

Department of World Cultures
University of Helsinki
Finland

Southern historiography in modern history

*Figural and philosophical aspects of historical discourse in
Virginia and South Carolina, 1800–1844*

Pasi J. Kallio

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Helsinki, for public examination in Auditorium 107, Athena Siltavuorenpenger 3A, on 22 January 2016, at 12 noon.

Finland 2015

ISBN 978-951-51-1823-3 (pbk.)
ISBN 978-951-51-1824-0 (PDF)

Unigrafia
Helsinki 2015

Abstract

This thesis examines the nature—origin, character, and temporal change—of the difference that educated and mostly male white southerners had about history at the level of historiography and other texts among themselves and in relation to “modern history” mostly in the states of Virginia and South Carolina in the first four decades of the 19th century. The study compares and contrasts such postulate with two other areas of cultural discussion that included, but was not limited to, history. The first is the locality of New England, with some support from the Mid–Atlantic States New York and Pennsylvania. By the 1790s, these areas dominated the national intellectual landscape of U.S. culture. The individuals resided, grew up, educated or published in these states. The second is the change about culture that was initiated in Europe roughly after the 1750s the thesis refers to as “modern history”. It transformed history into a major area of interest and cultural component. History attained a status it had previously lacked within Western modernity.

The practical method is mainly a scanning of digitalized online contemporary printed sources—mostly leading books about history, leading contemporary journals, letter collections, and historical novels mostly produced in the U.S.—for word “history” and a variant “histor” that yields for example “historical” and “histories”. In order to reveal the southern difference, the findings have then been subjected to the study’s theoretical and methodological framework. Instead of being a scientific undertaking, linguistically neutral, or grounded in material reality as usually treated in the U.S., written history overlaps with other text production and communication such as literary writing, poetics, and cultural discourse. The philosophy of modernity and scientific truth history became associated with in its modern guise can be read as a metaphysical problem and crisis of especial severity in the southern areas. There, modern history entailed an experiential and communicative renovation that extended to individuals and their relationship to society. Through partly deductive, partly poetic readings, the study charts the course of this change that spans from syntax to discourse, philosophy, semiotics and poetics. Some key individuals, many rather obscure today, are identified. The concerns help reveal the tension of modern association of reality with history that has obscured and forgotten competing claims about and experiences of this relationship.

The New England–led “bloc” departed from European skepticism at first still present in modern history as well. Virginia and South Carolina seldom rejected the European critical tradition. Modern history became disseminated more only in the 1840s, comparatively more in South Carolina. Previously, it was rare to see history as romantic, evangelical or scientific like in New England. Especially until the late–1830s, history predating modern history was combined with skeptical and ironic views about the history–reality relationship. Unlike often portrayed, these learned white southerners were rarely sentimentalists. Equally rare was to conflate reality and science with history for nationalist ends and mold useful (white, male) citizens. Forgotten perspectives and agencies can be re–examined by including more recent theories about history and language.

Keywords: U.S. South, Early National Period, Antebellum Period, historiography, philosophy of history, narratology, deconstruction

Tiivistelmä

Tutkimuksen tarkoitus on selvittää, miten enimmäkseen miespuoliset koulutetut tai oppineet henkilöt lähinnä Yhdysvaltain Virginian ja Etelä-Carolinan osavaltioissa erosivat historiakäsityksiltään sekä ”modernista historiasta” että keskinäisesti historiankirjoituksen ja muiden tekstien tasolla 1800-luvun alun Yhdysvalloissa. Henkilöt asuivat, kasvoivat, kouluttautuivat tai julkaisivat näissä osavaltioissa. Tutkimus vertailee tätä alkuoletusta kahteen vaikutusvaltaisempaan historian sisältävään kulttuurikeskustelun alueeseen. Näitä ovat ensiksi Yhdysvalloissa ensisijaisesti New Englandin alue, toissijaisesti sitä kulttuurisesti myötäilleet New Yorkin ja Pennsylvanian osavaltiot. Toinen alue on Euroopassa 1750-luvun jälkeen tapahtunut kulttuurikeskustelun muutos. ”Moderni historia” ymmärretään tutkimuksessa monitahoisena muutoksena, jossa kiinnostus historiaan virisi toden teolla länsimaissa tärkeänä osana yhteiskuntaa että kulttuuria.

Aineisto koostuu painetuista internetiin digitoiduista aineistoista: tunnetuimmat historiantutkimukset ja akateemiset lehdet, joidenkin tunnetuimpien henkilöiden kirjekokoelmat ja Yhdysvalloissa tuotetut tunnetut historiaromaanit. Tutkimus tutkii aineistoja ensisijaisesti käyttämällä hakusanoja ”history” ja ”histor”. Löydöksiä on seuraavaksi käsitelty tutkimuksen viitekehysten kautta. Yhdysvalloissa historia käsitetään usein tieteelliseksi, kielellisesti neutraaliksi ja materiaaliseen todellisuuteen pohjautuvaksi ilmiöksi tai tutkimusalaksi. Tutkimus väittää, että historialla on yhtymäkohtia muun kielen tuottamisen ja kommunikaation–kirjallisuuden, runouden, kulttuurikeskustelun–kanssa. Modernin historian filosofia ja tieteellistys voidaan lukea vakavana maailmankuvallisena ongelmana ja kriisinä kyseisissä etelävaltioissa. Moderniin historiaan sisältyi näillä alueilla kommunikatiivinen ja kokemuksellinen muutos, joka ulottui yksilöön ja hänen suhteeseensa yhteiskuntaan. Tutkimus yrittää kartoittaa tätä muutosta lukemalla tekstejä osin yleisiä suuntauksia heijastellen ja osin runollisesti. Samalla tutkimus tunnistaa useita nykyisin jo lähes täysin unohdettuja yksilöitä. Nämä kysymykset auttavat näkemään moderniin miellelyhtymään historiasta todellisuutena kytkeytyvät jännitteet, joka on jättänyt syrjään sen kanssa poikkeavat ja ristiriitaiset kokemukset ja väitteet.

New Englandin ”blokki” hylkäsi epäilyn historiasta, joka kuului eurooppalaiseen historiaperinteeseen ja aluksi moderniin historiaan. Virginiassa ja Etelä-Carolinassa perintö harvoin hylättiin. Vasta 1840-luvulta alkaen lähinnä Etelä-Carolinassa ilmeni enemmän modernia historiaa historiankirjoituksessa. Romanttiset, evankeliset ja tieteelliset ainekset historiasta olivat aiemmin harvinaisia Virginiassa ja Etelä-Carolinassa, toisin kuin New Englandissa. Historian ja todellisuuden suhde oli vähintään 1830-luvun jälkipuoliskolle hyvin epäilevä ja ironinen. Perinteinen Etelän historiatietoisuuden luonnehdinta sentimentaalisenä nostalgiana oli lähes tuntematon, samoin historian näkeminen tieteenä, jonka tehtävä on nationalistinen ja synnyttää hyödyllisiä (valkoisia, miespuolisia) kansalaisia. Unohdettuja näkökulmia ja kulttuuritoimijoita voidaan tutkia uudelleen sisällyttämällä uudempaa teoriaa historian ja kielen suhteesta. Tutkimus liittyy kiinnostukseen valkoisten etelävaltiolaisten kulttuuriin ennen sisällissotaa.

Asiasanat: USA:n Etelä, USA:n itsenäisyyden alku, USA:n sisällissotaa edeltävä aika, historiankirjoitus, historianfilosofia, narratologia, dekonstruktio

In loving memory of my mother
Leila Irene Kallio (née Latva-Aho)
(1954–2011)

Acknowledgements

This study has been fairly long in the making. Almost exactly a decade ago, I decided to embark on my Ph.D. studies. I had just finished my English M.A. studies at the University of Jyväskylä (in central Finland). Going back, the two figures that were absolutely essential for this study are author John Jakes and my late mother.

It was Mr. Jakes's literary output in the form of his *North and South Trilogy* (1982, 1984, 1987) –especially the TV miniseries adaptation of the first two volumes as *North and South* (1985) and *North and South: Book II* (1986) respectively by producer David L. Wolper and Warner Bros.–that first aroused my interest in the topic when the series was first broadcast on Finnish television in spring of 1990. When the series was re–broadcast in autumn of 1995, I became hooked. At this point, my mother's inestimable contribution began. She borrowed me the books of the trilogy from the local library next spring. When my interest in military history of the Civil War began in earnest, mother was again there to provide help and assistance. She began to purchase dozens of books related to the war campaigns and the leading generals at Amazon. Her third major contribution commenced simultaneous to my Ph.D. studies. Over the next several years, she purchased at least a hundred volumes that related mainly to U.S. history, but also to philosophy and literary theory, and funded other materials as well. All this she did to get me started. This almost superhuman achievement and dedication from her is something that I will always remember with love and gratitude.

In the academic world, the first big encouragement for the project came from my first supervisor Michael C. Coleman. An enormously accessible, down–to–earth, thoughtful and sympathetic character full of candor and witty humour, this Irishman was the one who for the first time recommended me to apply for the now–ceased Finnish Graduate School for North and Latin American Studies programme at the University of Helsinki. Kalevi Ahonen, representing what was then the Department of History at the university, was my second early supervisor. His comments to my early proposals and plans, though laconic and brief, were always very much to the point and very encouraging.

The fact that the study took shape at the University of Helsinki and in the field of North American Studies is first and foremost all thanks to the Grand Old Man of the subject, Markku Henriksson. It was Markku, the backbone of academic study of North America in Finland and the head of the former Graduate School, who admitted me to study here in this great university in the first place. In this capacity, Markku became my supervisor. In addition to this crucial role, Markku provided me with much candid criticism that at times reminded me of fruitful and engaging interactions between a son and a father.

As the work progressed, Hannu Salmi of the University of Turku suggested that I contact his colleague, Kalle Pihlainen of Åbo Akademi. Although not in official capacity at first, Kalle soon became my supervisor in practical terms. Kalle has always been a most receptive, patient, encouraging and open–minded listener to my ideas about history. In terms of quantity, he has read and commented on more various drafts and versions of the present study than anyone else.

After Markku's retirement, Mikko Saikku, affiliated with my department, became my fifth and final supervisor. Though we have known each other more closely for less time than my other supervisors, we have always had a good and cordial relationship. Mikko was one of those welcome clear-headed voices that helped me somewhat clarify my thinking and prose style and provided me with some insightful remarks.

It has been my pleasure to acquaint myself with several colleagues. Of my graduate student days at the University of Jyväskylä, I recall with especial fondness the early welcome commentary by Arja Piirainen-Marsh and Paula Kalaja. Although I was not a part of the Graduate School that resulted in me having to stick to my day time job as a teacher, I have benefited from several past or present colleagues or affiliates at Helsinki as well. Of those who have provided me with either emotional or intellectual support I would especially like to mention Ari Helo, Marika Sandell, visiting Bicentennial Fulbright Professor Mark Miller, Outi J. Hakola, Rani-Henrik Andersson, Pekka Kilpeläinen, Anna-Leena Korpijärvi and Pirjo Ahokas.

As for the preliminary examination of the study, my sincere thanks are due to Ari Helo and Jewel Spangler. Both scholars have provided me with indispensable and perceptive commentary and suggestions on the manuscript version of the present work. Without their considerable effort, the study undoubtedly would have been far inferior.

There are other scholars and individuals who have offered their thoughts on the study in its various stages or otherwise provided assistance. Of these, I would like to name John Jakes, Gary W. Gallagher, Michael O'Brien, Petri Ylikoski, and Jussi Pakkasvirta. Especially Vesa Ryhänen and Sirpa Väyrynen have provided my bread and butter at the schools of Lintumetsä and Hansakallio respectively the past few years. To my sister Sanna Koskela and her husband Ari a big thank you for fetching and copying numerous books from Oulu University Library. I would like to express my gratitude also to Terri Lewers of *Southwest Review*, Leigh Anne Couch of *The Sewanee Review*, Leslie A. Green of *The Southern Review*, and Ayse Erginer of *Southern Cultures* for promptly answering my article requests.

In my Jyväskylä days, I was fortunate to have a workspace for a period at Mattilanniemi campus area. I shared a room with Risto Puutio. We had many pleasant discussions over lunch together. I learned from the internet that Risto has nowadays graduated, so my congratulations to him.

I would like to thank the following libraries and their staffs for kindly having assisted me in this project: The Library of Congress, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Library, Helsinki University Library, Jyväskylä University Library, Oulu University Library, University of Eastern Finland Library, Tampere University Library, and Turku University Library. I would especially like to thank Riitta Nyman for putting up with my numerous interlibrary loans and scrupulously communicating about them with me.

The study was financially supported by the following funding bodies: The University of Jyväskylä's Department of Languages, the Ellen and Artturi Nyysönen Foundation, the municipality of Nurmo, and the University of Helsinki, who are gratefully acknowledged.

Contents

Abstract	
Tiivistelmä	
Acknowledgements	
Abbreviations	11
1. Introduction	12
2. Virginia historiography and New England, 1800s–1820s: collisions in politics and poetics	37
2.1 History and language after the Revolution	37
2.1.1 History and language: postwar views	37
2.1.2 Strong version of “Austere Enlightenment” (SAE) and southerners’ awkward relationship to it	43
2.2 History and language in Virginia, 1800–1817	50
2.2.1 Early Virginian representatives of SAE	51
2.2.2 Heterologies to SAE: Communal	55
2.2.3 Heterologies to SAE: Classicism	57
2.2.4 Impact on biography: presence and spatial dynamism of historical signification	68
2.3 The “German renaissance”: widely different interpretations	78
2.3.1 Northern enthusiasm and dominance	78
2.3.2 Southern responses: A skeptical reading of Sir Walter Scott	81
2.3.3 Southern responses: A more critical historiography	83
2.3.4 Southern responses: Virginia	87
3. Critical reactions to German theories about history and their northern applications in Charleston, South Carolina, and Virginia, mid–1820s–1841	93
3.1 The “German renaissance”: widely different interpretations continued	93
3.1.1 A symbolic mode of historical discourse	93

3.1.2	Figuration as history: the diverging paths of Poe and Simms	99
3.1.3	Simms in the context of books and prose in the South	104
3.2	From romance to confidence	109
3.2.1	Northern linguistic modification of SAE	109
3.2.2	History and Virginia around 1830	111
3.3	The first “professional” histories, the first overall Virginia history, and southern reactions	113
3.3.1	The over–all context: the South as an anomaly to New England’s cosmopolitan schemes of history and culture	115
3.3.2	Bancroft	120
3.3.3	Virginia’s paradigm shift and responses: strong version of Whig history (SW) and weak version of Whig history (WW)	129
3.3.4	The first “general history” of Virginia	140
3.3.5	Prescott and his poetic and philosophical differences to southerners	148
4.	Beginnings of erosion of southern difference about history and historiography: discussion in Virginia, 1838–1844	159
4.1	History as educator and the overlap of social ontology and poetics compared	160
4.2	Views about history in Virginia around 1840: General	165
4.3	George E. Dabney and gendered southern semiotics of history	167
4.3.1	Dabney in context and the northern–tinted arguments of VHPS	173
4.4	Jane Tayloe Lomax, the pioneer of romantic history in Virginia	181
5.	Thomas Roderick Dew as a producer of southern historical identity: mixtures, distortions, idealities	185
5.1	Dew in context: extensions and convergences of Yankee imperialism	185
5.2	Dew and southern history: “The Review”	189
5.3	Dew and southern history: “The Digest”	199
5.3.1	Locating “The Digest”	199
5.3.2	Ties to Idealism and German philosophy of history	201

5.3.3 Embracing (papal) Idealism and SAE	210
5.3.4 Implications for American political philosophy	214
6. Beginnings of erosion of southern difference about history and historiography: discussion in South Carolina, 1835–1837, 1842–1844	226
6.1 Challenges to the symbolic–critical mode of southern historiography	226
6.1.1 <i>The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine</i>	226
6.1.2 Critically metahistorical aspects of Simms’s <i>The Partisan</i>	242
6.2 The lure of modern history and SAE: early historical discussion in <i>Southern Quarterly Review</i>	247
6.2.1 Bellicose entries and amplified northern–German views	248
6.2.2 Shadows of German Idealism: Holmes	256
6.2.3 Shadows of German Idealism: Simms	265
7. Results and discussion	270
References	277

Abbreviations

<i>CO1</i>	« Conjectures of Order : Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860, Volume I » by Michael O’Brien
<i>CO2</i>	« Conjectures of Order : Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860, Volume II » by Michael O’Brien
OM	The Oxford movement
SAE	Strong version of « Austere Enlightenment »
SLJMM	« The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine »
SW	Strong version of Whig history
VHPS	The Virginia Historical and Philosophical Society
WAE	Weak version of « Austere Enlightenment »
WW	Weak version of Whig history

1. Introduction

This study examines the relationship between the American South and New England concerning the writing of history in the early nineteenth century. Within these areas, the study pays most attention to the South and within the South, to the states of Virginia and South Carolina (especially Charleston), because these locales are traditionally considered the most influential areas concerning written culture that includes history.¹ To the north of Virginia, I shall emphasize New England, because the area was in a dominant position regarding white U.S. culture in the 1800s. During my examination, I shall constantly refer to European theories about history: the 1800s was an exciting time in terms of the change in Western history that built on previous Enlightenment ideas. The U.S. was not an outsider in the process. I shall focus on philosophy and literature,² because they impact the way history is written and what it is. According to my thesis, viewed from these angles, Virginia and South Carolina were very critical about the change, irreconcilable to it, or both. The research question I shall try to answer is: “What were the philosophical differences in *historiography* between the white southerners of Virginia and South Carolina and inhabitants of New England during the early nineteenth century?”

In order to discuss the relations of philosophy and literature on history, I shall divide “history” into three separate but interrelated areas of inquiry following Alun Munslow’s typology.³

¹ *Vernon Louis Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920, Volume II (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958), 61. Tellingly, Parrington, the interwar intellectual giant on American culture, spends only 125 pages on antebellum South out of the nearly 500 in his analysis that covers decades 1800–1860.*

² *See for just a sampling of work that examines these topics and change, Maurice Mandelbaum, History, Man, and Reason: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Thought (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971); Robert H. Canary and Henry Kozicki, eds., The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978); Suzanne Gearhart, The Open Boundary of History and Fiction: A Critical Approach to the French Enlightenment (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); Michael Allen Gillespie, Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ground of History (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984); Hans Robert Jauss, Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics. trans. Michael Shaw, Theory and History of Literature series Volume 3, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 104-9; Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy, The Literary Absolute: The Theory of Literature in German Romanticism, trans. Philip Barnard and Cheryl Lester, Intersections series (New York: SUNY, 1988); Michel de Certeau, The Writing of History, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 176-79; Ann Rigney, The Rhetoric of Historical Representation: Three Narrative Histories of the French Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Reinhart Koselleck, Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).*

³ *Alun Munslow, The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2006), entry for “Historiography,” 142-43. I have added space to this anatomy, because spatial change complemented the temporal one.*

First is the change in Europe that had begun in the 1700s brought forth *a new time* and *a new space*. For my purposes, I shall only make the following summary of this vast topic.

The new time moved—and thinned out—from cyclic to developing and linear. Previously among the ancients and Christians, the present and the future were not valued more than the past. Virtue and vice were impervious to time. Now the past became more obsolete and a hindrance to progress, and the future a promise to root out—or at least decrease at a cost—evil and pestilence from society. The new space synchronized history with modern man’s ability to control nature by using his independent, free mind. In other words, by the French Revolution, every individual person—at least white bourgeois male—became a historical participant. The new space was a unity of all men—in practice those that were agreeable to the bourgeoisie—within a nation. History, grounded in God, now guided men and nations. The old space had divided people into high and low, noble and savage. Its history that addressed humans—unlike natural history—was located either in poetry, rhetoric, or in events that happened to individuals. The old space never saw man as an active shaper of historical events themselves: spatially, history was retroactive collecting and compiling, not proactive doing. At the most, individual examples—persons categorically above others and hence outside discourse and comparison—could offer moral lessons for multitudes. The new space leveled these distinctions. The Yankee response—arguably, the most rigorous in the world—was to implement the mastery of mind over nature by imposing the new space that was grounded in natural science and natural history on the old to extract “a rational basis for public policy and reform.”⁴ In Germany, the new space entailed a new, essentially discursive philosophy about man in history that tried more ponderously to come to grips with the now—abandoned nature. Following Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the Germans held that Western man is only able to exist as a synthetic being, as someone who has become philosophically conscious of his split from nature. At the cost of breaking the security of natural identity, humanity could discourse about history in more free and more united space along its timeline.

Second is the question of history as an academic pursuit, how knowledge about the past is had and what it is. This question relates to the status of history as knowledge that belongs to the field of philosophy named *epistemology*. Epistemology is interested in both what and how can phenomena and things be known in science. Third is the question of historiography, that is, the textual remains of the past, the empirical level of the study. Its traditional definition is “the study of and writing about some past facts” dug up by academics. Combined, these three changes and levels constitute what the study refers to as *modern history*.

The more recent definition of historiography, subscribed to by the study, is “meta-history” or study of how history is written by others.⁵ However, although I shall deal with this relationship—since history was not a specialized field of knowledge at the time—and

⁴ Gillespie, Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ground of History, 14. While Gillespie only mentions “the Anglo-French tradition,” I have singled out New England, because differences within it, France and England were notable for my concerns.

⁵ Paul Cartledge, “Introduction,” in Companion to Historiography, ed. Michael Bentley (Routledge: London, 1997), 2.

for reasons of selection and method, I shall not limit my analysis of written history only to historians or proper historiographers.

As for regional grouping, the study will examine 245 written southern sources inclusive of Maryland, and 49 sources produced in New England, inclusive of the Mid-Atlantic. Since the focus is on southern states, they dominate in sources. For the most part, the northern regions are represented by those individuals that are considered major or leading in research literature. Most often, a source is regionally grouped based on it having been written by a person *residing or being active* in a given state. At times, however, what counts is either *the place of publication* or *the individual's past or present location*. This second, more phenomenological basis for grouping enables illuminating internal comparisons and contrasts in a given context. A common feature of my material is that—save for a few exceptions that were important in cases that featured white women more prominently—it was mostly produced by white males and persons more educated or self-learned than average. My South is thus composed mostly of such individuals residing in the states of Virginia and South Carolina, and their writings.

As for temporal framing, my time frame is roughly between 1800 and 1844, spanning the *Early National* and *Antebellum* periods of U.S. history. The rationale to focus on years starting from 1800 rather than the 1780s is, first and foremost, discursive and arising from the aims and design of the study. In history, the 1800s was the decade when especially in Germany, the spatiotemporal changes about history increasingly became applied to the more pedantic practice of scientific research.⁶ It was also the decade when, initiated by pro-Federalist historian John Marshall, historiography as a medium of transmitting the wisdom of the Founders appeared in the U.S. beset with partisan conflict about its meaning that was registered by Thomas Jefferson of Virginia.⁷ Also in Virginia, the first years of the 19th century saw prominent the first historical investigations into revolutionary leaders as well as a reflective look at its society by lawyer and man of letters William Wirt that stayed relevant in the South through the next several decades. Equally important, it was when New England annexed history to previous antisouthern politics of culture.⁸ This aggravated the notion of the South as an anomalous region in the national project the first wave of post-Revolution Federalist historians had established. Finally, it is my impression that the early-1800s have been less studied historically with a southern focus than the times around the Revolution, the American Civil War, or the Reconstruction. My end point is 1844, because in my locales of focus after roughly this

⁶ *The 1800s synthesized “the tradition of text criticism of classical philology; the work with sources by the erudites and legal historians; and the concept of the nation as a unique whole in which spiritual forces bind things together and each element influences the others. Used with these elements was a methodology taken from the diverse currents that helped maintain the autonomy of the historical inquiry in relation to all other scholarly inquiries.” Ernst Breisach, Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), 229.*

⁷ *ibid.*, 226.

⁸ *David Waldstreicher, In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 268. As I shall elaborate, antisouthernism began around the 1790s in New England.*

date, several changes occurred at individual and institutional levels that brought southerners closer to history as the other places conceived it. This manifested at levels of organizations and how history was thought about and communicated. Even though the 1840s marked the beginnings of southern sectionalism, the study contends that, in senses of philosophy and figuration of history, sectionalism ironically brought with it a stronger confluence of southern historical consciousness and modern history. As the justly famed intellectual historian Michael O'Brien possibly first pointed out, Antebellum South was never exceptional, an anti- or pre-modern sanctuary. However, this study contends that in the context of modern history, persons in Virginia and South Carolina also had philosophy, experience and figurations of older, differing and even conflicting sort. I agree with the kernel of O'Brien's argument, but I would insist that despite certain—and growing—inroads of modern history, there was discomfort and even difference in regard to it and its premises—in places implicitly acceded to by O'Brien himself—that can be perceived when sources are audited from these directions. The study is interested in this process from a comparative angle. Lastly, sheer scope of the undertaking renders a further foray into the time line impossible.

Like any academic endeavor, the study is hardly exhaustive of its subject. In the first place, it has been constrained by what has been preserved and digitally put online. All the writings analyzed were found on the Internet. The databases mainly used were Google Books, www.archive.org, and the University of Michigan's Making of America online journal collection. These contained digitalized reprints of books and journals. An online newspaper collection and an online manuscript collection were also used, but comparatively little. No archival research was conducted. This was the first criterion for selection. In the second place, there was a second, more interpretive criterion: it derived from research literature that was considered authoritative, with the goal to examine at least the figures and journals it considered prominent or influential for history in this time frame and locations as to their output in either book or journal format, in some cases aided by letter collections. In the third place, there was a third criterion for selection that was a scanning of the thusly found sources for the topic of history using computer help from beginning to end: entering "histor" into the search option yielded all matches of "history," "historical" or "historian" for example. Simple "history" was also used as a search criterion. There are two exceptions to this: 1. with the aim to attain as variegated an understanding of history as possible, if the sample was redundant to the contextual argument about history *and* reflected on history very little, the result was, as a rule, left out after careful consideration. As a result of this aim, although constrained by the first and second criteria, the sample extends from the major figures in research literature to include several more obscure personalities. 2. Chapter 5, analyzing a report and lecture notes printed as books, combines the results of the scanning with a closer examination of some of the sources that were most used in case of the notes. All the books and journals that slip outside these three criteria have been left out.

The results were analyzed through the theoretical and methodological framework of the study that claims that "history" was a concept loaded with philosophical and often figural value, in other words, that it did not exist in isolation but instead rose from surrounding discourse. Google Books was a necessity in locating some of the intertextual

relations across historiographical and poetic genres as well as, especially in chapter 5, some sources that were used. The study proceeds from the assumption it was not self-evident that only those trained as historians or aspiring to become such wrote and thought about history in public or private. It also was not obvious that history was to be in book monograph form or that it excluded the imagination. Thereby, I find it important to analyze both amateur and professional historical monographs as well as other printed sources such as published letter collections and discussions on the pages of major contemporary scholarly journals within the above-set frames. The authors are historians, men of letters, intellectuals, educators, theologians, novelists, poets and essayists, and even a *gazetteer*.⁹

The study thus follows the recent reconceptualization of society through culture, or the tendency to combine the intellectual “top-down” level of analysis on how culture was thought about with the “bottom-up” level of analysis on how these ideas were put to use in practice. However, the study departs from conceiving of cultural practice in a material(ist) manner.¹⁰ Rather, the study thinks of culture’s relationship to modern history more as philosophical and societal upheaval¹¹ in the South that the practice of modern history further disseminated and aggravated in texts. At the extreme, for example those areas of southern culture that were still emulating or living Renaissance humanism of the 1500s about history and culture gradually came under tremendous pressure from modern history in the 1800s. Such world-views and practices were ultimately irreconcilable. Thereby, the study seeks to continuously interpret culture as a regulative but at the same time violent force. This concern extends from general philosophical and aesthetic shifts affecting history to their concrete manifestations as texts and functional outlining of discourse formation and bourgeois prose industry in the South in the context of history.

Background of the study

The motivation for the study arises especially from my three above definitions of history that I shall next elaborate on.

Firstly, the U.S. culture in general has not been keen to think about history as time and experience. Satirist Henry Louis Mencken even once claimed all American thinking is

⁹ *A newsman or gazetteer preceded both the press and specialized history. In a form of a gazette (though the terms became interchangeable) he produced a simple record of everyday events as history. Gazettes as histories had generally become obsolete by the late-1600s. Yves Lavoine, “Journalists, History and Historians: The Ups and Downs of a Professional Entity,” trans. David Motlow, Réseaux, French Journal of Communication 2 (1994): 205-21. In the U.S., gazettes continued to be published in the 1800s.*

¹⁰ *Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, “Introduction,” in Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture, eds. Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, Studies on the History of Society and Culture series (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 11.*

¹¹ *See especially Eve Tavor Bannet, Postcultural Theory: Critical Theory after the Marxist Paradigm (London: Macmillan, 1993).*

religious, political or economic.¹² Americans have been “obsessed” with authenticity even in historical fiction at least up to the late-1940s.¹³ Pervasive faith in progress and the future in the U.S. have discouraged preoccupied backward glances.

However, relatively speaking, the strongest exception to the rule may be the U.S. South. Though few modern southerners have re-examined American history in detail, the more folksy levels of southern practice and experience, as well as theories put forth by some southern literary critics, indicate that southern culture is more traumatized in ways that resemble Europe.¹⁴ This notion extends to southern historical thinking and experience.¹⁵

¹² *Mencken* quoted in Richard Ruland, *The Rediscovery of American Literature: Premises of Critical Taste, 1900–1940* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967), 98.

¹³ Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Vintage, 1993), 29.

¹⁴ See, more generally, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, “The Anxiety of History: The Southern Confrontation with Modernity,” *Southern Cultures* 1 (1993): 68-70; David Goldfield, *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Vintage, 2009), 197. For Tate, Ransom and William Faulkner as modernists see, for example, Paul V. Murphy, *The Rebuke of History: The Southern Agrarians and American Conservative Thought* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 35-36, 87-88; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “William Faulkner: Art, Alienation, and Alcohol,” in *Bridging Southern Cultures: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, ed. John Lowe (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), esp. 80-81.

For Faulkner and modernist history see for example Jefferson Humphries, *Metamorphoses of the Raven: Literary Overdeterminedness in France and the South since Poe* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 112-14. *Leftists have failed to appreciate such theories.* Leigh Anne Duck, *The Nation’s Region: Southern Modernism, Segregation, and U.S. Nationalism*, *The New Southern Studies series* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2009), ch. 5, esp. 148-150; Daniel Joseph Singal, *William Faulkner: The Making of a Modernist*, *The Fred W. Morrison Series in Southern Studies* (Chapel Hill: The University of Carolina Press, 1997). *Faulkner’s historical imagination has been compared to post-WWII German authors in Peter Nicolaisen, “Faulkner and Southern History: A View from Germany,”* *Southern Cultures* 4 (1998): 31-44.

¹⁵ For a pioneering diagnosis, see C. Vann Woodward, *The Burden of Southern History*, rev. 3rd ed. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008). *Philosopher of history F. R. Ankersmit used the contemporary U.S. South as an example of rupture at the very core of modern Western historical consciousness idealist philosopher G. W. F. Hegel has diagnosed. In rupture, “a civilization discards a former identity while defining its new entity precisely in terms of what has been discarded or surrendered.”* Frank Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience Cultural Memory in the Present series* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), 13. *For a comparative approach into such southern trauma, see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery, trans. Jefferson Chase* (New York: Picador, 2004), ch. 1.

A strong counter tradition to this—one that is quite similar with the U.S. mainstream—has cared little for white southern culture apart from utilitarian use value. To this tradition, white southern culture matters only as a site or depository for political, economic and moral lessons. The original utilitarians on the South were Whigs such as Walter Hines Page, John Spencer Bassett, and William Peterfield Trent. From the 1880s, they retained an explicitly economic and moralistic framework about southern culture that extended even to southern literature.¹⁶ Their work stayed relevant for roughly a century, because they were also the first white southerners to criticize southern slavery. At the same time, they wanted to leave behind southern society before the Civil War. Ironically, many southerners themselves agree with such a mainstream approach into southern culture.¹⁷ Taking liberal progressiveness as an axiomatic truth about the South and converse polemics or exclusion of all phenomena that fail to fit has only recently been more forcefully exposed as a myth that serves national ends.¹⁸ In other words, seeing anything violent about the idea of America as essentially liberal and progressive has often been missed in a southern context. By contrast, this study extends the notion of southern trauma about modernity and culture to the period under study.

Secondly, this study seeks to rethink the spectacle presented by academic southern history. In other words, the study is critical of the roots of academic southern history and conceives history's relationship to knowledge differently. At its institutional birth, the purpose to study history in the U.S. was either scientific or utilitarian.¹⁹ The Southern History Association was founded in 1896 to branch out from preoccupation with military campaigns of the Civil War (1861–1865) to preserve written Confederate records and “to win the battle of history as partial compensation for the Lost Cause.” However, the association declined to merge with the American Historical Association, ending its

¹⁶ Daniel Joseph Singal, *The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919–1945* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 24; Michael O'Brien, *The Idea of the American South, 1920–1941* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 12.

¹⁷ For instance Trent became a sort of Turner of the South. Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The South Lives in History, The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History series* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955), 3-4. Ian Tyrrell, *Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890–1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 213. “The contours of the nation's history have been defined by the present: the story of America has been perceived as the triumph of freedom, national unity, and equality, the acquisition of wealth, the growth of great urban centers, and the ethnic diversification of the population. The present, as epitomized by those activities and values, is obviously northern in character; the North and America have been made synonymous. In a history so conceived, southerners can be viewed only as outsiders, people who never quite achieved a pure state of Americanism. How could they? They are outside the definition.” Carl N. Degler, “Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis: The South, the North, and the Nation,” *The Journal of Southern History* 53 (1987): 5. Also *ibid.*, 5-6.

¹⁸ Matthew D. Lassiter and Joseph Crespino, “Introduction: The End of Southern History,” in *The Myth of Southern Exceptionalism*, eds. Matthew D. Lassiter and Joseph Crespino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 7-9.

¹⁹ Stephenson, *South Lives in History*, 8.

publishing activities in 1907. Historians living in the former Confederacy combined were fewer than historians living in Massachusetts alone. They had heavy workloads, poor salaries and no specialization in history. From 1903, after the American Historical Association convened in New Orleans, Louisiana, articles on southern history steadily became more accepted in the American Historical Association's journal *The American Historical Review*, a major organ of United States history, provided they met the approval of its editor John Franklin Jameson.²⁰

When a utilitarian approach into southern culture became applied to southern history, the result resembled *the Whig interpretation of history*. In such an interpretation, historical research tends to value progress and progressive political philosophy. The amount of progressivism is inversely proportionate to the amount of time: the less temporally detailed the research, the more "whiggish" the result. What the past is becomes derivative from present, often political, issues.²¹

Historians seldom departed from social scientific or economic analyses that enabled them to bridge their scientific and utilitarian concerns. At the birth of academic southern history, powerful industrial interests had begun to dominate college boards that affected endowments. Popular political mannequins also interfered in academic work and advocates of wealth gained increasing prominence. Southern history was censored severely as a result.²² It was first conducted in accordance with *Social Darwinism*²³ of German-educated New Englander Herbert Baxter Adams at Johns Hopkins. Jameson had studied under Adams. Though lamenting the dry language of many histories, he applauded history's novel accuracy, thoroughness and its commonsensical separation from literature. Further, for Jameson, history had to be oriented for the future.²⁴

²⁰ *ibid.*, 7, 9, 11, citation on 7.

²¹ Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London: G. Bell, 1959), ch. 1.

²² Woodward contends the situation was similar across all American higher education. Woodward, *Origins of the New South 1877–1913, A History of the South series volume 9* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993), 440-46.

