellions. Linda Kerber employs the phrase “republican mothers” to articulate early American women’s roles in relation to home and nation. This conception of mothers treats the home as a microcosm of the nation by asserting women’s responsibility in educating their children to become good citizens. In later generations, writers like Ralph Waldo Emerson identified themselves as “sons” of the nation, who continued the Puritan tradition of simultaneously divine and national leaders even though they had broken from Puritanism, as Sacvan Bercovitch notes.

<sup>8</sup> Adam Smith’s *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), discussed at greater length in the Introduction, explores the bonds among citizens in order to theorize what would unite equals within a republic and move them to act in their shared interests. On the related subject of why loyalty to a family or kinship group can be more easily explained than national loyalty, and thus why conceiving of the nation as a family became such an important trope, see Pierre Van Den Berghe’s “A Socio-Biological Perspective.”

<sup>9</sup> Caroline Levander’s *Cradle of Liberty: Race, The Child, and National Belonging from Thomas Jefferson to W. E. B. Du Bois*. Walter Benn Michaels argues that, “Insofar as the family becomes the site of national identity, nationality becomes an effect of racial identity” (8). Though Michaels asserts that the representation of the nation as family and its implications shifted in modernist literature, he acknowledges the longer-standing racial implications of describing the U.S. in familial terms. Walter Benn Michaels’s *Our America: Nativism, Modernism, and Pluralism*.

<sup>10</sup> Their representations of African American families were particularly radical given that slavery denied many U.S. blacks access to traditional structures of domesticity and, as Hortense Spillers argues, “the *vertical* transfer of a bloodline, of a patronymic, of titles and entitlement . . . from *fathers* to *sons* and in the supposedly free exchange of affectional ties between a male and a female of *his* choice” (74). Hortense Spillers, “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe: An American Grammar Book.”

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>12</sup> For more on how Hopkins revises figures of national family through her use of form, particularly the historical romance, see Carla Peterson, “Unsettled Frontiers: Race, History, and Romance in Pauline Hopkins’ *Contending Forces*.”

<sup>13</sup> The eponymous protagonist of Brown’s *Clotel* (1853) is purportedly the daughter of founding father Thomas Jefferson, and the novel repeatedly comments on the brutal ironies of her enslavement and eventual death. Brown sets Clotel’s death—the result of her attempts to free her daughter and her refusal to return to slavery—within sight of the White House, thereby collapsing the white father’s failure to protect his daughter and the nation’s larger failure to extend sympathy to African Americans. Griggs’s *Imperium in Imperio* (1899) represents Bernard Belgrave, an ambitious light-skinned man, as the son of a white U.S. senator and an African American mother. Despite ensuring that Bernard receives a thorough education, the senator refuses to acknowledge his son in public. While William Wells Brown emphasizes how the failure of familial sympathy within the nation results in the deaths of noble, loving women like Clotel, Briggs suggests that this failure radicalizes African Americans leading to the creation of a black nation within the larger U.S. nation. He thereby underscores how segregation threatens white America, much as Hopkins does.

<sup>14</sup> Consider, for instance, Rudyard Kipling’s response to the Spanish-American War in “The White Man’s Burden” (1899) and imperial romances like Richard Harding Davis’s *Soldiers of Fortune* (1892). Both texts are discussed at greater length in later sections.

<sup>15</sup> By arguing that Hopkins contests racism and U.S. imperialism, I break from recent criticism that claims her last novel reifies the very racial and national hierarchies it seeks to disrupt. Such scholarship usefully notes how Hopkins appropriates scientific and spiritual discourses that were implicated in racism and imperialism. However, these interpretations overlook the familial relationships between her American and African characters and the paternal authority she attributes to Africans. Kevin Gaines claims that when Hopkins appropriates scientific and Biblical authority in her depiction of Africa, she re-inscribes the notion that African Americans should assimilate to a white, European ideal, while portraying the continent of Africa as a blank slate for conquest. Yogita Goyal similarly argues that, “It is . . . difficult to see how Hopkins might be presenting an alternative to American racism . . . when the portrayal of Africa follows conventional imperial logic” in asserting U.S. authority. Susan Gillman offers a more positive take, writing that the novel “destabilize[s] but [does] not dismantle” notions of racial inferiority. Kevin Gaines, “Black Americans’ Racial Uplift Ideology as Civilizing Mission: Pauline E. Hopkins on Race and Imperialism.” Yogita Goyal, *Romance, Diaspora, and Black Atlantic Literature*, 53. Susan Gillman, “Pauline Hopkins and the Occult: African-American Revisions of Nineteenth-Century Sciences,” 66.

<sup>16</sup> Here I build on the work of Colleen C. O’Brien who argues that Hopkins is centrally engaged with international politics and a form of “insurgent cosmopolitanism” in order to contest imperialism. To this, I add that Hopkins treats Americans’ international genealogy as a basis for such cosmopolitan ties. For more on the significance of envisioning African Americans as cosmopolitans to challenge nineteenth-century representations of Africans as barbaric that denied them access to “cosmopolitan

---

subjectivity,” along with “national subjectivity and human subjectivity,” see Ifeoma Kiddoe Nwankwo (10).

<sup>17</sup> While Pan-Africanism and cosmopolitanism are distinct from each other, Hopkins’s writing incorporates elements of both. She asserts the need both for the political action intended to improve the condition of all African peoples, which Ifeoma Kiddoe Nwankwo argues fundamentally characterizes Pan-African movements, and the cosmopolitan interest in exploring foreign cultures and celebrating “advanced” civilizations. Indeed, Hopkins explores how cosmopolitanism could offer African Americans insight into foreign cultures that would bolster their political work.

<sup>18</sup> Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*.

<sup>19</sup> Both Hopkins and Du Bois recognized that African Americans and other U.S. minorities were treated as “foreigners” or outsiders as the U.S. nation proscribed their rights through law and/or Jim Crow codes. As Carla Peterson argues, “Like other African-American intellectuals, [Hopkins] decried the American conquest of external frontiers as a distracting enterprise harmful to the welfare of her people. Indeed, black Americans of this period perceived with absolute clarity the racism of American imperialism and repeatedly drew parallels between racial prejudice at home and imperialism abroad” (180). Carla Peterson, “Unsettled Frontiers: Race, History, and Romance in Pauline Hopkins’ *Contending Forces*.” See W. E. B. Du Bois’s “The Present Outlook.”

<sup>20</sup> As Kaplan notes, Du Bois “makes an imperial argument against racism: imperial expansion has the potential to break down national borders and racial divisions and to promote multiracial affiliations across the globe” (178). Here she refers to “To the Nations of the World” and “The Present Outlook for the Dark Races of Mankind.” Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*.

<sup>21</sup> By attending to the significance of family in Hopkins’s work, I build on Jill Bergman’s essay, which offers an exception to the larger scholarly tendency to overlook the specific relations between Africans and Americans that Hopkins imagines in *Of One Blood*. Bergman writes that the novel imagines “the restoration of the national mother and the recovery of the glorious African past as the best remedy to the motherlessness of the African American community” (296). However, I suggest that Hopkins is interested not only in the figure of the mother or in emphasizing African Americans’ connections to Africa, but rather is concerned with the family as a whole and the ways in which it unites African Americans to the United States and Africa. Jill A. Bergman, “The Motherless Child in Pauline Hopkins’s *Of One Blood*.”

<sup>22</sup> Jeffrey Insko, “Passing Current: Electricity, Magnetism, and Historical Transmission in *The Linwoods*,” 297.

<sup>23</sup> The novel misattributes the quote to *The Unclassified Residuum*, by Alfred Binet, whose work James’s essay discusses.

<sup>24</sup> Throughout this chapter I continue to use the broad term “sympathy” to refer to this Enlightenment understanding to be consistent with my earlier chapters.

---

<sup>25</sup> Alan Gauld describes that mesmerism theory came into question as it became increasingly “apparent that the nervous system was not powered by some quasi-electrical energy or fluid” (266). *A History of Hypnotism*.

<sup>26</sup> Hopkins refers to Acts 17:26 for evidence of the universal connections among humankind. Notably, Hopkins’s assertion that God has made all races “of one blood” challenges the prevalent scientific theory of polygenesis used to explain and reify alleged racial difference, as Susan Gillman argues in “Pauline Hopkins and the Occult: African-American Revisions of Nineteenth-Century Sciences.”