²³ *Social Darwinism was an attitude about history that compared history with biological evolution. Before Darwin, it sought to apply theories from natural history, or history of geographical and biological phenomena, to history of groups and civilizations. The study argues that unlike most southerners, the Yankees were major practitioners and originators of such an application. Social Darwinism received an added boost from the late-1800s when capitalist competition for its own sake was projected as the superior driving force of American society, a view that became solidified by "consensus historians" by the 1950s. David Noble, Death of a Nation: American Culture and the End of Exceptionalism, Critical American Studies series (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 39-43, passim. This study seeks to undermine this bias to conflate history to natural history at the level of epistemology, because the study does not subscribe to turning history into social science, and because such a position about history was not a very southern one in my locales and period.*

²⁴ John Franklin Jameson, "The Influence of Universities upon Historical Writing," 271, *idem.*, "The Future Uses of History," in John Franklin Jameson and the Development of Humanistic

Jameson thus was receptive to *progressive* view about history. Progressive history spanned from individuals to institutions. It was chauvinistic, inherently in conflict, and liberal. It rejected the relevance of history and Europe “on behalf of a better future.” In such a future-oriented and context-independent view, American history would guarantee “the ever fuller realization of the individual rights of divine or natural law origins, within the new republican institutional order.”²⁵ Frederick Jackson Turner was one of the most influential perpetrators of the approach. For Turner, the supposedly anti-metaphysical geographical frontier was timeless space and the only ground of American history. The frontier guaranteed history’s continuity and potentially affirmed the scientific status of history. Such scientific history was composed of *positivism*,²⁶ Social Darwinism, and economics.²⁷ From the 1920s and 1930s, southern history, already immersed in the utilitarian side of things, saw the scientific element of history as an impartial antidote

Scholarship in America, Volume I: Selected Essays, eds. Morey Rothberg and Jacqueline Goggin (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1993), 302-15.

²⁵ Breisach, *American Progressive History: An Experiment in Modernization* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993), 8.

²⁶ *In the late-1800s, positivist Auguste Comte ended up holding moral truths as immovable and certain as apodictic truths; to save society from the upheaval of 1789, he sought to establish that altruism and self-love were reconcilable and “is” and “ought” could be one. Bruce Mazlish, The Uncertain Sciences (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 53. Positivism, where history was concerned, was founded on two unshakable maxims: The first was ascertaining of facts and the second framing of laws. At its extreme, since historical and natural processes were equalized in law-framing, it was possible to study history using natural scientific methods. This meant former conceptions of nature as static were discarded in favour of its progressiveness, the idea manifested best in Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* (1859). History became vastly more prestigious—now both history and natural science were perceived as progressive—and evolution fitted both types of knowledge generically. For empirical positivism, facts were something atomic and separate. The weaknesses of the theory were adoration of the minuscule and particular at the cost of ignoring the whole and the general, limitation of research to everything (supposedly) non-philosophical and archival, and ignorance of epistemological questions due to associating a historical fact with a scientific fact. The conflict springs from a misconceived postulate that a positivistic fact of immediate sense perception was equal with a historical fact. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, repr. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 126-33.*

²⁷ Breisach, *American Progressive History*, 23, 24. *Even quite recently, Kammen has insisted in the 1800s, the frontier absorbed Americans so that it mostly inhibited them from engagements with Europe. The present study disagrees with this interpretation. Kammen, *People of Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 250.*

against sectional prejudices.²⁸ As a result, academic southern history largely became a social science by 1920.²⁹

Although historian C. Vann Woodward highlighted the dilemma of the South as a misfit region and thus opened the relevance of my first category for southern history, Woodward also perpetuated the interpretation of the South as an exceptional region with exceptional problems grounded in geography.³⁰ This is not surprising since Woodward's work was inspired by the interwar progressive social science turn in and on the South.³¹ The scientific–utilitarian abandonment was so thorough that only in the 1980s have more scholars begun to examine this period's culture in more detail about culture beyond the traditional concerns with economics and slavery.³² The major exceptions to the rule were Wilbur J. Cash and Rollin G. Osterweis in the 1940s.³³ However, O'Brien has exposed their interpretations outdated and intellectually lacking.³⁴ It is O'Brien's work that has offered the most sustained treatment yet of this neglected field.³⁵ It has marked a

²⁸ Tyrrell, *Historians in Public*, 213-14.

²⁹ See, for example, Richard H. King, *A Southern Renaissance: The Cultural Awakening of the American South, 1930–1955* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 41-42; David Potter, "The Enigma of the South," *Yale Review* 51 (1961): 143-44.

³⁰ See especially Woodward, "The Search for Southern Identity," repr. in *idem.*, *The Burden of Southern History*, 3-25; Lassiter and Crespino, "Introduction," 8-9.

³¹ James C. Cobb, *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 122.

³² David Moltke-Hansen, "Intellectual and Cultural History of the Old South," in *A Companion to the American South*, ed. John B. Boles, *Blackwell Companions to American History series* (Malden: Blackwell, 2004), 212.

³³ Wilbur J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941); Rollin G. Osterweis, *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).

³⁴ O'Brien, *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), chs. 1, 2. Cash attempted to analyze the Antebellum South using an idealist framework, a philosophically poor conjecture (chapter 5). *idem.*, "W. J. Cash, Hegel, and the South," *The Journal of Southern History* 44 (1978): 379-98. Also Cobb, "Does Mind No Longer Matter? The South, the Nation, and The Mind of the South, 1941–1991," *The Journal of Southern History* 57 (1991): 716-17. For Woodward's qualified praise of Cash see for example Jack Temple Kirby, *Media-Made Dixie: The South in the American Imagination* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 80-85.

³⁵ For this general turn, see for example Jonathan Daniel Wells, introduction to *The Southern Literary Messenger 1834–1864*, by Benjamin Blake Minor, 2nd rev. ed., *Southern Classics series* (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2007), xiii. For O'Brien's contribution, see Moltke-Hansen, "Intellectual and Cultural History of the Old South," 223. Especially relevant for me are O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860*, Volume I (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004a) (hence: CO1); *idem.*, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860*, Volume II (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004b) (hence: CO2).

significant broadening of horizons especially in context of white southerners. But as a whole, O'Brien notes the "master paradigm" of New England has contributed to dealing with the South with the lenses of social history, little theory, and few leftist perspectives.³⁶

For me this is problematic since the research agenda of the southern progressive social scientists was attached to *nominalist*³⁷ science, or *scientism*, united by method.³⁸ Ironically, it is only a slightly rehashed view about history laid out by the Yankees more than a century earlier. In addition, the study revisits the time period the progressives wanted to forget, and I could spot only two southern authors who believed that natural science can simply be implemented on history. Therefore, the study holds that it is imperative to rethink the relationship between truth and history, something that gets seldom done in American history.³⁹ The study conceptualizes the relationship between knowledge and history in a way that is different from scientific or social scientific approaches.

Thirdly, metahistorical studies about American historiography have been quite rare.⁴⁰ Text analyses about the time period that would take into account philosophy and

³⁶ *idem.*, "Orpheus Turning: The Present State of Southern History," in *The State of U.S. History*, ed. Melvyn Stokes (Oxford: Berg, 2002), 315. Among the few exceptions, see David Brown, "Attacking Slavery from Within: The Making of 'The Impending Crisis of the South,'" *The Journal of Southern History* 70 (2004): 541-76.

³⁷ *Nominalism is a related philosophical position to positivism the study also rejects. In Bannister's definition related to American social science, "[s]ince society was simply a term for the collective responses of the individuals who comprised it, sociology should confine itself to the measurement and tabulation of environmental change and responses to it."* Robert Bannister, "Sociology and Scientism: The case of William F. Ogburn," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, 1988), accessed February 16, 2015, <http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/rbannis1/Sociology/Ogburn/ogburn.ASS.html>. *Conventional nominalism underplays concern with non-individual and abstract phenomena. It is therefore ill-suited for history and, especially, the purposes of the study.*

³⁸ *idem.*, "Scientism and American Sociology," in *Ten Years of American Studies: the Helsinki Experience*, ed. Markku Henriksson (Helsinki: SHS, 1987), 58; *idem.*, "Odum, Howard Washington," entry in *Dictionary of American Biography, Supplement 5 (1977)*, American Council of Learned Societies, accessed 25 October, 2014, <http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/rbannis1/pubs/Odum.htm>.

³⁹ Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*, *Ideas in Context series*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Dorothy Ross, "On the Misunderstanding of Ranke and the Origins of the Historical Profession in America," in *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of Historical Discipline*, eds. Georg G. Iggers and James M. Powell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990), 154-69; Breisach, *American Progressive History*; Allan Megill, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), 1-14.

⁴⁰ David D. Van Tassel, *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America, 1607-1884* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960); William Raymond Smith, *History as Argument: Three Patriot Historians of the American Revolution*,

*semiotics*⁴¹ are even more so. Textually speaking, only Philip F. Gura has paid more constant attention to the role that philosophy of language and semiotics have played in American cultural and religious history before the Civil War to my knowledge. Dorothy Ross is the only one who has cautiously speculated about northern historiography of the period as narrative.⁴²

In this scholarship, the American South is not the focus. For southerners, language has mainly been a theme for literature, and pressures for progressive utility have further discouraged applications of literary theory to history.⁴³ Sentimentalism and romance were the key literary tropes of southern reunion.⁴⁴ They are still relevant and have dominated southern history. However, often unnoticed are the implications of the essential commodification of such figuration that was in full swing by 1880. Already in 1873, it had pragmatically combined business with peace and reconciliation.⁴⁵ It is problematic in a sense that cuts across all my categories, because it lets slip the notion of history as a single, non-problematic entity under the radar that is hardly tenable today when history, in

Studies in American History series Volume 5 (The Hague: Mouton, 1966); Gene Wise, American Historical Explanations: A Strategy for Grounded Inquiry, 2nd rev. ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980); Ronald H. Carpenter, History as Rhetoric: Style, Narrative, and Persuasion, Studies in Rhetoric/Communication series (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); Ross, "The New and Newer Histories: Social Theory and Historiography in an American Key," in Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past, eds. Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 85-106.

⁴¹ I define semiotics like Perron as exploration of "the nature and function of signs as well as the systems and processes underlying signification, expression, representation, and communication." Paul Perron, "Semiotics," in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism: Second Edition*, eds. Michael Groden, Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 852.

⁴² For me especially relevant are Philip F. Gura, "Language and Meaning: An American Tradition," *American Literature* 53 (1981a): 1-21; *idem.*, *The Wisdom of Words: Language, Theology, and Literature in the New England Renaissance* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1981b); *idem.*, *The Crossroads of American History and Literature* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996). Ross, "Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty," *The American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 651-77.

⁴³ See, for example, William Terry Couch, "Reflections on the Southern Tradition," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 35 (1936): 284-97, photoduplication courtesy of *The Southern Historical Collection, The Louis Round Wilson Library Special Collections, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Library.*

⁴⁴ Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*, *Civil War America series* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 194.

⁴⁵ David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 171-72, 175-79, 129. Also Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, 120; George M. Fredrickson, *The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of the Union* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 94.

all these senses, gets theorized about.⁴⁶ The deceptive mixture of scientific objectivity, realism, (religious) pathos and commercialism has obscured issues such theorizing has brought up.⁴⁷

The period under study was when an aesthetic and communicative shift about language that paralleled the spatiotemporal one became cemented into a division into literature that dealt with the imagination and history that dealt with factual knowledge.⁴⁸ As I shall examine, unlike in New England, this was far from an obvious truth in the South. Still, scholars who take a linguistic approach into southern history are rare. Though speculations from literature to history have been fairly traditional⁴⁹ and language has been a peculiarly southern theme as testified by a strong tradition of philology by Jefferson and the 20th century emergence of *New Criticism*,⁵⁰ the issue has not been carried into historiography. The exceptions have not paid attention to how philosophy relates to history.⁵¹ Conversely, O'Brien pays attention to cosmopolitan ideas about philosophy and literature for history, but departs from treating history as textual practice, something intellectual history can, nevertheless, opt for.⁵² Though some acknowledge the South's *modernist*⁵³ issues about

⁴⁶ Megill, "'Grand Narrative' and the Discipline of History," in *A New Philosophy of History*, eds. Frank Ankersmit and Hans Kellner, *Critical Views series* (London: Reaktion, 1995), 151-73.

⁴⁷ Harry Harootian, "Remembering the Historical Present," *Critical Inquiry* 33 (2007): 475-76. This is a fairly novel discovery in the U.S. context. It was apparently unknown outside mass consumerism even in the mid-1980s. Michael Denning, "'The Special American Conditions': Marxism and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 38 (1986): 367.

⁴⁸ See, particularly, Hayden White, *The Politics of Historical Interpretation: Discipline and De-Sublimation*, *Critical Inquiry* 9 (1982): 113-37; Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, *Literary Absolute*; Rigney, *Rhetoric of Historical Representation*; John Bender and David Wellbery, eds., *The Ends of Rhetoric: History, Theory, Practice* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990); Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, 2nd rev. ed. *Continuum Impacts series* (London: Continuum, 2004).

⁴⁹ Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene D. Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholder's Worldview* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 199.

⁵⁰ *New Criticism* focused "critical attention on literature itself." It was a reading technique that emphasized the internal structures and workings of a text and, like the romantics, a text's autonomous space as an aesthetic production that transcended history, science and place and functioned as a firm repository of cultural values. It also put this insight to use via various pedagogic initiatives at universities. Leroy F. Searle, "New Criticism," in Groden et al., *Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*, 691-92, *passim*.

⁵¹ Robert Penn Warren, *Brother to Dragons: A Tale in Verse and Voices* (New York: Random House, 1953); Jennifer Rae Greeson, *Our South: Geographic Fantasy and the Rise of National Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

⁵² Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 1-2.

culture touch upon historiography,⁵⁴ southern historiography has not been examined in detail. Further, only fairly recently have such cultural problems been located around the period.⁵⁵ Even in southern literature at least to the early-1990s, theories about language remained rooted in a division of labor: literary analyses were left for New Criticism, positivist *Old Historicism* that had a theory-free ideal and materialistic focus examined history and biography.⁵⁶ Except the more cynical William Faulkner, religion rather than irony has offered a place of solace for southern historical consciousness and southern aesthetes alike. But critics say it is a weak defense against rational, individualistic society, amounts to utopia, and depends on (bourgeois) romance.⁵⁷ My niche, then, is a wholly new avenue into southern history where attention is paid to metahistory, textual practice as well as philosophy.

Theoretical and methodological framework

According to Forster, current avenues into southern history are four: 1. a literary agrarian approach crystallized in Richard M. Weaver, a source of influence for historian Eugene D. Genovese, basically *modernization*⁵⁸ critique via southern culture, 2. an institutional approach to religion, the most common area of the four according to Forster, 3. postwar reconciliation, 4. racism, pretty much the only issue of interest previously.⁵⁹ This study has most in common with the first area but it is more subtle about it. By contrast, Weaver, the agrarians and Genovese avoid thinking about southern history in a particularly recent European fashion and even O'Brien notes the European theories only in passing. Southern historical modernization critique need not exclude Western discussions about modernity

⁵³ By this term I mean discomfort and doubt about modernization process that manifests in aesthetic and philosophical ways.

⁵⁴ Paul A. Bové, *Intellectuals in Power: A Genealogy of Critical Humanism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), esp. ch. 6; Harootunian, "Remembering the Historical Present."

⁵⁵ Susan-Mary Grant, *North Over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000); David F. Ericson, *The Debate over Slavery: Antislavery and Proslavery Liberalism in Antebellum America* (New York: New York University Press, 2000); Anne Goodwyn Jones, "'The Tools of the Master: Southernists in Theoryland,'" in *Bridging Southern Cultures: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, ed. John Lowe, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 172-96; Greeson, *Our South*.

⁵⁶ Goodwyn Jones, "'The Tools of the Master,'" 173. For the term *Old Historicism*, see Murray Krieger, *The Institution of Theory* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994) 5, 42.

⁵⁷ Theodor W. Adorno, "Theses upon Art and Religion Today," repr. in *The Kenyon Review*, new series, 18 (1996): 236-37.

⁵⁸ In Fox-Genovese's definition, modernization has to do with accelerated material progress born of industrial capitalism, triumphant political democracy, and autonomous individuals. Fox-Genovese, "Anxiety of History," 69.

⁵⁹ Gaines M. Foster, "The Legacy of Confederate Defeat," in *A Companion to the Civil War and Reconstruction*, ed. Lacy K. Ford, *Blackwell Companions to American History series* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), 430, 434-36.

and culture done since the Second World War. To the contrary, these insights help address and examine: 1. Traditional ignorance of how philosophy and experience bear on history, 2. Traditional ignorance of the period as culture related to the groups and locales of focus, 3. The belief that applied natural science can be methodologically adequate about history and historiography, 4. Traditional ignorance of language as related to history and historiography. These problems are greatly different from the Yankees in regard to history as time, thought, and experience, and from most modern white Americans across the board in regard to history as knowledge and historiography.

Consequently, the study shifts the entire previous science-based tradition about its object towards a more historical one that, by comparison, is extremely wary of generalities as well as conscious of their instrumental and parasitic substance as explanatory, or substantially empty, means. Such operations were only enabled by humans existing in a historically conscious manner in the first place.⁶⁰ The study questions this bias, because the study contends its subject matter cannot be reconciled to these presuppositions. It tries to accomplish this in two interconnecting ways. 1. It will re-examine the convention of modern history as an academic practice to make no bones about text that is still paramount about southern history. 2. Using texts, it will try to map the mutations in historical awareness that bear on historical text in terms of semiotics and philosophy. These aims are elaborated on below.

Conventionally, text of history is only window-dressing to an objective and separate social sphere that causally determines it.⁶¹ In the late-1990s, less than 1% of American and Canadian historians ranked historiography as close to their top priorities.⁶² However, in its desire to dethrone the independent and rational enquirer of history—something Victorian liberal historians cherished⁶³—materialistic social history also prohibited philosophy from intervening, via *concepts*, between consciousness and material reality. Concepts are a filter to provide meaning.⁶⁴ Except for Woodward's opening, this philosophically idealist claim is in my research tradition a fairly unknown intermediate step. However, concepts and meanings are a very old notion in European history and almost a truism for historians today according to Munslow.⁶⁵ Its relevance has increased in the past decades of historical theory. The study seeks to further refine this postulate.

⁶⁰ White, "Formalist and Contextualist Strategies in Historical Explanation," repr. in *idem.*, *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 45-46.

⁶¹ Miguel Cabrera, *Postsocial History: An Introduction*, trans. Marie McMahon, (Lanham: Lexington, 2005), 20.

⁶² Sande Cohen, "On the Body and Passion of History and Historiography," *Rethinking History* 12 (2008): 523.

⁶³ Christopher Parker, "English Historians and the Opposition to Positivism," *History and Theory* 22 (1983): 120-45; Reba N. Soffer, *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870-1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

⁶⁴ Cabrera, *Postsocial History*, 20.

⁶⁵ Munslow, *Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*, 66, entry for "Constructionist History."

Specifically, as text, the study shall conceive of historiography as *figural* in a sense of theorist of history Hayden White. On White's definition, the reality claim of a historical text cannot do without establishing relations between contexts, objects, and, lastly, descriptions or representations comprised of historical events, actions, structures and processes. The end product that emerges is squeezed through specific discursive communities in the academy and the audience for approval. These relations, thus, serve narrative ends rather than emerge isometrically from nature or possess inherently analytic or formal content. Therefore, historian must manipulate the relations across these levels. Although often made implicit, historians need to actively establish some relations between them. This active establishing means that history, comprised of context, object and description—categories that roughly correspond with the historical anatomy of this study—is *figural*. This is because even what *is* historical, what is at first glance the most obvious level of history, is not something given or grounded in nature.

History is through and through *metaphorical*. However, as White and a host of others have hastened to add, metaphoricity does not impair historical, or even scientific, veracity. It only impairs direct access to what is real.⁶⁶ It is not necessarily vicious, but it can be if metaphoricity is forgotten and more rational and natural scientific methodology is imposed on phenomena instead, particularly if such an imposition distorts said phenomena and turns a blind eye to its own presuppositions. Such has been the case in my object of study. Since poetic metaphor “is not necessarily connected with poetry, it is possible to generalize from [this] suggestion to the idea that producing, responding to and analyzing metaphor is a form of active participation in the circulation and criticism of meanings in society.”⁶⁷ This concern has become more acute among historians at least since 1990 when

⁶⁶ White, “Formalist and Contextualist Strategies in Historical Explanation,” 51-52. I have added the point about audiences. For opening salvos of such a position about language, see Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) esp. ch. 9; Roland Barthes, “History and Discourse,” in Introduction to Structuralism, ed. Michael Lane (New York: Basic Books, 1967), 145-55; White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973). For a hermeneutic view, see Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello, *Routledge Classics series* (London: Routledge, 2003). My reading of Bachelard on metaphor is indebted mostly to Christopher Norris. Christopher Norris, *Against Relativism: Philosophy of Science, Deconstruction and Critical Theory* (Malden: Blackwell, 1997); *idem.*, *Deconstruction and the “Unfinished Project of Modernity”*, *Athlone Contemporary European Thinkers Series* (London: The Athlone, 2000), 82. For other philosophers related to the topic, see, for example, Arthur C. Danto, *Analytical Philosophy of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); *idem.*, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); *idem.*, “Metaphor and Cognition,” in *Knowledge and Language, Volume III, Metaphor and Knowledge*, eds. Frank Ankersmit and J. J. A. Mooij (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1993), 28-30; Ankersmit, “The Dilemma of Contemporary Anglo-Saxon Philosophy of History,” *History and Theory* 25 (1986), 2, 3, *passim*.

⁶⁷ Martin Montgomery et al., *Ways of Reading: Advanced Reading Skills for Students of English Literature, Second Edition* (London: Routledge, 2000), 158.

first language and then agency have raised concern over writing of history.⁶⁸ At issue is not *ridding* metaphor from history, nor *collapsing* history into poetics. Rather, the study shall attempt to examine *how* the metaphoric or figural element of history that produces discursive meanings interacts with broader concerns of philosophy, semiotics and aesthetics in my object of study.

The study shall not stop at meaning—the concession that in history, concepts are a necessary filter that gets imposed on reality, that function metaphorically, and that are steeped in ideology and discourse. The study goes further afield to seek to address the more complex question how my first category—philosophy manifest as experience and time—shapes historical meaning at levels of semiotics and *ontology* or, “what is?” In other words, the study tries to pay attention to the residue and conflict modern history as a philosophical, aesthetic and semiotic force metaphysically enacted on my authors and their world. Loosely following philosopher Jacques Derrida and his *deconstruction*,⁶⁹ the study

⁶⁸ Geoff Eley, “Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later,” in *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*, ed. Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *Rewriting Histories series* (London: Routledge, 2005), 38.

In the main, American historians have simply ignored White and incorporated the supposedly “truly” meaningful and ethical social history even into narrative. For instance, in one of the latest manuals, White has shrunk into little more than a footnote. James W. Cook and Lawrence B. Glickman, “Twelve Propositions for a History of U.S. Cultural History,” in The Cultural Turn in U.S. History: Past, Present, and Future, eds. James W. Cook, Lawrence B. Glickman, and Michael O’Malley (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008), 25-26. Perhaps the most sympathetic American historian to White and the problems associated with him has been Robert F. Berkhofer. See especially Robert F. Berkhofer, Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse (Harvard: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995). Osborne has speculated ignorance has to do with departures from ideological projects. Thomas Osborne, “History, Theory, Disciplinarity,” in The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences, ed. Patrick Joyce (London: Routledge, 2002), 176. This notion certainly has relevance for U.S. history and its ethnic “culture wars.” Gertrude Himmelfarb, The New History and the Old: Critical Essays and Reappraisals (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 22-23, 27; Eley, A Crooked Line: From Cultural History to the History of Society (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005), 186-87. These “wars” have also targeted the South. However, ignorance for ideological reasons is philosophically too conservative. Samuel Weber, Institution and Interpretation, Theory and History of Literature series Volume 31 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), ch. 4; Wlad Godzich, Culture of Literacy (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 14. Narrative has always had a very subordinate role in U.S. history. Ross, “New and Newer Histories,” 93. For the few related enthusiastic proposals to the contrary, see Mark Poster, “Textual Agents: History at ‘The End of History,’” in “Culture” and the Problem of the Disciplines, ed. John Carlos Rowe (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 213-14.

⁶⁹ One definition of deconstruction close to the study is “simultaneously a critique of the [conceptual and oppositional sets of] categories proffered by the text, and an exposé of the text’s unacknowledged challenges to its own premises.” Jane Caplan, “Postmodernism, Poststructuralism,

claims that although discursivity and language is an inescapable condition for humans to be,⁷⁰ white southern existence met with a crisis in relation to the philosophical and semiotic forces of modern history that effected a transformation on their human ways to be. Though lacking in systematic method in principle,⁷¹ the study aims to present a deductive reading of this transformation by paying careful attention to the text–history and history–philosophy relations.

Though white southerners were not exceptional, the study shall attempt to address this change, because like Derrida, most of them doubted Platonic philosophy.⁷² A reformulation of Plato was *the* philosophy behind modern history and historical text. This reformulation radicalized “the thinking of totality and the Subject” towards infinity and ambiguity. On the one hand, being became uniformly deduced from the supersensible realm that everyone’s shared feelings accessed and partook in. On the other hand, being became an actor in an *organicist* history that aimed for an ideal resolution among thus feeling–sharing–but mutually and internally conflicting–beings.⁷³ Because every–one partook in the One as spirit and organism, it no longer was possible to be without the spiritual–organicist bond. This change underpinned modern history. It conflicted with the South, where vestiges of categorically different *organic* society of the body politic survived that was far more static, hierarchic and communal. By dramatic contrast, New

and Deconstruction: Notes for Historians,” Central European History 22 (1989): 267. Broadly speaking, deconstruction is about genealogy, a concept of Friedrich Nietzsche’s. Genealogy can be defined as “a mode of investigation that seeks to uncover forgotten interconnections; reestablish obscured or unacknowledged lines of descent; expose relationships between institutions, belief–systems, discourses, or modes of analysis that might otherwise be taken to be wholly distinct and unrelated. Genealogy in this way seeks to denaturalize ‘the contingent [social, institutional, discursive, or other] structures we mistakenly consider given, solid, and extending without change into the future as well as into the past’.” Alexander Nehamas, Nietzsche: Life as Literature (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 130, cited in David Herman, “Histories of Narrative Theory (I),” in A Companion to Narrative Theory, eds. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), 20–21.

⁷⁰ See, for example, Jacques Derrida, “Violence and Metaphysics: An Essay on the Thought of Emmanuel Levinas,” repr. in Writing and Difference, by Jacques Derrida, trans. Alan Bass, Routledge Classics series, 6th ed., (London: Routledge, 2006), 139–46.

⁷¹ Deconstruction is no method because it cannot be formalized.

⁷² Fox–Genovese and Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class, 273–74.

⁷³ Lacoue–Labarthe and Nancy, Literary Absolute, 15; Martin Jay, Songs of Experience: Modern American and European Variations on a Universal Theme (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 87. I shall define the functionality of organicism as follows: 1. fragmentary experience forms 2. connective and implicative links between beings. The links expose 3. individual contradictions, gaps, oppositions or counteractions, but are 4. spontaneously resolved in an organic whole. The organic whole was 5. implicit in the fragmentoriness of experience and 6. transcends the previous gaps via a coherent totality that 7. economizes, saves, preserves and up–lifts all fragments of experience without loss. Stephen C. Pepper, World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 283. I have added up–lift as an important dialectic addition.

England scholars radicalized organicism. The study attempts to chart these differences and shifts that overlap with history's textual and semiotic dimensions. In this overlap of being, text, semiotics and philosophy, Derrida is relevant, because he strategically questions idealist iterations of Plato that modern history became grounded in. Such undertaking reaches beyond metaphor and metaphysics. According to philosopher Martin Heidegger who Derrida follows on the issue, metaphor can only examine production *within* metaphysics⁷⁴ whose connotations are idealist, Platonic and theological.⁷⁵ Limiting metaphor and idealist historiography within metaphysics enables alertness, first, to their effects as organizers of reality, second, to the changes they exacted on being and thereby on culture, and, third, to differences *from* them.

Derrida is interested in being that is not only linguistic (written or spoken), scientific (known or referred to), thought about in reflection, nor material negative of these ways to reality. For clarity, I shall refer to these relations as R[1]. R[1] refers to reality, but it is also incumbent upon reality. I shall refer to these incumbent remains as R[2].⁷⁶ Simply put, R[2], as being, cannot be exhausted by R[1]. The way to examine the effects R[1] has had is for Derrida, as in case of White, a historical and rigorous examination into the discursive ways thinking has influenced concepts at levels of context, medium and effective limit. The point is to attain a glimpse of R[2]. At issue is not more genuine truth inherent in R[2] or its specific grounding, but a critical exposition on how R[1] has dealt with R[2]⁷⁷ that is still ethical.⁷⁸ Due to Plato, R[2] became ignored in art and truth: the only way to R[1] or nature was via inferior and secondary imitation that put present R[1] as primary and superior. R[1] could only be accessed through discourse or secondary, posterior imitation. The dynamics to access R[1] depend on re-presentation as relation or resemblance that agrees, relates or equalizes with a present unveiled object. Thus, imitation aims at either *revealing* nature—the move from R[2] to R[1]—or *imitating* R[1] in an equal relationship that ideally makes R[1] and its inherent meaning transparent and effaces the imitator. Derrida names this *the process of truth*. Using modernist poet Stephane Mallarmé as an example, Derrida claims that syntactically, texts—especially those that are undecidable or more self-conscious about their operation on nature—write using a figure that is both other and free from the homogenous and homogenising space that is R[1]. This writing does not overturn the sacredness of truth, but it wants to escape

⁷⁴ Derrida, "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy," repr. in *Margins in Philosophy*, by Jacques Derrida, trans. Alan Bass (Brighton: The Harvester, 1982b), 226.

⁷⁵ *idem.*, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 3rd ed. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 13.

⁷⁶ Rodolphe Gasché, *Inventions of Difference: On Jacques Derrida* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 41-42.

⁷⁷ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 14.

⁷⁸ Marianna Papastephanou, "Onto-Theology and the Incrimination of Ontology in Levinas and Derrida," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 31 (2005): 461-85, accessed May 31, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0191453705052981.

its pertinence or authority, and maintains a playful relationship to it. In such writing, *what writes* and *what is written* are both dislocated.⁷⁹

I claim in their similar suspicion or even liminal difference in regard to metaphysics, many southerners were in a dangerous position about idealist philosophy as it manifested in truth and meaning⁸⁰ within modern history. It derived from a philosophical dislocation: a version of freedom and life that defied the philosophy of modern history. This entails alertness about their texts of history *and* philosophy of modern history.⁸¹ A strategic examining of the discursive metaphysics of history may produce “a force of dislocation that spreads itself throughout the entire system”⁸² when it pays attention to production of southern text. Derrida’s approach is comparable to Faulkner’s: both men sorrowfully reject all comfort of representations as temporal continuity and language, faith in uniform

⁷⁹ Derrida, “The Double Session,” in *Dissemination*, by Jacques Derrida, trans. Barbara Johnson (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981b), 183-93. Also *ibid.*, 205-8.

⁸⁰ Bass, introduction to *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, xiii.

⁸¹ *The breakdown of the barrier between text and reality can still yield knowledge, “a knowledge about the mechanics of knowledge, a knowledge destructive of knowledge, but a knowledge nonetheless.”* Gasché, “‘Setzung’ and ‘Übersetzung’: Notes on Paul de Man,” *Diacritics* 11 (1981): 45, cited in Mark Currie, *Postmodern Narrative Theory, Transitions series* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1998), 46. On Derrida and history, see for example Mark Mason, “Exploring ‘the Impossible’: Jacques Derrida, John Caputo, and the Philosophy of History,” *Rethinking History* 10 (2006): 501-22; Sally Hart, “On Jacques Derrida: The Politics of Mourning,” *Rethinking History* 11 (2007): 169-85; Ethan Kleinberg, “Haunting History: Deconstruction and the Spirit of Revision,” *History and Theory* 46 (2007), *Theme Issue: Revision and History*, 113-43; Mason, “Historiospectography? Sande Cohen on Derrida’s *Specters of Marx*,” *Rethinking History* 12 (2008): 483-514; Toby Widdicombe, “Utopia, Historiography, and the Paradox of the Ever-present,” *Rethinking History* 13 (2009): 292. Lather has called this “ironic validity” that makes methodological practices visible. Patti Lather, “Fertile Obsession: Validity after Poststructuralism,” *The Sociological Quarterly* 34 (1993): 676-77.

This level is the formal or syntactic praxis of writing, dependent on logic but not simply content with it, composition and decomposition, an allusion of undecidability, not an illusion. Derrida compares it with Kurt Gödel’s theorem of undecidable proposition: “a proposition which, given a system of axioms governing a multiplicity, is neither an analytic nor deductive consequence of those axioms, nor in contradiction with them, neither true nor false with respect to those axioms.” He explicitly denies his analysis stops at idealism or mysticism as some early critics have accused. Nor is syllepsis, double notion of words as literal and figural, the last word. His analogy is sylleptic hymen penetrated by penis: what is decisive and primary is the syntactic, residue-leaving act of penis on hymen, not the other way. Derrida, “Double Session,” 219-21, citation on 220.

⁸² Derrida, “Force and Signification,” repr. in *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, 22. Elsewhere Derrida states this aim as “through a double gesture, a double science, a double writing—put into practice a reversal of the classical opposition and a general displacement of the system.” *idem.*, “Signature Event Context,” repr. in *Margins in Philosophy*, by Jacques Derrida, 329, *emphasis original*. Compare with *idem.*, “Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” repr. in *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, 354-355.

and linear time and narrative. But in addition, Derrida is a very theological writer as well.⁸³ Many southerners held similar distrust about the text of history.

This is, still, an entirely novel approach in the present context—but that’s “the point.”⁸⁴ If U.S. historiography and U.S. history have differed from this study in their general lack of interest in theory, American Studies acts as a blessing and a curse. On the one hand, scholars in the discipline are nowadays sympathetic to postmodern practices of inquiry that, after some opposition in the 1990s, include deconstruction.⁸⁵ On the other hand, history’s textual and philosophical sides, though also acts of cultural producing after

⁸³ *The always lost and buried human presence of R[2] by the metaphor as an endless stand-in was known to many southerners about history as I shall explore. It also relates to the 17th century Puritanism of New England. Since all humans are surrounded by language like a net thrown over their bodies, even a confession of sin to God is in danger of causing only more sin. David Harlan, introduction to The Degradation of American History, by David Harlan (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), xxv-xxvi, xxvii-xxviii. For more on theological qualities in Derrida, see for example the last part of John D. Caputo, More Radical Hermeneutics: On Not Knowing Who We Are, Studies in Continental Thought series (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000). For Derrida and history in this context, see Mason, "Exploring 'the Impossible'."*

⁸⁴ *Perhaps influenced by the initial reception of deconstruction at Yale, Americans have traditionally misread Derrida as a supporter of liberalism and deconstruction as an ally in their (ultra)liberal political struggles within modernization. This is not what deconstruction is about as philosopher Rodolphe Gasché has perhaps most effectively pointed out. Gasché, Views and Interviews: On Deconstruction in America, Contemporary European Cultural Studies series (Aurora: The Davis Group, 2007). For early American misreadings of deconstruction, see for example M. H. Abrams, "The Deconstructive Angel," Critical Inquiry 3 (1977): 425-38; William V. Spanos, "Retrieving Heidegger's De-struction: A Response to Barbara Johnson," SCE Reports 8 (1980), Deconstructive Criticism: Directions: 36, passim. Gary Hall, "Why You Can't Do Cultural Studies and Be A Derridean: Cultural Studies After Birmingham, the New Social Movements and the New Left," Culture Magazine 6 (2004), Deconstruction is/in Cultural Studies, accessed October 20, 2015, <http://culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/5/30>.*

⁸⁵ *On postmodernism as integral to American Studies, see for summary observations Julian Murphet, "Postmodernism as American Studies," Australasian Journal of American Studies 25 (2006): 66, 71-73. More generally, Shelley Fisher Fishkin, "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004," American Quarterly 57 (2005): 17-57. For Americanist opposition to deconstruction and the French, see Steven Watts, "The Idiocy of American Studies: Poststructuralism, Language, and Politics in the Age of Self-Fulfilment," American Quarterly 43 (1991): 625-60; Paul Jay, Contingency Blues: The Search for Foundations in American Criticism, The Wisconsin Project of American Writers series (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 20-25. For inclusion of deconstruction in American Studies, see for example John Carlos Rowe, The New American Studies, Critical American Studies series (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).*

White, have usually been left alone by American Studies.⁸⁶ I know of only one scholar—Robert F. Berkhofer—who is a historian, Americanist, *and* interested in deconstruction.⁸⁷ Sadly, Berkhofer fails to advance beyond the initial U.S. reception of deconstruction by claiming deconstruction has got nothing to do with the real world. This interpretation easily obscures more nuanced commitments pertaining to freedom, namely, freedom's originally pre-Socratic interest in being and language as something that is irreducible to ideology, science or commodity,⁸⁸ an important consideration about the South in the study. David E. Nye, historian, Americanist and interested in White, wrote roughly three decades years ago that American Studies has ignored the underlying philosophical issues for history.⁸⁹ His observation seems correct even today.

Chapter 2 covers the stages in southern historical discussion in Virginia from the 1800s to the 1820s vis-à-vis the mighty New England's rationalist-religious history—referred to as “Austere Enlightenment”—that greatly differed from southern ways. Subsequent northern importation of German ideas was also little echoed in Virginia. The chapter contends that unlike New England that was complicit with the novelties, Virginians'—perhaps to an extent other white southerners'—notion of history cannot be simply reduced to modern historiography and its presuppositions, because many held on to older views. Even the dynamic of southern cultural discourse differed philosophically from that found elsewhere in the West. This showed also in biography, a historical genre in which lawyer-polymath William Wirt was a local authority, far more progressive about

⁸⁶ *In American history, deconstruction “seems to constitute a major threat to a tradition built on the confident and non-reflective construction of narrative.” Kleinberg, “Haunting History,” 124, passim. Also Cohen, “Supplement A: Research Historians and French Theory,” in French Theory in America, eds. Sylvère Lotringer and Sande Cohen (New York: Routledge, 2001): 289-301. Among the last engagements with deconstruction and history in America by an Americanist to my knowledge is Barry Shank, “Colouring Evidence for Experience: Imagining a Post-Structuralist History,” American Studies 36 (1995): 81-92. Only studies of slavery and blacks have “applied” deconstruction in southern history, and this has been rare. Craig Werner, “The Framing of Charles W. Chesnut: Practical Deconstruction in the Afro-American Tradition,” in Southern Literature and Literary Theory, ed. Jefferson Humphries (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990): 339-66; Ben Child, “Mapping the Democratic Forest: The Postsouthern Spaces of William Eggleston,” Southern Cultures 17 (2011): 37-54. Even the liberal Woodward did not care for deconstruction and identified it with multiculturalism. Peggy Kamuf, “Going Public: The University in Deconstruction,” in Deconstruction is/in America: A New Sense of the Political, ed. Anselm Haverkamp (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 104-10. By all accounts, and with understandable reason, southern historians have conflated deconstruction with such projects.*

⁸⁷ Berkhofer, “A New Context for a New American Studies,” repr. in *Locating American Studies: The Evolution of a Discipline*, ed. Lucy Maddox (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 282.

⁸⁸ Julia Kristeva, “Europhilia, Europhobia,” in Lotringer and Cohen, *French Theory in America*, 40-42.

⁸⁹ David E. Nye, “American Studies as a Set of Discourses,” *American Studies in Scandinavia* 17 (1985): 53.

history than most around him, but still not ready for modern history. When German ideas entered New England, I conjecture some southerners, on the one hand, developed a skeptical reading of history through author Walter Scott. On the other hand, simultaneous southern fascination and appreciation of historian Barthold Georg Niebuhr entailed no *historicist* history. Kantian idealist philosophy about history did become introduced through him as *historism*. However, within Idealism, the difference between *historism* and more practically radical and liberal historicism was critical.⁹⁰ The Yankees preferred their Christian social science reading of historicism; in great contrast, many southerners seemed, similar to Friedrich Nietzsche, to apply *historism* to augment their more language-oriented tradition that included humanistic and very skeptical thinking about history. An extreme variant of this direction the study calls *historiality* was found to exist particularly in Virginia. On the one hand, *historiality* flatly rejected history's philosophical content, emphasizing instead its poetic and rhetoric qualities in an antimodern reversal. On the other hand, *historiality* welcomed enlightened skepticism about historical representing. In *a preliminary phase to modern history*, Western history was philosophically value-laden and linked with the state roughly from the 1600s to the 1750s. The discrepancy of *historiality* means profound suspicion about the modern project and its philosophical and semiotic interpellations in the context of history.

Chapter 3, covering the years from the late-1820s to 1841, first turns more to Charleston, to compare and contrast its learned historical views with state-level organizing of historical research begun by and in the North. Though more engaged with Germany than Virginia, these theories about history were far more developed and critical than Yankee versions. There was not only skepticism about history that was almost unknown in New England, semiotics of history differed as well. More recent aesthetic discourse was applied to history than in Virginia. This enabled a modernist direction about history as an ironic symbol that turned into juxtaposition between admiration of the ancients and most self-consciously modern theories. The slight exception here is author William Gilmore Simms. Simms's urban fretting about lack of civilized southern book discourse was indicative of a different attitude to prose around him. A different attitude to prose from modern history would illuminate the peculiar southern desire to censor writings about slavery in books of romance and history. A comparison with Edgar Allan Poe, a Jefferson graduate, brings Simms's difference into relief. The chapter proceeds to critically investigate the first professionalized historiographies by Germany-imbibed northerners, beginning with George Bancroft. He was metaphysically indebted to

⁹⁰ *Historism derived from German theorists. It acknowledged difference between individuals across time. Similarity existed only in synchronic "slice-of-time" within individual period without any overlapping logic, process/progress or plan. It was precursor to postmodernism according to Ankersmit. Ankersmit, Historical Representation, Cultural Memory in the Present series, (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2001), 10-11. In contrast, historicism, represented by Hegel, was temporally causal and continuous linkage of change as diachrony, hence more total in implications. Historicism was very influential in New England (chapter 3). Compare with Mark E. Blum, Continuity, Quantum, Continuum, and Dialectic: The Foundational Logics of Western Historical Thinking (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 305n6.*

historicist Hegel and his conception about history was strengthened by the transcendentalists. I shall examine their discrepancies with southerners. However, Bancroft also got support in the South, mainly in the person of Maryland novelist–historian John P. Kennedy. At the same time, the institutional organizing of history took place in Virginia. Manned solely by Whigs, it was far more in tune with the national project. However, internally, it left out a residue of different thinking and experience about history that was perhaps best represented by the Jefferson Republicans. I shall proceed to look at the first overall history of Virginia as a gazette, and then examine another pioneering northern professional William H. Prescott. Prescott epistemologically misunderstood or manipulated what modern history was about in ways that had cultural consequences. For Prescott, modern enlightened history meant certain and objective historical truth in practice. His approach began to reverberate also within the historical organization of Virginia and similar organizations in the South. Notable here is southern sensitivity, in the person of Maryland linguist Severn Teackle Wallis, about Yankee reinscription of modern history as manipulation in his discursive analysis of history’s use and abuse. Wallis was the pioneering public southern commentator on Prescott’s first history. Ironically, he still had not examined Prescott’s presuppositions deeply enough.

Chapter 4 resumes the Virginia historical discussion in the journal *Southern Literary Messenger* around 1840. Here the individuals who stand out are Jane Tayloe Lomax and George E. Dabney. Lomax is previously in practice fully forgotten theorist of history and letters, and a pioneer of romantic historiography in Virginia. This may be explained, however, by her quite cosmopolitan life: she moved away from Virginia in her teens. Her changes of view about history can be deduced from her texts and poetics. Here was the first unblushingly bourgeois and novel opinion about history in that state. Dabney, in contrast, was another Virginia graduate and a representative of a semiotically idiosyncratic conception of history that helps reveal southern rhetorical and metaphysical differences to modern history still existed, particularly in Virginia. Striking is also Dabney’s departure from Victorian moralism that conventionally had women enclosed to the home. Rather, Dabney sees the female fluidity of keen perception and existence as a positive resource about history that functions like a physician—an extremely un–bourgeois but very sophisticated notion. Organization of history in Virginia continued to careen towards the North and pressured folks outside it to civilize themselves and care about history. Meanwhile, following the local reinscription of idealist aesthetics, historicism became more popular in the North.

Chapter 5 looks at the main historical writings of Thomas Roderick Dew, influential slave theorist and political philosopher in Virginia in the 1830s and early–1840s and a representative of the Virginia organization. Though Dew made a great, even decisive and tragic, impact on southern historical awareness in his texts, his arguments are a potpourri that includes more historicist and northern tones than was the local norm: his views do not represent the white South as a whole. I will demonstrate how Dew actively and systematically distorted his sources to suit his agenda and that he was in close contact with the Catholic revival in England, a movement with a philosophically idealist side as cultural politics.

Chapter 6, covering the late-1830s and the early-1840s, returns to Charleston to investigate editor Daniel K. Whitaker's two scholarly ventures: *The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* and the early years of *Southern Quarterly Review*. Whitaker, born and schooled in New England, increased the similitude between South Carolina and New England about history metaphysically. However, even here there remained fairly violent differences about history, especially on the pages of the first journal. The controversies again bring up the strongly skeptical tradition about history that emanated from Jefferson's university. Covering the early years of the latter, my particular focus is on George Frederick Holmes and Simms. Holmes was perhaps the first more sustained examiner of the novel German philosophy of history in the South he, like Dew, knew through Catholicism. However, he remained far from completely embracing it. Simms, in turn, moved into a more outright acceptance of romantic history in the early-1840s. As in Lomax he probably had read, Simms was particularly receptive to the arguments of aesthete Friedrich Schiller, a significant precursor to Hegel about history and the relationship between literature, aesthetics and history. But Simms, like Dew, now also sympathized more with northern thinking about history. In the course of four decades, the different strands of southern thinking of and writing about history from New England and Europe did not disappear, but they became philosophically and textually steadily less pronounced, with the 1840s as the decisive decade.

2. Virginia historiography and New England, 1800s–1820s: collisions in politics and poetics

2.1 History and language after the Revolution

This section has two aims. First, I will attempt to interpret historical discussion after the Revolution. The heavy utilitarianism of history and classical world up North was different in degree, if not in kind, from southerners and Jefferson's more erudite approach. While scholars generally only took from Antiquity useful ideas for the present and disseminated them heavily and democratically in translation, he focused more on words and was more wary of translation. By clinging to ancient Rome and its exemplar history more tenaciously and retaining the humanistic view of language as key to reality, southerners—unlike northerners—were less willing to embrace a Cartesian/Platonic rationalist notion of history. By contrast, influential northerners were blind to the philosophical contradictions involved. Second, I contend for a different reception of Scottish Philosophy and revivalist evangelical religion in the South. I argue responses were more guarded in Virginia, leading, with greater sensitivity to rhetoric, to more subtle and ironic figural awareness that paralleled Scottish linguists. Therefore, again unlike the northern custom, Evangelicalism was seldom linked to rationalist history in Virginia, yielding no austere “political science” as a synthesis of the two.

2.1.1 History and language: postwar views

History was too profane and too utilitarian a subject to be studied in the religiously strict American colleges before the Revolution, especially among the Calvinist colleges out of which Wiesen singles out Yale.⁹¹ However, history as a utilitarian pursuit crept onward: already in the 1750s at King's College (later Columbia), New York, visionaries such as William Smith saw Americans not only as existing in a direct continuum with the ancient world which could teach them valuable lessons in ethics of virtue, heroism and politics in accordance with the classical standards, but also history as something useful. Antiquity was, to someone like John Adams, a reflective mirror to the past with no essential differences. Their programme connected history side by side with geography in a way what was to become a trend. This useful utilitarian side, something we could call the social and the political science of history today, began to gain ground after the Revolution in American higher education. Remarkably for my purposes, this was done at the expense of linguistics, literature and mythology of ancient history. The Enlightenment ideal of law-seeking and statecraft in history, fully underway by the 1790s, combined with a

⁹¹ David S. Wiesen, "Ancient History and Early American Education," in *The Usefulness of Classical Learning in the Eighteenth Century: Papers Presented at the 107th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association*, ed. Susan Ford Wiltshire (Chico: American Philological Association, 1976), 53-69.

desire to simplify and democratize the study of the ancient world while suspicions grew about the immorality of its content. This was a part of a trend, previously launched by Benjamin Franklin of Philadelphia, to only take from Antiquity what is useful in the present and disseminate the knowledge about the ancients without the cumbersome effort of mastering foreign languages.⁹² The grammatical study of Greek and Latin had ruled American higher education for more than two centuries. By comparison, history and literature had miniscule roles. Language was also seen as the key to classical language study. American scholars restricted themselves to recovery of texts from Antiquity and to examining texts. By the 1800s, history was separate from poetry and drama⁹³ but especially in the South, there was no clear preference of history over the two as to depictions of the real.

To these northern scholars, like for the 16th century humanists, language itself provided the key to all spheres of reality.⁹⁴ They thus ignored John Locke on the referential power on language. For Locke, language was arbitrary and always distortive of the real and simple a-linguistic, “psychological” ideas of the mind and the individual.⁹⁵ It was this thesis for instance Kant criticized. It “fails to acknowledge the discursive nature of human cognition,” leading to downgrading of conceptual representation.⁹⁶ In other words, not only did the scholars ignore Locke on this issue, they ignored its critique by Kant.⁹⁷

However, critically for me, and departing from the humanist symmetry between rhetoric, grammar and logic, they *underplayed* rhetoric as contingent, empirical/spatial imprecision in favor of a rigorous, solid—indeed, eternal—system. This deduction reduced the phenomenal world, epistemologically secondary in any case, into theory.⁹⁸ Americans such as Franklin emulated, instead, the Lockean ideals on education concerning rote repetition and translation of text into the 1820s, though the inclusion of translation was a century old even in Locke’s time.⁹⁹ In addition, Locke’s anti-patriarch polemic in pedagogy, arguing for child as independent individual, had begun to substitute the harmonious, ordered family by the late-1700s.¹⁰⁰

⁹² *ibid.*, 57-62 and n76.

⁹³ *Caroline Winterer, The Culture of Classicism: Ancient Greece and Rome in American Intellectual Life, 1780–1910 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 29-31.*

⁹⁴ *ibid.*, 30-31.

⁹⁵ *Catherine Labio, Origins and the Enlightenment: Aesthetic Epistemology from Descartes to Kant (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 75, passim.*

⁹⁶ *Henry E. Allison, Kant’s Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense, Rev. and Enlarged ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 27.*

⁹⁷ *This position in Kant is briefly referred to in ibid., 455n32.*

⁹⁸ *On this theme see for example Norris, Against Relativism, 39, 43-45.*

⁹⁹ *Winterer, Culture of Classicism, 38. The translation advocates had their opponents though. ibid., 39-40.*

¹⁰⁰ *Robert N. Bellah et al., Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life (Harper and Row: Perennial Library, 1986), 57-58.*

According to influential northern pioneers such as physician Benjamin Rush, history was first conducted on a Federalist, pro-Constitution basis as utilitarian and rationalist. Rush sought to counter the anti-Constitution argument that was found in Virginia for example (2.1.2). In a scheme resembling Plato, he advocated a “federal university” to serve the whole country that would supercede local or state level education: after thirty years, a law should be made that would bar office seekers who had not attended. The highest object of this totalizing university was to unite natural law and political science for the needs of the new nation, immediately followed by ancient and modern history, though especially natural history was a useful field. The style of British authors such as Tory-leaning satirist and philologist Samuel Johnson and Edward Gibbon—powerful authors in the South—should be rejected: the U.S. present calls for simplicity of style, but it should also aim for perfection, because it will be the new language of mankind and the building block of commerce, happiness and civilization. The models for the scheme derived from “the wisest kings in Europe” and “[t]he inhabitants of Massachusetts.” Its aim was “a permanent foundation.”¹⁰¹

In addition, the old Puritan wish to unite God’s law and human conduct was prevalent. Interestingly, it found nourishment in Presbyterian Evangelicalism, and became disseminated as semiotics: “Let all the heathen Writers join / *To form one perfect book.*” This semiotic to reconcile God and *all* language explicitly called for a rejection of Tory leader Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke—paragon of *Universal History*¹⁰² and also much followed in the South (chapters 3, 6)—as well as the French *philosophes*.¹⁰³ In order to sustain the American government, knowledge of history had to be universal. Historical language was simply means to bring from the past ideas and thoughts for present sociopolitical ends. *Words* did not matter, *ideas* did: translation from Greek to English was a bridge more than a studious problem. This formed a secure basis for American

¹⁰¹ *Citizen of Pennsylvania* [Benjamin Rush], “Plan of a Federal University,” *The American Museum* 4 (1788), 442, 444, 443, 444, citations on 444.

¹⁰² *My reading of Universal History, a precedent to modern history in this study, is indebted to Foucault. According to Foucault, ordering and classifying of natural history made time continuous, with God and perfection waiting at the end of the multiple and simultaneous variations of hierarchically-set beings. Individual natural beings were substituted to fossils, their fixed variations and the relations within system. Identity and system of language-coded names, instead of separate living things, were the primary movers of this history. The historical a priori of confusion of tongues at Babel put the living things and knowledge-fields into neat modal boxes, knowledge-domains and definable variables. Constant order divided into representations so both ordering and description of empirical objects became possible, but the language of this ordering needed to be universally valid and consistent as a metalanguage. Exact descriptions were turned into invariable reality patterns and each being was designated its place. The names fit only specific propositions resulting in a structure that accommodated all the possible variations a being may have. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* trans. [?] (London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1970), 151-52, 156-59.*

¹⁰³ *Hortensius* [William Livingston], “Thoughts on Deism,” *The American Museum* 4 (1788), citations on 442, emphasis added, 441.

nationalism.¹⁰⁴ Critically departing from southerners, they wanted to re-introduce certainty into history that mainstream Universal History had undermined. Mainstream Universal History, present in Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and Bolingbroke, was essentially formal—thus rhetorical—about historical presenting. Thereby, the Yankees subverted rhetoric with rationalist philosophy of René Descartes, on the one hand, and Evangelical Christianity, on the other hand. This was an extremely anti-empirical position about history, because it was beyond even the formal and moralistic confines of Universal History. As we will discover, it also represented a stark contrast to southerners. These early American thinkers and institutions relied on *Neoplatonism*¹⁰⁵ that later fused with German Idealism (chapter 3). The South had far less such a—poetic, rationalist, in Derrida’s phrase “heliotropic” enthusiasm whose vestiges survived into the U.S. reception of Hegel. In New England as we shall see, multiple anti-sensist references to light¹⁰⁶ testify to the power of such a—poetic, rationalist episteme that extended to history through language.

Furthermore, this entailed a change in history’s subject matter. Many northern pioneers sought to treat history as a synthesis of systematic and scientific natural philosophy and Universal History. Nadel contends these were difficult to reconcile with Locke’s philosophy that relied on the individual and the psychic. Thus, they *abandoned* history for *social science*. After Locke’s reductionism to a psyche, a systemic history of true propositions and Universal History’s ethics of exemplarity became incommensurable. The response was, in case of influential Scottish Philosophy, focus on sociology, anthropology, physiology and economics. The previous humanistic—Christian conception about history weakened but importantly, especially in the South, did not disappear. The model for the preceding exemplar history in America, in its pragmatic and stately concerns, was arguably ancient Rome.¹⁰⁷ The Yankees had a social science with a vengeance however: the Cartesian rationalist bias about history they endorsed had been abandoned elsewhere

¹⁰⁴ Wiesen, “Ancient History and Early American Education,” 61, 62. *The practicalities of studying history was in Smith’s plan a recital of the text as a whole chopped into bits and then writing down its main parts, to be of service later in life, a sort of synthesis of Locke and the old tradition. ibid., 57.*

¹⁰⁵ Bregman states American philosophy was Neoplatonic and Scholastic “from the beginning.” *It was dominant at King’s College, the cradle of classicist-utilitarian history. Bregman defines Neoplatonism as having a concept of a rational human soul intimately connected with three divine hypostases: “the One and the Good, the principle of Unity and the unknowable ground of all Being; Its first manifestation Intellect or Noûs (One-Many), the eternal intelligible paradigm of the sensible realm, and Universal Soul (One and Many) which moves away from the noetic and through different levels of experience and activity, gives rise to nature and to our world of time, space and body.” Plotinus held possible that all could become unified with the One itself because each of us is a microscopic intelligent realm. Our center is the center of All. Jay Bregman, “The Neoplatonic Revival in North America,” *Hermathena* 149 (1990), Special Issue: *The Heritage of Platonism*, 100, 101, citations on 100, 101.*

¹⁰⁶ For light thematized this way, see Norris, *Against Relativism*, 24.

¹⁰⁷ George H. Nadel, “Philosophy of History before Historicism,” *History and Theory* 3 (1964): 312-14. For Rome, see *ibid.*, 294-96.

by the late-1600s.¹⁰⁸ Hence, they 1. rejected “pre-Lockean” humanism about history and 2. wanted to ground Universal History more rationalistically than as poetry, rhetoric, or the example. The end result was grounded in God metaphysically, and in progressive social science methodologically. Free and rational, but pious, individual subject connected the two realms. This arrangement made them far more unsusceptible to skepticism about history. Instead, rationalism was incorporated into a peculiarly anti-figural reception of Enlightenment history *and* modern idealist history (chapter 3). According to Greeson, by the 1790s in the Yankee literary magazines, the South was an anomaly to history, a conclusion deduced from natural history¹⁰⁹ that had utilitarian ends. But to southerners, a second problem was the rationalist-religious Universal History. Southerners were not squarely anti-modern, but almost all departed from such radicalization of Universal History. Even free individuality, presupposed by Universal History, was at times contested by them (2.2.3, chapter 4).

2.1.1.1 A different interpretation of Scottish intellectuals in the South

The U.S. was decisively impacted by this change Locke made on humanist history. Americans had known its remedy, Scottish thought, more since the 1760s thanks to John Witherspoon and Samuel Davies at the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University). Archibald Alexander and Charles Hodge continued this work in the later decades of the century, spreading its influence. However, the differences between regions stand out: Up North, Princeton Evangelical interpretation simplified its content and ignored its split source.¹¹⁰ One needed not necessarily be an Evangelical to be a Scottish intellectual. In contrast, William Robertson, a noted historian and Principal at the University of Edinburgh, was the “leader and exemplar” of a more moderate take on religion that lost its majority position to the evangelicals in the 1790s, just when the Evangelical revival began to sweep America in what has been called *the Second Great Awakening*. While the more populist Evangelicals in Scotland wished for a return to austere Calvinism and insisted on doctrinal purity, the moderates of Robertson defended decorum and lawful government, “eloquent preaching, ethics, natural theology, scholarship, and free philosophic inquiry.” Their conduct in society was reportedly what the Evangelicals reprehended: noisy, bragging, licentious, undisciplined, sympathetic to heresy and gentlemanly in air and manner.¹¹¹ Since Robertson “was a favourite among late-18th century Virginians” and his reputation as a modern historian and a supporter of

¹⁰⁸ Günther Pflug, “The Development of Historical Method in the Eighteenth Century [1954],” trans. ?, *History and Theory 11* (1971), *Enlightenment Historiography: Three German Studies*, 2-3.

¹⁰⁹ Greeson, *Our South*, *op cit.*, 70-74.

¹¹⁰ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, “The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology,” *Church History 24* (1955): 261-62. *Davies is included in Francis L. Hawks, Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America, Volume I (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1836b), 107-9.*

¹¹¹ Ahlstrom, “*Scottish Philosophy and American Theology*,” 258-60.

chivalry lasted into the Civil War in the South,¹¹² I think it safe to say Scottish Philosophy was interpreted differently between northern and southern intellectual centers, which created slightly different metaphysical makeups. Specifically, political moderation and rhetoric became more welcomed in the South: unlike the statecrafting neoplatonic rationalists, humanist rhetoric had never been exchanged there for the reason–religion dyad. The evangelical take on language as pure contributed to the previous rationalist rejection of phenomenal experience from eternity and mathematical science far more in the North.

The Scottish philosophers left language undeveloped as a problem when they rejected David Hume’s ideational representationalism.¹¹³ This rejection combined with rationalism in the North. It became disseminated by early leading Virginian evangelicals in Virginia as well (2.2.1). However, other Scottish intellectuals had strong ambivalence about modernity as shown in their more historicist *stadialist theory of progress* that, though not fully cyclic, was more doubtful about progress, and ungrounded in an ethnic hierarchy.¹¹⁴ New England, rejecting nature for reason, never subscribed to it: the first wave of rationalist–neoplatonic historians and cultural theorists in Boston in the first years of the 19th century took the *ethnically hierarchic and linear theory of progress* as a given.¹¹⁵ Supplied by Locke, this counterintuitively led to racially normative metaphysics of history in the North, but not in the South (chapters 3, 5, 6). Southerners were more receptive to the non–racially hierarchic stadialism, because they retained more the humanistic, unreconstructed Christian theory about history that made no bones about a (mystical) unity of a people: they consequently had no comparable urge to sanctify and universalize American history. I could find only one published southern view about history that fully endorses the northern metaphysics from the 1840s (chapter 6).¹¹⁶

As an instance of stadialism, Scot Hugh Blair’s *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783) was a staple in American colleges well into the 19th century and a

¹¹² Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 203-4.

¹¹³ Ahlstrom, “Scottish Philosophy and American Theology,” 260-61; Gura, *Wisdom of Words*, 22-23.

¹¹⁴ George Dekker, *The American Historical Romance*, *Cambridge Studies in American Literature and Culture series* (Cambridge: The University of Cambridge Press, 1987), 75-76, 83.

¹¹⁵ For Franklin’s neoplatonic racial hierarchism, see Benjamin Franklin, *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind* (Boston: S. Kneeland, 1755), 14-15, cited in Lawrence W. Levine, *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 108. Also O’Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 20n55; Lewis P. Simpson, *The Man of Letters in New England and the South: Essays on the History of the Literary Vocation in America* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973), 68-70.

¹¹⁶ See, for instance, the more sensitive treatment of quadroons by Legaré in contrast to August W. Schlegel. Hugh Swinton Legaré, *Writings of Hugh Swinton Legaré, Volume 1* (Charleston: Burges & James, 1846), 135, cited in John T. Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, *University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures series Number 51* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, n.d. [1965]), 14.

“formative” source of southern criticism.¹¹⁷ Blair offered a history of philosophy on language that ironically recognized its historical and contextual dependence: the increase of reason and philosophy, correctness and accuracy were done *at the expense* of the expressive, the figural, the poetic and the lively. O’Brien claims Blair was still no romantic.¹¹⁸ However, Harshbarger counters Blair “epitomized” a countercurrent of oral rhetorics that saw expressivity and pragmatics of discourse as compatible. This current would fuel the Romantic cause with “rhetorical appeal, social relevance, and revolutionary force.”¹¹⁹ Blair radicalized the conception that communication, especially poetry, was influenced by sociohistorical circumstances by making its human need independent of either place or civilization into a general economy of rhetoric. As an oral event of communication, oral communication had more value than the written word that cured the gap between thought and expression left in neoclassicism. The communal, instructive and appealing pattern of poetic communication that engaged values and beliefs instead of reason made the world of the Scots split into an oppressive “proper” writing and speech and “improper” feeling and chatting.¹²⁰ Hence Blair fanned the southern flames about history as communication where phenomenal experience–nature, words and rhetoric–indeed counted. Unlike in Universal History, *expression* also mattered, not only propositional (but rhetorical) *representation*¹²¹ weeded out by the Yankees, but by and large, the outcome was different from modern history. As I will show, southerners decisively differed from the Yankee extreme rigidity about language and history. The power of Blair is an example of southern unwillingness to subvert nature and the natural to the Yankee reason–religion binary.

2.1.2 Strong version of “Austere Enlightenment” (SAE) and southerners’ awkward relationship to it

The Scots situated in an ironic position between a propositional system of science, conceived as philosophy, and empirical particularity with a historicist twist that Blair articulated. In this respect, southerners resembled them ontologically in history and

¹¹⁷ Winterer, *Culture of Classicism*, 26; CO 2, 684.

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*, 690-91.

¹¹⁹ Scott Harshbarger, “Robert Lowth’s Sacred Hebrew Poetry and the Oral Dimension of Romantic Rhetoric,” in *Rhetorical Traditions and British Romantic Literature*, eds. Don H. Bialostosky and Lawrence D. Needham (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 200.

¹²⁰ *ibid.*, 208-9, 207, 205. David Buchan, *The Ballad and the Folk* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), 69, cited in Harshbarger, “Robert Lowth’s Sacred Hebrew Poetry and the Oral Dimension of Romantic Rhetoric,” 209; Edmund Wilson, *Axel’s Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870–1930* (New York: Charles Scribner’s, 1959), 2-6.

¹²¹ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, trans [?], Taylor and Francis e-Library ed. (London: Routledge Classics, 2005), accessed August 23, 2013, http://beautifuldata.metabolab.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Foucault_The-Order-of-Things.pdf, 102. All subsequent references to this edition.

discourse that later extended to aesthetics (chapter 3). The difference has not often been registered: for instance Rodgers contends the historical sense of America as *exceptional*, i.e., suprahistorical as a rationalist synthesis of Enlightenment and religion, was “not widely doubted.”¹²² However, for southern history, the curious northern combination of Locke with natural philosophy was problematic, because it rejected: a) the humanist notion of rhetoric, b) expressive communication and phenomenal experience, c) “non–utilitarian” linguistics and even d) the rhetoricity, or representational essence, of Universal History. Still, as early as the 1790s, New England sarcastically contrasted its learned and true syntax with the faulty southern one in literature.¹²³

Jefferson had few qualms about history as a secular enterprise of utility and social science. But religion was a non–issue to him.¹²⁴ In addition, Jefferson was *also* more sensitive about the importance of studying the classics in the original, as well as an ardent amateur linguist. An interest in Saxon culture was not in conflict with Tory English aristocracy in Virginia. But in Jefferson’s case, interest in Saxon increased the appeal of paganism in relation to Christianity.¹²⁵ Though Jefferson was a metaphysical optimist about progress into the 1820s as well, the important distinction is that for him, history was not *reducible* to Whig Federalist political science connected with nation–building according to the rationalist model. Thus, his relationship to Locke, Evangelicalism and modernization was one of tension.¹²⁶ The unambiguous and *natural* national unity of postwar America disseminated by Noah Webster—one of the major original champions of classicism and utility—and other federal–minded historians thus deliberately excluded anti–Federalist views: to the anti–Federalists, the Federalist connection of natural law, i.e.,

¹²² Daniel T. Rodgers, “Exceptionalism,” in *Molho and Wood, Imagined Histories*, 24.

¹²³ Greeson, *Our South*, 84–85.

¹²⁴ Wiesen, “*Ancient History and Early American Education*,” 63–64.

¹²⁵ Stanley R. Hauer, “Thomas Jefferson and the Anglo–Saxon Language,” *PMLA* 98 (1983): 879, *passim*. French postrevolutionary contemporaries saw Virginia as aristocratic in contrast to New England. Cobb, *Away Down South*, 11. Grayson claims a similar disposition was typical of South Carolina. Richard J. Calhoun, ed., *Witness to Sorrow: The Antebellum Autobiography of William J. Grayson* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1990), 90–91. For an example of a Saxon aristocrat in Virginia, see William Martin “A Biographical Sketch of General Joseph Martin,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 4 (1901): 349–50. Revolution general Martin lived in the same county as Jefferson. For Jefferson’s ambivalence about Christianity, see for example Patricia Lafayllve, “Thomas Jefferson, Anglo–Saxon Culture, and the Declaration of Independence,” accessed September 15, 2013, <http://www.thetroth.org/Lore/Thomas%20Jefferson%20Anglo-Saxon%20Culture%20and%20the%20Declaration%20of%20Independence.pdf>.

¹²⁶ Compare with Dekker, *American Historical Romance*, 81–82. For Locke’s importance for Federalists and its connection with political science see for example Richard D. Mosier, *Making the American Mind: Social and Moral Ideas in the McGuffey Readers* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1965), 2–3. Cf. Lewis P. Simpson, *The Fable of the Southern Writer* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994), 204. I think Simpson’s treatment of Jefferson suffers from being one–sided in this context.

Universal History, and God in history was not as obvious.¹²⁷ Since Jefferson retained the classicist–humanistic emphasis on language as words, and was more cautious about jumping from words to utilitarian ideas grounded in God, he tried to reconcile classical humanism, including Tory views, with more popular democracy very differently from future President Andrew Jackson (chapter 3).

Though they differed about politics and world–views, Patrick Henry, a powerful Virginian populist, lawyer, war hero and statesman, shared this difference. Henry became a Federalist in old age but in his youth he was deeply interested in history in the classicist mode as well.¹²⁸ To this, he combined a critical attitude towards reason as a guide in politics.¹²⁹ For a third powerful Virginian John Randolph, statesman and king’s former attorney–general, language and history were far different. Randolph was a classical rhetorician who refused to reduce rhetoric to dialectic. He criticized history’s reduction to reason and logic and opposed abstract dealings in public matters. Weaver remarks such intuition is the method of an artist and an aristocrat as a mixture of self–confidence and simplicity, while logic and dialectic belong to the scientist and democrat.¹³⁰ But aristocracy as too much abstract reasoning and corruption in politics was also a target of southern criticism that extended to history (chapter 6).

These cases indicate a significant–more ancient–departure from what was to them anomalous New England history. More democratic and emotion–driven–but not Rousseauan–anti–federalism and experience welcomed elements of humanism and even secular thinking. Murphy claims some anti–Federalists, distrustful of reason, opposed the statism and Gnosticism, i.e., excessive Platonism, manifest in the Constitution. Like the ancients and history before its change, they preferred practical experience¹³¹ of the non–discursive exemplar history. As I shall explore below, a critical stance regarding regulating, ordered power of the Federalist “machine” was inherent.

The protest was much obscured in French liberal theory (chapters 3, 5), key American historiography, and even organization of history within Virginia (2.2.4, chapter 3). To later liberals like Tocqueville, Federalism was intrinsic to the Revolution, and anti–Federalism dating from the critics of George Washington—who Wingfield mentions counted among their ranks several of the leading Virginia figures–unreasoning excess.¹³²

¹²⁷ *Van Tassel*, *Recording America’s Past*, 44–45, 51.

¹²⁸ *On Henry’s change*, see for example *Parrington*, *Main Currents in American Thought*, 2, 33. *On Henry and the classics*, see for example *William Wirt*, *The Life of Patrick Henry*, 4th rev. ed. (New York: McElrath & Bangs, 1831), 31.

¹²⁹ *Frederick M. Dolan*, *Allegories of America: Narratives, Metaphysics, Politics*, *Cornell Studies in Political Theory series* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 45.

¹³⁰ *Wirt*, *The Life of Patrick Henry*, 34; *Richard M. Weaver*, “Two Types of American Individualism,” in *The Southern Essays of Richard M. Weaver*, eds. *George M. Curtis, III and James J. Thompson* (Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 1987), 88–91.