<sup>27</sup> Alison Winter makes a compelling argument that “mesmerism provides a window onto how Victorians portrayed power relations in their own society—to use their terms, relations of sympathy, power, authority, and inequality,” which likewise resonates with nineteenth-century American uses of mesmerism (8). Moreover, Russ Castronovo explores the links between abolition and mesmerism, arguing that in both antebellum discourses, white subjectivity and spiritualism became troublingly tied to black bodies and labor, “The Antislavery Unconscious: Mesmerism, Vodun, and Equality.”

<sup>28</sup> Samuel Chase Coale, *Mesmerism and Hawthorne: Mediums of American Romance*, 8-9.

<sup>29</sup> Alan Gauld traces the rise and fall of mesmerism, while challenging earlier histories of the science that overstate the ostensible “death” of the science, which was still practiced after its fall in popularity during the 1850s. Gauld notes that mesmerists continued to practice and even hold international conferences in the postbellum era, including a Paris conference in 1889, at the same time as the first International Congress of Hypnotism (265).

<sup>30</sup> While mesmerism serves as a central figure in *Of One Blood*, the text also refers to hypnotism twice and employs the term interchangeably with mesmerism. Hopkins refers to a “hypnotic trance” and “hypnotic influence” (525; 620). These powers of hypnotism function just like the powers of mesmerism in the novel, are employed by the same characters who use mesmerism, and the “hypnotic trance” is described—much like the mesmerism trances—as a “magnetic spell” (525). Through these connections, the novel underscores the continuity between mesmerism and hypnotism and, in so doing, heightens Hopkins’s emphasis on how antebellum culture influences postbellum America.

<sup>31</sup> See Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *The House of the Seven Gables*. In personal letters, Hawthorne objected to his wife’s wish to be mesmerized in order to treat her migraines, arguing that the act’s intimacy would violate their marriage. “Love is the True Magnetism,” excerpted from Hawthorne’s letters in the Norton Critical Edition. On concerns about women’s vulnerability to mesmerism, see Jeffrey Insko, “Passing Current: Electricity, Magnetism, and Historical Transmission in *The Linwoods*.”

<sup>32</sup> Russ Castronovo, “The Antislavery Unconscious, Mesmerism, Vodun, and ‘Equality.’”

<sup>33</sup> Alan Gauld, 180.

---

<sup>34</sup> In effect, Hopkins anticipates Castronovo's critiques of antebellum mesmerism. Castronovo suggests that we can locate an early critique of mesmerism in Frederick Douglass's "The Heroic Slave," given its depiction of how white Americans struggle to reconcile a belief in universal principles of liberty with a belief in African American inferiority. Hopkins, however, much more directly explores the problems of mesmerism, including the history of experimentation on black bodies and the ways in which mesmerism offers a figure for a long history of black enslavement.

<sup>35</sup> In *Contending Forces*, Hopkins associates mesmerism with two minor African American characters: Dr. Abraham Peters and Madam Frances. Peters relates how slaves used mesmeric powers against one another, whereas Madam Frances employs mesmerism to read characters' fortunes and foretells the antagonist's lonely death. While mesmerism appears powerful in its ability to evoke terror, Hopkins suggests that as long as the occult is perceived as the purview of "blacks," this power cannot alter racial hierarchies. Still, the narrator notes that by the turn-of-the-century, belief in the occult had spread to include white Americans. Thus Hopkins hints that mesmerism could transform from a figure of racial difference to a sign of interracial bonds. She writes that white Americans' interest in mesmerism destabilizes a key "racial characteristic" and, by implication, broader categories of race (199).

<sup>36</sup> Mesmerism is mentioned only once, when an older white villain asks the young female protagonist, "Shall I hold your hand, and see if I can mesmerize you into telling me your thoughts?" (145). The heroine's "alarm" signals his question's insidious undercurrent. We later learn that the heroine is unintentionally passing and that the man who attempts to entrap her into marriage was implicated in her mother's enslavement. This link expresses Hopkins's recurring concern with how Americans were repeating their violent past.

<sup>37</sup> Hopkins describes how her African American hero, Judah, employs hypnotism. He tames a dangerous horse by drawing on "The power of the hypnotic eye [which] was known and practiced among all the Indian tribes of the West" (324). Crucially, this scene comes in the midst of a narrative of Judah's enslavement. While his hypnotic power does not provide him a means of escape, it models how African Americans' cross-cultural alliances with Native Americans prove a source of strength.

<sup>38</sup> Psychoanalytic interpretations of the novel argue that mesmerism evokes the influence of the past on the present and read the characters' mesmeric trances as a symptom of repressed historical trauma, including slavery and rape. Yet this criticism does not account for how Hopkins's characters employ mesmerism to liberate, as well as oppress one another. For an example of a psychoanalytic reading, see Deborah Horvitz.

<sup>39</sup> Hopkins includes cultural reference points that suggest the novel is set both in the 1870s and the 1890s. Specifically, she alludes to scientific work on the occult from the 1880s and 1890, and also includes a scene where the Fisk Jubilee singers perform in Boston for the first time (which occurred in the early 1870s). By collapsing these postbellum decades into one another, she links the challenges of Reconstruction—particularly the ongoing racial oppression facing African Americans—to the problem of burgeoning U.S. Empire that emerged toward the turn-of-the-century.

---

<sup>40</sup> See Susan Gillman's *Blood Talk: American Race Melodrama and the Culture of the Occult* and Kevin Gaines's "Black Americans' Racial Uplift Ideology as Civilizing Mission: Pauline E. Hopkins on Race and Imperialism."

<sup>41</sup> Believers found support for the scriptural depictions of Africans' historic contributions to civilization, on which Ethiopianism was based, in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century explorations of Meroe's pyramids. At least as early as the 1780s, African Americans used their Christianity to assert that they were needed as leaders for African civilizations and forged emigration plans to places such as Liberia. Floyd Miller's *The Search for a Black Nationality: Black Emigration and Colonization, 1787-1863*.

<sup>42</sup> Like many of her contemporaries, Hopkins recognized the significance of Christianity in forging community among turn-of-the-century African Americans. W. E. B. Du Bois succinctly described the Church's role: "a proscribed people must have a social centre, and that centre for this people is the Negro church." At a typical church, "Entertainments, suppers, and lectures are held beside the five or six regular weekly religious services. Considerable sums of money are collected and expended here, employment is found for the idle, strangers are introduced, news is disseminated and charity distributed." Uniting its congregants, Du Bois concluded, "the Church often stands as a real conservator of morals, a strengthener of family life, and the final authority on what is Good and Right." Through her use of Ethiopianism, Hopkins likewise suggests that Christianity provides African Americans access to financial and cultural resources, fosters moral behavior, and links them to a community. Specifically, Christianity becomes the basis for her characters' sympathetic ties to an *international* community. W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, 117-118

<sup>43</sup> Amanda Anderson, "Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity" in *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, 267.

<sup>44</sup> Yogita Goyal describes the inhabitants of Telassar as "trapped in the hermetic glory of an ancient civilization" (51). Though the fact that the civilization is hidden can certainly prove problematic, Hopkins adds nuance to this by characterizing how these inhabitants stay well informed of contemporary cultures; their secret identity seems to protect them, rather than to prevent them from advancing. *Romance, Diaspora, and Black Atlantic Literature*.

<sup>45</sup> Yogita Goyal, *Romance, Diaspora, and Black Atlantic Literature*, 49; 43.

<sup>46</sup> Amy Kaplan's *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*.

<sup>47</sup> For instance, see Kevin Gaines "Black Americans' Racial Uplift Ideology as Civilizing Mission: Pauline E. Hopkins on Race and Imperialism."

<sup>48</sup> For an extended discussion of the masculine ideals associated with imperialist rhetoric, which Hopkins also evokes here through her figure of the American man as explorer see Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*.

<sup>49</sup> Further, Lois Brown notes that Aubrey Livingston's name calls to mind the well-known David Livingstone, arguing that "Hopkins enacts a dramatic inversion of nineteenth-century history, white agency, and African exploration when the fictional

---

Livingston commits crimes that compel Africa to seek him out” (391). Lois Brown, *Pauline Elizabeth Hopkins: Black Daughter of the Revolution*.

<sup>50</sup> Katherine Adams offers a more extended analysis of Hopkins’s relation to historicism, arguing that “Like [Walter] Benjamin, who characterizes historical narrative as a ‘triumphal procession in which the present rulers step over those who are lying prostrate,’ she exposes the way historicism naturalizes hegemonic power, erases its violent constitution, and silences its victims” (137; quoting from Benjamin’s *Thesis on the Philosophy of History* 256).

<sup>51</sup> Notably, Amy Kaplan argues that in imperial romances, the American hero typically is offered a position as the king or national leader, only to refuse it. She reads this refusal as an assertion of power, marking him as an international American leader, who need not rely on earlier, feudal forms of power. By accepting his position as Ethiopian king, then, Reuel breaks from this tradition and aligns himself more closely with the foreign nation that confers this role upon him. Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. In *Romance, Diaspora, and Black Atlantic Literature*, Yogita Goyal briefly discusses Hopkins’s relation to the imperial romance; however, I challenge her argument that Hopkins’s engagement with this genre undermines her attempts to advocate for racial equality.

<sup>52</sup> For instance, Nadia Nurhusein asserts that, “it would be unthinkable that Reuel would have remained in Telassar if it had been revealed to him that he was descended from an ordinary ancient Ethiopian” (283). “‘The Hand of Mysticism’”: Ethiopianist Writing in Pauline Hopkins’s *Of One Blood* and the *Colored American Magazine*.”

<sup>53</sup> Reuel’s refusal to acknowledge his African heritage resonates with nineteenth-century Americans’ concern that sympathizing with the oppressed could weaken those in power; such sympathy reduces the apparent difference between the sympathizer and subject of sympathy and thereby undermines the former’s claim to power. Elizabeth Barnes explores this concern in “Fraternal Melancholies: Manhood and the Limits of Sympathy in Douglass and Melville” in *Frederick Douglass and Herman Melville: Essays in Relation*.

<sup>54</sup> Willard B. Gatewood’s *Black Americans and the White Man’s Burden, 1898-1903*.

<sup>55</sup> For instance, Stephen Crane’s dispatches from the Spanish-American War include phrases such as “the animal-like babble of the Cubans,” that imply foreigner’s inferiority, particularly in contrast to the heroism of U.S. soldiers, such as the stoic signalmen in “Marines Signaling Under Fire at Guantanamo.” While this is just one example of the representation of colonized subjects circulating at the time Hopkins wrote, it reminds us that popular conceptions of foreign peoples were shaped by such representations, rather than personal interactions.

<sup>56</sup> This criticism resembles work on Alexander Crummell, Martin Delany, and Frederick Douglass. For an example of such readings, see Bruce A. Harvey’s analysis of Martin Delany’s career in *American Geographics: U.S. National Narratives and the Representation of the Non-European World, 1830-1865*.

---

<sup>57</sup> For instance, Simone Francescato argues that the novel suggests that the turn to Africa reveals an inability to seek redress within America in “‘Nothing but a feeling of Brotherhood’: The Interracial Question and the Return to Africa in Pauline Hopkins’s *Of One Blood*.”

<sup>58</sup> Meg Wesling’s work on the Spanish-American War notes how this trope circulated in popular culture, including a political cartoon that depicted the Philippines as Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Topsy and Uncle Sam as Miss Ophelia. Wesling argues that by drawing on these characters from *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, the cartoon promises that the Philippines can be civilized and brought to God through the intervention of white Americans and sentimental ideology. *Empire’s Proxy: American Literature and U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines*.

<sup>59</sup> Gretchen Murphy, *Shadowing the White Man’s Burden: U.S. Imperialism and the Problem of the Color Line*.

<sup>60</sup> Russ Castronovo “Geo-Aesthetics: Fascism, Globalism, and Frank Norris.”



## Coda

Concluding this project with Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*—which is profoundly interested in the past, even as it looks ahead to the twentieth century—invites us to reflect on the continuities in nineteenth-century depictions of global sympathy. Her response to the effects of burgeoning imperialism offers a lens onto the era's substantial shifts in foreign relations, including America's territorial expansion, incorporation of new populations, forging of international treaties, and participation in foreign and domestic wars. Hopkins's work attests that these very changes rendered depictions of global sympathy relevant to literature across the century. Thus her novel helps elucidate major themes that are threaded throughout this study's primary texts. Hopkins grappled with the same questions of what linked Americans to foreign peoples that Royall Tyler had explored in the 1790s. Indeed, like Tyler, James Fenimore Cooper, Maria Cummins, Nathaniel Hawthorne, María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, and Pauline Hopkins all assigned feeling a key role in thinking about international relations, while exploring how national, cultural, and racial divisions limited foreign sympathy.

The engagement of postbellum writers, including Hopkins, with the subject of global sympathy that had figured so prominently in literature of the early national and antebellum eras might strike some readers as belated. Yet the familiarity of key tropes for foreign sympathy meant writers could employ these figures both to evoke earlier historical periods and to address the cultural moment within which they wrote. Even by the early national era, relationships of friendship and kinship had already accumulated

rich political and cultural associations that we can trace back to Enlightenment theories of sympathy. Such layers of associations proved generative, allowing writers to allude to the past in order to portray changes in international relations or to suggest how historic foreign encounters continued to shape the present day. In other words, these familiar figures played a vital role in writers' efforts to tell new stories about Americans' encounters with the world.

By drawing on tropes of cross-cultural friendship, marriage, and kinship, U.S. writers could depict newly forged international ties in recognizable terms. In using these pervasive tropes, writers imply that seemingly foreign peoples are in fact quite familiar and, in doing so, address concerns about the influence of America's shifting international relations on the nation. Thus this project has examined how representations of foreign peoples as Americans' friends, spouses, and families suggest that these peoples are natural and proper subjects for U.S. sympathy. Notably, the authors' uses of such tropes overlap, rendering the pervasiveness of these figures all the more apparent. Familial metaphors for domestic and foreign relations circulate in the works of Cooper, Cummins, Hawthorne, and Hopkins. Moreover, each of these writers revises prior depictions of Americans' familial bonds. For instance, Cooper rethinks earlier representations of Americans as the children of British parents by instead imagining the two nations as friends, and Hopkins in turn imagines Americans as the children of Africa.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, both Cooper and Ruiz de Burton deploy the trope of marriage to portray how new "foreign" populations have been incorporated into the nation.<sup>2</sup> The imbricated uses of such figures indicate both these tropes' familiarity and their cultural significance.

Yet while depictions of global sympathy convey the familiarity and even propriety of particular international bonds, Hopkins's writing also demonstrates how sympathy could appear supernatural or even unnatural. This unnaturalness—which has received less attention in *Global Sympathy*—becomes apparent as Hopkins entwines her portrait of the world as a family with the figure of mesmerism. Her characters' use of mesmerism to influence their international families implies a strangeness to Americans' foreign bonds, evoking the potential for these bonds to make Americans uneasy. Through her fantastical novel, Hopkins draws our attention to the unsettling aspects of sympathy. Notably, her emphasis on the unnatural fits with a larger pattern of concerns regarding international affiliations that runs throughout nineteenth-century literature.

U.S. writers explored the unnaturalness of sympathy, in part, by representing how Americans became entangled in disconcerting alliances. For instance, Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun* depicts cross-cultural encounters that evoke a sense of disorientation and even eeriness. We see this in the novel's shadowy murder, the disappearance of the American heroine, and the depictions of violent, bewildering Roman pageantry. The ominous scenes in Hawthorne's novel suggest uncertainty as to how Americans will navigate their relations to Europe in the midst of mid-century revolutions and rebellions. More broadly, his novel demonstrates both how authors' depictions of unsettling encounters registered shifts in foreign relations and how writers qualified their laudatory depictions of global sympathy.

Yet by portraying cross-cultural encounters as unnatural and unsettling, writers not only convey anxiety over change, but also express a desire for new forms of foreign relations. For instance, Hopkins's depictions of mesmerism emphasize how unnatural it is

for white Americans to deny sympathy to African Americans, while exploiting the familial bonds that linked the races and perpetuating the abuses of slavery. Ruiz de Burton's *Who Would Have Thought It?* likewise questions the arbitrary limits placed upon Americans' fellow-feeling. While the novel does not incorporate supernatural elements, a scene near the start, in which the Mexican heroine has developed spots, works to similar effect.<sup>3</sup> This scene underscores how strange Mexican Americans' racial identity could seem in an era when California law defined them as neither "civilized" nor "savage," but rather "semi-civilized."<sup>4</sup> Ruiz de Burton's spotted heroine provides a strikingly unnatural, satirical image of this designation. Moreover, the novel explores how Mexicans and Mexican Americans' ambiguous racial identity became a means of justifying Anglo-Americans' lack of sympathy for these exploited peoples. By reading Ruiz de Burton in relation to Hopkins, we can consider how writers strove to undermine assumptions about white Americans' superiority to "foreign" peoples, while expressing the need for more expansive sympathy.