¹³¹ *Murphy*, *Rebuke of History*, 231, 233.

¹³² *Alexis de Tocqueville*, *Democracy in America*, ed., trans., intr. *Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop* [Abridged ed.] (London: The Folio Society, 2002), 1, 67, 219–20, 220n17; *Marshall*

Since such “mechanist” federalism presupposed Lockean equality among enlightened citizens, I claim the conflict reached down to the body and its place in political theory as “a policy of coercions that act upon the body” made large analogous to Scotland above. It was categorically different from great many southerners who preferred—as in development of American art audiences to disciplined passivity intrinsic to a bourgeois *stratified*, instead of *general*, society—the *public as an active body*.¹³³ They contested, rather than simply embraced, the re-allocation of bodily activity to writing, ideas or religious fervor, in short, *the renovation of culture* modern history was a part of. The Constitution was about legitimating democracy¹³⁴ but this had ontic and political implications that excluded many southerners from such rigidified liberal federalism. In Kelley, the Constitution was born of the alliance between Virginia’s wealthiest crust and northern bourgeois visionaries in the framework of nationalism.¹³⁵ However, not all opponents, not even Jefferson who was ambivalent about the Constitution,¹³⁶ belonged to the other extreme of austere, anti-intellectual Princeton Presbyterianism later represented by Jackson. Unlike the critics of the Constitution, the Virginia Presbyterians of the early-19th century became complicit with Anglican bourgeois ideology, but gained little headway (2.2). Compared to New England, southerners were far more oblivious to regulating excess in everyday life by either rationalist or religious means: Dionysian traces survive in historiography and semiotics (2.2, 2.3, chapters 3, 5, 6). Tocqueville’s position did not include *all* America, or even Virginia: still, his exemption of the South is ignored in scholarship such as the famed study by Bellah et al.¹³⁷

Further, Scottish ambivalence about language and progress was lost much more in the northern United States than in its southern part, though even Jefferson apparently failed to see it.¹³⁸ In American popular education that did not exist in the pre-war South, the jump from “learning” of language by committing arbitrary pieces of syntax to memory to

Wingfield, A History of Caroline County, Virginia: From Its Formation in 1727 to 1924 (Baltimore: Regional Publishing, 2005 [1924]), 193-95.

¹³³ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1977), 137-38. Tocqueville admits the origins of the machinist government “had received greater development in the North than in the South” and that in the South, its central ingredient the township administration is absent. *De Tocqueville, Democracy in America*, 1, 37n13, 76. For art development, see Linda Williams, “Discipline and Distraction: Psycho, Visual Culture, and Postmodern Cinema,” in Rowe, “Culture” and the Problem of the Disciplines, 107-8. Kelley implies the Constitution put strains on excessive individual behavior, while Kammen contends balancing excess was a desirable goal for all the Founding Fathers. Robert Kelley, *The Cultural Pattern in American Politics: The First Century* (London: Random House, 1979), 92; Kammen, *People of Paradox*, 72.

¹³⁴ *ibid.*, 217.

¹³⁵ Kelley, *Cultural Pattern in American Politics*, 89.

¹³⁶ *ibid.*, 91; Paul Leicester Ford, *introduction to The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Volume I: 1760–1775*, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1892), xiv.

¹³⁷ Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart*, 38-40.

¹³⁸ *Jefferson was both a materialist and on friendly terms with the Scots. CO2, 1019.*

Christian morality and romantic sensationalism in the 1830s was dubious aesthetically and epistemologically. It was overwhelmingly New England–biased. So were the anti–European ideas about American nationalism in the books. Although no American history was taught separately until after the Civil War, geography alongside history and grammar cemented extrapolations about “minds” of entire nations and states within America. The American tradition should then choose what is worthy. The few southern educators had no choice but to adapt willy–nilly.¹³⁹ This tactic also confused Lockean epistemology with Enlightenment natural law philosophy no Scot thinker endorsed. The educators, perhaps spurred by Evangelicalism, overlooked what language *is*: the syntactic form of language was true because it was logical and related directly to facts in the mind. Rational speech–true, universal, and enlightening–covered real speech. The questions of semantics, rhetoric, or the relationship between language and reality did not appear.¹⁴⁰

Among the Yankees, the absolute truth of language co–existed with religion beside history in influential figures like Noah Webster. For Webster of Yale as late as 1839, language occupies an equal position with reason just like the Bible can be analyzed next to the classics. Since truth is the only object of the labors of literature and science, the task is to write true language. To illustrate this, he shows how the Word of the Bible, not shaky historical tradition, instructs even belated pagans such as Ovid.¹⁴¹ The Creator has created humans, thus not only must one be His servant, the Bible also has to be in plain, simple language: it contains all true knowledge of Him and His moral government, the duty of humans and means of happiness “political, social, and eternal.” He confesses the Bible, literally the foundation of life, becomes the cause for his whole endeavor as a linguist. The truth should be absolute to reason, a pure form. Mistaken terms and wrong and improper use of words have consequences for both religion and government which are identical.¹⁴² Webster refers to “Histories of the United States” with a big H but in plural form—a Derridean gem. As a pioneer of America’s history education, Webster translates his methodology straight to history by pointing out school histories are not free of popular opinion and report. His personal knowledge of the facts shows them to be misrepresentations.¹⁴³ There is no truck with Humean *misrepresenting* related to

¹³⁹ Ruth Muller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 2–9. Also Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 128.

¹⁴⁰ This characterization of language derives from Manfred Frank, “2. Limits of the Human Control of Language: Dialogue as the Place of Difference between Neostructuralism and Hermeneutics,” trans. Richard Palmer, in *Dialogue and Deconstruction: The Gadamer–Derrida Encounter*, eds. Diane P. Michelfelder and Richard E. Palmer, *SUNY Series in Contemporary Continental Philosophy* (Albany: SUNY, 1989), 152.

¹⁴¹ Noah Webster, *Observations on Language, and on the Errors of Class–Books; Addressed to the Members of the New York Lyceum* (New Haven: Babcock, 1839), 3, 7–8.

¹⁴² *ibid.*, 12–13, citation on *ibid.*, 12. See also Gura, *Wisdom of Words*, 15–16.

¹⁴³ Peter Marshall and Ian Walker, “The First New Nation,” in *Introduction to American Studies*, eds. Malcolm Bradbury and Howard Temperley (London: Longman, 1981), 53; Webster, *Observations on Language*, 32.

accessibility of knowledge. By this time, Federalist domination began in popular schoolbooks.¹⁴⁴ In sum, New England propelled itself into another revelation as transcendence over history from post–Revolution history, identifying its old status as “redeeming community of God with the rise of the Union as a redemptive nation.”¹⁴⁵ By contrast, Jefferson and his followers neither conflated Locke with universalism or divination linguistically, nor conceived of citizenship as, in De Hart’s phrase, Lockean individual mind as self–directed earning, instead of republican virtuous citizenry.¹⁴⁶ Why?

In the South, the family still counted for more than contractarian individual autonomy embraced by Locke in education, though Priest reminds this did not extend to property rights.¹⁴⁷ Even the democratic Jefferson, though opposing primogeniture, held fast to feudal–derived English *inheritance law* where landed estates stayed and were ideally nurtured within the same family for generations. In England’s case, this bore into political influence, because land became the intransigent guarantor of family status, impervious to capitalist buying and selling.¹⁴⁸ This is critical, because Jefferson’s position was overshadowed by mainstream postwar state legislature and what Priest names *commercial republicanism*, that is, “the importance of the expansion of commerce to the creation of an American meritocracy.” Already supported by the powerful Noah Webster and later by his cousin Daniel, it would guarantee an antiaristocratic society, a vision strengthened by erasure of entailed property and primogeniture by 1800. This has been interpreted as an anti–English measure, overlooking that its instigators had been the English.¹⁴⁹ Relevant

¹⁴⁴ *The earliest examples in Mosier are from the late–1830s. Mosier, Making the American Mind, ch. 1.*

¹⁴⁵ *Simpson, Man of Letters in New England and the South, 204.*

¹⁴⁶ *For this inter–relationship generally, see Gura, “The Transcendentalists and Language: The Unitarian Exegetical Background,” repr. in idem., Crossroads of American History and Literature, 162, 165; Jane Sherron De Hart, “Welfare as Identity Politics: Rediscovering Nationalism, Re–viewing the American National Experience, and Recasting the ‘Other’ in the Post–Cold War United States,” in Roots and Renewal: Writings by Bicentennial Fulbright Professors, eds. Mark Shackleton and Maarika Toivonen, Renvall Institute of Area and Cultural Studies series (Helsinki: Hakapaino, 2001), 39.*

¹⁴⁷ *Claire Priest, “Creating an American Property Law: Alienability and Its Limits in American History,” Harvard Law Review 120 (2006): 401n39.*

¹⁴⁸ *ibid.*, 400–1.

¹⁴⁹ *ibid.*, 440–41, 446, 394–95, citation on 440. *Kelley’s view of southerners as in the main anti–English and, especially, that land inheritance was anathema to all post–Revolution politicians, seems too bold in regard to Jefferson. Further, English culture was not as securely antislavery according to a leading southern reception (chapter 5) as he implies. Kelley’s “antiauthoritarian mode” with corresponding changes towards a (bourgeois) haphazard society was not rejected, but neither was it so enthusiastically embraced in the South. Kelley also asserts most colonists were post–Lockean Whigs. However, there were several southerners, among them Jefferson, who also welcomed the Tories at least in relation to historiography and education. In his liberal–republican interpretation, Kelley apparently relies on the impact the First Great Awakening had on Americans. Kelley, Cultural Pattern in American Politics, 25, 82, 32–33, 36–37, 40. The same event is argued by Kammen as*

for me are two themes: 1. the implicit liberal bias against Jefferson reinforced by Tocqueville that conflates *all* land inheritance with aristocratic antiburgeois laziness and, following him, makes the resulting *frontier mobility of land* the central tenet of America that has lasted into Turner and beyond. It flatly ignores Jefferson's sort of natural aristocracy founded on a relationship to land and nature that differs from the new space of modern history, because it was fundamentally protective, not wantonly exploitative—the northern credo. I glimpsed humility before nature among some southerners (chapter 6).¹⁵⁰ 2. Therefore, I claim the patriarchic family arrangements held more in the South, but increasingly conflicted with the times. This contributed to the modernist pangs of disarray about modern history as well that was dependent on the new individual freedom. Jefferson's interest in history thus was almost *anything but* rational: neither anti-humanist nor rationalist, as in New England.¹⁵¹ Opposition to the abolishment of primogeniture was widespread in Charleston as well.¹⁵² In that location, this extended to a difference about history between bourgeois and more aristocratic orders of society (chapter 3).

Ironically, since those who shaped American identity in history and education were almost exclusively from the North, the application of Newtonian natural law into moral law survived into the early decades of the 19th century, and Evangelicalism fit this model perfectly.¹⁵³ A sympathetic Tocqueville felt such a trait for universal reason and human perfection is a necessary counterpart to individual independence of and pride in the willing self, a union crystallized in the ratification of the Constitution. Like a lack of pride among

having destroyed coherent Christianity from America. Kammen, People of Paradox, 65. But contemporary scholarship suggests Virginia, for one, was affected less by it. For instance Hawks reports in Virginia, dissenters were seen as troublesome. They did not exist in the Tidewater and they were politically opposed by such figures as Peyton Randolph. Only meddling by the populist–evangelical Princeton Yankees led by Davies strengthened their position slightly from almost nil, and even then only towards the end of the period. Hawks, Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America, 1, 101-11. My point is, Christianity predating modern history still existed in the South.

¹⁵⁰ Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 1, 335, 268-74; Herbert M. Sloan, *Principle and Interest: Thomas Jefferson and the Problem of Debt* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 60-62. Again Bellah et al. follow Tocqueville on the issue. Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart*, 57.

¹⁵¹ *I also met derisive southern talk of march of mind that often meant criticism of utilitarian pursuits. For one of the most blatant examples, see the character of General A. B. C. in Edgar A. Poe, "The Man That Was Used Up," Burton's Gentleman's Magazine 5 (1839): 66-70, accessed September 20, 2013, <http://www.eapoe.org/works/tales/mnusda.htm> (accessed 20.9.2013).*

¹⁵² Maurie Dee McInnis, *The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 149.

¹⁵³ George M. Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 231-32.

the non-whites, a lack of rational and universalistic self-determination went astray from “a democratic freedom” into self-destruction.¹⁵⁴

I will subsequently call this suprahistorical synthesis of Enlightenment received as antifigurative, Evangelicalism, political science and rational history *the strong version of Austere Enlightenment* (SAE). The critique of northern resolution of systemic science of history into a-historical social-historical stereotypes within the metaphysical framework of progress—a move the Scot stadialist progress theory never granted—is applicable to Native Americans, because they were thereby seen inferior.¹⁵⁵ But it is also applicable to southerners: many were less ignorant about progress as a problem, experience and representation Scots and the European tradition in general knew about, others continued to simply ignore the question, and still others adhered to a continuous classical identity: it is violent to reduce these strands to the North.

2.2 History and language in Virginia, 1800–1817

In this section, my attempt is to review discussion about language and history in Virginia. As in Scotland, there was a discrepancy and conflict between the hyperordered Presbyterian Evangelical linguistics that endorsed SAE and two more entrenched forces: a) “improper” communality and figuration as hint and b) ancient rhetoric and humanist semiotics that was in touch with classical republicanism. There was less conflict between a) and b) than between both and SAE. In other words, SAE as a combination of straitjacket religion, bourgeois culture and stern semiotics was a relatively minor phenomenon in Virginia at the period, if powerful for its size. This ontological aporia—either ignorance of history or history as continuous identity, vs. SAE—remained unsolved and was reflected in the peculiar dynamic of southern cultural discourse.

It is also evident in early southern historical biography that, in contrast to SAE, contains traces of a refusal to reduce the object under study neither to science—compulsory on a nationalist federal level by the 1800s—nor to unveiled and true presence. This exhibited a modernist, self-conscious and rhetorical awareness about such an operation that is comparable to Derrida’s semiotic investigations. The section finally looks at biography of Henry by Federalist Marylander William Wirt—influential statesman, lawyer, widely-read commentator and Presbyterian—as an instance of this difference. Importantly, Maryland was different from the South in Jefferson’s eyes, more in league with the northern states.¹⁵⁶ Though Wirt was a Presbyterian and later a Whig, he did not fully subscribe to SAE. The difference was his preference for rhetoric and awareness of Blair’s symbolism that caused him conflict in history. I will call this approach *the weak version of*

¹⁵⁴ Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop, *introduction to Democracy in America, by Alexis de Tocqueville*, lxxviii. *Tocqueville maintains New England style union between education, religion and Enlightenment was critical to freedom in America. ibid., 1, 41-42.*

¹⁵⁵ Dekker, *American Historical Romance*, 79-80.

¹⁵⁶ Greeson, *Our South*, 50.

Austere Enlightenment (WAE). My claim is, in the period under study, very few Virginian scholars advanced beyond Blair into “full” *Romanticism*¹⁵⁷ as history and literature.

2.2.1 Early Virginian representatives of SAE

Presbyterian Evangelicalism in Virginia was spread further by Alexander, president of Hampden–Sidney College from 1794 to 1806.¹⁵⁸ Alexander was to play an important role a few years later in exploiting the Richmond theater fire of 1811 for the Presbyterian cause.¹⁵⁹ Another prominent figure in Virginian cultural discourse of the 1810s, almost forgotten today, was Conrad Speece. Speece was a Presbyterian minister from 1801 and functioned as a missionary of sorts, becoming a pastor in 1813. He served pretty much the whole state for more than twenty years.¹⁶⁰ For the Federalist *Republican Farmer*, a weekly published in Staunton, Speece published pieces of social commentary between 1813 and 1816, later gathered together into a book called *The Mountaineer* that was going through its third edition only less than a decade later.¹⁶¹

Marsden notes Presbyterianism was one branch of Evangelicalism reacting against the amorality of the French Revolution. The Genoveses state the anti–Federalists had neither rejected nor fully agreed with it. However, Marsden claims Presbyterians saw Jefferson as the Antichrist ahead of general infidelity and immorality rampant in society. Accordingly, with the ultra–Calvinist Yale as the nexus, 800,000 New Englanders spread across northern states such as New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan between 1790 and 1820. With ministers forming societies and centers of opinion, their mission became national out of which emerged not only a conception of American bourgeois culture but also a more developed philosophy of history for the nation (2.3). Instead of the internally conflict–free and gradual approval the Genoveses imply, I claim at least Virginia and South Carolina were discontent with Evangelicalism since, as we saw, it intimately

¹⁵⁷ *By this large term, I shall mean especially the German development of the Rousseauan notion of man as a philosophically split being from nature. History and art could plaster this split—though by the time of Schiller in the 1790s, they did so in categorically different ways—but no longer restore the primordial oneness.*

¹⁵⁸ Robert Benedetto, *Historical Dictionary of the Reformed Churches*, 2nd ed. (Blue Ridge Summit: Rowman & Littlefield, 2010), 6–7.

¹⁵⁹ *That religion spread as a result of the fire is asserted in Alfred J. Morrison, “The Virginia Literary and Evangelical Magazine, Richmond, 1818–1828,” The William and Mary Quarterly 19 (1911): 267. See the rhetoric in Archibald Alexander, A Discourse, Occasioned by the Burning of the Theatre in the City of Richmond, Virginia, on the Twenty–Sixth of December, 1811 (Philadelphia: John Welwood Scott, 1812). For the phenomenon more generally, see Meredith Henne Baker, The Richmond Theater Fire: Early America's First Great Disaster (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012).*

¹⁶⁰ “Stroud Booksellers,” accessed August 14, 2013, http://www.stroudbooks.com/?page=shop/flypage&product_id=1580.

¹⁶¹ Conrad Speece, *The Mountaineer*, 3rd ed. (Staunton: Isaac Collett, 1823).

connected with SAE. Marsden argues the Presbyterians were strong in the Middle Atlantic and the South.¹⁶² I intend to examine this relationship more critically. An existential conflict between this religious zealotry and southern ways is implied in that unlike the mainstream, Speece was not enthusiastic or fanatical about his preaching in practice.¹⁶³

Interestingly, the rhetorical form both Speece and the editor of his book emulated was the *Spectator*, a famous newspaper published in London a century earlier and synecdoche of enlightened bourgeois culture.¹⁶⁴ Speece not only explicitly recommends the *Spectator*, he also uses similar tropes and strategies of figuration in his pieces. *The Mountaineer* was compiled into a book from newspaper articles like many *epistolary novels* at the time. Wirt had praised the magazine in his *The Letters of the British Spy*—the first general commentary on Virginia society that originally appeared in 1803—to be now praised in turn by Speece. For Wirt in this work, “the love of genuine and exalted religion” had been “a far more important quality” than oratory.¹⁶⁵ But as I will explain (2.2.4.1), Wirt would later realize the difficulty of history without rhetoric. This adaptation of bourgeois forms was extended to local southern history of Virginia in the 1830s, telling of the power bourgeois culture began to enjoy (chapter 5). However, tensions exhibited by Wirt continued.

Speece operated along very similar lines to SAE: in a piece from 1814, he connects reason with reading, utility and religion. The Bible makes “the weakest sincere inquirer wise to salvation” while providing instruction for life and governance. Utilizing Enlightenment rhetoric, an extensive investigation leading to proper acquaintance “with our nature, and the modes in which our passions operate” is recommended.¹⁶⁶ A right selection of reading material, instead of reading nothing or politicking emotionally in newspapers, combine with diligent study of history for politically useful ends, second only to “devotion and the interchange of kind affections.”¹⁶⁷ The old have a disease that sees books as boring, but if reading is begun young, one acquires a taste to them better. But books of the 18th century, including religious, are dull in content and disgusting in form, “and after a little inspection, you wonder how such a book could possibly be read, even three ages ago.” Old poetry is deceptive pseudo-poetry to the eye. “A scrap” named a history turns out to be a mere chronicle, “as dry and empty as the shells of birds’ eggs

¹⁶² Marsden, *Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience*, 9-10; Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 12-16. Also O’Brien seems content to leave the question of origin intact, speaking of a homogeneous “American mind.” CO2, 1000.

¹⁶³ “Stroud Booksellers,” accessed August 14, 2013, http://www.stroudbooks.com/?page=shop/flypage&product_id=1580.

¹⁶⁴ *ibid.* On this, see Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (MIT: Polity, 2006), especially ch. 2.

¹⁶⁵ Speece, “On Reading with Attention,” repr. in *Mountaineer*, 49; Wirt, *The Letters of the British Spy*, 10th rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1832), 240-43, citation on 202, 203.

¹⁶⁶ Speece, “On a Taste for Reading,” repr. in *Mountaineer*, 44.

¹⁶⁷ *ibid.*, 45.

strung upon a thread, but without any of their prettiness.”¹⁶⁸ Although some may consider it too strict, “extended knowledge” and “just application” of spoken language is imperative in society. Clear and distinct speaking or reading is a pleasure. Its opposite is caused most often by habitual laziness and negligence—southern cardinal sins for many contemporary observers. Too much emotion in speech is impolite, and a deviation from any standard, even if unknown, is disgusting unless done for a good reason. In deviating from the standard, the hearer receives a less than full knowledge of the communication, sometimes causing “troublesome misunderstandings and mispresentations” in public life. Knowledge and usefulness are compromised in any man “if he speak not clearly and gracefully the current language of his country.”¹⁶⁹

The tactics of Speece that pertain to governance tell of a change, because Virginia Presbyterians had in the 1780s emphasized the separation of their faith from national politics, and neither they nor the general populace of Virginia had supported even salaries for teachers of Christianity, though even Henry had supported the provision.¹⁷⁰ Thus, the people of Virginia by and large were perhaps content with the Jeffersonian outlook. Variations survived remarkably long (chapter 6).

This pattern of argument about language was continued by the Presbyterian leaders of Virginia to the late-1810s to the rise of bourgeois romantics up North. But now the format, already middle class, transformed into a journal. Edited by John Holt Rice, another Presbyterian pastor and a lifelong friend to Speece who was a contributor, the *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* circulated between years 1818–1828.¹⁷¹ Rice was also friends with Presbyterian Jonathan P. Cushing, president of Hampden–Sidney and the future 2nd vice–president of Virginia Historical and Philosophical Society established in 1831 (chapter 3).¹⁷² Rice had taught at the place.¹⁷³ He had moved to Virginia in 1812, but between 1812 and 1823 managed to get only 265 members to his church, indicative of the wary reception of the Presbyterians among the general populace.¹⁷⁴

The paper was “to be consecrated principally to the interests of religion, without however neglecting those of sound and good learning.”¹⁷⁵ In the first issue, views about language have at first glance slightly evolved. The SAE objection about focusing on

¹⁶⁸ *ibid.*, 45-46, citations on 45, 46.

¹⁶⁹ *ibid.*, 52-53, citations on 52, 53.

¹⁷⁰ Thomas Cary Johnson, *Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty in Colonial and Revolutionary Times* (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1907), 99-116.

¹⁷¹ Wells, introduction, xvi-xvii; Morrison, “Virginia Literary and Evangelical Magazine,” 268.

¹⁷² George W. Dame, “Sketch of the Life and Character of Jonathan P. Cushing, M.A.,” *American Quarterly Register* 11 (1838): 115-16.

¹⁷³ “Guide to the Rice Family Papers,” accessed August 10, 2012, http://www.history.pcusa.org/collections/findingaids/fa.cfm?record_id=327.

¹⁷⁴ For example, he complains the young are “greatly exposed” to “many evils” in Richmond. John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers, July 25, 1817, in “Letters of John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers, 1817–1819,” ed. Margaret DesChamps Moore, *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (1959): 308, 308n4, 309.

¹⁷⁵ *ibid.*, 311.

language was still repeated: it takes attention “from things to words; from real important knowledge to things insignificant in themselves, [sic] and valuable only as a means for the attainment of an end.” But, although such studies may cloud the truth in some cases, this need not always be the case. The ideas of the author and the reader may connect simultaneously in reading. A tracing of words and their varieties may offer “insight into the principles” of everyday speech. The language of literature is from ancient times and multinational with multiple origins, and if one is unaware of the aesthetic and argumentative allusions, many passages of modern writers are lost to “our pleasure and our profit” in written word and polite conversation. Translations are no good.¹⁷⁶

Thus, instead of “crass” utilitarianism for its own sake and disdain of language, there is a semiotic *tracing* that is internal to language and correspondent with the classical episteme, that is, an internal taxonomy of discourse as general grammar that disappeared by late-1700s. What lacked was awareness of the paradigmatic connection between language and society¹⁷⁷ and as in the Yankees, ignorance of rhetoric—the double split within representing inherent in the grammar and Universal History—for utility and religion. Further, the article was written in Edinburgh, Scotland, not Virginia. It was procured perhaps at the request of Rice and its tone, praising oratory and poetry, genres Rice disliked, seems more moderate than his request.¹⁷⁸ Speece concurs spare time “should be marked with something worthy of rational and immortal beings” and one indication “is a sacred regard to truth.”¹⁷⁹

In relating matters of fact, many seem to think it allowable to embellish the story, more or less, by the addition of fictitious circumstances. These may illustrate the narrator’s inventive powers, and please the hearer for a moment, by adding an air of the marvellous to common events. But they soon diminish that confidence which we should aim to enjoy; and moreover involve the guilt of sporting with truth and falsehood. You may, for our amusement, play with your own veracity, until you seriously impair it, and render us unable to place reliance upon your simplest assertions.

¹⁷⁶ Strila, “On the Utility of Studying Ancient and Foreign Languages,” repr. in *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine 1 (1818): 38-41, citations on 39, 40.*

¹⁷⁷ See for example Foucault, *Order of Things, 100-2. Condillac had advanced this thesis but he also succumbed to the paradox between science and history while maintaining an optimistic theory of language. Labio, Origins of the Enlightenment, 96-100.*

¹⁷⁸ Rice asked for “new publications of any description, that have a strong tendency to call forth zealous exertions to promote the cause of vital piety; to explain and defend the true doctrine of the gospel; to overthrow infidelity; or destroy the creeping pestilence of Socinianism.” Rice to Chalmers, “Letters of John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers,” 312. On Rice and poetry, see Morrison, “The Virginia Literary and Evangelical Magazine,” 268.

¹⁷⁹ Melancthon [Speece], “On Conversation,” *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine 1 (1818a): 289. Compare with Hugh Blair, Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (New York: James Conner, 1832), 268-69. Blair makes a clear distinction between formal science and history, giving history the role of warm moral guidance to virtue. This awareness seems lacking in Speece. Blair also sees Gibbon’s irreligious history of Rome, a southern favourite, dangerous. ibid., 269.*

This fairly absolute austerity had apparently spilled to history earlier in the year: historical novels such as Sir Walter Scott's *Rob Roy* were like mixing oil and water, possibly "calculated to do serious mischief" and without utilitarian value.¹⁸⁰ SAE was very austere about language and about history. However, we need to be wary of saying it stood for the whole.

2.2.2 Heterologies to SAE: Communal

Semiotically, theory of language of most southerners at this early period differed from SAE. It was neither representationalist, enlightened, nor scientific. It was not rational, philosophical, nor even necessarily Christian. Rather, it was factual and experiential, situation-specific. Its truths were concrete and varied, not general or generalisable. They were anterior to philosophical discourse in that they combined immediacy, communality and rhetoricity.¹⁸¹

I think Heidegger's semiotics may illuminate the issue. Heidegger has been fully unknown in prewar southern analyses to my knowledge even though Heidegger was also a critic of rationalism, science and representation, emphasized language and ontology, admired the ancients and criticized urbanization and modernization. Further, his usefulness consists of the fact that he has tapped into what alterity from modern philosophy might entail for experience and thinking. What Heidegger calls a "hint" (*Wink*) functions differently from "sign" (*Zeich*). A hint does not *define* the object of expression unlike a sign based on previous agreement. Transformation from pointing to signifying meant a transformation in what was thought of as true. That signifying can be true is based on *representationalism*, i.e., on either a) correspondence between the sign and the real thing, b) its true definition as a sign, or c) its tautological form. The truth opened by a hint, in contrast, escapes all systematicity or modelling of reality. For Heidegger, signs are means because they indicate something. They are combined together to form wholes. But, signs should not only be looked at instrumentally, because they are not real in a sense of real life thing-hood. Hints are the first signs and discovered by poets.¹⁸² Regarding the problem of knowledge, a metaphor of Nietzsche's used by Heidegger is "The desert grows!" It connects to Heidegger's critique of representationalism and individual "self-founded reason" (*selbsterfundene Vernunft*) that, in a democratic spirit, erases qualitative differences between all phenomena through analytic will. Instead, phenomena should be seen as something elusive of capture and full knowledge, respectful of their difference.

¹⁸⁰ Rice, "Domestic Intelligence," Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine 1 (1818): 96. Speece, however, had earlier recommended Scott for those who were not "too old to acquire a perception of a high poetic excellence in a new style." Speece, "On Reading with Attention," 49.

¹⁸¹ Compare with Murphy, Rebuke of History, 233.

¹⁸² Jani Vanhala, "Martin Heidegger länsimaisen metafysiikan rajalla teoksessa 'Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache,'" (MA thesis, University of Jyväskylä, 2008), 30-31.

What Heidegger calls “care” or “worry” (*Sorge*) is a metonymical approach to something that is on-hand (*Zuhandenheit*), not as an individual to be known, but as a part necessarily connected to the whole and opening up to it. In contrast, approaching something as present-at-hand (*Vorhandenheit*) is based on knowledge for its own sake, independent of the whole. The thought process of knowledge means the disappearance of metonymy and qualitative difference, i.e., the increase of the desert. Abstraction and causality make phenomena disappear. Even concepts are only substitutes for reality.¹⁸³ In this way, also Heidegger connects with the ironic “anthropological turn” Blair announced that is sympathetic to pre-science world views: I shall return to Heidegger later for philosophical similarities between him and southerners (chapters 4, 6).

Comparing northern Ohio and southern Kentucky, de Tocqueville lists society, work ethic, industry and especially exploitative pursuit of wealth belonging to the former, nature, leisure, agitation and pleasure, hunting, combat and war to the latter. Plausibly, the latter characteristics were even more pronounced in Virginia and South Carolina. A less exploitative approach to nature, a vestige of premodern semiotics and family dynamic and separate from modern history, existed in the South. Tragically, the bourgeois formalization and accompanying atomization of the subject, accentuated by modern history and applied to America by key European theorists, rendered such residues irrelevant. This southern difference to and conflict with bourgeois, polite, refined and urban culture has been explored, but the transition as conflict and crisis in the 19th century remains uncovered.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ *ibid.*, 16-19.

¹⁸⁴ *de Tocqueville*, *Democracy in America*, 1, 331-35, 337, 361. *Though acknowledging it as having existed in the South in the past, de Tocqueville held this tradition in contempt and even anti-American. ibid.*, 1, 335, 2, 430-31. *For the phenomenon more generally in culture, see Peter Stallybrass and Allon White*, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), and in *America in general as anthropological economic history, Charles Sellers*, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 9-14. *For a philosophical account of this problem related to the U.S., see David Lloyd*, “Foundations of Diversity: Thinking the University in a Time of Multiculturalism,” in Rowe, “Culture” and the Problem of the Disciplines, 28. *For Virginia folkways in the late-18th century, see Rhys Isaac*, “Evangelical Revolt: The Nature of the Baptists’ Challenge to the Traditional Order in Virginia, 1765 to 1775,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1974): 345-68. *For a pioneering study about the prewar South, see Grady McWhiney*, *Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South* (London: University of Alabama Press, 1988). Also James D. Bratt, “[Review:] *Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South*,” *Pittsburgh History* 73 (1990): 185-86. *The change, developed further by David Potter from Davidson, was recently summed up by McPherson as follows: “This gemeinschaft society, with its emphasis on tradition, rural life, close kinship ties, a hierarchical social structure, ascribed status, patterns of deference, and masculine codes of honor and chivalry, persisted in the South long after the North began moving toward a gesellschaft society with its impersonal, bureaucratic meritocratic, urbanizing, commercial, industrializing, mobile, and rootless characteristics. Above all, the South’s folk culture valued tradition and stability and felt threatened by change; the North’s modernizing culture enshrined change as progress and condemned the South as backward.” James M. McPherson*, “Antebellum Southern Exceptionalism: A New Look at an Old

Since my focus is on language, I can only postulate a “communal South” that was “dirty” in comparison to bourgeois polished refinery and that had a semiotically divergent relation to SAE in terms of ontology and discursivity, which would affect historical experience.

2.2.3 Heterologies to SAE: Classicism

The lingering classical world was not unrelated to politics and religion. In this study, I can only point out some of their implications for history and historiography.¹⁸⁵ My general interest is especially in its relationship to SAE and German *romantic liberalism* that were made compatible by northerners. In Germany, romantic liberalism as social change was revolutionary. Among central changes were mass movements towards more political and social equality, the process of industrialization, and the emergence of nationalism.¹⁸⁶

*Question,” Civil War History 50 (2004), accessed August 12, 2011, <http://www.southernhistory.net/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=9408>. In the context of Virginia, see for antebellum historical view Robert R. Howison, A History of Virginia, Volume II (Richmond: Drinker and Morris, 1848), 464. Howison claims Virginians have never been readers or interested in education or refined letters as a whole. For similar contemporary observations, see for example W. J. G. [Grayson], “The Character of the Gentleman,” Southern Quarterly Review 8 (1853): 75-79; *idem.*, Witness to Sorrow, 59-63. From the viewpoint of religion, see Wyatt-Brown, “Religion and the ‘Civilizing Process’ in the Early American South, 1680–1860,” in Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s, ed. Mark A. Noll (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990): 172-95. However, I would dispute Wyatt-Brown’s postulate “[t]he Southern mind has always been divided between pride and piety.” *ibid.*, 172. Bradford suffers from a similar shortcoming in my view by grounding prewar southern “clanish” existence in faith. Murphy, The Rebuke of History, 232. Such constructs are not eternal and tend to simplify issues.*

Mostly psychological studies on prewar southern culture have been conducted. See for example Wyatt-Brown, Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982); Robert Nisbett and Dov Cohen, Culture Of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South, New Directions in Social Psychology series (Boulder: Westview, 1996). Such a bourgeois psychological approach is, however, problematic in my view because of a general lack of self-criticism in such studies. For example, the application of concepts may be violent, e.g., “mind” as a universal, and questions of discourse and semiotics are usually ignored. For a brilliant study that exposes this problematic, see de Certeau, The Mystic Fable, Volume One: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, trans. Michael B. Smith, Religion and Postmodernism series (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 6-9.

¹⁸⁵ *For an in-depth view, see for example Fox-Genovese and Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class, ch. 8.*

¹⁸⁶ *Jörn Rüsen, “Jacob Burckhardt: Political Standpoint and Historical Insight on the Border of Post-Modernism,” History and Theory 24 (1985): 235.*

Translated to America, such reforms were grounded in an interpretation of the Declaration of Independence, Enlightenment reason and religious ideals.¹⁸⁷

Philosophically, the keyword is *ideals*. Ideals made German Idealism particularly attractive as a metaphysical truth about history (chapter 3). According to SAE, religion was both the purpose and the end of history in America. Mintz claims religious fervor pervaded the reformers and influenced a new ideal social order that was grounded in morality. This order was composed of *a missionary impulse*, i.e., the submitting of leisure time to Protestant morals, *a humanitarian impulse*, i.e., erecting of institutions for nurturing middle class behavioral and character traits to attain the right kind of character, and *a liberationist impulse*, i.e., freeing individuals from corrupt customs and coercive institutions. Interestingly, in Mintz's characterization, these "impulses" have seen only superficial criticism: before the 1960s next to none beyond them, and even afterwards little. When criticism has been made in history, it has been made mainly as social history, i.e., histories of groups and institutions.¹⁸⁸ However, I contend a deeper and more amorphous criticism is more valuable when trying to meet southerners, especially Virginians, in history, because they existed in tension, including intellectual tension, to all these forces. I would argue all these reform premises are distant from southern commentators' views on history and, as a corollary, society and politics.

Perhaps partly because of a relative lack of concept history, powerful belief in history as a science and the utilitarian and moralising imperatives, more genealogical approaches to such concepts as *liberty* and *liberalism* have until recently been fairly scarce. The former term would be more relevant for me, since it can go beyond ideology that is itself a construct and tends to streamline all literary output into politics.¹⁸⁹ For example Louis Hartz famously claimed in the 1950s that in America there was a single core idea of liberalism that, resembling reason's dialectic, needed the perceived anti-liberalism of slavery as a merely erroneous antithesis, as fodder, to run its course of progress.¹⁹⁰ Pretty much the whole progressive tradition of American history has agreed.¹⁹¹ That early American political thinking could be classically republican instead was first promoted by explicitly materialistic, conflict-seeking social historians.¹⁹² According to one influential adherent of dialectics, Gordon Wood, liberalism conquered republicanism in the 1780s in the Constitution to establish a recognizable modernity. Modifications to this view by

¹⁸⁷ Steven Mintz, *introduction to Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers*, by Steven Mintz, *The American Moment series* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), xiii.

¹⁸⁸ *ibid.*, xviii, xvi.

¹⁸⁹ For review of this literature concerning liberalism in America from recent decades, see for example Leonard Williams, *American Liberalism and Ideological Change* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997), 9-13.

¹⁹⁰ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 9.

¹⁹¹ Noble, *Death of a Nation*, ch. 1; Ross, "New and Newer Histories," 87-88.

¹⁹² Rodgers, "Republicanism: The Career of a Concept," *The Journal of American History* 79 (1992): 12.

Wood himself among others survived into the 1990s and were widely accepted.¹⁹³ A countercurrent to this interpretation about republicanism in America was that of J. G. A. Pocock that reflected problems with and pessimism as well as anxiety about historical time and continuity, a republicanism whose origins lay in Renaissance Italy and highlighted *civic virtue* instead of *public good* or utilitarianism. Some among Pocock's camp maintained these problems survived to the Jackson era.¹⁹⁴ However, in the 1980s, when Pocock's interpretation had incorporated Geertz's structuralism, those insisting on the continuity of liberalism joined forces with materialists and utilitarian thinkers about history, thereby also driving language away as a problem in history.¹⁹⁵ Ultimately, the dialectic of liberalism was re-embraced around the 1990s.¹⁹⁶ Most often republicanism was used "in opposition to liberalism" which was not Pocock's argument.¹⁹⁷ Beyond the early-1990s, conceptual discussion on republicanism seems to taper out in American history, but more recently, the dialectic dynamic has finally been questioned on a general level. In other words, thinking was "neither fully classical nor fully liberal," consisting of complex idea webs or languages.¹⁹⁸

Pace a desire for "neat" explanation models, it is no argument to state that because liberalism was so pervasive, cohesive and dominant, an absence of an antithetical force of similar composition and popularity is a sufficient reason to adhere to liberalism.¹⁹⁹ This would be to miss the whole point of dialectic's deconstruction that argues precisely the reverse—though holding onto the relevance of the obverse: the demand for an antithesis is, in itself, a major philosophical, semiotic, epistemological and ethical problem in history. On scale of historical narrative, a similar error would be to treat language as a series of true-false statements reason could detect. This way of looking at history is deficient. Hence, I shall focus on liberty. Republican considerations have been applied to the South, but largely within a liberal framework of dialectic that is grounded in materialist forces, ignoring narrative, language, metaphysics, thinking or similar concerns.²⁰⁰ As Oakes

¹⁹³ *ibid.*, 19; Jürgen Heideking and James Henretta, "Introduction," in *Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750–1850*, Heideking and Henretta, eds., *Publications of the German Historical Institute series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 5.

¹⁹⁴ Rodgers, "Republicanism," 19-20. For a characterisation of these positions, see for example Robert L. Shalhope, "Republicanism, Liberalism, and Democracy: Political Culture in the Early Republic," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 102 (1992), 100.

¹⁹⁵ Rodgers, "Republicanism," 23.

¹⁹⁶ *ibid.*, 24.

¹⁹⁷ *ibid.*, 33, 34, 35-36, citation on 33.

¹⁹⁸ Heideking and Henretta, "Introduction," 4.

¹⁹⁹ Williams, *American Liberalism*, 11-12. *The desire for science-like models is so pervasive that even metahistorical investigations have fallen into such presenting. See for example Wise, American Historical Explanations*, xi.

²⁰⁰ Rodgers, "Republicanism," 31. For a review of this literature, see Shalhope, "Republicanism, Liberalism, and Democracy," 99n1.

complains, antebellum South “has been obscured” in the debate.²⁰¹ Only relatively recently have there been more sustained accounts on the hold classical writers and theorists had on southerners.²⁰² To illustrate the power of older patterns of discourse about liberty, it is necessary to also touch briefly on the composition and function of southern discourse.

In the early–18th century, utilitarianism became the force that spelled the end for classical theories of liberty with arrival of urban, polite, refined bourgeois culture.²⁰³ A hundred years later improvement, urbanity, utility and increasing heterogeneity through democracy played a leading role in northern moneyed and powerful centers of learning as well.²⁰⁴ However, although southern cities likewise grew rapidly and the region had its own bourgeoisie, southern states had next to none utilitarian thinkers.²⁰⁵ I thus propose to rethink Pocock’s position and examine Isaiah Berlin’s reading of Niccolo Machiavelli’s republican thought, and then compare it to the southerners’ take on classical historiography.²⁰⁶

²⁰¹ James Oakes, “From Republicanism to Liberalism: Ideological Change and the Crisis of the Old South,” *American Quarterly* 37 (1985), *Republicanism in the History and Historiography*, 552. However, Oakes also uses materialist reduction in his analysis of the phenomenon. *ibid.*, 553, 569.

²⁰² The most thorough seems to be Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*. But see also M. E. Bradford, *A Better Guide Than Reason: Federalists and Anti–Federalists*, *The Library of Conservative Thought series* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1994) and for more general treatment, CO1 and CO2.

²⁰³ Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 96–97.

²⁰⁴ Thomas Bender, “The Erosion of Public Culture: Cities, Discourses, and Professional Disciplines,” in *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory*, ed. Thomas L. Haskell, *Interdisciplinary Studies in History series* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 85–88.

²⁰⁵ Southern urbanization was third fastest in the world. Cobb, *Away Down South*, 46. For urban prewar Virginia, see for example Peter S. Carmichael, “New South Visionaries: Virginia’s Last Generation of Slaveholders, the Gospel of Progress, and the Lost Cause,” in *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, eds. Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 111–26. However, McPherson notes the growth was increasingly less in comparison to the North. James M. McPherson, “Antebellum Southern Exceptionalism.” O’Brien finds the only major exception to the dearth of utilitarian thinkers scholar and materialist Thomas Cooper who was born in England and educated in the North. CO2, 1040. Anonymous is able to declare a notion of progress of mind through history, for decades a truism in New England, was visionary to most southern readers even in 1842 even when it came wrapped in original Hobbesian social philosophy. This would hark back to conceptions of history predating *Universal History*, that is, to the Renaissance. Anonymous, “[Review:] Taylor’s *Natural History of Society*,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842): 305, 307, *passim*.

²⁰⁶ Isaiah Berlin, “The Originality of Machiavelli,” repr. in *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays*, eds. Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer (London: Pimlico, 1998), 269–325.

The Genoveses assert the 19th century saw a Machiavelli revival in the South. Machiavelli “enjoyed a pride of place” for almost all southern commentators.²⁰⁷ Machiavelli drew on Livy and was inspired by the latter’s account of ancient freedom as *libertas*, the ability “to stand upright by means of one’s own strength without depending on the will of anyone else.”²⁰⁸ To such body politic, public servitude or slavery was marked in its second definition, besides the obvious one, by “living in a condition of dependence on the will of another nation or state.” Skinner maintains the analogy between a human and a political body was complete so the latter will lose its liberty if forcibly or coercively deprived of its ability to act at will in pursuance of its chosen ends. If such a force is used against a free people, it defines tyranny.²⁰⁹ According to Skinner, this was the rationale behind the Declaration of Independence,²¹⁰ which would support the “no broken identity” thesis in terms of historical consciousness and undermine the persistent liberal essentialism of the document.

In Berlin’s erudite research, Machiavelli is very far from a moralist or a humanitarian: in addition to pragmatic attitude to politics and immoral realism, there are other anomalous traits about him that could be summarized as a lack of positivity. The account of politics is strictly empirical: there is no natural law philosophy, no teleology, no Christianity, no mention of an ideal order of things, in brief, a *lack of abstractionism*, a lack of utopian “reason” or “mind.”²¹¹ Importantly for me, for Machiavelli, religion is not an end in itself but only a means, an instrument for social cohesion and solidarity. Roman paganism is good for society because of its strong and spirited characteristics. In contrast, Christian otherworldly meekness is a source of decay. There is no God-based law: what counts is republican political freedom, freedom of one State, or more accurately city or *patria*, from control by any other State. There is practically no historical sense and no notion of progress, no metaphysical explanation of the whole, no eternal values, only a notion that the classical age can be brought back if a leader exercises *virtù* and the citizens are appropriately trained and bravely and skillfully led.²¹² Berlin claims he speaks of strong, well-governed social wholes, where a necessity for leadership is both right knowledge and self-knowledge: direct perception of reality and the self, and this is accomplished with observation of current events and consulting Antiquity. Reality precedes ideas about it.²¹³ Cities became great by developing citizens’ “inner moral strength, magnanimity, vigour, vitality, generosity, loyalty, above all public spirit, civic sense, dedication to the security, power, glory, expansion of the *patria*” as well as

²⁰⁷ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 147-49, citation on 147.

²⁰⁸ Evan T. Sage, trans., ed., *Livy’s History of Rome*, Volume X, Books XXXV–XXXVII, *Loeb Classical Library series* (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1935), 35.32.11, 94, cited in Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, 46.

²⁰⁹ *ibid.*, 46-47, citation on 46.

²¹⁰ *ibid.*, 50.

²¹¹ Berlin, “Originality of Machiavelli,” 270, 280-81.

²¹² *ibid.*, 281-82.

²¹³ *ibid.*, 283, 285.

“[p]ower, magnificence, pride, austerity, pursuit of glory” and “discipline, *antiqua virtus*” disseminated through “legislation and education that promoted pagan virtues.”²¹⁴

This *pagan life ideal and morality*, rooted partly in Livy’s Rome and whose disappearance was lamented in Tacitus and Juvenal, was in Machiavelli the Renaissance humanist impossible to reconcile with *Christian life ideal and morality*.²¹⁵ The latter is based on imagination, not reality of how men are universally, and is hence shoddy as society material. However, there is no subverting Christianity, because the pagan ideal is not based on reason but instead on practical lessons garnered from Antiquity and disseminated through pagan education. Christian education was contradictory to the flourishing of civic spirit and pride.²¹⁶ Importantly, a State cannot be led on a Christian basis because, as Aristotle had held, a good citizen need not be a good man.²¹⁷ Violence was not exempt from good governance, but it is not an end in itself because it disrupts order, harmony and strength.²¹⁸ As Aristotle had shown, society modeled on Greek *polis* can be ethical without utilitarian ethics, word of God, reason or other philosophical construct or, I would add, Lockean natural law.²¹⁹

The ends of individuals are those of his or her community, and one cannot evade this fact because a membership in *polis* is a part of being human. There is no separation of the individual from his community even in thought, because an individual cannot tear loose from community.²²⁰ As Berlin notes, this is not amorality, only a different morality based on Rome and classical values.²²¹ Though Christian values need to be supported as far as they advance communal cohesion and solidarity, the State cannot be a Christian Paradise, and violence is a normal part of it, because public life cannot be reduced to Christian principles.²²² He emphasizes Machiavelli sets the two worlds side by side in an antinomy so men could “choose either a good, virtuous, private life, or a good, successful, social existence, but not both.”²²³ Philosophically, this deconstructs the idea of a single structure, truth or idea, “a monistic pattern” Berlin finds in “traditional rationalism, religious and atheistic, metaphysical and scientific, transcendental and naturalistic” at the basis of

²¹⁴ *ibid.*, 287, 288.

²¹⁵ *ibid.*, 289. Berlin lists the former concept to consist of “courage, vigour, fortitude in adversity, public achievement, order, discipline, happiness, strength, justice, above all assertion of one’s proper claims and the knowledge and power needed to secure their satisfaction” while the latter concept is made of “charity, mercy, sacrifice, love of God, forgiveness of enemies, contempt for the goods of this world, faith in the life hereafter, belief in the salvation of the individual soul as being of incomparable value—higher than, indeed wholly incommensurable with, any social or political or other terrestrial goal, any economic or military or aesthetic consideration.” *ibid.*

²¹⁶ *ibid.*, 290-91.

²¹⁷ *ibid.*, 294.

²¹⁸ *ibid.*, 295-96.

²¹⁹ *ibid.*, 297.

²²⁰ *ibid.*, 297-98.

²²¹ *ibid.*, 299.

²²² *ibid.*, 307, 311.

²²³ *ibid.*, 316.

Western civilization and political thought.²²⁴ Though certainty or “final truth” is thus severely shaken, there are also positive implications that are not anti-liberal:

If there is only one solution to the puzzle, then the only problems are firstly how to find it, then how to realise it, and finally how to convert others to the solution by persuasion or by force. But if this is not so . . . then the path is open to empiricism, pluralism, toleration, compromise. Toleration is historically the product of the realisation of the irreconcilability of equally dogmatic faiths, and the practical improbability of complete victory of one over the other. Those who wished to survive realised they had to tolerate error. They gradually came to see merits in diversity, and so became skeptical about definitive solutions in human affairs.

ibid., 324.

It remains to connect such social and political outlook to my concerns. Unlike SAE, Machiavelli lacks many of the *positive* traits many modern Western thinkers in general and northern Americans in particular advocate. Especially, the grounding of history and politics in God and Plato is much ill at ease with him. Unlike New England, very few southerners advocated that politics be based on Christianity, or that Christianity be based on philosophy, genres modern history blurred.²²⁵ In Jefferson among others, the tension between Christianity and paganism was present and, as far as historical figuration, its humanistic impulses would continue to flourish, especially in Virginia but elsewhere as well.²²⁶ Further, the Genoveses assert “almost every southern writer followed Aristotle in insisting upon the social basis of individuality” and Tate plays off Aristotelian rhetoric against Platonic ideas at the period.²²⁷ Even a vehement and pioneering Yankee critic Royall Tyler insists in the South, knowledge was more *a craft* than the preferred modern and New England way of *the book and mind*, but I question his conventional reduction of the theme to economics.²²⁸ Such thoughts were very familiar to many in the South, but increasingly repulsive in the North, because they were antagonistic to SAE, the individualistic liberal ethos of Locke and, in aesthetics and history, Romanticism.²²⁹ Rice

²²⁴ *ibid.*, 312-13.

²²⁵ For northern religious liberalism, see for example Mintz, *Moralists and Modernizers*, 22. For difference in the South, see Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 534; Howison, *A History of Virginia*, 2, 143-44.

²²⁶ For example Grant asserts that “a comparative lack of religious sentiment” in the South was a standard view in the North. Grant, *North over South*, 91.

²²⁷ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 676; Allen Tate, “A Southern Mode of the Imagination,” repr. in *idem.*, *Essays of Four Decades* (Chicago: The Swallow Press, 1968), 583-84.

²²⁸ Royall Tyler, *The Algerine Captive; or, the Life and Adventures of Doctor Updike Underhill, Six Years a Prisoner Among the Algerines* (Walpole: Daid Carlisle, 1797), 167-68, cited in Greeson, *Our South*, 87.

²²⁹ Such Aristotelianism was closer to Burke than Locke. Murphy, *Rebuke of History*, 231. Also Mark G. Malvasi, *The Unregenerate South: The Agrarian Thought of John Crowe Ransom*, Allen

was complaining precisely of lack of religious faith as an existential outlook and lack of religious education in Virginia. It continued, though weakened, up to the Civil War.²³⁰ My corollary claim that departs from Genovese and Bradford²³¹ is that Christianity was more often a resource in governance than an end in itself in Virginia and South Carolina at this time. Thus, the humanistic, comparatively secular approach to history died only slowly as well. I argue their positions are too informed by especially Donald Davidson's sacralisation of southern history.²³² In my view, more research into "pagan" southern attitudes would be welcome without reductionism to Christianity.

Indeed, the commanding and restricting nature of the Word and its hearing SAE required is phenomenologically in sharp contrast with the classicism of vision pertaining to freedom especially southern elites and the region in general was more aware of.²³³ Momigliano states recommendations for history in the early-17th century could not conceive a replacement of ancient historians by modern work.²³⁴ Similarly, in their choice materials of ancient history, southerners exhibit a deep awareness of history as a counterweight to formal philosophy and SAE. This would put into question Buckley's blanket claim in Virginia, "evangelical Protestants . . . profoundly influenced the political

Tate, and Donald Davidson, *Southern Literary Studies series* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997), 10; Fox-Genovese, "Anxiety of History," 67.

²³⁰ Rice to Chalmers, "Letters of John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers," 310, 311. For the dismal situation of religion in Virginia in the 1790s, see Devereux Jarratt, *The Life of the Reverend Devereux Jarratt* (Baltimore: Walter & Hanna, 1806), 5. For unwillingness to overextend religion in the 1800s Virginia, see Hawks, *Contributions*, 1, 218, 232-33. For the Presbyterians' similar view, see for example Marsden, *Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience*, 99-101. For negative views about religion as politics in the 1829-1830 convention in Virginia, see Anonymous, *Proceedings and Debates of the Virginia State Convention, of 1829-30* (Richmond: Samuel Shepherd, 1830), 38, 40, 43.

²³¹ For their schematic positions that stress the dominance of Christian over pagan outlooks in Genovese and Bradford, see Murphy, *Rebuke of History*, 232, 259, 261; Eugene Genovese, *The Southern Tradition: The Achievement and Limitations of an American Conservatism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 4.

²³² For this element in Davidson, see for example Murphy, *Rebuke of History*, 31, 57. Bradford's analysis succumbs to Davidson as well. *ibid.*, 231. Davidson was no friend of Modernism, preferring a more straightforward and populist approach to southern identity and culture. Singal, *The War Within*, 220-25. To Davidson, studiously anti-progressive thoughts and deeds were worse than anti-evolutionism and racism. George Brown Tindall, *The Emergence of the New South 1913-1945, A History of the South series volume 10* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967), 216.

²³³ Hans Blumenberg, "Light as a Metaphor of Truth: At the Preliminary Stage of Philosophical Concept Formation," trans. Joel Anderson, repr. in *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*, ed. David Michael Levin (Berkeley: University of California Press 1993), 45-49; Van Tassel, *Recording America's Past*, 97.

²³⁴ Arnaldo Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950): 291.

culture.”²³⁵ I question it, because as de Certeau has shown, the Evangelical revival connects intimately to changes about dynamics of society that already entail a changed history.²³⁶ The wary receiving of the Evangelicals especially about history indicate southerners were not fully prepared for them and, consequently, for the workings of modern history. Further, O’Brien contends Polybius, practical historian and disseminator of the Roman model of historians as men of political action, was rare reading. Instead popular were the Greeks Thucydides and Herodotus, the latter more concerned with rhetoric and style of history, the former with emphasis on seriousness and truth along with cyclical ethics and oratory. I claim both had an “un-Platonic” conception about the nature of history. Past experience, rather than Platonic philosophical precepts, was the locus of historical learning, a direction hinted at by Aristotle. Tacitus was read as social criticism and danger of a corrupt government and cautious guide for politics.²³⁷

Unlike Plato and New England, southerners did not—especially before the Turner rebellion in the 1830s (chapters 3, 5)—worry literature and the arts diverted from their prescribed objective: “the potential imitation of the true and the morally good” and “the politically necessary” through distortion. Conception of literature as unpredictable and potentially dangerous, politically unreliable and irresponsible survived in Scholastics such as Saint Augustine who regretted his weeping over Dido’s death in Virgil’s *Aenid*.²³⁸ By contrast, southerners of the period by and large did not object to tears, and those in the higher education had knowledge of Virgil as a part of their cult of chivalry.²³⁹ Plato

²³⁵ Thomas E. Buckley, S.J., “After Disestablishment: Thomas Jefferson’s Wall of Separation in Antebellum Virginia,” *The Journal of Southern History* 61 (1995): 445.

²³⁶ de Certeau, *Writing of History*, 176-79.

²³⁷ Compare with CO2, 593, 597; Nadel, “Philosophy of History Before Historicism,” 295, 301, 303. For Aristotle, see *ibid.*, 297. Compare with the cornerstones of *Scottish Philosophy*: “I. Philosophy depends on scientific observation, with the primary object of such observation being self-consciousness and not the external behavior of other men. (The a priori extension of Newtonian physics to the mental realm was held to be illicit just as ‘external’ observation was felt to imply deterministic conclusions right from the outset.) II. The observation of consciousness establishes principles which are anterior to and independent of experience. Some principles, like that of substance or cause-and-effect, are necessary, others, like the existence of things perceived, are contingent, but all are in the very constitution of the mind and not the product of experience. (It is at this point where Reid most clearly foreshadows the Kantian revolution in philosophy.) III. Nothing can be an efficient cause in the proper sense but an intelligent being; matter cannot be the cause of anything but is only an instrument in the hands of a real cause. (This notion of agency or power is revealed by self-consciousness.) IV. The first principles of morals are self-evident intuitions; moral judgments, therefore, are not deduced from non-moral judgments, for they are not deductions at all.” Ahlstrom, “*Scottish Philosophy and American Theology*,” 261, *emphasis original*. Cf. Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, 41-42. Kammen’s view of postrevolutionary Americans as a-historical people seems implausible in southern context.

²³⁸ Krieger, *Institution of Theory*, 49-50. Augustine was no neoplatonist however, i.e., he did not push Plato’s philosophy to the extreme. Blumenberg, “*Light as a Metaphor of Truth*,” 43-44.

²³⁹ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 334, 256, 343-44.

disparaged Homer for his complexity and mythology in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It threatened the rational structure of propositions and fixed social order and undermined the call to perfection by catering instead to human emotions. The application of signs to worldly objects diverted from the ideal realm and was didactically harmful.²⁴⁰ But in the South, not only was Homer found in Virginia's higher education of the 1810s and recommended reading for South Carolina ladies in at least one instance, both the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* appeared translated in the 1840s and 1850s in prestigious southern journals.²⁴¹ Essential was also Plutarch, favored by Nietzsche (2.3.3). Plutarch provided the only more systematic account of the virtuous example. It was based—not on Platonic and neoclassical passive imitation—but on active investigation of the circumstances. Aesthetic sensibility of history as mainly literary of Dionysus of Halicarnassus in *Letter to Pompey* was also read by at least some southerners.²⁴²

Greece and Rome enabled southerners to be aware of history as literary, not just rationalist. But despite this, southerners were not romantics or antiquarians. Rather, they simply did not *have* a “general” philosophy of history. Neither Universal History as a science, nor exemplary history that had an inherently religious undertone, were truisms to them (2.3.4, chapter 6).²⁴³

2.2.3.1 Differential southern dynamic of public discourse

Southern intellectual culture, of which area books will be discussed later (chapters 3, 4), was little confined to—even represented in—the urban world. While London had 3,000 coffee houses for discussion and debate by the 1710s,²⁴⁴ southern *debating societies* were far different. They had no similarly stable, externally abstract organization in space. Usually, they met haphazardly at some local place. In execution, they intentionally parodied miniature parliaments, existed mostly only in small towns, and were usually only for men.²⁴⁵ There were more *conversation clubs*, far more conservatively executed, that served travelling intellectuals. But they were apparently not open for all, were only for men, their members were old, and most of their discussions never went public.²⁴⁶

The former trained young southern men to gentility and propriety, the latter pursued knowledge for its own sake without instrumentality. Their rationale thus was categorically

²⁴⁰ Krieger, *Institution of Theory*, 55-56.

²⁴¹ CO1, 323-24, 257; Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 260-61, n23.

²⁴² Nadel, “*Philosophy of History before Historicism*,” 298; Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 126, 298n93.

²⁴³ Compare with Erich Auerbach, who notes that for the ancients, intellectual or material historical developments were not in question as problems but instead ethical judgment, vice and virtue, success and mistake. Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), 38, cited in CO2, 597.

²⁴⁴ Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 32.

²⁴⁵ CO1, 422, 421, 422, 423.

²⁴⁶ *ibid.*, 425-26, 428-29.

different from novel bourgeois interests.²⁴⁷ The 17th century dialectic between the state and private individual Habermas has covered had not yet been resolved in the South. Especially in case of southern debating societies, lack of stable space and serious political discourse combined with a Christianized form of Aristotelian virtues. They served as an index of social status and authority as *public representation of virtue* similar to the High Middle Ages and the Renaissance.²⁴⁸ In other words, in the South, a private self was not as developed as elsewhere, because the state that demolished the feudal order was weaker. “Privacy” meant *exclusion from outsiders* more than individuality. This resulted in an amalgamation of local feudalism and state-based aristocracy. It was not without the impact of the state, capitalism and trade that demolished the feudal order, but neither had it fully separated the public and the private as dialectic within the state as had happened in Europe by the 1700s. Therefore, the next step in the development of private personality Habermas dates to German *neohumanism*²⁴⁹—that of “freely self-actualizing” *for bourgeois ends*²⁵⁰—also had not yet been fully taken, as the function of discussion clubs indicates. The South was not immune to it, but its *philosophical* implications for the social order and social dynamic had not sunk in.

For history, this meant that the new interpretation towards the ancients that was launched mainly by neohumanism that was collapsing the old one by the 1750s²⁵¹ and that was vital for the German take on modern history had not yet reached the South in a way that would alter individuality. The grounders of American history in the idea of liberalism tend to miss such absence or ignorance of ideas as discursive. That ideas are discursive about is today self-evident. However, in the South in the early decades of the 19th century, not everything was up for grabs as discourse, nor did discourse function similarly. Historical identity within a classical republican vision was not discursive, because for those outside SAE, there was not yet even singular History as a metaphysical construct,

²⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 422, 429.

²⁴⁸ Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 8.

²⁴⁹ *Neohumanists, wanting to depart from Augustan neoclassicism, eulogized over ancient Greece. However, their discussion situates firmly in late Enlightenment social ideals that were grounded in liberal ideas about cultural institutions, society, and pedagogy. In addition, neohumanists emphasized work of the intellect for its own sake but in symbiosis with the state. Aesthetically, as in case of J. J. Winckelmann, sculpture was turned into a demand for purity of form that bathed in spirit. Semiotically, for F. A. Wolf, secularized but spiritual text analysis became the road to the mind and spirit of the ancients, situating it on differing distances from the single, ever unattainable ur-text. History was, similarly, an end in itself. Wolf also advocated the idea of an independent literary culture of a people. Suzanne L. Marchand, Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 5-8, 11-12, 18-20, 24. In this way, new interpretations about Plato extended from art to history in Germany. My point is, southern relationship to the ancients cannot be conflated neither with Augustan neoclassicism nor German neohumanism.*

²⁵⁰ Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 10-13.

²⁵¹ Arnaldo Momigliano, “Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946): 154.

nor a public sphere for discussion that would be identical with major western locations and the North. Bradford even claims a continuous identity of ancient Rome was not shattered in or by the Revolution.²⁵²

2.2.4 Impact on biography: presence and spatial dynamism of historical signification

When one looks at the first histories written by southerners at this period, they turn out to be biographies—excepting Wirt’s *Letters* that also was, in one function, a study of rhetoric.²⁵³ While they certainly had political functions, they also were deeply conscious of the rhetoric of history. Their utility was in classical republicanism and sometimes, they were even critical of neoclassicism. The tension between form of literature and reality is present, if more rhetorically than aesthetically—a step taken in the 1820s (chapter 3).²⁵⁴ It relates to a philosophical difference about history taken as knowledge as well.

For instance Jefferson felt the pressure of history’s “federalization” in the 1800s in case of the last volume of the hugely influential arch-Federalist John Marshall’s George Washington biography. To Jefferson’s chagrin, Marshall portrayed the republicans “as lawless rabble” and a disorganizing force to the smooth-running, fixed, Constitution-based government, an old Federalist theme.²⁵⁵ De Tocqueville, explicitly drawing from Marshall, echoed this judgment and extended it to cover “the South.” He extrapolated from the first wave of Virginia migrants led by greedy, immoral, unstable and excessive persons, and from the second, “elevated at almost no points above the level of the lower classes of England,” that the future of the region is doomed. This argument was closely in line with Marshall and with earlier Yankee accounts from the 1790s.²⁵⁶ Marshall saw the republicans as enemies to SAE. Federalism had already distanced itself from Jefferson’s republicanism in history, which New Englanders would begin to exploit in the same decade.²⁵⁷ It is not that Jefferson had no nationalism: what counts are functional,

²⁵² Bradford, *A Better Guide Than Reason*, 22.

²⁵³ CO2, 659.

²⁵⁴ Compare with Rancière’s criticism of representationalism in literature on aesthetic-political grounds. Alison James, “Poetic Form and the Crisis of Community: Revisiting Rancière’s *Aesthetics*,” in *Thinking Poetry: Philosophical Approaches to Nineteenth-Century French Poetry*, ed. Joseph Acquisto (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 167.

²⁵⁵ Van Tassel, *Recording America’s Past*, 82; *John Adams to Benjamin Hichborn, January 27, 1787*, in *The Works of John Adams, Volume IX*, ed. Charles F. Adams (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1851), 551, cited in Kammen, *People of Paradox*, 50.

²⁵⁶ de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 1, 30-31; Greeson, *Our South*, 75-76.

²⁵⁷ Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes*, 268. *However, I would claim one cannot extrapolate from the very few Virginia Episcopalians such as reverend James Madison and William H. Wilmer much into republican myth-making as nationalism. Rather, not only one must be careful with the concept of nationalism, as I will argue (chapters 4, 5), this generation of Virginia Episcopalians was pretty much ignored by mainstream Virginia society and education in comparison*

metaphysical and conceptual differences from both SAE and bourgeois liberal–romantic nationalism.²⁵⁸ This difference was not missed by, at this level, southern–sympathetic and Virginia–educated poet and essayist Edgar Allan Poe (chapters 3, 6).

In addition, for me important is Jefferson’s semiotically different attitude to history as rhetoric of presence. When Jefferson wanted to counter Marshall’s portrayal, he preferred bodily presence, locality and speech to the sign. Jefferson protested against the existence of singular History as sign: to the contrary, the sign as history “should free men from the past.” Unlike Montesquieu, the model for de Tocqueville²⁵⁹ and for Wirt (2.2.4.1), Jefferson could not agree history was a determinate and binding causal link. Instead, he wanted to reject such links. Importantly, he still did not *romanticize* presence over writing. Italian “hot” enthusiasm about liberty in the present, referred to by some as *pure republicanism* (chapter 6), was more valuable than its “cold” exposition and arrangement like in Marshall. I argue this pertains to the peculiar communal culture of the South that was philosophically at odds with bourgeois ideology and SAE. It is skeptical or even modernist about language as such communication. Ironically, van Tassel concludes the publishers he contacted could not spot this dilemma and Jefferson’s history remained unpublished.²⁶⁰

Jefferson played his own collections of various scraps and notes, i.e., *haphazard writing*, off against Marshall’s *book* that pretended to be the *sole* history of the Washington period. Without Marshall’s history book, he would have thrown away the scraps. Yet, he also had bound them together with a cabinet binder “under [his] own eye” and finally, self–critically censored them for publicity.²⁶¹ This indicates a formal discrepancy between history as book and history as memory scraps. My argument, partly deriving from Derrida, concerns *southern resistance to the tendency at unification and homogeneity of communication about history*. Marshall’s book of history differed greatly from Jefferson’s convention about history in terms of experience, form, philosophy and communication. Although Jefferson had no “theory” about history, in this instance the former but not the latter presumed the book format as true and complete history. Indeed, this presents the stark confrontation of *austere theory* and *lack of theory* about history. Marshall’s presumption was virtually never shared, and often repudiated, by southern scholars (chapters 3, 4, 6). Semiotically, Marshall de–ontologized presence to absence of

to the next one. Further, many had a more Whig and Lockean view on history and society than the republicans, which is important for my argument.

²⁵⁸ *Compare with Greeson, Our South, 52.*

²⁵⁹ *de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, I, 28.*

²⁶⁰ *Van Tassel, Recording America’s Past, 84-85, citation on 85. Compare with Randolph: “The anniversary of Washington’s birth–day . . . will be a memorable day in the history of my life, if indeed any history shall be attached to it.” John Randolph to John Brockenbrough, February 23, 1820, in Hugh A. Garland, ed., The Life of John Randolph of Roanoke, Volume II (New York: D. Appleton, 1850), 131, emphasis added.*

²⁶¹ *Thomas Jefferson, “The Anas,” in Ford, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, I, 154-55, citation on 155.*

the receiver and, paradoxically, turned absence as true *and* stand-in or substitute.²⁶² I agree with Derrida all writing is beset by this phenomenon, but the important aspect for me is qualitative differences *within* writing as conflict and crisis. The resistance took more aesthetic, ironically symbolic forms later in the South (chapter 3). It was the radical, peculiarly Yankee novel deduction *from idea to thought/signification* in Universal History—the rejection of the discrepancy between them—that troubled southern critics. It attempted to *unify idea and reality in the sign as paradoxical “true commodity”* to make presentation as sanctified legitimacy of the (capitalist-Christian) book. This was done at the cost of absence *and* representation. Most southerners never lost sight of the discrepancy between signification and presence and absent signification and present reality. I shall apply Dekker and Greeson²⁶³ and call Marshall *an instance of imperial writing to rival Europe* that was imposed on the South from within and outside.

Unlike Whig John Quincy Adams, Jefferson reluctantly co-operated with Federalist historians such as William Plumer of New Hampshire. Plumer was at this time planning an American history. Adams ordered Plumer to write a Federalist history with the moral that there was an unbreakable union covering the whole continent of North America.²⁶⁴

The biography of George Washington by Episcopalian M. L. “Parson” Weems who lived mostly in Virginia explicitly renounces the public life as the sphere that contains the truth of a character. It is artificial and less than half the whole picture. Weems uses an organicist and romantic simile: like “a forced plant robbed of its hot-bed” a person in privacy “will drop his false foliage and fruit, and stand forth confessed in native stickweed sterility and worthlessness.” He mentions many romantic tropes such as song, picturesque nature and rural events that are, in their more profound, concrete and older ways, marks of greatness, but—ironically—pushed to the background like the noblemen of Paris and London push the elderly so as not to “depress the fine laudanum-raised spirits of the *young sparklers*.” Weems connects light with public oratory praise and dark with private truth so he seems aware of Plato and anti-neoclassicism. He uses three exclamation marks at the end of his sentences.

At one point illuminating for me, Weems compares the difference between polished public printed text used by the eyes, and mere scribbling—which turns out to be true because of young age and intuition—while also keeping the Scottish way of speaking intact. What is striking is this early example of *aesthetic of spontaneity* as a communal medium. It was to appear in several southern arguments about history, and has similarities to Derrida as intense preoccupation with becoming and time versus the sign as praxis and reality. In this regard, it resembled baroque painting where, according to Hollander, sketches and single moments in temporality were valued for the first time. However, juxtaposed to the 19th century, it develops into modernist discord: Weems wrote about more temporarily conventional themes as well. Religious rhetoric of perfectibility of man; a concern, clothed in Old Testament language, of a civil war as a result of disunion in America; a statement about progress “in riches and strength” and “arts, manufactures, and

²⁶² Derrida, “Signature Event Context,” 309-16.