The unsettling portraits of U.S.-foreign interactions that surface throughout nineteenth-century literature suggest that depictions of global sympathy center not just on who warrants fellow-feeling, but also on those who are denied Americans' sympathy. While asserting the value of foreign sympathy as a means of navigating cross-cultural relations, writers also represented the impediments to such feeling. They questioned these impediments to argue for more capacious fellow-feeling and, at times, to demarcate new boundaries for U.S. sympathy. In other words, writers from the early national era through the close of the nineteenth century shared in a larger project not only of portraying the value of global sympathy, but also of identifying its limits.

This emphasis on the limits of sympathy links the novels included in this study to other nineteenth-century literature. Such diverse texts as Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's *Evangeline* (1847) and Edith Wharton's *The House of Mirth* (1905) express a grave concern with the obstacles, whether political or cultural, that inhibit sympathetic attachments. We could analyze *Evangeline* in relation to global sympathy by examining how the poem depicts Acadians' displacement to the United States, which results in the eponymous heroine's separation from her fiancé and her life-long search for him. We might ask what this poem suggests about foreign sympathy, which appears unable to redress the heroine's loss of home and family. Or we might draw on global sympathy to examine what happens when Wharton's American heroine, Lily Bart, travels in Europe. Strikingly, her adventures abroad do not foster valuable international alliances, but rather serve to underscore her social isolation and the lack of sympathy available to her.

Nineteenth-century literature's concern with the limits of Americans' ability to feel for foreign peoples echoes Adam Smith's assertion that those closest to us—our families and countrymen—are those most strongly “recommended to us” as befitting subjects for our sympathy.<sup>5</sup> However, in representing global sympathy, U.S. writers did not simply reiterate Smith's claim that people are unlikely to form powerful foreign attachments. Their novels convey how divisions of race, nation, and culture could inhibit Americans' international affiliations. Yet their writings also explore moments when such boundaries proved permeable or arbitrary, so that characters could forge international bonds. Indeed, Hopkins's visions of foreign peoples as magnetically linked to one another offers a striking metaphor for how all of the authors in this study depict Americans as forcibly pulled into contact with the world, despite the potential dangers of

foreign encounters; they portray how Americans are attracted to the global sphere, for instance, by their international history, religious sentiments, or, their expansionist politics.

Reading novels from the early national era through the turn-of-the-century, we can identify a tradition within nineteenth-century American literature of texts that simultaneously register the difficulties of sharing in others' feelings and create compelling narratives of how Americans might enact the ideal of global sympathy. The persistence of this tradition across the century demonstrates that the study of sympathy, so long associated with domestic relations, is likewise vital to the developing field of global American studies. By entwining depictions of imperialism and cosmopolitanism with expressions of sympathy, writers sought to characterize U.S.-foreign relations not only in terms of the acquisition of territories, resources, or cultural knowledge, but also in terms of strong affective bonds. Current critical efforts to further our understanding of U.S. culture by analyzing how America's identity was shaped by its roles as a colony, a nation among nations, and a young empire would benefit greatly from an attention to foreign sympathy.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See James Fenimore Cooper's *The Pilot* and Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*.

<sup>2</sup> See James Fenimore Cooper's *The Prairie* and María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *The Squatter and the Don*.

<sup>3</sup> María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, *Who Would Have Thought It?*, 77-80.

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of Mexican Americans' racial classification in nineteenth-century California law and Ruiz de Burton's engagement with this issue, see John-Michael Rivera, 459.

<sup>5</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 269.

<sup>6</sup> Here, I refer to work in global American studies by scholars including Thomas Bender, Edward Larkin, Wai Chee Dimock, Amy Kaplan, and Donald Pease.

## Bibliography

- Adams, Katherine. "Black Exaltadas: Race, Reform, and Spectacular Womanhood after Fuller." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 57.1-2 (2011): 135-163. Project Muse. Web. 29 Dec. 2011.
- Ahmed, Sara. *The Promise of Happiness*. Durham: Duke U P, 2010. Print.
- Alemán, Jesse. "'Thank God, Lolita is Away from Those Horrid Savages': The Politics of Whiteness in Who Would Have Thought It?" *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 95-111. Print.
- . "The Other Country: Mexico, the United States, and the Gothic Conquest." *Hemispheric American Studies*. Eds. Caroline F. Levander and Robert S. Levine. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2008. 75-95. Print.
- . "Wars of Rebellion: U.S. Hispanic Writers and Their American Civil Wars." *American Literary History* 25.1 (Spring 2013): 54-68.
- Anderson, Amanda. "Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* Eds. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1998. 265-289. Print.
- . *The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2001. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1983. Print.

- Anthony, David. "Class, Culture, and the Trouble with White Skin in Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 12.2 (Fall 1999): 249-268. *Project Muse*. Web. 10 Aug. 2011.
- Appiah, Anthony. "Cosmopolitan Patriots." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* Eds. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: University Minnesota Press, 1998. 91-114. Print.
- Aranda, José F. "Contradictory Impulses: María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, Resistance Theory, and the Politics of Chicano/a Studies." *No More Separate Spheres!: A Next Wave American Studies Reader*. Eds. Cathy Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher. Durham: Duke U P, 2002. 121-148. Print.
- Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. "The Problem of Population and the Form of the American Novel." *American Literary History* 20.4 (2008): 667-685. *Project Muse*. Web 7 Dec. 2012.
- Auerbach, Jonathan. "Executing the Model: Painting, Sculpture, and Romance-Writing in Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*." *ELH* 47.1 (1980): 103-120. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 May 2012.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. "Fraternal Melancholies: Manhood and the Limits of Sympathy in Douglass and Melville." *Frederick Douglass and Herman Melville: Essays in Relation*. Eds. Robert S. Levine and Samuel Otter. Chapel Hill: U N C P, 2008. 233-256. Print.
- . *Love's Whipping Boy: Violence & Sentimentality in the American Imagination*. Chapel Hill: U N C P, 2011. Print.



- Baym, Nina. "Concepts of the Romance in Hawthorne's America." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 38.4 (1984): 426-433. *JSTOR*. Web 8 Dec. 2012.
- . Introduction. *The Lamplighter* by Maria Susanna Cummins. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1995. Print.
- Bell, Michael Davitt. *The Development of American Romance: The Sacrifice of Relation*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Bender, Thomas. *A Nation Among Nations: America's Place in World History*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2006. Print.
- Bennett, Paula. "'The Descent of the Angel': Interrogating Domestic Ideology in American Women's Poetry, 1858-1890." *American Literary History* 7.4 (1995): 591-610. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 June 2012.
- Bentley, Nancy. "Slaves and Fauns: Hawthorne and the Uses of Primitivism." *ELH* 57.4 (1990): 901-937. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 March 2012.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale U P, 1975. Print.
- Bergman, Jill A. "The Motherless Child in Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*." *Legacy: A Journal of American Women Writers* 25.2 (2008): 286-298. *Project Muse*. Web. 15 Mar. 2010.
- Berlant, Lauren. *Compassion: The Culture and Politics of an Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print
- . "Cruel Optimism." *The Affect Theory Reader*. Eds. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth. Durham: Duke U P, 2010. 93-117. Print.

- Bernardi, Debra. "Narrative of Domestic Imperialism: The African-American Home in the *Colored American Magazine* and the Novels of Pauline Hopkins, 1900-1903." *Separate Spheres No More: Gender Convergence in American Literature, 1830-1930*. Ed. Monika M. Elbert. Tuscaloosa: U Alabama P, 2000. 203-224.
- Boudreau, Kristin. *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses*. Gainesville: U P of Florida, 2002. Print.
- Boyd, Anne E. "Tourism, Imperialism, and Hybridity in the Reconstruction South: Constance Fenimore Woolson's *Rodman the Keeper: Southern Sketches*." *The Southern Literary Journal*. 43.2 (Spring 2011). 12-31.
- Breitwieser, Mitchell. "False Sympathy in Melville's *Typee*." *American Quarterly* 34.4 (1982): 396-417.
- Brockden Brown, Charles. *Arthur Mervyn, or, Memoirs of the Year 1793*. Eds. Sydney J. Krause and S. W. Reid. Kent: Kent State U P, 2002.
- . *Edgar Huntly; or, Memoirs of a Sleep-Walker*. Eds. Philip Barnard and Stephen Shapiro. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2006.
- . *Wieland*. Ed. Jay Fliegelman. New York: Penguin, 1991.
- Brooks, Daphne A. *Bodies in Dissent: Spectacular Performances of Race and Freedom, 1850-1910*. Durham: Duke U P, 2006.
- Brown, Lois. *Pauline Elizabeth Hopkins: Black Daughter of the Revolution*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2008. Print.
- Brown, William Wells. *Clotel*. 1853. Ed Robert S. Levine. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. Print.