²⁶³ Greeson, *Our South*, 6-9. See also chapter 3.

²⁶⁴ *Van Tassel*, *Recording America’s Past*, 83.

commerce.” Not surprisingly, especially northern commentators found the religious element welcome.²⁶⁵ A further possibility, implied by Foucault, would connect to the Scots–English conflict: the aesthetic of spontaneity was common, because it challenged the deontological “profound establishment of order in space”²⁶⁶ by New England signification and British neoclassical culture. That is, it challenged their extreme semiotic and scientific rigidity. Southern temporality was in process of negotiation between bourgeois world view that included the predominant conception (social science and historicism) of linearity,²⁶⁷ and what preceded and contested it. The important point is not to reduce it to romantic theory or SAE. The aesthetic of spontaneity at times explicitly manifested as secularity: since Hobbes, relying on appearances had been un–Christian (2.3.4, chapters 3, 4, 6). Further, I interpret this recurring observation in social terms as *un–education as a resource*. While education was critical for Locke, New England and neohumanism, several learned southerners seemed to prefer lack of it in the context of history.

O’Brien claims that David Ramsay of Charleston, a physician and public official who wrote a history of Washington at the same time, represented a historian more concerned about evidence and exhibited “utmost formality” in style.²⁶⁸ However, though Ramsay fills up his account with public speaking, it does not to me imply he was more concerned about truth in an epistemological, enlightened sense. Instead, Ramsay seems to celebrate public oratory as a republican–not utilitarian–virtue. Not only is historical signification qualitatively different from life, the “great” events that do end up as history do so in “enlivening” and “adorning” ways.²⁶⁹ In other words, the element of persuasion is present, as is the ironic mixture, here more aesthetic and humanistic, of reality and signification expressed as a classicist rather than neoclassicist, let alone positivist, practice. In categorical distinction to southerners, those northern historians who were inspired by Enlightenment history ignored its epistemological status of language as rhetorical (2.2.4.1, 2.3, chapter 3).

2.2.4.1 Weak version of “Austere Enlightenment” (WAE)

One marked exception addressed more recent and northern theories: Wirt’s biography of Patrick Henry from the late–1810s. Wirt, born in Maryland to Swiss and German parents,

²⁶⁵ M. L. Weems, *The Life of George Washington, Eighth Edition–Greatly Improved* ([? (Philadelphia)]: [?], 1809), 3–6, 31–32, 221–22, [n.p.], citations on 4, 6, emphasis original, 221; Martha Hollander, “Baroque Aesthetics,” in *The Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), accessed September 18, 2014, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/22141904/Baroque-Aesthetics>.

²⁶⁶ Foucault, *Order of Things*, 91.

²⁶⁷ For this change in temporality, see Donald M. Lowe, *History of Bourgeois Perception* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), 39–43.

²⁶⁸ CO 2, 655.

²⁶⁹ David Ramsay, *The Life of George Washington* (London: Luke Hanford, 1807), 23, 126.

was a critic of Virginia and an admirer of the French Enlightenment and rationality. His approach to letters made him unpopular in some circles.²⁷⁰ However, he never goes the full way of SAE, settling on WAE. This shows in his complex methodology that indicates him to be an ironist about history: simultaneously an admirer of the French Enlightenment and an extreme case of a classical rhetorician, a text critic and one who laid emphasis on personal acquaintance, Wirt was *a reconciler of two worlds*, a southern trend about history even among its more progressive thinkers (chapters 3, 4, 5, 6).

In the *British Spy*, Wirt's use of history is still rare and disorganized, using the word in battles of natural history of the 18th century against the anti-American Buffon as well as to refer only to the events of a single person.²⁷¹ However, he complains the style of the day is too ornamental instead of "pure, substantial and useful thought." He laments "a feast of reason" becomes "a concert of sounds." Public taste had degraded, and authors had responded accordingly. A history of the changes of style, "philosophical, as well as chronological," would be a curious and highly interesting one. Wirt refers explicitly to Blair and casts some doubt on the progress of history, which indicates his historicist "proto-romantic" stance.²⁷²

However, only a year later, in 1804, his views on history have become more rigorous: he holds on to natural history as "authentic history," writes history in the singular and without "H," and implies this singular history, even in its modern sense, can be known as true.²⁷³ Again a few years later, he turns to glorifying history as "splendid and immortal" in its pages, mentioning astronomy in the same connection.²⁷⁴ Most radical in the South, however, is his assertion that historical language and language of journalism are equally true.²⁷⁵ Thus he apparently had become immersed in the SAE metaphysics about history.

There are other neoplatonic passages: the whole "Number XXIV" is a lengthy and skillfully crafted allegory on the superiority of enlightened, neohumanistic and romantic thought, gathered in a single person named Sidney—a possible catachresis of Algernon Sidney (chapter 6)—compared to contending values and world-views represented by three persons.²⁷⁶ In other words, aesthetically, scholars, like artists, "are born, not made," and

²⁷⁰ For example, *Minor mentions Wirt to have been "little more than a frothy declaimer, a spouter of poetry, and an inditer of light newspaper essays."* Anonymous [Lucian Minor], "Chief Justice Marshall," *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836b): 182.

²⁷¹ Wirt, *Letters of the British Spy*, 156, 162. For more on Buffon vs. the Americans, see for example Antonello Gerbi, *The Dispute of the New World: The History of a Polemic, 1750–1900*, trans. Jeremy Moyle, enl. and rev. ed. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973), 565–71, *passim*. He continued his polemic a year later. Wirt, "On the American Genius, Part I," repr. in *The Rainbow*, by William Wirt (Richmond: Richie and Worsley, 1804), 39–40.

²⁷² *idem.*, *Letters of the British Spy*, 246–48, citations on 246, 247.

²⁷³ *idem.*, "On the American Genius, Part I," 40; *idem.*, "On the Condition of Women," repr. in *The Rainbow*, by William Wirt, 61, 62.

²⁷⁴ *idem.*, "Number X," repr. in *The Old Bachelor*, by William Wirt (Richmond: Enquirer, 1814), 60.

²⁷⁵ *idem.*, "Number XVIII," repr. in *The Old Bachelor*, by William Wirt, 114.

²⁷⁶ *idem.*, "Number XXIV," repr. in *The Old Bachelor*, by William Wirt, 149–56.

their “writing is individual, isolated, and internal; not social but eccentric.”²⁷⁷ I cannot dwell on it here more however except to note that as in New England, history is natural history with religious and rational dimensions. Here Wirt spells out his historical epistemology: the ideal is Locke’s “large, sound round–about sense,” i.e., “the ability to scrutinize the presuppositions from which one reasons,” but before this, willingness “to recognize the contingencies that provide the basis for one’s premises, and to engage with those alternate premises that develop within different sets of contingencies.”²⁷⁸ Wirt, ahead of his peers, is thus covertly criticizing Virginians of not being rationalist subjectivists enough in history—the premise with which useful history is grasped—instead settling on, as Locke had had it, deductive reasoning found on chance, laziness or conceit that has no notion of a boundary. The men were acquainted with “all the pre–eminent incidents” of history but, settling on custom, they had not applied this rational measure to cause and effect. They appealed to them rhetorically—for aid—but lacking this theory of epistemology, Sidney “was able to seize and drive back upon them like routed Elephants upon their own army.”²⁷⁹ Wirt’s fascination with causality in history derived probably from Montesquieu’s general anthropology that was a–historical and a –particularistic at the basis, i.e., the reverse of the southern heterologies.²⁸⁰ This criticism seems remarkably unsympathetic and lacking in poesy. Gone are the poetic speculations of Blair or attempts to sympathize with different views, though on the surface the description is not hostile. It is one of the best examples of the different quality of historical thinking in Virginia at this time.

In the biography, Wirt begins with an abstract “right to know what credit is due to the following narrative.” He admits he lacks personal connection to Henry. But, in his research he has been assisted among others by Nathaniel Pope, a colonel in the Revolution killed in a duel in 1810 before Wirt’s study was published. Wirt tells Pope was a “sacred observer of truth” and a lawyer who indefatigably collected information from every quarter, but accepted only that coming “from the purest sources,” thus a reliable intermediary. Wirt is not only prepared to use written sources alongside oral and communal ones, he also contends the written sign is *superior in epistemic value* to human memory and acquaintance. On the face of it, then, epistemological reason and logic have displaced the more human communal, rhetoric ways. It is the printed word of the archive, the court, and the newspaper that is now the judge of true history. They provide *the* sources of “certain and permanent evidence” that have allowed the author “to correct some strange mistakes in historical facts.” Like Locke’s inhabitants of the isolated Mariana Islands, “even those most respectable gentlemen” of Virginia had false memories, not having been in contact to each other. He reduces history to logic so that out of these

²⁷⁷ James E. Porter, “Intertextuality and the Discourse Community,” *Rhetoric Review* 5 (1986): 41. Porter mentions only creative writing, but this is a blatant case of extending the same principle to science.

²⁷⁸ Wirt, “Number XXIV,” 154; Rayner Mason, “John Locke and the Creation of Liberal Subjects,” (MA thesis, the College of William and Mary, 2013), 13.

²⁷⁹ *ibid.*; Wirt, “Number XXIV,” 154.

²⁸⁰ On this see Pflug, “Development of Historical Method in the Eighteenth Century,” 13-16.

scattered reminiscences and tales—i.e., “premodern” history—“the author has been obliged, in several instances, to contradict even the several histories of the times concerning which he writes.” But he has never done this “without the most decisive proofs of his own correctness, which he has always cited: nor has he never departed from the narratives of his several correspondents, except under the direction of prepondering evidence.” And if those could not be obtained, he has chosen those he has considered most reliable. He stresses this is nothing personal, with no intention to question any of the gentlemen, only something he had to do “or else [abandon] the work altogether.” The straightening out of the story, disentangled intricacies and inconsistencies in his words, was extremely hard work. Even so, the result is “crude sketches” far from the truth but that may still live on rather than perish “on [my] hands.” There is “that larger portion of readers” who are “willing to be pleased” with the best reasonable effort at such a goal in history i.e., the truth, but “[t]he most indulgent reader,” nevertheless in sympathy for defects, will become “disappointed *in the matter itself*,” so scanty and meager is the result in comparison to Henry’s fame. In terms of knowledge, much remains unknown and much has perished. American history’s pages are “immortal” and can be disgraced.²⁸¹

We have to remember Wirt was a master rhetorician, a literary polymath, and a powerful theorist of the public sphere. In frame of mind more an outsider looking in, his language about historical veracity is only a calculated metalanguage. The late Pope is more a literary trope who serves two functions: a) an ideal methodologist of history for Wirt’s own stated desire of history as neoplatonic natural history, b) a symbolic entry point of access, a diamond drill of sorts, to respectability of the work on the inside. Wirt’s extensive argumentation for his methodology of “disturbing” the inchoate mass of memory and tales suggests his procedures and episteme was rare in Virginia at the time. This further indicates a different understanding of history around him—something Wirt himself was not free from. Wirt values independent literary works highly as permanent signs. But, his sign desires the truth but must yet differ from it, a conundrum he is unwilling to publicly confront. Assuring the truth of the sign is more an aporia than conviction as I will explore shortly. Even Wirt’s portrayal of his audience as equally interested in truth of the sign is more his own implied reader, his own nationalist–neoplatonic idea of America and a bow to the prominent public figures than reality.

To illustrate, let’s look at an interesting discussion about a stenographic recording of Henry’s speech in 1791. Henry had delivered a stunning piece of oratory and its first argument had been recorded on stenograph. Wirt had obtained this record and “extracted” from it “an imperfect analysis” of the speech. Wirt laments the speech is only on manuscript form, that it is not something esteemed higher. It “may be unquestionably relied on” since it provides “the *substance* of the arguments” and the state of law. However, it is marred “as a sample of Mr. Henry’s peculiar and inimitable eloquence” for the same reasons printed debates of the Virginia convention are. The manuscript had been

²⁸¹ Wirt, *preface to The Life of Patrick Henry, by William Wirt, v-xvi, citations on v, vi, viii, xi, xii, xiii, xv, emphasis original, 128, 225.* “*JHBL Family Genealogy: Colonel Nathaniel Pope, Jr.,*” accessed August 24, 2013, <http://latrobefamily.com/genealogy/getperson.php?personID=117177&tree=mytree>.

tidied up too much: it failed to catch “either the captivating flights of Mr. Henry’s fancy, or those unexpected and overwhelming assaults which he made upon the hearts of his judges.” All such passages in the copy had been crossed out with a pen in a way that still left the words legible. Simultaneously, “the same thought, or something like it, had been interlined in other words.” But even the interlineations themselves are almost always “erased, altered, and farther interlined” to “amend the expression.” The best expressions, “without the hazard of mistake,” were the ones most blotted and interlineated. The notes had not “*the very expression*” of Henry in them, only “some hint merely of the thought” the writer “was afterward unable to fill up to his own satisfaction.” These “imperfect specimens” to which Wirt had been “compelled to resort” were mere imitations. This is proven by the negative reaction “with strongest expressions of disappointment” they caused when read to several people. In some cases, they were corrected with memory. If they were to be a synecdoche of his whole work, it would be fully discredited and treated “rather as romance than history.” Practical effects of his speech, not the language of Wirt’s study, nor the stenograph, is where the reader should look.²⁸²

This passage is very interesting and illuminating for several reasons. First, the stenographer on Wirt’s account does not share Wirt’s romanticized fetishism for oral expression. He did not record the second argument Henry delivered, because “it would be nothing more than a repetition of the first” and “he was afterward told it was much inferior.”²⁸³ Thus, while for him, oratory was merely better or worse as rhetoric, for Wirt, reverting to Blair and romantic thought, it is *the* source of truth, a unique event as is proven by a live audience and its concrete emotional reaction. Wirt mixes together nationalism, Christian metaphors, bar eloquence and Antiquity to support this claim.²⁸⁴ Second, unlike those around him, Wirt upholds the value of the work as a sign, though he admits it is not concretely real in the way speeches are, a perfectly coherent estimation in Universal History, but not in SAE that wanted to reduce reality to form. By comparison, even Virginia general court decisions and their grounds were not preserved in writing until 1819, indicative of the persistence of an oral Renaissance culture, instead of the typographical one of Universal History.²⁸⁵ Third, the rhetoric of rational methodology manifest as literal “arche–writing” is obvious. But juxtaposed to the condition of the stenograph, it shows the irony associated with it like a crack in a mask, or a Derridean trace. Not only is Wirt now drawing on Calvinist rhetoric of reason’s imperfections, his assurance the stenograph—more a *steganograph* in form—is nevertheless something to be trusted without criticism and substantially true is catachretic, since the very substantiality of the sign was denied in Universal History, but not by the Yankees.²⁸⁶ Fourth, for the

²⁸² Wirt, *The Life of Patrick Henry*, 330-31, *emphasis original*.

²⁸³ *ibid.*, 330.

²⁸⁴ *ibid.*, 332.

²⁸⁵ Benjamin Blake Minor, “Judge William Brockenbrough,” repr. in *Virginia Law Register* 5 (1900): 733. Lowe, *History of Bourgeois Perception*, 12-13.

²⁸⁶ On substance in Aristotle, see for example A. Kadir Cucen, “Heidegger’s Critique of Descartes’ *Metaphysics*,” accessed April 25, 2009,

stenographer, interpretation and allegory are the tools of choice, i.e., the signs are not true, they *resemble* or *hint* at that which is itself a resemblance but secure in its identity via metonymy. There is no enlightened rationality involved. For Wirt, by contrast, the inability to order the signs, though *not* according to epistemological but aesthetic criteria, would jeopardize the whole work as romance and not history. However, this dyadic dichotomy is a romantic ordering of the world. Wirt's own attitude to Romanticism is a romance in White's terms, a recuperative one that surely did not enjoy full acceptance in Virginia. He does not consider the stenographer is not a believer in truth in the sign, more a humanist than SAE about signification. He overtly juxtaposes Universal History and Renaissance, while covertly, he appeals to his own extrapolations from romanticized expressivity. Fifth, his dismissal of passive imitation in comparison to original oral utterance is an aesthetic judgment couched in Romanticism. But it is awkward given the dis-ordered character of the stenograph. Since the stenographer tried to "fill [it] up," Wirt sees the sign as desire for fulfillment with what was spoken *and* thought, with expression *and* idea. Overtly, Wirt is looking at semiotics through philosophy instead of spatial ambiguity. But covertly, he is assured of the less philosophical symbolic and poetic nature of historical language, since he was torn between representation, expression and ambiguity. In other words, profoundly dislocated, Wirt could firmly settle neither with Universal History's ordered rhetorical representation, SAE's grounding of representation in reality, humanism's inexactitude, nor romantic valorization of expressivity.

Though he stopped at Romanticism, Wirt entertained a modernist notion of history as a result of his disavowal of Montesquieu's Universal History causality. In a letter to a friend, he lets the cat out of the bag. When James Boswell, the famed Scottish biographer of Johnson, mentioned "the infinite difficulty and trouble" of accurate fixing of time with newspapers, he thought it was only ranting. But now he was beginning to learn "by woful experience Bozzy was right." Collecting of facts was much more difficult than he had thought. Instead of having them "all ready cut and dry, "at every turn of Henry's life" he "had to stop and let fly a volley of letters over the State, in all directions, to collect dates and explanations, and try to reconcile contradictions." Notably, even such writing is referred to in aesthetic terms as saddling Pegasus and riding up Parnassus. He mocks his own methodology of rigid and precise statement of facts and truth: "what the deuce has a lawyer to do with truth!" This bar he had set for himself and historical writing is "entirely a new business" even to him, and he found it and scrupulous regard of fettering facts awkward. "It is like attempting to run, tied up in a bag. My pen wants perpetually to career and frolic it away. But it must not be." Instead, he "must move like Sterne's mule over the plains of Languedoc," "without one vintage frolic with Nanette on the green," without "even the relief of a mulberry-tree to stop and take a pinch of snuff at."²⁸⁷ Wirt acknowledges he has not succeeded with his narrative gait with his "palfrey"—etymologically a post horse and semantically the horse of choice in the Middle Ages.

http://metaphysics2009.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=66&Itemid=37&lang=en, 1.

²⁸⁷ William Wirt to Dabney Carr, August 20, 1815, in *Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt*, Volume I, ed. John P. Kennedy, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Lea and Planchard, 1850), 344.

More than a hundred pages on, he is “as far to seek, as ever, for the lightsome, lucid, simple graces of narrative.”²⁸⁸ In other words, the de-rhetorized boots of the romantic’s view of historical narrative as *middle style*²⁸⁹ did not fit. This shows Wirt’s knowledge of Laurence Sterne’s—a very popular author in connection with history in the South (chapters 3, 6)—metafictional strategies in *Tristram Shandy*. The reader “is no longer a safe observer who looks in but is a player in a game which the narrator directs and alone knows the rules.” The work has no rigorous and linear beginning and ending and referentiality of language does not hold.²⁹⁰ Wirt enjoys the play of language too much for such simplicity.

Wirt was very conscious of history as literary narrative. Even the enlightened Jefferson, no friend of Henry’s but more concerned about history than most and recipient of an early manuscript for approval, had not gone out of his way about the truth of history as narrative language. Instead, he was going by memory. Jefferson referred to the work with the romantic metaphor of canvas.²⁹¹ A more “general” history of Virginia would have to wait until the 1830s (chapter 3). Wirt is among the first southern theorists of history. As a paradigm setter of WAE, i.e., history as necessarily rhetorical and symbolic, his influence would be felt later. In comparison to his intellectual and creative wealth, he is today forgotten.

By the early-1830s, the influential Harper brothers of New York thought the work too ambitious in method. Significant is their condemnation of both rhetoric and un-truth found in the text. These “repel” a reader who exercises his reason. This illustrates the difference between SAE and WAE. Rhetoric in history is, by now, almost a cardinal sin and clearly separable from personage of history, as in history itself cause and effect are separable. An audience that falls to its victim—and here the *North American Review*, the primary mouthpiece of New England opinion, is quoted—is not rational enough. But, they point out, rhetoric is very popular in Virginia, including, but not limited to, eminent

²⁸⁸ *ibid.*, 345.

²⁸⁹ *The purging of history of rhetoric also meant the linearization of its meaning that had to be disciplined and that had ideological and political functions. Aesthetically, from a skeptical, modernist view, this is only an attempt to erase rhetoric by imposing de-rhetoric as rhetoric. The composition of history began to be moot: according to White, this “middle style” excluded the pagan and Christian on the one hand, and grotesque on the other. White, “Politics of Historical Interpretation,” 116, 122.*

²⁹⁰ Michael Hardin, “Is There a Straight Line in This Text?: The Homoerotics of *Tristram Shandy*,” *Orbis Litterarum* 54 (1999): 189-91, citation on 189.

²⁹¹ *Jefferson still willingly corrected his memory. George Morrow, The Greatest Lawyer that Ever Lived: Patrick Henry at the Bar of History, Williamsburg in Character series (Williamsburg: Telford, 2011), 69, 70. On Jefferson’s concern about rhetoric in history see for example ibid., 71. Jefferson still consciously manipulated history. His concern about its too flowery character may have had more to do with rhetorical history lacking in critical insight rather than in epistemology. ibid., 72, 73. Also Kammen points out that Jefferson was familiar with romantic thinking. Kammen, People of Paradox, 247-48. But he, like many southerners, departed from romantic liberalism. In addition, I disagree with Kammen his thinking about history was reducible to Crèvecoeur (chapter 3). Thus, O’Brien’s view that Jefferson was unpoetic about history is questionable, though he can be considered father of southern social science. CO2, 659.*

members of society. More than the *North American Review*, the authors sympathise with the different role rhetoric and powerful individuals hold in Virginia. Thus, while New England had rejected rhetoric from history by the late-1810s, it flourished in Virginia even in the early-1830s and beyond.²⁹² Historian, intellectual, lawyer, journalist and statesman Hugh Blair Grigsby, Virginian himself, reported as late as 1858 that Virginians were reading the work.²⁹³

2.3 The “German renaissance”: widely different interpretations

Here my attempt is threefold: first, an outline of the *German renaissance* in its northern interpretations as regards history and literature. By the term I mean powerful interest in German aesthetics, philosophy, politics, education and culture, including history, in America from the late-1810s. I contend northerners, buoyed by SAE, overwhelmingly received German Romanticism as a positive resource for nationalism and romance history.²⁹⁴ Second, I will examine how at the same time, Sir Walter Scott offered the southerners outside SAE and WAE a far more nuanced and skeptical view about romance in/as history. At the same time, Rome historian Barthold Georg Niebuhr’s combined humanism, philology and Kantian historicism made southerners far more critical of historiography in ways that resembled Nietzsche. Third, I will focus more specifically on Virginia, where southerners found a nexus of support for such history at Jefferson’s new University of Virginia. Indicative of the persistent heterology is that the German onslaught was kept fairly at bay in Virginia.

2.3.1 Northern enthusiasm and dominance

Between the late-1810s and 1830s in white American culture, the popularity of Rome began to decline while that of Greece began to rise as a part of European romantic nationalism, especially its German variation, and its neohumanistic interpretation of Greece. Rome became more associated with pragmatic political state philosophy. The language and culture of Greece interpreted by Germans became the language of the self, the spiritual, and the ideal.²⁹⁵

²⁹² J & J Harper, “Biographical Sketch of William Wirt,” in Wirt, *Letters of a British Spy*, 76-77. During the whole prewar period the *North American Review* was in existence, i.e., 46 years, only one native southerner contributed to it, out of 446 contributors. CO1, 547.

²⁹³ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 127.

²⁹⁴ On this connection between nationalism, romance, readership and history, see the succinct marks in Renée Hulan, *Northern Experience and the Myths of Canadian Culture (Ithaca: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002) 13-14.*

²⁹⁵ Winterer, *Culture of Classicism*, 61-63, 49-50.

These revolutionary bourgeois developments were first introduced in the U.S. in education. A new generation of American classical linguistic reformers criticized and refashioned the previous ways of approaching Antiquity and its methods. With Edward Everett (schooled in Göttingen in 1817), German scholarship and admiration of German education poured across the Atlantic from the early–1820s. The first audiences were the students at Harvard and the citizenry of Boston.²⁹⁶ By 1826, Everett was applying his German theories to American history.²⁹⁷ I contend another factor in the process was the rediscovered worth of German letters in England and the formation of British nationalism.²⁹⁸ In other words, northern United States felt secure enough to open up to Germany after Napoleon was defeated. Strikingly, however, all the major reformers were very young, roughly in their mid–twenties—and only *one* was southern.²⁹⁹ Similarly, only two institutions the reformers occupied were southern, located in South Carolina. Significantly, the first specialist American historian, George Bancroft and northern literary scholar George Ticknor were among the earliest and most ardent of the Germany–dazzled “philhellenists.”³⁰⁰ This epistemic loading of language with knowledge made manifest as ideal unity has not been studied as a disruptive change. The implications of this revolution in its philosophical, social and political spheres are hard to disconnect from those of the aesthetic and linguistic. If Gura is correct that in America, there occurred a culture–wide shift towards a more symbolic ordering of reality, the varying positions to it should be examined.³⁰¹

What cannot be emphasised too much is, besides being northern almost to a man, the major reformers were mostly Unitarians or friendly with them. Harvard had become their nerve center. The main difference in powerful Unitarians such as William E. Channing and Andrews Norton to SAE was extension of Locke’s view of language as arbitrary to Biblical truth. However, though liberals, they still did not take into account Kant’s critique, let alone Hume’s skepticism. Instead, they jumped to material conditions surrounding shaky words. Human reason, with its absolute principles independent of experience, could then grasp the emerging idea. There was no need for figuration or poetics of language in a rational person. This was the view of New England’s intellectual centers for the most part of the 1820s, and it had spread to such powerful northern institutions as Harvard, Yale and Princeton.

Their opponents, the Trinitarians such as Moses Stuart, operated in institutions such as Andover Theological Seminary that was founded to counter these liberal ideas. They held

²⁹⁶ *ibid.*, 49-50, 52.

²⁹⁷ *Van Tassel*, *Recording America’s Past*, 106-7.

²⁹⁸ *Hege R. Segerblad*, “*Transcending the Gothic: ‘The Extravagancies of Blackwood’*,” (*MA thesis*, *University of Glasgow*, 2010), 52-53. For the linkage between linguistics and nationalism in Germany at the time, see for example *Adam R. Nelson*, “*Nationalism, Transnationalism, and the American Scholar in the Nineteenth Century: Thoughts on the Career of William Dwight Whitney*,” *The New England Quarterly* 78 (2005): 354, 358.

²⁹⁹ *Winterer*, *Culture of Classicism*, 50. *Winterer* lists nine key names.

³⁰⁰ *ibid.*, 61, 52.

³⁰¹ *Gura*, *Wisdom of Words*, 18.

views closer to, but not identical with, the Virginia SAEs: first, they separated philosophy from philology, a bold move in this context, because it undercut the basis of language in rationality. An orthodox Calvinist—the main religious sect in Virginia that only grudgingly gave ground to SAE—Stuart kept in mind the limited faculties of man. He entertained the possibility of the poetic character of language in religion before the indescribable, but without drawing the bold Gnostic conclusions of the liberals. Though words were more a façade to God’s light and the definite meanings of the text were binding ideas, Stuart’s arguments did not point to a Gnostic dualism that assailed the frailty of “natural” existence and reduced it to function only as an antithesis to light, i.e., the dominant northern metaphysics. “Natural” being is dependent on light and its truth, not *reduced from* light: being is capable of existing attached to a wire as it were. There is no *transcendence* but *difference*, though conditioned, between the realms of Being and truth.³⁰²

Beginning in the 1820s, northern authors exploited their unrefined language theory and published and disseminated literary works that purportedly were true history but which later scholars have exposed as mythical.³⁰³ I cannot enter into this criticism in depth. For instance, Hazlett states Washington Irving wanted to create an American hero while at the same time insisting on a completely unmediated vision of history.³⁰⁴ Their philosophy *in* history rested on a linguistics they applied aesthetically as romantic symbolism for philosophical, political, ethical and social ends. Their SAE audiences took it as referential truth. In other words, they used romantic aesthetics and literature to make social science out of history. The reader overlooked language for the didactic romance. In terms of genre, Lincoln explains, such a theory of literature violated the everyday of the novel with the extraordinary of the romance and erected morality on the result. The emerging morality of the romance connected to historicism: a larger, law-like process beyond one’s control. The resulting world-view is that of a disinterested winner in a world where morality significantly determines action and truth and virtue are absolutes. I claim this aesthetics bolstered SAE. Even a mild ironist such as James Fenimore Cooper applies dialectic anthropology, not philology let alone rhetoric, to his works that deal with history

³⁰² *ibid.*, 22-30; Blumenberg, “Light as a Metaphor for Truth,” 32-33. According to Blumenberg, the distinction becomes blurred already in Plato.

³⁰³ For example Irving reportedly set out to write “an ample and complete account” with his history of Columbus. Anonymous, “[Review:] Irving’s Life of Columbus,” *Southern Review* 2 (1828): 3.

³⁰⁴ See, for instance, John D. Hazlett, “Literary Nationalism and Ambivalence in Washington Irving’s *The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*,” *American Literature* 55 (1983): 560-75, citing 562-63; Ian Marshall, “Cooper’s ‘Course of Empire’: Mountains and the Rise and Fall of American Civilization in *The Last of the Mohicans*, *The Spy*, and *The Pioneers*,” accessed August 26, 2013, <http://external.oneonta.edu/cooper/articles/suny/1989suny-marshall.html>. Cf. Wells, *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800–1861* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 57-58. Wells thinks both North and South aimed not only at ridding themselves from Europe but also at establishing a nationalist literary and intellectual culture. Wells argues that progress was a universal target in both North and South. This seems too imprecise.

and wraps it in neoplatonic imagery of northern nationalism. Classicism and rhetoric were getting more irrelevant.³⁰⁵

2.3.2 Southern responses: A skeptical reading of Sir Walter Scott

There was a relative hiatus of several years of published historical thought in the main southern intellectual centers, indicative of the bafflement at the northern game changer and the new theory of subjectivity.³⁰⁶ Besides institutional power, the initiative about historical language theory and historical metaphysics was now firmly in the hands of northerners.

Walter Scott now began his rise to prominence among southerners everywhere.³⁰⁷ However, Scott did not exist in a vacuum so that historical thinking could be reduced to his works—until recently the American *credo* in southern context.³⁰⁸ Here I contend to point out his relationship to historical narrative and for southern historical theory in the 1820s.

Scott's differences to northern romancers of history and their implied readers are several. First, Scott did not distinguish between genres as story and history, history and philosophy of history, romance and novel. He knew history was always a constructed narrative. O'Brien states Scott thought fiction had inherited Aristotle's epic as poetry of greater truth in philosophical terms than history. Lincoln points out that he was also aware of the newfound cultural authority of history. Second, Scott left the connection between morality and history contingent. In other words, immoral actions may turn out to be beneficial to all. The hero, though humanitarian in principle, loses to the calculating environment of moderation. The winning aspect of environmental calculation is always virtuous and beneficial to others. Scott entertains the possibility of a divinely ordered history and is a qualified believer in progress, but does not valorise them. As Nakamura

³⁰⁵ For genre analysis, compare with Andrew Lincoln, *Walter Scott and Modernity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 17-18. For Cooper and irony, see, for example, Dekker, *American Historical Romance*, 91, 93. In terms of genre, history is a ground, while romanticism is a vehicle and social science a tenor in the New Critical idiom. For the decline of eloquence registered by southerners, see CO1, 48.

³⁰⁶ On the latter issue for southerners, see Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 142.

³⁰⁷ Cobb, *Away Down South*, 45. Scott was a friend to several Scottish historians. Dekker, *American Historical Romance*, 74.

³⁰⁸ Scott was never a mediaevalist but rather a romantic modernist even bordering on aesthetic modernism, and thereby it is controversial to make pre-modern politics out of Scott as the major intellectual studies on the South in the 20th century arguably have done. O'Brien, *Rethinking the South*, 52-53. This is yet more ironic given that Scott himself took part in inventing myths and traditions. Hugh Trevor-Roper, "The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland," in *The Invention of Tradition, Past and Present Publications*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 15-41.

has it, Scott is free from Whig idealistic glorification of the victors that, I shall show, was evident in New England (chapters 3, 5). Third, Lincoln adds that similar to other Scottish theorists of society, the conflicts are often resolved more explicitly as tragedies that leave the philosophical bases of knowledge and social order more inconclusive and uncertain. This invited Tory skepticism that criticized Romantic idealist philosophy. Crucial for my purposes, his novels could be read *both* as a “warm” romance of moral sympathy and identification, as mainly literary, *and* as a “cold,” skeptical and more analytic commentary on history, as mainly historical. This type of reading was what Scott had in common with other Scottish and Irish authors. In history, such a reading had been offered by Gibbon and Edmund Burke, another southern favorite. Conservatism for these authors becomes a cover for expression of ironic social discontent.³⁰⁹

Scott’s novels not only serve as “foundational tropes” about the problematic and unstable boundary between history and fiction, they also appeal “to those who see through the fiction (of national cohesion, of historical progress, of liberal participation).”³¹⁰ Southerners were never keen practitioners of (post–Rousseau) Romanticism politically or aesthetically instead of 18th century³¹¹ and even more ancient ways. But they often engaged novel theories critically or ironically. It is therefore conceivable that southern audiences included similar reception. By contrast, Levin claims New England read Scott mainly for romance qualities.³¹²

Some southern theorists possibly read Scott cynically against the grain of northern historical romance. For example, Irving’s history of Columbus received scathing criticism from an anonymous reviewer in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, a major artery of southern critical opinion established in the 1830s (chapter 3). The critic appeals to Gibbon and almost reverently to Robertson and, from the viewpoint of common sense, questions Irving’s mixing of romance with history and Neoplatonism.³¹³ Hugh Swinton Legaré of

³⁰⁹ CO2, 746; *Lincoln*, Walter Scott and Modernity, 17-20; Masahiro Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms: Southern Conservatism and the Other American Romance* (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2009), 50.

³¹⁰ Ian Duncan, “Authenticity Effects: The Work of Fiction in Romantic Scotland,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 102 (2003): 101, 107, quoted in *Lincoln*, Walter Scott and Modernity, 19. Scott was free from fanaticism and sentimentality. Dekker, *American Historical Romance*, 83.

³¹¹ John Crowe Ransom, “Reconstructed but Unregenerate,” repr. in *The American Intellectual Tradition*, Volume II: 1865 to the Present, eds. David A. Hollinger and Charles Capper, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 212-13. Cf. Green who claims all Americans, buoyed by Scott among others, shared in the tradition of historical romance grounded in history. The view seems too simplistic in the southern context, as is his grouping of Scott with Cooper and Simms with Kennedy (chapter 3). Harvey Green, “Myth, History, and the American Historical Romance in the Nineteenth Century,” in *Shackleton and Toivonen*, *Roots and Renewal*, 162-63.

³¹² David Levin, *History as Romantic Art: Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman* (New York: A Harbinger Book, 1959), 12, 17-18.

³¹³ Anonymous, “[Review:] Irving’s Life of Columbus,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840): 569-71. Cf., however, a previous glowing review in Anonymous, “Irving’s Life of Columbus,” 1-31.