- Budick, Emily Miller. *Nineteenth-Century American Romance: Genre and the Construction of Democratic Culture*. New York: Twayne, 1996. Print.
- . “Perplexity, Sympathy, and the Question of the Human: A Reading of *The Marble Faun*.” *The Cambridge Companion to Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Ed. Richard H. Millington. New York: Cambridge U P, 2004. Print. 230-250.
- Burstein, Andrew. *Sentimental Democracy: The Evolution of America’s Romantic Self Image*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000. Print.
- Carretta, Vincent. Introduction. *Complete Writings*. By Phillis Wheatley. New York: Penguin, 2001. Print.
- Castronovo, Russ. “The Antislavery Unconscious: Mesmerism, Vodun, and Equality.” *The Mississippi Quarterly* 53.1 (1999): 41-56. *Literature Online*. Web. 3 March 2013.
- . “Geo-Aesthetics: Fascism, Globalism, and Frank Norris.” *boundary 2* 30: 3 (Fall 2003): 156-184. *Project Muse*. Web. 18 Oct. 2010.
- Chase, Richard. *The American Novel and its Tradition*. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1958. Print.
- Child, Lydia Maria. *Hobomok*. Ed. Carolyn Karcher. New Brunswick: Rutgers U P, 1986. Kindle book.
- Claybaugh, Amanda. “Fantasies of Law and Government.” Race, Law, and American Literary Studies Conference. Department of English. College Park, Maryland. March 2012. Conference Presentation.
- Coale, Samuel Chase. *Mesmerism and Hawthorne: Mediums of American Romance*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1998. Print.

- Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Deerslayer or, The First War-Path*. Historical introduction and explanatory notes by James Franklin Beard; text established by Lance Schachterle, Kent Ljungquist, and James Kilby. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987. Print.
- . *Gleanings in Europe: England*. Historical introduction and explanatory notes by Donald
- A. Ringe and Kenneth W. Stange; text established by James P. Elliott, Kenneth W. Staffs, and R. D. Madison. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982.
- . *Gleanings in Europe: France*. Historical introduction and explanatory notes by Thomas Philbrick; text established by Thomas Philbrick and Constance Ayers Denne. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- . *The Last of the Mohicans: A Narrative of 1757*. Historical introduction by James Franklin Beard; text established with explanatory notes by James A. Sappenfeld and E. N. Feltskog. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- . "Letter to Gen. Lafayette." Ed. Robert E. Spiller. New York: Columbia U P, 1931.
- . *Notions of the Americans: Picked up by a Traveling Bachelor*. Text established with historical introduction and textual notes by Gary Williams. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- . *The Pilot: A Tale of the Sea*. Edited with historical introduction and explanatory notes by Kay Semour House. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986. Print.

- . *The Prairie: A Tale*. Edited with historical introduction by James P. Elliott. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985. Print.
- . *Precaution*. *Project Gutenberg*. 20 July 2012.
- . *The Red Rover: A Tale*. Edited, with historical introduction by Thomas and Marianne Philbrick. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Crain, Caleb. *American Sympathy: Men, Friendship, and Literature in the New Nation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001. Print.
- Crane, James. "Love and Merit in the Maritime Historical Novel: Cooper and Scott." *Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism*. Web. 25 April 2011.
- Crane, Stephen. *The War Dispatches of Stephen Crane*. Eds. R. W. Stallman and E. R. Hageman. New York: New York U P, 1964. Print.
- Crummell, Alexander. "Civilization, the Primal Need of a Race." *American Negro Academy, Occasional Papers*, no. 3 (Washington, D.C.: The American Negro Academy, 1898): 3-7. Reprinted in *Destiny and Race: Selected Writings, 1840-1898*. Ed. Wilson Jeremiah Moses. Amherst: U Mass P, 1992. 284-288. Print.
- Cummins, Maria Susanna. *El Fureidis*. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1860. Print.
- . *The Lamplighter*. 1854. Ed. Nina Baym. New Brunswick: Rutgers U P, 1995. American Women Writers Ser. Print.
- Davidson, Adenike Marie. *The Black Nation Novel: Imagining Homeplaces in Early African American Literature*. Chicago: Third World P, 2008. Print.
- Davidson, Cathy N. *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America*. Expanded Ed. New York: Oxford U P, 2004. Print.

- Davis, Richard Harding. *Soldiers of Fortune*. 1892. Ed. Brady Harrison. Orchard Park: Broadview, 2006. Print.
- Dawson, Melanie V. "Ruiz de Burton's Emotional Landscape: Property and Feeling in *The Squatter and the Don*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*. 63.1 (June 2008): 41-72.
- Dekker, George. *The American Historical Romance*. New York: Cambridge U P, 1987.
- De la Luz Montes, Amelia María. "'Mine is the Mission to Redress': The New Order of Knight-Errantry in *Don Quixote de la Mancha: A Comedy in Five Acts*." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 206-224. Print.
- De la Luz Montes, Amelia María and Anne Elizabeth Goldman, eds. "Introduction." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 1-8. Print.
- Dimock, Wai Chee and Lawrence Buell, eds. *Shades of the Planet: American Literature as World Literature*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2007. Print.
- Dimock, Wai Chee. *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2006. Print.
- Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Avon, 1977. Print.
- Douglass, Frederick. *The Heroic Slave. Autographs for Freedom*. Ed. Julia Griffiths. Miami: Mnemosyne, 1969.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. 1903. Print. New York: Dover, 1994. Print.

- Duquette, Elizabeth. *Loyalty: Bonds of Nation, Race, and Allegiance in Nineteenth-Century America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2010.
- Dworkin, Ira. Introduction. *Daughter of the Revolution: the major nonfiction works of Pauline E. Hopkins*. By Pauline Hopkins. Ed. Ira Dworkin. New Brunswick: Rutgers U P, 2007. Print.
- Ellison, Julie K. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1999. Print.
- Engell, John. "Hawthorne and Two Types of Early American Romance." *South Atlantic Review* 57.1 (1992): 33-51. *JSTOR*. Web 8 Dec. 2012.
- Fawaz, Leila. "The City and the Mountain: Beirut's Political Radius in the Nineteenth Century as Revealed in the Crisis of 1860." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 16.4 (1984): 489-495. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Fenton, Elizabeth. *Religious Liberties: Anti-Catholicism and Liberal Democracy in Nineteenth-Century U.S. Literature and Culture*. New York: Oxford U P, 2011. Print.
- Fetterley, Judith. "'My Sister! My Sister!': The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *American Literature* 70.3 (1998): 491-516. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 June 2012.
- Fiedler, Leslie. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. Rev ed. New York: Stein and Day, 1966.
- Fisher, Beth. "Precarious Performances: Ruiz de Burton's Theatrical Vision of the Gilded Age Female Consumer." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 187-205. Print.

- Fliegelman, Jay. *Prodigals and Pilgrims: The American revolution against patriarchal authority, 1750-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1982.
- Folsom, Ed. "The Vistas of *Democratic Vistas*: An Introduction." *Democratic Vistas* by Walt Whitman. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 2010. xv-lxvii. Print.
- Foreman, Amanda. *A World on Fire: An Epic History of Two Nations Divided*. New York: Penguin, 2010. Print.
- Formichella, Annamaria. "Domesticity and Nationalism in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Agnes of Sorrento*." *Legacy* 15.2 (1998): 188-203. *JSTOR*. Web 6 Aug. 2013.
- Forster, Sophia. "Americanist Literary Realism: Howells, Historicism, and American Exceptionalism." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 55.2 (Summer 2009). 216-241.
- Foster, Hannah. *The Coquette*. Ed. Cathy Davidson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Francescato, Simone. "'Nothing but a feeling of Brotherhood': The Interracial Question and the Return to Africa in Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*." *Recharting the Black Atlantic: Modern Cultures, Local Communities, Global Connections*. Eds. Annalisa Oboe and Anna Scacchi. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Franklin, Wayne. *James Fenimore Cooper: The Early Years*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Frazer, Michael. *The Enlightenment of Sympathy: Justice and the Moral Sentiments in the Eighteenth Century and Today*. New York: Oxford U P, 2010. Print.
- Fuller, Margaret. "*These Sad But Glorious Days*": *Dispatches from Europe, 1846-1850*. Eds. Larry J. Reynolds and Susan Belasco Smith. New Haven: Yale U P, 1991.



- Gaines, Kevin. "Black Americans' Racial Uplift Ideology as Civilizing Mission: Pauline E. Hopkins on Race and Imperialism." *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Eds. Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease. Durham: Duke U P, 1993. Print
- Gardner, Jared. *Master Plots: Race and the Founding of an American Literature, 1787-1845*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1998.
- Gates, W. B. "Cooper's Indebtedness to Shakespeare." *PMLA* 67.5 (Sept. 1952): 716-731.
- Gatewood, Willard B. *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden, 1898-1903*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1975. Print.
- Gerstle, Gary. "Race and Nation in the United States, Mexico, and Cuba, 1880-1940." *Nationalism in the New World*. Eds. Don H. Doyle and Marco Antonio Pamplona. Athens: U Georgia P, 2006. Print.
- Gillman, Susan. *Blood Talk: American Race Melodrama and the Culture of the Occult*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2003. Print.
- . "Pauline Hopkins and the Occult: African-American Revisions of Nineteenth-Century Sciences." *American Literary History* 8.1 (Spring 1996): 57-82. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Sept. 2011.
- Gilmore, Michael T. "Eulogy as Symbolic Biography: The Iconography of Revolutionary Leadership, 1776-1826." *Studies in Biography: Harvard English Studies* 8. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1978. 146-7. Print.
- Gilmore, Paul. "John Neal, American Romance, and International Romanticism." *American Literature* 84.3 (2012). 477-504. Print.

- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1993. Print.
- Gladsky, Thomas. "James Fenimore Cooper and American Nativism." *Studies in the American Renaissance*. (Jan. 1994): 43-53.
- Godbeer, Richard. *The Overflowing of Friendship: Love Between Men and the Creation of the American Republic*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009. Print.
- Goldman, Anne. "Beasts in the Jungle: Foreigners and Natives in Boston." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 75-94. Print.
- . *Continental Divides: Revisioning American Literature*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Goyal, Yogita. *Romance, Diaspora, and Black Atlantic Literature*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2010. Print.
- Greven, David. "Masculinist Theory and Romantic Authorship, Or Hawthorne, Politics, Desire." *New Literary History* 39.4 (2009): 971-987. *Project Muse*. Web. 7 March 2012.
- Greenson, Jennifer Rae. "Expropriating *The Great South* and Exporting 'Local Color.'" *Hemispheric American Studies*. Eds. Caroline F. Levander and Robert S. Levine. New Brunswick: Rutgers U P, 2008. Print. 116-139.
- . *Our South: Geographic Fantasy and the Rise of National Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 2010. Print.

- Griggs, Sutton E. *Imperium in Imperio: A Study of the Negro Race Problem*. 1899. New York: Arno, 1969. Print.
- Gruesser, John Cullen. *Black on Black: Twentieth-Century African American Writing About Africa*. Lexington: U P of Kentucky, 2000. Print.
- Gruesz, Kirsten Silva. *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*. Princeton, Princeton U P, 2002. Print.
- Gustafson, Sandra. "Histories of Democracy and Empire." *American Quarterly*. 59 (March 2007): 107-133.
- Guterl, Matthew Pratt. "An American Mediterranean: Haiti, Cuba, and the American South." *Hemispheric American Studies*. Eds. Caroline F. Levander and Robert S. Levine. New Brunswick: Rutgers U P, 2008. Print. 96-115.
- Haddox, Thomas. "Whitman's End of History: 'As I sat Alone by Blue Ontario's Shore,' *Democratic Vistas*, and the Postbellum Politics of Nostalgia." *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 22 (Summer 2004): 1-22.
- Hamelman, Steven. "Orientalism and Sympathy in Maria Susanna Cummins's *El Fureidîs*." *Legacy* 25.1 (2008): 62-82. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 May 2012.
- Harper, Frances E. W. *Sketches of Southern Life*. Philadelphia: Ferguson Bros & Co, 1891. Net Library Ebook.
- Harvey, Bruce A. *American Geographics: U.S. National Narratives and the Representation of the Non-European World, 1830-1865*. Stanford: Stanford U P, 2001. Print.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Blithedale Romance*. 1852. New York: Penguin, 1983. Print.

- . “Chiefly About War-Matters: By a Peaceable Man.” 1862. *The American Civil War: An Anthology of Essential Writings*. Ed. Ian Frederick Finseth. New York: Routledge, 2006. 390-410. Print.
- . *The French and Italian Notebooks*. Ed. Thomas Woodson. Columbus: Ohio State U P, 1980. Print.
- . *The House of the Seven Gables*. 1851. New York: Norton, 2006. Print.
- . *The Marble Faun Or, The Romance of Monte Beni*. 1860. Ed. Richard H. Brodhead. New York: Penguin, 1990. Print.
- Heckewelder, John. *A Narrative of the Mission of the United Brethren*. Philadelphia: McCarty & Davis, 1820. *GoogleBooks*. 21 Sept. 2011.
- Hendler, Glenn. *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Chapel Hill: U N C P, 2001. Print.
- Hinds, Janie. “Deb’s Dogs: Animals, Indians, and Postcolonial Desire in Charles Brockden Brown’s *Edgar Huntly*.” *Early American Literature* 39.2 (2004): 323-354.
- Holt, Keri. “‘All Parts of the Union I Considered My Home’: The Federal Imagination of *The Algerine Captive*.” *Early American Literature* 46.3 (2011): 481-515. *Project Muse*. Web. 7 Dec. 2012.
- Hopkins, Pauline E. *Contending Forces: A Romance Illustrative of Negro Life North and South*. 1900. Ed. Hazel V. Carby. New York: Oxford U P, 1988. Print.
- . *Hagar’s Daughter: A Story of Southern Caste Prejudice*. 1902. *The Magazine Novels of Pauline Hopkins* Ed. Hazel V. Carby. New York: Oxford U P, 1988. Print.

- . *Of One Blood or, the Hidden Self*. 1903. *The Magazine Novels of Pauline Hopkins* Ed. Hazel V. Carby. New York: Oxford U P, 1988. Print.
- . *Winona: A Tale of Negro Life in the South and Southwest*. 1902. *The Magazine Novels of Pauline Hopkins* Ed. Hazel V. Carby. New York: Oxford U P, 1988. Print.
- Horvitz, Deborah. “Hysteria and Trauma in Pauline Hopkins’s *Of One Blood; or, the Hidden Self*.” *African-American Review* 33.2 (1999): 245-260. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Mar. 2013.
- Howard, June. “What is Sentimentality?” *American Literary History* 11.1 (1999): 63-81. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 June 2012.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought?: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Howells, William Dean. *A Hazard of New Fortunes*. 1890. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. Print.
- Hsu, Hsuan. *Geography and The Production of Space in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Ed. Ernest C. Mossner. New York: Penguin, 1969. Print.
- Ibsen, Kristine. *Maximilian, Mexico, and the Invention of Empire*. Nashville: Vanderbilt U P, 2010. Print.
- Ihara, Rachel. “‘The Stimulus of Books and Tales’: Pauline Hopkins’s Serial Novels form the *Colored American Magazine*.” *Transnationalism and American Serial Fiction*. Ed. Patricia Okker. New York: Routledge, 2012. 127-147. Print.