South Carolina, possibly the best-read intellectual in the South, wrote to Virginian Jesse Burton Harrison, a German scholar and another Hampden man, to hold fast to Greek literature instead of Irving, Cooper or similar “smatterers” up North where, echoing Johnson’s observation on Scots, in-depth knowledge was absent. Northerners lacked even the rudiments of scholarship before Europe travels: Philadelphians and New Yorkers will remain satisfied with “souvenirs’ and such stuff” in taste and capacity for a while yet.³¹⁴ Another prominent South Carolinian, historian, novelist and poet William Gilmore Simms, enthusiastic about neohumanism and German culture and an admirer of Scott, declared romance in history unrealistic. With irony, Simms realised the faulty dialectic apparatus between “civilized” and “savage” in Cooper was the only thing America—I argue especially northerners—saw.³¹⁵

2.3.3 Southern responses: A more critical historiography

In general, southerners were by now far more nuanced than northerners about history, and leaps and bounds ahead as critics. Of the modern historians, essential were, in addition to Robertson, the anti-Whig, anti-Puritan David Hume and Edward Gibbon, the historian of Rome,³¹⁶ remarkably modern in his methodology, style and religious relativism. Thus, southerners apparently did not agree with SAE nor held Puritan religion a key element in history. Since the immensely read Hume was not entirely distinct as a historian than as a philosopher, they were uniquely more disposed to demarcate clearly between tautological realm of ideas and real-life inductions of fact. For Hume, the latter were always “a result of fixed prejudice or indurate habits of belief.”³¹⁷ In other words, the phenomenal-empirical realm of history was not reduced to the peculiar northern mix of utilitarian-rationalist pseudo-social science and Christianity. This is critical, because such separation extended to seeing rhetoric at work in historiography—never abandoned by leading Enlightenment historians³¹⁸—even in case of more bourgeois theorists like Wirt as we saw. Further, it corroborates the argument that instead of a unified nation or even a state

The same volume also praises Cooper. Anonymous, “[Review:] American Naval History,” Southern Review 2 (1828): 350-51.

³¹⁴ Legaré, *Writings*, 1, 10, cited in Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 50; “*Gifts to the Library*,” *The Record of the Hampden-Sydney Alumni Association* 8, April 1, 1934.

³¹⁵ John C. Guilds, “*William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette*,” *Studies in Bibliography* 21 (1968): 72, 74-76; Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 48-49. *On Simms and Scott*, see *ibid.*, 31.

³¹⁶ CO2, 594, 596.

³¹⁷ Norris, *Against Relativism*, 200.

³¹⁸ For Voltaire, historical process was reason, but he realised its relationship with form was ambiguous. Gearhart, *Open Boundary of History and Fiction*, 74-75; Lionel Gossman, “*History and Literature: Reproduction or Signification*,” in Canary and Kozicki, *Writing of History*, 10-14. *An entire brand of enlightened historians did not give up on rhetoric inherent in history. O’Brien, Narratives of Enlightenment. I shall return to them in the next chapter.*

presupposed by modern history, the South was more an internally variegated collection of constituencies or *patrias* that had an instrumentalist, rather than mystical–collectivist, character. For Hume, the whole notion of an enlightened public sphere was less a source of ground for national pride and identification—as in the North and southern bourgeois theorists of history—and more “a set of potentially irrational wishes that must be appeased if any system of power is to remain stable.” In other words, more cynically, it was a necessary evil to settle with and check private interests through institutions. It rested neither on enlightened citizenry as in Locke and SAE, nor on maximum democratic willed participation, the position of major liberal northern historians like Bancroft.³¹⁹ The subsequent American glorification of institutions is, at the very least, an ambiguous undertaking to such political philosophy (chapter 3). Since they failed to dispense with historical particularity, southerners were not suprahistorical where the future counted more than the past, nor were all advocates of universalized Lockean citizenship adhered to by most other liberals around them and, in cases, among them.

One indication of these discrepancies relevant for me is that by the late–1820s, many southerners had adopted Kantian historicism. Kant was the first philosopher to go beyond Hume to introduce discourse, not just mental representation, as ground for concept formation. Accordingly, southerners were radically sensitive about modern history *as production*, a notion increasingly strongly rejected in the North. I gather this from popularity of Barthold Niebuhr. Besides strong appreciation of Antiquity and criticism of the French Revolution, Niebuhr’s mixture of historicism and deep erudition appealed to southerners and influenced them more than Leopold von Ranke, O’Brien contends. Niebuhr showed an ability to create order from chaos on a historicist premise. However, I would disagree with O’Brien Niebuhr subscribed to the neohumanistic expulsion of aesthetics from history, and his assessment that Nietzsche completely rejected historical knowledge. Both Niebuhr and his southern readers rejoiced at the possibility of uniting history and natural science.³²⁰ But, from this possibility they drew conclusions more akin to Nietzsche than Schiller. This is first of all because Niebuhr desired his historiography to be grounded in Kant’s second *Critique*.³²¹ We have to distinguish Kant’s philosophy of history—ungrounded in paradigmatic, empirical history—from Kant’s theory of knowledge Niebuhr became immersed with. Kant’s philosophical critique of philology can be related back to reflective judgment of the third *Critique*, which uncouples philology from deductive reasoning and only leaves analogy or induction as modes of generalisation.

³¹⁹ David A. Hollinger, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Basic, 2000), 147-48; Daniel Gordon, “Philosophy, Sociology, and Gender in the Enlightenment Conception of Public Opinion,” *French Historical Studies* 17 (1992): 885-89, citation on 885.

³²⁰ CO2, 603-5. Niebuhr was revered in the South. See for example Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 30, 44. Thomasa H. Brobjer, “Nietzsche’s Relation to Historical Methods and Nineteenth–Century German Historiography,” *History and Theory* 46 (2007): 172n77, 177.

³²¹ Alexander Conison, “B. G. Niebuhr’s Romantic Imagination,” (paper presented at a meeting of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., 2009), accessed September 18, 2013, <http://www.camws.org/meeting/2009/program/abstracts/06C2.Conison.pdf>.

Thus, history cannot be *known* to be progress of God as SAE insisted, and empirical phenomena are only locally or intersubjectively true and purposive in analogy with the intellect in reflection. There is no *a priori* objective standard or Scholastic prescriptivism, only communality, and no higher ideal than human authenticity.³²² I contend Kant's practical reason was carried to southerners in Niebuhr's history and, in places, radicalised to question modernity's free will manifest in history from natural scientific view. Philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer rejected free will, historical causality and philosophical moral repentance on a Kantian basis. Not all southerners took this step from Kant, but some did (chapter 3). My point is, many still reflected on the discrepancy as modernization critique, which strengthened the strands of opinion about history separate from SAE.³²³ By contrast, for example the pioneering Briton, Oxford clergyman Thomas Arnold received Niebuhr not as a progressive or cyclic but pessimistic philosopher of history,³²⁴ and this view was disseminated to Boston.

My reasons are: a) southerners' faith in universal being was crumbling, b) for the many outside SAE, history had no meaning as a grand metaphysical totality or anthropological romance, c) the postulate that reason guides history was suspect and d) the appreciation of rigorous philology and science was strong. For example George Tucker, Virginia politician, essayist and educator, engaged Malthus, and Presbyterian historian Mitchell King, despite his religion, treated natural sciences and history together.³²⁵ Thus, I claim some southerners were, rather uniquely, positioned in a polemic against an optimistic, democratic and Judeo-Christian-liberal teleology of history.³²⁶ Few southerners were downright pessimists, though some were. But they resembled Schopenhauer and particularly Nietzsche who came later as critics of such an apparatus. Specifically, they embraced a version of *Anglo-French Enlightenment* Miller defines roughly as anti-Christian, skeptical and positivist.³²⁷ The biggest differences are a less negative stand against religion and a more communal self as a part of the whole. Still, there were functional similarities: 1. Intellect and perception were deep and powerful, classical,

³²² Rudolf A. Makkreel, "The Confluence of Aesthetics and Hermeneutics in Baumgarten, Meier, and Kant," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 54 (1996): 69-71.

³²³ Louis Miller, "Foucault, Nietzsche, Enlightenment: Some Historical Considerations," repr. in *Postmodernism and the Enlightenment: New Perspectives in Eighteenth-Century French Intellectual History*, ed. Daniel Gordon (New York: Routledge, 2001), 181. For Niebuhr's avoidance of the romantics, see Fritz Renker, *Niebuhr und die Romantik* (Leipzig: C. & E. Vogel, 1935).

³²⁴ Anonymous [Thomas Arnold], "[Review:] *Early Roman History*," *Quarterly Review* 32 (1825): 85. Arnold's authorship is claimed in William R. McKelvy, *The English Cult of Literature: Devoted Readers, 1774-1880* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 291.

³²⁵ CO2, 605; A Citizen of Virginia [George Tucker], "On the Theory of Malthus," in *Essays on Various Subjects of Taste, Morals, and National Policy*, by George Tucker (Georgetown: Joseph Milligan, 1822), 305-36.

³²⁶ Miller, "Foucault, Nietzsche, Enlightenment," 181-82.

³²⁷ *ibid.*, 183.

aristocratic or simple, not mechanist, bourgeois, or grounded in faith.³²⁸ 2. Ontologically, many southerners were outside Christianity and morality in their renovated (or Gnostic) guises of abstraction, prescription, knowledge or modern liberalism. 3. Persevering will, effort and the body preceded a (cultured) intellect, which was only an instrument, not a ground.³²⁹ 4. Suspicion about and focus on form, because reality was about becoming, a process. Being was not universal, nor grounded in history.³³⁰ 5. Neither Nietzsche, southerners or Niebuhr were enemies to aesthetics in history *tout court*. Romantic aesthetics that placed art outside history was the problem.³³¹

As readers of Niebuhr, Nietzsche—a diligent student of Wolf and Niebuhr—and southerners are comparable. First, history for Nietzsche was not a utilitarian, social scientific, nor necessarily even a Christian pursuit, attitudes that also circulated in the South. Second, Nietzsche “valued historical method and scholarship as a *precondition* of culture (and of cultural discussions and diagnosis), but objected to them as the *goal* of culture.” This is reminiscent of southern suspicion of historical romancing and associated teleology of liberal progress. Third, Nietzsche saw history not as a romantic undertaking but in his words “a new and stronger genii of *that very Enlightenment*” out of which it had developed into prominence. Enlightened skepticism granted by Scott and the appreciation of authentic history was what southern theorists at the period likewise appreciated. This coolness of “new” skepticism is what Nietzsche valued. He quipped: “There may be good reason for warm-blooded and superficial humanitarians to cross themselves before precisely this spirit.” Neither Nietzsche nor southerners were reformists or humanitarians in historical thinking. Fourth, Nietzsche put philology before idealistic philosophy and neohumanism. Similarly, southerners had only a qualified acceptance of both. Fifth, like many southerners, Nietzsche hated abstraction in history and historical methodology instead of the personal, “the example, the habit, the simile.” He combined hard work with philology and original thinking without too many books. Sixth, the highest goal for him in history was the comprehension of Antiquity, coinciding with southern admiration. Seventh, Nietzsche probably had Niebuhr in mind in many of his statements about history, many of which were critical of Romanticism.³³² Eighth, besides Plutarch he praised

³²⁸ Compare with Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*, trans. Helen Zimmern, *Dover Thrift Editions series* (New York: Dover, 1997), section 252.

³²⁹ Miller, “Foucault, Nietzsche, Enlightenment,” 182.

³³⁰ Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, section 254; Miller, “Foucault, Nietzsche, Enlightenment,” 188.

³³¹ For Niebuhr and art in history, see Francisco Murari Pires, “Thucydidean Modernities: History between Science and Art,” accessed September 19, 2013, <http://www.fflch.usp.br/dh/heros/FMP/ThucydideanModernities.pdf>, 815.

³³² “The best that Germany has given, critical discipline—Kant, F. A. Wolf, Lessing, Niebuhr etc. The defence of skepticism.—Stronger and more determined courage, the confidence of the hand which moves the knife, pleasure in saying no and analyzing. The opposite movement: Romanticism.” Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, eds., *Friedrich Nietzsche: Kritische Studienausgabe*, Volume XI (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980a), 34, cited in Brobjer, “Nietzsche’s Relation to Historical Methods,” 169.

Thucydides, southern favorites in contrast to Plato. Most southerners probably would have agreed with his assessment: “Plato is a coward in face of reality—consequently he flees into the ideal; Thucydides has *himself* under control—consequently he retains control over things.”³³³

2.3.4 Southern responses: Virginia

By 1820, Jefferson, worrying about education, charged that southerners “are not trusting to those who are against us in position and principle,” who “fashion to their own form the minds and affections of our youth.” Simpson insists that in this context, though not in these letters, Jefferson singled out Harvard—the nerve center of new German thought—“as in institution particularly antagonistic to southern principles”: Dunn holds that Jefferson started to suspect *all* major northern education at the time. In education—like at times previously, I add—“the country” was now Virginia.³³⁴ Jefferson’s reaction is understandable given this new thought alien to Virginians in general. Indicative of widely different aims, the first faculty at the University of Virginia was almost entirely British and continental Europeans were welcomed as well.³³⁵ There was, thus, less zealotry about uniquely American nationalism in learning.

For the southerners outside SAE, choices within northern discussion were not inviting. Clemmer summarises the historical thinking in Pennsylvania and New England: “With respect to the attitude toward history . . . the New England movement must be regarded as an extension or prolongation of the Enlightenment, whereas the Pennsylvania movement [of the 1830s] was ‘in phase’ with the development of idealism and romanticism in Europe.”³³⁶ That is, either SAE or German Idealism. The Tory-leaning Virginians were suspicious of the German renaissance, and the old Tory dismissal of German culture

³³³*ibid.*, 157-70, citations on 157, emphasis original, 162. Nietzsche, *Daybreak*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 197, emphasis original; Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, eds., [*Jenseits von Gut und Böse*], in Friedrich Nietzsche: Kritische Studienausgabe, Volume XII (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980b), 269; Nietzsche, *Twilight of the Idols*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), “What I Owe to the Ancients,” 2, emphasis original, all cited in Brobjer, “Nietzsche’s Relation to Historical Methods,” 161, 169, 170, emphasis original.

³³⁴ Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, August 14, 1820; Thomas Jefferson to James Breckenridge, February 15, 1821, in *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Volume XV, eds. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1905), 269, 314-15, cited in Lewis P. Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), 8, *ibid.*, 9-10; Susan Dunn, *Dominion of Memories: Jefferson, Madison, and the Decline of Virginia* (New York: Basic, 2007), 65.

³³⁵ Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 4.

³³⁶ Robert Clemmer, “Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (1969): 579.

between late-1790s and early-1810s persisted far longer.³³⁷ Pretty much the only inroad of novel German ideas in Virginia in the 1820s was made by Harrison in 1827, but even he was in contact with northerner James Marsh, another Hampden teacher and his protégé (chapter 3).³³⁸ The Harvard and Göttingen-schooled Harrison leaned to Quakers, Episcopalians and Puritans and was a cousin to Henry Clay. However, he was rejected from Jefferson's university.³³⁹ This would suggest a cultural tension in Virginia with both German romantic liberalism and New England I shall briefly explore below as related to history.

Tucker had become Jefferson's educator of choice. He taught moral philosophy until 1845. The differences between Tucker and northerners are significant. Though a believer in American progress and a supporter of science like Jefferson, Tucker also prophesied the ultimate decline of American history more than a decade before Cooper. He shared the *topoi* of a conservative enlightened skeptic: contrary to popular northern opinion, he had great admiration for Tory Hume as a philosopher, a Scott influence. Tucker criticized utilitarianism at the expense of the humanities and classical languages. He distinguished between "real eloquence," apparently ancient rhetoric, and "affectation," "gaudy epithets, striking metaphors, and fanciful allusions." He protested against style for its own sake—the northern literary paradigm by the 1820s—and contended all languages must ultimately corrupt and decay. He was also practically an atheist. Tucker was inspired by Scott when he published *The Valley of Shenandoah* in 1824, a tragedy about the economic ruin of a Virginia family.³⁴⁰

Historiographical thought in Virginia retained emphasis on ancient rhetoric and older history. In a satire à la Wirt but far less a bourgeois social criticism, Grigsby wrote *Letters of a South-Carolinian* in 1827. It studied several prominent Virginian orators since "Virginia is the land of orators." O'Brien comments Grigsby's assessments were "implausible." However, I think he misses the different semiotics and episteme involved. Though there was a contending one based on German neohumanism in Charleston, Grigsby comments Virginians were not interested in the German idea of a native literary genius, nor should they necessarily be.³⁴¹ Grigsby was elected to the Virginia

³³⁷On Tory disregard of German culture see for example Segerblad, "Transcending the Gothic," 50. This tendency to disregard Germany existed in literary matters even in the mid-1820s. Arnold, "Early Roman History," 84-85. Nathaniel Beverley Tucker contends Virginia after the fall of Charles II was where "of the foreign dominions of England . . . the spirit of loyalty [to the king] was the strongest." Anonymous [Nathaniel Beverley Tucker], "[Review:] A History of the United States," *Southern Literary Messenger 1* (1835): 587, *passim*.

³³⁸CO2, 1043; CO1, 136.

³³⁹Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, 4, 51, 46, 2.

³⁴⁰James Fieser, introduction to *The Life of George Tucker: Excerpted from the Life and Philosophy of George Tucker*, ed. James Fieser (Bristol: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004), viii, ix-xi, xiii-xiv, xvii-xx; George Tucker, "On Style," in *Essays on Various Subjects*, 165-67.

³⁴¹CO2, 640-42; Hugh Blair Grigsby, *Letters of a South-Carolinian* (Norfolk: C. Bonsal, 1827), 42, cited in CO2, 640.

Constitutional Convention of 1829–1830 where he began a sketchbook of the other members.³⁴²

Grigsby is a good example of a southern historian working in the mold of enlightened Tory skepticism. He names Tory Jonathan Swift, a Scott favorite, as model. This indicates another stand taken against neoclassicism. Swift's writing was anathema to Augustan polite refinement by its inclusiveness of polite and vulgar, refined and popular modes. Lincoln states he did not reject politeness, but he played with it and with many different genres. Other similar authors popular in the South were Sterne and François Rabelais (chapters 3, 6). That Grigsby admired Swift but chose not to publish the notebook until much later in a polished form suggests a transformation about historical representation concerning bourgeois public sphere had occurred (chapter 6). To my knowledge, the original has still not been published in entirety. As an example of playful genre blending, he in the original mentions "structure of minds" of the participants in the same breath as "delineation" of their personal appearances and styles of eloquence.³⁴³ His interest is not in ideas but in living men. They, not abstract forces, made history. There are practically no abstract or even social patterns in history outside the men. This was an aristocratic practice of history according to de Tocqueville.³⁴⁴ This sort of history *predates* Universal History—that presupposed ideas as primary—all the way to Renaissance humanism. Further, it shows history was not everywhere discursive in the South. The language of the sketches functions as allegory rather than historical realism, as *commentary*, not *criticism*, a categorical difference.³⁴⁵ Grigsby's goal is not to capture the truth of his subject, reduce it to words or treat it rationally or philosophically, but to hint at it and its entangled, metonymic wholeness. Nor is the object a separate entity from the rest. Rather, the whole seems greater than the parts. Compared to Cooper, what is lacking is an anthropological and ethnic haphazard individualism. No romantic style, no serious moral message underneath the comic. No communal division, no newness of experience. Figuration, not social politics, solidarity, not social conflict.³⁴⁶ Grigsby, like Tucker, also does not appear very evangelical, indicating the humanistic counter-current to SAE.

³⁴² *ibid.*, 642-43.

³⁴³ Grigsby, "Sketches of Members of the Constitutional Convention of 1829–1830," 2nd. ed., repr. in *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 61 (1953): 319; Lincoln, *Walter Scott and Modernity*, 14-15.

³⁴⁴ *CO2*, 643, 645; de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2, 469-70.

³⁴⁵ Foucault, *Order of Things*, 87-88.

³⁴⁶ Compare with Simpson's reading of Cooper's ironies. David Simpson, *The Politics of American English, 1776–1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 158-62. See also Simms's criticism of Cooper's one-sidedness in Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 50. *On parallels between southern networks and 17th century England see for example Simpson, Mind and the American Civil War*, 14-18. However, I remain skeptical about his reduction of the phenomenon to mind, land and slavery.

2.3.4.1 Humanism, historicity, and pyrrhonism at the University of Virginia

Humanism about history spread at the University of Virginia—the world’s first purely secular agency of learning and letters³⁴⁷—due to its European faculty members George Long and Georg Blättermann. Edgar A. Poe studied under both during his ten-month stay as a student of linguistics in 1826.³⁴⁸ I argue Poe was influenced by this:³⁴⁹ it would illuminate his poetics of culture (chapters 3, 6). Poe had his Tory sympathies: he may have admired John Wilson, the famed contributor to Tory *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, though he also satirized him and the paper.³⁵⁰ *Blackwood’s* may have been the magazine he was most familiar with.³⁵¹

Blättermann was a philologist like Jefferson, but for history, perhaps more relevant is Long.³⁵² An eminent classicist admired by Matthew Arnold, he “represented history with the classics”: he affirmed the relevance of the classics to the present.³⁵³ I claim this take on classical culture was ethical, philological, aesthetic and rhetorical, *not* utilitarian, rationalist or bourgeois neohumanist as it became in the North. This sharpened the critical tools of his pupils about modernity and history, because it enabled for a theory of signs about history to extend *simultaneously* far back to the Renaissance and far forward to skeptical “protoromanticism.”

Specifically, I contend Long *juxtaposed* 16th century Renaissance humanist histories of *Artes Historicae* with Kant’s and Blair’s discursive semiotics of Universal History.

Artes Historicae generally had little philosophy. Instead, they embarked from the literary and rhetorical qualities of history. Following Dionysus and Lucian, these were not history’s purpose. However, since in the South, the underlying Polybean pragmatism about history was not widespread, these concerns and accompanying imitation of the

³⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 29.

³⁴⁸ John Ward Ostrom et al., eds., Edgar Allan Poe, The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe, Volume I: 1824–1846, 3rd rev. ed. (New York: The Gordian, 2008a), 6.

³⁴⁹ Poe writes, for example: “I have made prosody, in all languages which I have studied, a particular object of inquiry.” Edgar A. Poe to Beverley Tucker, December 1, 1835, in Ostrom et al., Edgar Allan Poe, 1, 115. Compare with Nietzsche on music in, for example, Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, section 252.

³⁵⁰ Edgar A. Poe to Joseph E. Snodgrass, September 11, 1839; Edgar A. Poe to Joseph E. Snodgrass, June 17, 1840, in Ostrom et al., Edgar Allan Poe, 1, 189-90, 229-31. On Poe’s satire see for example Margaret Alterton, Origins of Poe’s Critical Theory (Hamburg: SEVERUS Verlag, 2011), 10-11.

³⁵¹ *ibid.*, 12-13.

³⁵² Blättermann was a scholar of Saxon, the first and only English course in America—the first northern one would have to wait until 1841. For Jefferson, Saxon was not an antiquarian curiosity but a resource for lawyers and humanists in accordance with the English—not German—higher education paradigm. Hauer, “Thomas Jefferson and the Anglo-Saxon Language,” 891.

³⁵³ Thomas Fitzhugh, ed., Letters of George Long ([?]: The Library, University of Virginia, 1917), 18, 20.

Ancients arguably held. *Artes Historicae* probably also existed because the absence of Christianity at the university implied history needed not be exemplary. History could be *without* philosophy, i.e., without inherent meaning, moral, method or episteme. Secular and sacred history were categorically different, though even the latter acceded history was *res gestae*, the lived, and beyond study.³⁵⁴

I shall refer to this mix of humanism and enlightened skepticism as *historiality*. Historiality critiqued even spatial unity within a time period, the basic assumption of modern history. It chopped historicism more finely into individual textual productions that partake in reality but fail to yield any larger or higher (metaphysical, idealist) spatial patterns that the new space presupposed. Further, historiality thought such “unity–dependent” historiography potentially occludes its normative, philosophical and aesthetic qualities. Because opposed to Plato *and* sacredness/morality of history *and* very skeptical, it is perhaps best represented by Nietzsche. On Nietzsche’s scale, *Artes Historicae* is closest to *monumental history*. Central for me in monumental history is the *nonreflected* presence of the heroic individual in the sign and humanity as beautiful decisive action that manifests in such *unreflected* representation *and* existence. This echoes the Jeffersonian, and broadly southern, dynamism to tear loose from metaphysical networks. But since even Nietzsche takes Polybius as his point of departure,³⁵⁵ it is possible Long or his hearers emphasized the origins of *Artes Historicae* even more. This was extreme heterodoxy to SAE. But it was also distant from Universal History: after “Vossius” in the 1620s, the moral value of history had been on the rise. In other words, the *reduction* of empirical exemplary existence to the sign was grafted on Universal History as a guide to prudential existence. Universal historians Bacon and Hobbes reinforced this trend.³⁵⁶

Monumental history was opposed to *antiquarian history*. The latter denied life as becoming, the former celebrated it; the latter made no internal value and proportional judgments but treated everything equally; the former saw greatness in unique protean individuality. Nietzsche seems to disagree especially with neoplatonic immortalizing of the past as life–enervating³⁵⁷ that corresponds to the historical rationalism present in New England. Ironically, antiquarian history was *the* state–run paradigm about history the Yankees introduced (chapters 3, 4, 5). A further parallel between the university and Nietzsche is *balancing* monumental history with what he names *critical history*, the dismantling of the past as binding Jefferson had explicitly recommended. The resulting synthesis, if done right, was “a conflict between our inherited customary nature and our knowledge . . . a war between a new strict discipline and how we have been brought up and what we have inherited from time immemorial.” It was achievable through cultivation, but hard to attain. If successful, it created individuals with profound innate distrust about the past. I perceived this attitude especially among Virginia intellectuals. It proceeded

³⁵⁴ Nadel, “*Philosophy of History before Historicism*,” 304.

³⁵⁵ Nietzsche, *On the Use and Abuse of History for Life*, trans. ?, Kessinger Publishing’s Rare Reprints series ([?], Kessinger, 1998), 10-11.

³⁵⁶ Nadel, “*Philosophy of History before Historicism*,” 305, 304, 309-10.

³⁵⁷ *ibid.*, 17-18.

from real life, i.e., past *a posteriori* “out of which we may be descended in opposition to the one from which we are descended.”³⁵⁸

Such history broke out of the linear temporality of modern history and combined the *Artes Historicae* with enlightened semiotic skepticism and, as a third intellectual element, *pyrrhonism*. Pyrrhonist history, most popular from the late-1500s to the early-1600s, was what Vossius had explicitly resisted. According to one definition of pyrrhonism, “history is no more than an imperfect record of singular events, not a discipline subject to a definite method.”³⁵⁹ Pyrrhonism was extreme skepticism about history as an epistemic *or* philosophical pursuit—history as *either* Universal History *or* exemplary, i.e., the places modernity allocated for history from the 1600s onwards. Often, pyrrhonism included intense source criticism of language. Pyrrhonism had to do with secular attitudes about history and revolutionary attitudes about its teaching.³⁶⁰ Exemplarity and Universal History overcame it until historicism brought some of its aspects back. In my material, especially those southerners who were Virginia students, alumni or faculty persisted with pyrrhonist attitudes at least to the 1840s. Conversely, almost no-one settled for “simple” Universal History and its societally more radical variants historicism and social science, let alone SAE. The Virginia approach was thus very distant from the hegemonic, much better-known New England.

³⁵⁸ *ibid.*, 19.

³⁵⁹ Nadel, “*Philosophy of History before Historicism*,” 309.

³⁶⁰ Momigliano, “*Ancient History and the Antiquarian*,” 295-96.

3. Critical reactions to German theories about history and their northern applications in Charleston, South Carolina, and Virginia, mid-1820s-1841

3.1 The “German renaissance”: widely different interpretations continued

In this section, I will continue to back up my claim about the very different reading of Germany in the South in the late-1820s and early-1830s. First, I will argue for the emergence of a symbolic, ironic interpretation of history in the journal *Southern Review*. This was a result of rejecting SAE and WAE, guardedness about the idealistic and metaphoric element in German Romanticism in literature and history, and feelings of confusion and irony at New England –imposed discourse about culture and history. Second, I will examine the versions of this ironic symbolist critique in Charleston. My claim is, the initial reception of German Romanticism was far stronger there than in Virginia, but far from uncritical. Crucially for me, though Charleston shared in the fervor to establish a national literature, reception of German Romanticism also contained its criticism that is modernist. In sum, Virginia and Charleston critics had more in common with each other than either had with the northerners who were simply enthusiastic and utilitarian about romance and German Romanticism. This I shall illustrate by comparing and contrasting Poe with Simms, and by examining the latter in context of southern thinking and experience as related to function of books and prose.

3.1.1 A symbolic mode of historical discourse

As Grigsby had implied, a stronger center of southern cultural opinion, including history, was now Charleston and to an extent Columbia—the two southern places the reform impacted. Intellectuals had to respond to the northern intellectual armsrace on northern terms. Pennsylvania, where Hegelian thought would be welcomed in the 1840s (chapter 4), had taken the task of writing history for all the states to the south of Pennsylvania in 1815. It neglected to do so in practice, preferring Pennsylvania. To remedy this, the Pennsylvania State Historical Society was formed in 1824, which “began as an attempt to control national historiography through state organization.” In the 1800s and 1810s, New York and Massachusetts respectively had founded similar organizations. Importantly for me, the methods of these regional organizations about history were antiquarian,³⁶¹ not humanist let alone modernist. In other words, the level of sophistication about history was categorically different compared to the southern centers of intellect. Still, southerners apparently had to respond to the weight Pennsylvania and the young northern German-educated historian George Bancroft (3.3.2) had recently added to historical discussion.

³⁶¹ *Van Tassel, Recording America's Past*, 63-65.

By 1827, frustration with intellectual dependency helped establish the *Southern Review*, a learned and cosmopolitan journal for various intellectual discussions. It ceased publication in 1832 after Legaré was sent to Brussels by Jackson. However, there was no separatist fervor, no attempt to define or conceptualise a “southern” culture or identity. Though patriotic and interested in national literature, southerners were forced to play on a foreign turf: these concerns would not appear even as concepts until the 1840s.³⁶² There was less organicist fetishism of the soil and nature, *topoi* northern romancers enjoyed and linked to American nationalism. Thus, modern history was less endorsed.

Indicative of the different cultural dynamic that prevailed, and the Humean cynicism about public institutions (chapter 2), the *Southern Review* was explicitly advocated as a countermeasure to the *evils* of printed discourse and its ideologies. In a Nietzschean argument, these turn presumptions of today into future fact. There was acuteness of perception of *the press as a despot* that, in its functions, was directly connected to absorptive and hegemonic abuse of power—“constructive power”—against southerners that extended to the signifier. The writers also exhibit the attitude of waking up innocuous southern readers to this pressing fact of discourse. It is both novel and unfortunate that print and public opinion today possess such power, and mass education is the cause: it must be countered, or loss of power may result. Phenomenologically, this again harks back to the Renaissance–baroque era (chapter 2). Palpable concern about the South as Other is present. But the writers depart from sectionalism: the world–famed Constitution is an instrument *and* virgin. Its permanence and purity—as it was created—is the nail that keeps the nation united in friendly terms. Interestingly, the effusions of intellect are still described in neoplatonic and organicist imagery close to the North and much closer to modern history.³⁶³ In sum, southerners had to begin to see double between alienation and community.

Although the journal engaged Romanticism, it did not follow they held a similar view about history or even language as the northern mainstream. Instead, there is *a heightening of the symbolic mode* reminiscent of modernism, a different semiotic economy, where Calvinist symbolism, rhetorical emphasis, philology and the “cold” Scott reception were transformed into a much darker and pessimistic view about language and history and idealist philosophy.

Psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan has illustrated this in case of Poe’s “The Purloined Letter.” By way of Shoshana Felman and Derrida, I would extend his analysis to cover the cultural semiotic of leading contemporary southerners.³⁶⁴ Southerners occupied a third, *symbolic*, perspective that sees the limitations of the dialectic of romance and supposedly

³⁶² Compare with CO1, 46; CO2, 700-1; *idem.*, *Rethinking the South*, 46, 44.

³⁶³ “*Prospectus of the Southern Review*,” *City Gazette and Commercial Daily Advertiser*, January 1, 1828, n.p.

³⁶⁴ Jacques Lacan, “*Seminar on ‘The Purloined Letter,’*” trans. Jeffrey Mehlman, *Yale French Studies* 48 (1972): 39-72. Shoshana Felman, “*On Reading Poetry: Reflections on the Limits and Possibilities of Psychoanalytical Approaches*,”; Derrida, “*The Purveyor of Truth*,” trans. Alan Bass, both in *The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida, and Psychoanalytic Reading*, eds. John P. Muller and William J. Richardson (London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 133-56; 173-212.

rational language. This entailed a simultaneous lack and rejection of these modes to overarching mastery and stable, secure identity. This was almost diametrically opposed to the imperialist, aggressively outreaching figuration of New England that the southerners had already put up with since the 1790s (chapter 2). Not only does history lose its place as the analyst of the real (history as true language), the analysand (history as romance) become disenchanted: they stop seeing themselves in the analyst's mirror *and* perceive the mirror itself as imaginary. This became the condition of southern textual theorists, because many failed to believe that either reason or mirror mastered nature in history. Because of this heterology (chapter 2), they perceived the limitations, dimensions of ethics and power, and illusions of such figuration of truth. For them, as for Poe in Lacan's analysis, "to feel safe is itself a great danger, to believe that one has arrived at the truth is to be deluded, to declare one's mastery over a situation or body of knowledge is to declare one's blindness to the forces that overwhelm and control us all." As Derrida notes, the realization is still open to perennial metaphysical dispute.³⁶⁵ This drives a wedge between: a) history vs. textuality, b) ideality vs. textual ontology, and c) history as the morally conscientious psychologist vs. the "sick unethical" patient.

3.1.1.1 *Effects on history in the Southern Review*

In historical discussion, many southerners would probably have agreed with historian Jacob Burckhardt's assessment of the neohumanist liberal spin about ancient Greece—the interpretation in the North—as fallacious.³⁶⁶ This different understanding of liberty from German romantic liberalism is vital for southerners.³⁶⁷ As in case of Burckhardt, their rhetoric of political conservatism and awareness of language as figural produced critical commentary about history inside and outside history proper. Southern emphasis in history remained on philology, literature and rhetoric besides a qualified romantic aesthetics, instead of social-made-political science that was grounded in natural science and religion.

Legaré in the *Southern Review* stated classical history is better than modern in a criticism of education policy by Thomas Grimké, an ardent Christian and a stark opponent of the ancients. History should not be made a utilitarian pursuit. Democratic spirit contained in phrases like "practical" and "the people" is distasteful and vulgar Platonic idealism and scholasticism. Like in Plato's scheme, poets—except the harmless didactics— orators, stunning literary individuals and their divine spirit would vanish as a result.

³⁶⁵ Scott Peeples, *The Afterlife of Edgar Allan Poe* (New York: Camden House, 2004), 58-61, citation on 59.

³⁶⁶ Felix Gilbert, *History: Politics or Culture? Reflections on Ranke and Burckhardt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 74-75. For northern liberalization of Greece, see for example Winterer, *Culture of Classicism*, 61, 63-64.

³⁶⁷ On Burckhardt's political difference from liberal historians, see for example Rüsen, "Jacob Burckhardt," 236, *passim*.