- Insko, Jeffrey. "Passing Current: Electricity, Magnetism, and Historical Transmission in *The Linwoods*." *ESQ* 56.3 (2010): 293-326. *Project Muse*. Web. 5 Sept. 2011.
- Jacobs, Heidi L. M. "Maria Susanna Cummins's London Letters: April 1860." *Legacy* 19.2 (2002): 241-254. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 May 2012.
- Jackson, Helen Hunt. *Ramona*. 1884. Ed. Siobhan Senier. Buffalo: Broadview, 2008.
- Jameson, Frederic. "Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre." *New Literary History* 7.1 (1975): 135-163. *JSTOR*. Web 1 Dec. 2012.
- Japtok, Martin. "Of One Blood, Africa, and the 'Darwinist Trap.'" *African American Review* 36 (Fall 2002): 403-415. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Apr. 2010.
- Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 2002. Print.
- Kassanoff, Jennie. "'Fate Has Linked Us Together': Blood, Gender, and the Politics of Representation in Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*." *The Unruly Voice: Rediscovering Pauline Elizabeth Hopkins*. Ed. John Cullen Gruesser. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1996. 158-181. Print.
- Kemp, Mark A. R. "The Marble Faun and Postcolonial Ambivalence." *Modern Fiction Studies* 43.1 (1997): 209-236. *Project Muse*. Web. 7 March 2012.
- Kennedy, J. Gerald. "National Narrative and the Problem of an American Nationhood." *A Companion to American Fiction 1780-1865*. Ed. Shirley Samuels. Malden: Blackwell, 2004. 7-19.
- . "Cooper's Europe and His Quarrel with America." *A Historical Guide to James Fenimore Cooper*. Ed. Leland S. Person. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 91-122.

- Kerber, Linda. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1980. Print.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The White Man's Burden." 1899. *The Writings in Prose and Verse of Rudyard Kipling: The Five Nations*. Ed. Charles Walcott Balestier. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. 78-80. *Google Book Search*. Web. 10 Jan. 2011.
- Kolich, Augustus M. "Miriam and the Conversion of the Jews in in Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*." *Studies in the Novel* 33.4 (2001): 430-443. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 5 March 2012.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. "International at the Creation: Early Modern American History." *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*. Ed. Thomas Bender. Berkeley, U of California P, 2002. 103-122.
- Lamb, Jonathan. *The Evolution of Sympathy in the Long Eighteenth Century*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009. Print.
- Larkin, Edward. "Nation and Empire in the Early US." *American Literary History* 22.3 (2010): 501-526. *Project Muse*. Web 12 Dec. 2012.
- Levander, Caroline. *Cradle of Liberty: Race, The Child, and National Belonging from Thomas Jefferson to W. E. B. Du Bois*. Durham: Duke U P, 2006. Print.
- Levine, Robert S. "'Antebellum Rome' in *The Marble Faun*." *American Literary History* 2.1 (1990): 19-38. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 March 2009.
- . *Conspiracy and Romance: Studies in Brockden Brown, Cooper, Hawthorne, and Melville*. New York: Cambridge U P, 1989. Print.
- Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth. *Evangeline*. 1847. *Poems and Other Writings*. New York: Library of America, 2000. Print.

- Loveland, Anne C. "James Fenimore Cooper and the American Mission." *American Quarterly* 21.2 (Summer 1969): 244-258.
- Luedtke, Luther S. *Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Romance of the Orient*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1989. Print.
- Luis-Brown, David. *Waves of Decolonization: Discourses of Race and Hemispheric Citizenship in Cuba, Mexico, and the United States*. Durham: Duke U P, 2008. Print.
- Lush, Rebecca. "'Louisianian Lady': Racial Ambiguity, Gender, and National Identity in Cooper's *The Prairie*." *Literature in the Early American Republic* 2 (2010): 153-171.
- Makdisi, Ussama. "After 1860: Debating Religion, Reform, and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 34.3 (2002): 601-617. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Mancuso, Luke. "'Reconstruction is still in abeyance': Walt Whitman's *Democratic Vistas* and the Federalizing of National Identity." *American Transcendental Quarterly*. 8 (Sept. 1994): 229-250.
- Mann, Barbara Alice. "Aunt Jane and Father Fenimore: The Influence of Jane Austen on James Fenimore Cooper." *Literature of the Early American Republic* 1 (2009): 221-253.
- . *George Washington's War on Native America*. Westport: Praeger, 2005.
- . "Race Traitor: Cooper, His Critics, and Nineteenth-Century Literary Politics." *A Historical Guide to James Fenimore Cooper*. Ed. Leland S. Person. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 155-185.



- Marr, Timothy. *The Cultural Roots of American Islamicism*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2006.
- Matthiessen, F. O. *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman*. 1941. New York: Oxford U P, 1968. Print.
- May, Robert E. "Lobbyists for Commercial Empire: Jane Cazneau, William Cazneau, and U.S. Caribbean Policy, 1846-1878." *Pacific Historical Review*. 48.3 (1979): 383-412. *JSTOR*. 12 Feb. 2011. Web.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Melville, Herman. "Bartleby, the Scrivener." 1853. *Billy Budd and Other Stories*. Ed. Frederick Busch. New York: Penguin, 1986. 1-65. Print.
- . *Moby-Dick; or the Whale*. Ed. Andrew Delbanco. New York: Penguin, 2002.
- . *Pierre: or The Ambiguities*. Ed. William C. Spengemann. New York: Penguin, 1996. Print.
- . *Typee: A Peep at Polynesian Life*. Ed. John Bryant. New York: Penguin, 1996.
- Michaels, Walter Benn. *Our America: Nativism, Modernism, and Pluralism*. Durham: Duke U P, 1995. Print.
- Miller, Floyd. *The Search for a Black Nationality: Black Emigration and Colonization, 1787-1863*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1975. Print.
- Morrison, Michael A. "American Reaction to European Revolutions, 1848-1852: Sectionalism, Memory, and Revolutionary Heritage." *Civil War History* 49.2 (2003): 111-132.

- Moses, Wilson Jeremiah. *Creative Conflict in African American Thought*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2004. Print.
- Moyna, Maria Irene. "Portrayals of Spanish in 19<sup>th</sup>-century American prose: María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *The Squatter and the Don*." *Language and Literature*. 17.3 (2008): 235-252.
- Murphy, Gretchen. "A Europeanized New World: Colonialism and Cosmopolitanism in *Who Would Have Thought It?*". *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 135-152. Print.
- . *Hemispheric Imaginings: The Monroe Doctrine and Narratives of U.S. Empire*. Durham: Duke U P, 2005. Print.
- . *Shadowing the White Man's Burden: U.S. Imperialism and the Problem of the Color Line*. New York: New York U P, 2010. Print.
- Nelson, Dana. "Cooper's Leatherstocking Conversations: Identity, Friendship, and Democracy in the New Nation." *Historical Guide to James Fenimore Cooper*. Ed. Leland S. Person. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 123-154.
- Norris, Frank. "The Frontier Gone At Last." 1902. *Frank Norris: Novels and Essays*. Ed. Donald Pizer. New York: Library of America, 1986. Print.
- Nwankwo, Ifeoma Kiddoe. *Black Cosmopolitanism: Racial Consciousness and Transnational Identity in the Nineteenth-Century Americas*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2005. Print.

- Nurhussein, Nadia. "“The Hand of Mysticism”": Ehtiopianist Writing in Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood* and the Colored American Magazine." *Callaloo* 33.1 (Winter 2010): 278-289. *Project Muse*. Web. 18 Apr. 2010.
- O'Brien, Colleen C. "“Blacks in all Quarters of the Globe’: Anti-Imperialism, Insurgent Cosmopolitanism, and International Labor in Pauline Hopkins's Literary Journalism." *American Quarterly* 61.2 (June 2009): 245-270. *Project Muse*. Web. 18 Apr. 2010.
- Orman, Richard A. Van. *The Explorers: Nineteenth-Century Expeditions in Africa and the American West*. University of New Mexico Press, 1984. Print.
- Pagden, Anthony. *European Encounters with the New World: from Renaissance to Romanticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Pease, Donald. *The New American Exceptionalism*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2009. Print.
- Person, Leland S., ed. "James Fenimore Cooper, 1789-1851: A Brief Biography." *A Historical Guide to James Fenimore Cooper*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 27-57.
- . "The Historical Paradoxes of Manhood in Cooper's *The Deerslayer*." *Novel* 32.1 (Fall 1998): 76-98.
- Peterson, Carla. "Unsettled Frontiers: Race, History, and Romance in Pauline Hopkins' *Contending Forces*." *Famous Last Words: Changes in Gender and Narrative Closure*. Ed. Alison Booth. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 1993. 177-196. Print.
- Pfsiter, Joel. *The Production of Personal Life: Class, Gender, and the Psychological in Hawthorne's Fiction*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1991. Print.

- Plamper, Jan. "The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns." *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History*. 49.2 (May 2010). 237-265.
- Reddy, William. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2001. Print.
- Renan, Ernest. "What is a nation?" Trans. Martin Thom. *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1994. 8-22. Print.
- Review of *Who Would Have Thought It? Lippincott's Magazine of Popular Literature and Science*. Nov. 1872. 607. GoogleBooks.
- Rezek, Joseph. "Cooper and Scott in the Anglophone Literary Field: *The Pioneers*, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and the Effects of Provinciality." *ELH* 78.4 (2011): 891-916.
- Ridge, John Rollin. *The Life and Adventures of Joaquín Murieta, The Celebrated California Bandit*. 1854. Ed. Paul Reilly. Grass Valley, CA: Poitín Press, 2003. Print.
- Rifkin, Mark. "Settler States of Feeling: National Belonging and the Erasure of Native American Presence." *A Companion to American Literary Studies*. Eds. Caroline F. Levander and Robert S. Levine. Malden: Blackwell, 2011. 342-355.
- Riis, Arthur. "The Art of Discrimination." *ELH* 71.1 (2004): 251-287. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 March 2012.
- Rivera, John-Michael, "Embodying Greater Mexico: Maria Amparo Ruiz de Burton and the Mexican Question." *Look Away!: The U.S. South in New World Studies*. Eds. Jon Smith and Deborah Cohn. Durham: Duke U P 2004. 451-470. Print.

- Robey, Molly. "Sacred Geographies: Religion and Race in Women's Holy Land Writings." *American Literature* 80.3 (2008): 471-500. *Project Muse*. Web. 7 March 2012.
- Rogan, Eugene L. "Sectarianism and Social Conflict in Damascus: The 1860 Events Reconsidered." *Arabica* 51.4 (2004): 493-511. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Rowson, Susanna. *Charlotte Temple*. Ed. Ann Douglas. New York: Penguin, 1991.
- Ruiz de Burton, María Amparo. *The Squatter and the Don*. 1885. Ed. Ana Castillo. New York: Modern Library, 2004. Print.
- . *Who Would Have Thought It?* 1872. Eds. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita. Houston: Arte Público Press, 1995. Print.
- Ruiz, Julie. "Captive Identities: The Gendered Conquest of Mexico in *Who Would Have Thought It?*" *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln: U Nebraska Press, 2004. 112-132. Print.
- Ryan, Susan M. *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race & the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003. Print.
- Samuels, Shirley. *Romances of the Republic: Women, the Family, and Violence in the Literature of the Early American Nation*. New York: Oxford U P, 1996. Print.
- Sanborn, Geoffrey. *Whipscars and Tattoos: The Last of the Mohicans, Moby-Dick, and the Maori*. New York: Oxford U P, 2011.
- Sánchez, Rosaura and Beatrice Pita, eds. *Conflicts of Interest: The letters of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton*. Houston: Arte Público Press, 2001. Print.

- Schiller, Emily. "The Choice of Innocence: Hilda in *The Marble Faun*." *Studies in the Novel* 26.4 (1994): 372-392. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 5 March 2012.
- Schoonover, Thomas. "Dollars over Dominion: United States Economic Interests in Mexico, 1861-1867." *Pacific Historical Review*. 45.1 (Feb. 1976): 23-45.
- Schueller, Malini Johar. *U.S. Orientalisms: Race, Nation, and Gender in Literature, 1790-1890*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 1998. Print
- Schweitzer, Ivy. *Perfecting Friendship: Politics and Affiliation in Early American Literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006. Print.
- Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. *Hope Leslie, or Early Times in Massachusetts*. Ed. Carolyn Karcher. New York: Penguin, 1998.
- Sexton, Jay. *The Monroe Doctrine: Empire and Nation in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2011. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Much Ado About Nothing*. New York: Signet, 1998.
- Shields, Juliet. "Savage and Scottish Masculinity in *The Last of the Mohicans* and *The Prairie*: James Fenimore Cooper and the Diasporic Origins of American Identity." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 64.2 (Sep. 2009): 137-162. Print.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Jury of Her Peers: Celebrating American Women Writers from Anne Bradstreet to Annie Proulx*. New York: Vintage, 2009. Print.
- Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993. Print.
- Simpson, David. "The Limits of Cosmopolitanism and the Case for Translation." *Transatlantic Literary Studies: A Reader*. Eds. Susan Manning and Andrew Taylor. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U P, 2007. 53-57.

- Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. New York: Penguin, 2010. Print.
- Spillers, Hortense. "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book." *Diacritics* 17.2 (Summer 1987): 64-81. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb. 2012.
- Stecopoulos, Harilaos. *Reconstructing the World: Southern Fictions and U.S. Imperialisms, 1898-1976*. Ithaca: Cornell U P, 2008. Print.
- Stern, Julia A. *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1997. Print.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Agnes of Sorrento*. 1861-1862. New York: Barnes and Noble Digital Library, 2011. Ebook.
- . *Uncle Tom's Cabin, or Life Among the Lowly*. 1852. New York: The Modern Library, 2001. Print.
- Taketani, Etsuko. *U.S. Women Writers and the Discourses of Colonialism*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 2003. Print.
- Tellefsen, Blythe Ann. "'The Case with My Dear Native Land': Nathaniel Hawthorne's Vision of America in *The Marble Faun*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 54.4 (2000): 455-479. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 March 2012.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750-1850*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2007.
- Thomas, Brook. "Love and politics, sympathy and justice in *The Scarlet Letter*." *The Cambridge Companion to Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Ed. Richard H. Millington. New York: Cambridge U P, 2004. Print. 162-185.
- Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*. New York: Oxford U P, 1985. Print.

- Twain, Mark. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1885. New York: Penguin, 1985. Print.
- Tyler, Royall. *The Algerine Captive Or, The Life and Adventures of Doctor Updike Underhill*. 1797. Ed. Caleb Crain. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. Print.
- Van Den Berghe, Pierre. "A Socio-Biological Perspective." *Nationalism*. Eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. New York: Oxford U P, 1994. 96-103. Print.
- Vardy, Steven Béla. "Louis Kossuth and the Slavery Question in America." *Eastern European Quarterly* 39.4 (2006): 449-464.
- Vargas, Zaragosa. *Crucible of Struggle: A History of Mexican Americans from Colonial Times to the Present Era*. New York: Oxford U P, 2011. Print.
- Warford, Eliza. "'An Eloquent and Impassioned Plea': The Rhetoric of Ruiz de Burton's *The Squatter and the Don*." *Western American Literature* 44.1 (Spring 2009): 5-21.
- Warner, Susan. *The Wide Wide World*. New York: The Feminist Press CUNY, 1987.
- Washington, Booker T. *Up From Slavery*. 1901. *Three Negro Classics*. Ed. John Hope Franklin. New York: Avon, 1965. Print.
- Webb, Frank J. *The Garies and their Friends*. 1857. New York: Arno P, 1969. Print.
- Weinstein, Cindy. *Family, Kinship, and Sympathy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.
- Wesling, Meg. *Empire's Proxy: American Literature and U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines*. New York: New York U P, 2011.



- Wharton, Edith. *The House of Mirth*. 1905. Ed. Elizabeth Ammons. New York: Norton, 1990. Print.
- Wheatley, Phillis. *Complete Writings*. Ed. Vincent Carretta. New York: Penguin, 2001. Print.
- White, Ed. "Divided We Stand: Emergent Conservatism in Royall Tyler's *The Algerine Captive*." *Studies in American Fiction* 37.1 (2010): 5-27. *Project Muse*. Web 12 Dec. 2012.
- Whitfield, James M. *The Works of James M. Whitfield: America and other Writings by a Nineteenth-Century African American Poet*. Eds. Robert S. Levine and Ivy G. Wilson. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011. Print.
- Whitley, Edward. *American Bards: Walt Whitman and Other Unlikely Candidates for National Poet*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2010. Print.
- Whitman, Walt. *Democratic Vistas*. 1870-71. Ed. Ed Folsom. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2010. Print.
- Wills, Garry. *Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.
- Wineapple, Brenda. *Hawthorne: A Life*. New York: Knopf, 2003. Print.
- Winter, Alison. *Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1998. Print.
- Whittier, John Greenleaf. "The Crisis." 1848.
- Woolson, Constance Fenimore. *Rodman the Keeper: Southern Sketches*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1886. *Google Books*.

Zoellner, Robert H. "Fenimore Cooper: Alienated American." *American Quarterly* 13.1  
(1961): 55-66.