History, it is implied, is among the arts that addresses taste, imagination, and the heart³⁶⁸—and in no need of Yankee uplift. Those who question classical learning are equally ill-disposed to all elegant studies, and will ultimately rid themselves of all literariness.³⁶⁹ Historical assessment of the classical world is about written and spoken language of the leaders, not about the masses, what they were or did. Classical rhetoric as the mode of moral lessons—now sadly neglected outside grammar schools—is superior to modern metaphysical ethical theories.³⁷⁰ Because of the interpreters of the Germans, literature is in danger of forgetting the simplicity of classicism that drew from real, material and everyday instead of passions and human heart, abstract ideas and the spirit world. In “this philosophic age,” with its “broad and garish light,” increase of knowledge and current philosophy actually threaten the poetic realm. Interestingly, Legaré here alludes to Edmund Spenser through John Milton and to the 16th century theory of knowledge: a skull is now not a memento mori but *a sign* that “mysteries of phrenology” have “brought to light.” Legaré thus seems painfully aware of the rage for neoplatonic blinding light, prevalent and fateful in northern discussion. Likewise, he acknowledges philosophy as an enemy to the poetic—and its overlap into natural history prevalent in New England. Translations are not only bad, they are dangerous, Legaré implies, if religious revelation for instance is not left to the philological scholars.³⁷¹

Robert Henry, a reviewer of Niebuhr’s *Roman History*, assures the chronicle is in truth the only history there is. The rest is reflection and embellishment—contrary to Speece (chapter 2). In an anti-neohumanist argument, art in history has been in history for all time, but the Romans managed to keep it in check better than most. Rigorous philology may shift among history what is added and what is in the core.³⁷² But, a bit of warmth of

³⁶⁸ *The point of education is moral character and it is not “teaching what to think but persuading to act well,” not “loading the memory with cold and barren precepts, but forming the sensibility by the habitual, fervid and rapturous contemplation of high and heroic models of excellence,” not “definitions of virtue and speculations about the principle of obligation” but “making us love the one and feel the sacredness of the other.” Anonymous [Legaré], “Classical Learning,” Southern Review 1 (1828a): 19. For identification of authors of Southern Review, I draw on Edward Reinhold Rogers, “Four Southern Magazines,” (PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1903), 52-60, and O’Brien, A Character of Hugh Legaré (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 285-96.*

³⁶⁹ Legaré, “Classical Learning,” 29.

³⁷⁰ *ibid.*, 27-29, 29n⁺.

³⁷¹ *ibid.*, 30-36, citations on 33, 35, 34. Legaré mentions Byron in a negative light as an example of a romantic. This is questionable however given Byron’s strong ambivalence about Romanticism, discussed later. Legaré himself departed from his initially negative view some years later. Legaré, “[Review:] Byron’s Letters and Journals [Volume II],” Southern Review 7 (1831): 1-42. For the Spenser connection, see for example <http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=36892>, accessed August 30, 2013. Also for the young Simms, literary criticism should be about the text, not the person. Guilds, “William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette,” 78.

³⁷² Anonymous [Robert Henry], “[Review:] Niebuhr’s Roman History,” Southern Review 1 (1828): 324-27. An extreme view into history as science was provided by physician Josiah Nott, who

Friedrich Schlegel—the most radical German historian—was not so bad in a work of history, “lively interest” and “warm, delightful colouring,” Legaré contends. Even Roman history should not be “mere compilation,” though the literature of the Romans themselves did not inspire enthusiasm like that of the Greeks. The Greeks had originality, not by way of Augustan neoclassicism, but as intrinsic to their whole society as *Bildung*, a national literature. Next to the Greeks in originality are South European Troubadours, “full of gallantry and sentimental love.” “These simple effusions, the first language, perhaps the first lessons of chivalry” were exempt from all classical models. An allusion to the 16th century in connection with Ludovico Ariosto, Torquato Tasso and others: “Their subjects alone are full of poetry.” The more polished and elegant versions of these 16th century writers do not quite capture the “freedom, freshness, and originality” of primitive literature.³⁷³

Legaré satirises modern history by a chiasm reminiscent of de Man’s reading of German poet Rainer–Maria Rilke, who similarly tied symbol to physicality.³⁷⁴ The format of history of an American experience, as in Grigsby, is a journal or diary written by Bernhard, Duke of Saxe–Weimar Eisenach. Legaré reverses the truth content of the duke’s diary and modern historical study. The truth of a desire for non–publication is actually greater than publication proper. Legaré states it is far from certain the current forms of historiography that differ greatly from the duke’s are well–founded. Histories have become philosophies of history, something far different from Thucydides or Xenophon: atop narration of causality proper to understanding, histories now exhibit such things as “ponderous disquisitions about political economy and national wealth, excursions on the march of intellect, and the state of letters and science.” Biography and travel books have

wrote little on history. Nott, schooled in Philadelphia and Paris, was an extreme scientist and admirer of science, but more a dilettante than an expert even to many of his contemporaries. Ironically, he was the best known southern intellectual abroad for his racist theories which were not agreed on by some other southerners. Thus, his views on history should be critically approached and seem rare in his context. Ironically, the views seem much more reminiscent of more contemporary “scientific” history. For Nott, for example, history is a dignified name that has no room for “constant partiality and superficial knowledge.” Bias in history is smoothing over, suppression, picking and choosing among the correspondence “to prove falsehood, cowardice, skepticism” where there was none. Nott attacks explicitly such forms of historiography that fail to accord with science and logic. Anonymous [Josiah Nott], “[Review:] Butler’s Life of Erasmus,” Southern Review 3 (1829): 78-124, esp. 109, 122-24. O’Brien attributes the piece to his brother Henry Junius Nott, but it is doubtful because of the scientific rhetoric. O’Brien, A Character of Hugh Legaré, 289. On Josiah Nott, see for example CO1, 240-48.

³⁷³ Anonymous [Legaré], “[Review:] Roman Literature,” Southern Review 1 (1828b): 358-61, citations on 358, emphasis original, 360, 361, 360. Also Simms saw Scott in terms of F. Schlegel. Nakamura, Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms, 32. Southerners by and large did not object to the Schlegels, but more to what came after them.

³⁷⁴ Paul de Man, Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Rilke, Nietzsche, and Proust (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 20-56. “Biography: Rainer–Maria Rilke,” accessed September 9, 2013, <http://www.poetryfoundation.org/bio/rainer-maria-rilke>.

had the same fate. All these genres are full of “speculation[,] fine–spun theories [and] high–flown rhetoric.” Legaré entertains the possibility such models “form our ideas.” The duke only tells what he personally saw and heard, and cautions if hearsay is presented. There are still errors, so how many more are there in larger corpuses that treat subjective speculation as fact and build conclusions on loose materials as if they were demonstrative evidence? A stated purpose of a hasty glance over the surface is more reliable as a guide to truth.³⁷⁵ This was a strikingly secular conclusion about history (chapter 6).

By comparison, in Rilke’s “Archaischer Torso Apollos,” only the broken and fragmentary statue is capable of observation. The absent eyes create the space and the play for the chiasmus in which they become a new totality. In Legaré, the intact, incorporating view of history is ironically the blind one, while the superficial one is the more authentic. Save for the mystic conclusions of Rilke–Legaré stays on the ground–the rhetorical structures are remarkably similar. As in Rilke, it is not a question of deepening knowledge of reality, but a virtuoso, rhetorical ploy that captures and fascinates. In both, there is a protest against referentiality of language, and primacy of epistemological object: in de Man’s phrase, it is *lexis* over *logos*. In figuration, both go beyond metaphor as recuperative agent of stable meaning or meaning–set where presence overcomes language. Legaré goes even further: like Nietzsche and Derrida, he does not treat even the careless observer a faultless totality. De Man observes chiasmus can only exist as a void, a lack. For both, only negative experiences can be poetic that make figuration possible. And for both, figuration is capped with a new positivity, in Legaré’s case, simplicity of description and honesty. I would not go so far as de Man this implies *full* renunciation of extra–textual reality,³⁷⁶ but I would insist, like Derrida, this opens the paradoxical play of the sign within discourse, where it both means and means not.

Modern history, full of “finished, courteous and brilliant colours” with which to dress “the meagerness of reality,” was not harsh and severe enough according to Henry Junius Nott. A better history is found, for instance, in the letters of Paul Louis Courier, the French satirist and anarchist.³⁷⁷ Like in Nietzsche, art as such was not antithetical to history–Courier being a Hellenist and a lover of the arts and literature–but history as romantic aesthetics was to be questioned. Modern history is no longer teacher of life by example. It frequently becomes “the discoloured representation of the prejudices, the feelings, or the ignorance” of historical writers because of politeness and perishing of the agents.³⁷⁸ Christian sermons, sort of rhetoric for the masses, though fine, have been one factor that has lessened classical oratory’s relevance to political freedom, and science and

³⁷⁵ Anonymous [Legaré], “[Review:] *Travels of the Duke of Saxe–Weimar*,” *Southern Review* 3 (1829): 193–94, citations on 193, 194.

³⁷⁶ de Man, *Allegories of Reading*, 44–47, 49–50.

³⁷⁷ Anonymous [Henry Junius Nott], “[Review:] *Paul Louis Courier*,” *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 150. *History was not about exactitude however.* Anonymous [Samuel Elliott, Sr.], “[Review:] *Bourrienne’s Memoirs*,” *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 269n.

³⁷⁸ *ibid.*, 277.

reason have weakened rhetoric and imagination.³⁷⁹ To Legaré, Byron's letters and their masterful use of rhetoric he compares to the ancients offer a perspective more akin to history and philosophy than do romantic aesthetics and, apparently, liberal romanticism. Legaré's concept of rhetoric is not cold or calculative. It is hot, but without relapsing to bourgeois affectation. Previous efforts to sugarcoat Byron were "disgusting," "whining and mawkish hypocrisy." Legaré's language resembles Nietzsche here.³⁸⁰ To Nott elsewhere, it is not because chivalric poetry or way of life was moral, neoclassically refined, imitative or concerned with science or philosophy that it is valuable. The simple and earnest, in a romantic sense a—rhetorical honesty, and wicked seduction of "loose and lustful" ladies and "ravishing, robbing, rioting gallants," its "colloquial ease," is what is attractive. Moral or poetic genius does not require aesthetic alteration. Nevertheless, Nott does not go the way of Poe, Nietzsche or Legaré. Modern society is not worse: to the contrary, for Nott, it is because society is now better that fiction has become more correct.³⁸¹ Nott takes a step towards the Schiller—Whig barrier between art and society that rules out the postmodern possibility that in history, figural poetics becomes politics. Still, notable is his decisive departure from Victorian womanhood (chapter 4).

To another writer, however, modern increase in historical productions has meant increased departure from philologically—arrived truth of the stern genius that Rome and Greek historians had. The good name of Christianity and the truth of philology—guided history have been abused by catering to the masses. This has been done by facile and false semi—barbaric spirit, in the former, and politicking of various generalised interest groups, in the latter. There is much skepticism about modernity as superior to the ancients. The masses have improved to be sure, but individual moral grandeur, "a stern sense of justice, a strict regard for truth, and a devoted patriotism, an exalted and uncompromising love of country" are not found today, probably never again will. Modernity's claims of mental and social refinement are an emperor without clothes. In their domestic manner, the Romans were "infinitely superior" to half the moderns.³⁸² The liberal arts of the Romans the reviewer refers to were very different from the liberal institutions that the theorists in Europe and the northern states preferred.

3.1.2 Figuration as history: the diverging paths of Poe and Simms

The young Poe, fresh out of the University of Virginia, had implemented the idiosyncratic southern idea of un—education as something positive (chapter 2). Knowledge was an

³⁷⁹ Anonymous, "Ancient and Modern Oratory," *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 333, 336-37. Nott, however, protests the epithet "dark" does not suit the Middle Ages. To the contrary, there was more light between years 900 and 1000 than in Augustan Rome. At any rate, the Catholic Church utilized reading. Anonymous [Nott], "[Review:] French Novels," *Southern Review* 7 (1831): 324.

³⁸⁰ Legaré, "Byron's Letters and Journals [Volume II]," 2-5, citation on 3.

³⁸¹ Nott, "French Novels," 333.

³⁸² Anonymous, "[Review:] Life of Mary Queen of Scots," *Southern Review* 8 (1832): 345-47. Also *ibid.*, 381-82.

enemy of “true” knowledge made more authentic because it is non–perfect. Firstly, masking himself as child prodigy, he put his age as fourteen in his first collection of poems of only forty pages. He signed them “By a Bostonian” despite having lived there less than three months and only once returning to the place afterward, to lecture.³⁸³ Secondly, he contends enlightened, powerful, pompous, ambitious and rational society is an inhuman one: on the pinnacle of historical Turko–Mongol ruler Timur’s (Tamerlane’s) earthly success that drives men and society he comments: “And now what has he? what! A name.” He has *become a sign* in a history book of civilization. Power and refinery entail the dying of God, of the force behind the poesy of the young and what is human that exceeds figuration (“There are no words / Unless of Heaven”), and even of “him, whose loving spirit will dwell / With Nature, in her wild paths; tell / Of her wondrous ways, and telling bless / Her overpowering loveliness.” There is “the good” light of unrefined youth and “the bad” light of societal power and excessive refinery. One cannot but look at the world dimly through the shades of dark and tears after the latter has lost its charms and life because of the dual combination of time, i.e., history, and societal power. After Timur has possessed a mere sign and the “successful” narrator has been exposed to “[t]he sound of revelry by night . . . with the mingled voice” coming from the first group, he contends in a leader, “[p]ower / Its venom secretly imparts;” and concludes: “Nothing have I with human hearts.”³⁸⁴ Nature is not the enemy, society and opportunism, though part and

³⁸³ Edgar Allan Poe, “Tamerlane,” in *Tamerlane and Other Poems*, by Edgar Allan Poe, ed. Richard Herne Shepherd, rev. ed. (London: George Redway, 1884), 17-18; Ostrom et al., *chronology to Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, xxv-xlii. Poe rams this message home fairly explicitly in comparison with his usual style near the conclusion of “Tamerlane”: “When Fortune mark’d me for her own / And my proud hopes had reached a throne (It boots me not, good friar, to tell / A tale the world but knows too well, / How by what hidden deeds of might, / I clamber’d to the tottering height) / I still was young; and well I ween / My spirit what it e’er had been. / My eyes were still on pomp and power, / My wildr’d heart was far away / In valleys of wild Taglay, / In mine own Ada’s matted bower. / . . . in a peasant’s lowly guise, / I sought my long–abandoned land; By sunset did its mountains rise / In dusky grandeur to my eyes: / But as I wander’d on the way / My heart sunk with the sun’s ray. / To him, who still would gaze upon / The glory of the summer sun, / There comes, when that sun will from him part, / A sullen hopelessness of heart.” The message is similar to Legaré’s: too much light, too much dependence on the eyes or worldly accomplishment, or refinery, and too much knowledge, is not good. Life is ultimately about shades of darkness. The narrator goes on to tell how the mist is both “so often lovely” and yet frightening. Poe, “Tamerlane,” 36-37. Poe takes the classical approach to light and liberty and critiques both. It is plausible he refers to the exuberance of light and overconfidence of knowledge the Neoplatonic northern thinkers and artists advocated as a double–edged sword. Also notable is his use of “ween” that comes straight from Old English *wenan* and meant “to think,” archaic since the 17th century and revealing the effects the university had had on him. http://etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=ween&searchmode=none, accessed September 4, 2013.

³⁸⁴ Poe, “Tamerlane,” 34-35. See also Michael J. S. Williams, *A World of Words: Language and Displacement in the Fiction of Edgar Allan Poe* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1988), 9.

parcel of existence, are. Hovey states Poe would in the next few years move more toward Byron and away from New England poet William Cullen Bryant, a particularly vehement critic of Jefferson.³⁸⁵

Nakamura contends Poe was no social commentator.³⁸⁶ However, I claim it is not a question of individual volition discursively. In addition, as elaborated below and elsewhere (chapter 6), Poe actively engaged historiography and culture politics. The problems between Poe and Simms about history are similar, but their solutions differ in important ways.

Poe joins, by aesthetic and semiotic channels, the criticism of romance as the backbone of history when he suggests history is only one signifier among others. Humphries refers to this as *translatedness*: as in Derrida, the signifier does not connect to the signified. In my context, romance does not happen, tragedy of symbolism does, nor does historical reality happen in a historical text. Therefore, linguistically-oriented perception is necessarily ironic. In Poe's case, rebellion against derivativeness from and dependence on New England influenced the critique of Romanticism and his semiotic of translatedness. In it, history is simply "the beginning of a self-conscious translatedness in literature." Already Quintillian named translatedness *metalepsis* in rhetoric, an intermediary step omitted in syllogism "if a is like b and b is like c, a is like c." There is no bridge between reality and description in the sign-only allegory of rhetoric by other means as (bourgeois) production. It precludes any secure linkage of phenomena together as form, awareness that romance and a metaphysical structure that connects phenomena lack. Since southerners were strongly linguistic and rhetorical in their orientation to history, and since they rebelled against its hegemonic northern connections, Poe's semiotics comes close to theirs. Translatedness is the rhetorical space of maneuver between idealist tautology of identity, and a syllogism.³⁸⁷ As rhetoric and style, Quintillian's influence on southern theorists of history was strong, as was that of Aristotle's *Poetics*.³⁸⁸

Poe's semiotic is thus *not* restricted to poetry but extends to history. He criticizes modern history for too much romance and idealism, though these are human impulses: "We are perfectly aware that the history of remote antiquity has for every mind a charm which does not belong to the genius or the taste of the historian." He rejects the neohumanist emotional fondness for the ancients, and any history produced on that basis. Historical records are an "eternal tale of empty vanity and misbegotten hopes." Echoing Burke, Poe turns the historical pursuit into a pursuit of shadows by shadows, a "silent communion with the dead" that only confirms the absolute separation from truth, as spirit,

³⁸⁵ Kenneth Alan Hovey, "Critical Provincialism: Poe's Poetic Principle in Antebellum Context," *American Quarterly* 39 (1987): 344; Marshall and Walker, "First New Nation," 52.

³⁸⁶ Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 70.

³⁸⁷ Humphries, *Metamorphoses of the Raven, 1-3, 5-7, 9-10*. *The antipathies of the progressive Americans to Poe as a result of his "finding [himself] in a figure or representation that in principle is quite foreign" is noted also by Culler. However, it was precisely the combination of absorbing a romantic discourse and its critique at the same time that Baudelaire appreciated. Jonathan Culler, "Baudelaire on Poe," Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur 100 (1990): 63, 69.*

³⁸⁸ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 130, 269.

of all negative mortal existence of “perhaps an awful home.” In comparison to modern historians, “the ancients are still unequalled,” all of them but especially Thucydides, Tacitus and Plutarch, “great masters in their respective styles.” This is because Thucydides is free from personal injury and party spirit and acts himself in his histories, revealing “naked simplicity.” Niebuhr is great as a critical philologist, but nothing Thucydides would not offer. Included is a barb toward an unbalanced democracy. This suggests a Burckhardtian critique of neohumanism as democratic liberalism, a heterological political science that is enlightened but very skeptical and figural as in Nietzsche. Tacitus gives “glowing sketches, not pictures”—another barb at Romantic aesthetics resembling Legaré and Grigsby, if more neoplatonic. Reminiscent of Virginians and Derrida, Poe plays the energetics of spatialization as present rhetorical communication as sign/sketch about history off against any fixity of structure or form, no matter how beautiful or metaphysical. Poe states:³⁸⁹

Each sketch bears within itself the evidence of lofty conception, and shows in every line the traces of a master’s hand whose rapid touch is too busy in embodying the forms with which his brain is teeming to waste its energies in those minuter cares so necessary for filling out a perfect picture. With rapid pencil he leaves perhaps a simple line, but it is the line of Apelles—the hand of the master was there.

Poe, “The Classics,” 228.

Thus, once again, form really is a problem when figuring history: the more finalized, the more suspect. Again, this is fundamental questioning of both Universal History—that considered form a given instrument of the mind—and modern history *based* on form. Individual brain exceeds any form, which is close to a Renaissance ideal about the ground of history. A study of Plutarch’s models leads to knowledge and estimation what qualities are needed to rise far above “the common mass.” But it is mixed with enlightened skepticism: “[A] course of self–reflection will teach [the student] to exercise and improve his strength, and to measure the proportions in which it must be applied to the levers which move the ball of public opinion.” Plutarch’s *Lives* was the book of books, greater than all history and biography. Only Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon, is on the same rank of the English–speaking historians, others forget Cicero’s maxim *epistola non erubescit* [a letter does not blush]. This is, again, a Nietzschean judgement and suggests parallels between rhetoric and sign. Only two historians, Francesco Guicciardini (1483–1540) and Enrico Caterino Davila (1576–1631)—both wildly different from modern history—are almost as great as Thucydides and Tacitus, but still far from Plutarch.³⁹⁰ Poe is here actually exhibiting my reconstructed version about history at Virginia (chapter 2). Specifically, as Nadel has shown, Poe’s arrangement of history presents a prime example of thinking about history between humanism and exemplarity that is compatible with

³⁸⁹ Anonymous [Poe], “The Classics,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836c): 228. Perhaps a bit carelessly, Poe speaks of the ways of Thucydides and Tacitus as “rules.” *ibid.* That Poe is the author is maintained in Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 50n4, *passim*.

³⁹⁰ Poe, “The Classics,” 227–29, citations on 227, 228, 229.

Tories and that predates Rousseau.³⁹¹ History was in no need of revision from the classical era: there was no shattered identity or a new beginning of modern history found, *in extremis*, in New England. Other Virginia students interested in history would follow historicity (chapter 4).

In comparison to Poe, Simms's first novel *Martin Faber* (1833) is likewise a critique of Civilization vs. Nature in Nakamura's analysis. For both, civilization is no requirement for ethical conduct. Martin, depicted as Nature, defends and loves William, depicted as Civilization. Still, Simms takes the more compromising and decidedly more courtly view that Nature and Civilization can co-exist simultaneously, if with the latter on the verge of dominating the former, at times destructively. In addition, Simms puts the public life and calm, epistemological judgement on the side of civilization via "[tracing] the story . . . perpetual associations . . . close examination . . . to find out the materials of evidence." In other words, though nature and civilization are different, it is civilization that is able to rationalize and check nature by way of legal—and, by implication, historical—study. Besides, the impulses and inchoateness of Martin's speech are formally controlled and chronologically arranged by William by painting them into pictures. This is obviously a preference for aesthetically controlled sublime as structure. Alterton argues Poe, to the contrary, would not accept reduction of poetry and figuration into painting.³⁹² However, even these operations never fully expunge Martin from William, which keeps the symbolic, triangular vision. The constructed character of historical narrative is not hidden.³⁹³ Later, in *The Yemassee* (1835) and *Mellichampe* (1836), Simms has apparently come to agree with Poe romantic artistry is often about power politics and oxymoronic social science.³⁹⁴ However, by *The Yemassee*, he is also willing to broadly accept Schiller, and grant the separateness of poetics from history.³⁹⁵ *Faber* served as *topos* for subsequent Charleston opinion about the relationship between painting and history (chapter 6).

Simms did not prefer literature as immoral, but he agonized over southern place in romantic thought.³⁹⁶ He took part in the ideological struggle of letters. But in time, his method increasingly became more pragmatic, less approving of southern aesthetic or philosophical peculiarities and its philosophically different episteme about letters and history. Increasingly, Simms preached to the national choir (chapter 6).

³⁹¹ Nadel, "Philosophy of History Before Historicism," 305.

³⁹² Alterton, *Origins of Poe's Critical Theory*, 90-91.

³⁹³ Compare with Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 62-70. *William Gilmore Simms, Martin Faber; The Story of A Criminal*, repr. in *The Writings of William Gilmore Simms, Volume V: Stories and Tales*, ed. John C. Guilds, *Centennial ed.* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974), 64, cited in Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 68.

³⁹⁴ *ibid.*, 32, 51.

³⁹⁵ Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, 80-81.

³⁹⁶ Compare with Guilds, "William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette," 83.

3.1.3 Simms in the context of books and prose in the South

Simms, in his early twenties, echoed *Southern Review* in his short-lived *Southern Literary Gazette*. However, unlike in Poe, Simms's early mode of conceptualizing southern culture was organicist, in other words, complicit with modern history. With his co-editor, he wanted "to do justice to the claims of native genius, and show that the natural products of our own soil, want but the favouring warmth of local attention, [sic] to render unnecessary much that is furnished us from abroad." The magazine will provide the reader respite from the more complex *Southern Review*. In addition, the editors are all for erecting "a department" and "a sanctuary" for women "to which nothing but that which may properly belong to them shall be permitted to enter." In a very bourgeois sense, women are compared to the best of diamonds toiled on by a jeweler, for which they are expected to be grateful as patrons. In a 1829 book review of Virginian James E. Heath, later the first editor of *Southern Literary Messenger*, Simms writes southern books are rough, uncourtly in outside, as well as lacking the "meretricious aids and ornaments" of the polite societies of England and northerners. But, these are too often the only beauty their books have. This ironic realization, still approving of southern peculiarity, is then accepted and denied in a true ironically symbolic fashion. The southern niche in metaphorical future books of *American Classics* "may be, (if we determine, not otherwise) like the monument of the decapitated Doge, all black, blank and barren."³⁹⁷

This is a very interesting simile I cannot exhaust here. It illustrates the deep-seated modernism in Simms' historical thought *and* his sympathies with the organicist metaphysics of the romantics. Simms probably refers to Lord Byron's *Marino Faliero*, a Venetian tragedy, and not Schiller's *Fiesco*. First, a comparison of southern history with Byronian tragedy is significant. Importantly, in this play, Byron simultaneously admired and wanted to take distance from Schiller and Shakespeare, the whole British scene of drama.³⁹⁸ Tragedy is not in the incidents: there are only five tragic moments in about three hours, unlike in *Fiesco* that is filled with events and drama. *Marino Faliero*'s heroine is likewise cool and collected. Despite containing far less emotion, *Marino Faliero* is much more fatalistic: unlike Schiller who keeps the viewer guessing to the end, Byron makes the situation hopeless halfway through.³⁹⁹ Simms may be diagnosing the dark, skeptical atmosphere that prevailed in the South and its implications for history. Second, there is the symbolism of the doge's beheading and the black curtain. Even as figuration, it is hard to

³⁹⁷ James G. Simmons and Wm. G. Simms Jun [Simms], "The Tablet," *City Gazette and Commerical Daily Advertiser*, June 26, 1828. n.p.; Simms, "[Review:] Edgehill: A Novel," *Southern Literary Gazette, new series*, 1 (1829): 33-34, cited in Guilds, "William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette," 82. That Simms's alienation approached the avantgarde is maintained in CO2, 724.

³⁹⁸ Peter Cochran, "Editor's Introduction," in *Marino Faliero, Doge of Venice: An Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts, by Lord Byron*, ed. Peter Cochran, accessed August 29, 2013 http://petercochran.files.wordpress.com/2009/03/marino_faliero.pdf, 3. For Simms, see for example Guilds, "William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette," 87.

³⁹⁹ Cochran, "Editor's Introduction," 8-9.

say for sure whether: a) Simms is giving a parable for the ruinous and radical unsuitability of southern books and thinking in a polite national context, b) drawing a metaphor of its present tragic state, c) as an admirer of Byron at the time and friend of realism, encouraging southerners to only rethink their pragmatics but keep their ethos, in Byron's words, not feminine "hysterics—but the agony of reluctant tears—and the choaking shudder" of pure, chaste and dignified diction,⁴⁰⁰ d) simply noting the skepticism both Byron—who desired the whole thing be read instead of acted—and southerners felt about romantic tropes,⁴⁰¹ or e) taking a jibe at politics. Third, a "Schillerian" Scottish reviewer thought the play was more a rhetorical disquisition in politics than a romantic piece of drama as well: "there *is* a difference betwixt mere rhetoric, however splendid, and genuine poetry, especially genuine dramatic poetry." Instead of the head, dramatic poetry belongs "to the heart alone." *Marino Faliero* did not arouse sympathy, its social norms were dubious, moral was questionable: an eighty-year-old proud, arrogant man avenging an insult to the honour of his child-wife—received at her father's bequest—and to the man's family by planning to murder the ruling aristocracy. The reviewer would prefer the protagonist "a young, warm and devoted spirit, eagerly bent, even while inflicting carnage and ruin, on an object of its deepest and fondest adoration."⁴⁰²

In a magazine aimed more at a lay audience, such a cursory reference to Byron suggests southern readership was not attuned to the romantic mode the Whig reviewer desires. In the dominant northern Unitarian circles, in contrast, it was turning into commonplace to reject Byron for his (satanic) immorality by the 1820s. Northerners wanted to evade the gothic and the socially dangerous. Chivalry such as Scott's "may dispense with knowledge of men, taste, and reason," so it was the poorest form of romance. Romance on character was the best type, better than even German neohumanists' works, because faithful to life. Everett, Norton and the future historian William H. Prescott all renounced Byron.⁴⁰³ In poetry, the reception of William Wordsworth by the "American Lake School," with Bryant at its head, was putting aside Byron.⁴⁰⁴ As in the Scott reception, the pessimism of Wordsworth about the harmony

⁴⁰⁰ Lord Byron to John Murray, August 12, 1819, in *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: With Notices of His Life, Volume II*, ed. Thomas Moore, *The Library of Standard Literature series* (New York: G. Dearborn, 1836), 104-7.

⁴⁰¹ For Simms's admiration, see for example Guilds, "William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette," 79. Byron wrote: "It [*the play*] is too regular—the time, twenty-four hours—the change of place not frequent—nothing melodramatic—no surprises, no starts, nor trap-doors, nor opportunities 'for tossing their heads and kicking their heels'—and no love—the grand ingredient of a modern play." Lord Byron, *Ravenna Journal*, entry for January 12, 1821 in Moore, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, 2, 230-31. However, as Guilds points out, Simms was not an unqualified admirer of Byron. Guilds, "William Gilmore Simms and the Southern Literary Gazette," 80.

⁴⁰² Anonymous, "[Review:] Byron's Doge of Venice," *The New Edinburgh Review* 1 (1821): 237-41, citations on 237, emphasis original, 239.

⁴⁰³ William Charvat, *The Origins of American Critical Thought, 1810–1835* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1961), 70-71.

⁴⁰⁴ Hovey, "Critical Provincialism," 343.

between nature and history and its implications for identity was lost on these scholars.⁴⁰⁵ Legaré countered those who think Byron immoral and harmful are children. “[W]e must only take care to deny [him] to such people, as edged tools and dangerous drugs are kept out of the way of children, and adults who are no better than children.”⁴⁰⁶ Henry’s review of Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meister* likewise insists deformity of form may, sometimes, be more interesting than perfection. Temptations, miseries and vice should not be moralized out of existence, because virtue, the pillar of society, can discern them without such contrived help.⁴⁰⁷

In sum, at least in relation to literary cultural poetics, character—a central Whig theme—was not by any means the sole pressing didactic concern in the South, unlike in the whiggish North. Edward M. Michaelowitz, a Russian tutor of Oriental languages and Professor of German at South Carolina College, observed “intellectual ideas” and “philosophical power” that *now* are a necessity for poetics stood opposed to coarse, rude, sensual, undisciplined expressions. “Progressive reason has to struggle with an uncultured language, to dress its thoughts in an idiom not its own, to divide its power between language and ideas, and to form a middle state between roughness and refinement, between the crude wanderings of their imagination [sic], and the perfect exercise of the understanding.” First prose is thus born. The emerging figuration of language of philosophy enables to represent “graphically and truly” the forms found in external world as well as internal passions and feelings. The Middle Ages represent this synthesis. The associated metaphor of light as “between utter darkness and the brightness of meridian day” is poetic. But importantly, *before* philosophy interfered—at the time of chivalry *before* first prose—thought and passion were possible with the rude and primal language as well. All understood such verses that spoke of religion and virtue in patriotic song. They still have relevance for study, but a philosophically correct language leads to their disappearance. Readers should reject more advanced cultivation and embrace these originating roots in literature and morals.⁴⁰⁸ Such poetry, Legaré agrees, “is more subservient to the purposes of truth than of fiction” and more true than early history. It is superior to philosophers and historians of their time. Homer was the truest narrator. The

⁴⁰⁵ de Man, “Time and History in Wordsworth,” *Diacritics* 17 (1987): 4-17; Simpson, *Politics of the American English*, 176.

⁴⁰⁶ Legaré, “Byron’s Letters and Journals [Volume II],” 2.

⁴⁰⁷ Anonymous [Henry], “[Review:] Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meister*,” *Southern Review* 3 (1829): 373-74, 379.

⁴⁰⁸ Hugh Swinton Legaré to Jesse Burton Harrison, 26th August, 1830, in Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 12, 165n35. *German instruction ceased there in 1831. ibid.; Anonymous [Edward E. Michaelowitz], “[Review:] Influence of Chivalry upon Literature,” Southern Review* 4 (1829): 417-19, 433, citations on 417. Compare with Nietzsche: “[W]hen it is clear daylight the ear is less necessary. Hence the character of music, which is an art of night and twilight.” Nietzsche, *The Dawn of Day*, trans. John McFarland Kennedy (New York: MacMillan, 1911), 243.

minute oral poetry began to be driven by a desire to write and publish it, things got too polished.⁴⁰⁹

However, Simms seems to differ from contemporary southern society regarding print culture, especially books. By 1834, he had begun to co-operate with the “excellent” John P. Beile, a Charleston book publisher of some prestige and popularity. According to Mazyck, book selling alongside Evangelical tracts launched in Charleston *only* around 1840 by Fogartie’s Book Company.⁴¹⁰ The date is off, since Simms refers to Beile as bookseller in 1835 and Beile, among the pioneers of photography, had had the business at least a few years earlier.⁴¹¹ But the important point is scarcity of customers in, at least, minor southern book stores. In O’Brien’s research based on southern Natchez, Louisiana of the mid-1840s, only slightly more than one per cent of the population visited them as new customers in the course of one year. The average turnout was one new buyer per week. Further, there were very few novels for sale.⁴¹² Only in 1846 there emerged a book store in Charleston that was cosmopolitan in content. In other words, it had a wide variety of, and actively sought after, modern books and novels all across the world. In addition, considering O’Brien’s observation on scarcity of dialogue of variegated persons and voices in contemporary southern prose,⁴¹³ and Virginia’s prolongation of Renaissance oral culture in law (chapter 2) that was common a century before to exalt the king,⁴¹⁴ southern literary culture lagged behind Simms’s novel notions about it.

Simms represented the new in terms of authorship, subject matter, manner of delivery and audience. But since the stratification of society the bourgeois cultural order presupposed was not complete in the South (chapter 2), “idealization of private communication”—an integral part of the bourgeois public sphere—was lacking as well.⁴¹⁵

⁴⁰⁹ Anonymous [Legaré], “[Review:] *Early Spanish Ballads: Charlemagne and His Peers*,” *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 87-89, citation on 87. Henry Junius Nott and Poe agreed. Nott, “*French Novels*,” 322-23; Poe, “*The Classics*,” 229-30.

⁴¹⁰ William Gilmore Simms to Carey and Hart, August 2, 1841, in *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, Volume I—1830–1844*, eds. Mary C. Simms Oliphant et. al. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952), 254. For instance, Beile provided books for the Medical Society of South Carolina (MSSC). *MSSC Minutes, Friday, May 1st 1840, Thursday, April 1st 1841*, accessed December 16, 2014, <http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/catalog/lcdl:42987>; Arthur Mazyck, *Guide to Charleston Illustrated (Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, n.d. [1875?])*, 203.

⁴¹¹ William Gilmore Simms to James Lawson, 28th May, 1835, in Oliphant et al., *Letters of William Gilmore Simms*, 1, 67; Harvey S. Teal, *Partners with the Sun: South Carolina Photographers, 1840–1940 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001)*, 14; *COI*, 481.

⁴¹² *ibid.*, 477-79.

⁴¹³ *ibid.*, 481, 411.

⁴¹⁴ Patricia Crain, “*Print and Everyday Life in the Eighteenth Century*,” in *Perspectives on American Book History: Artifacts and Commentary*, eds. Scott E. Casper, Joanne D. Chaison, and Jeffrey D. Groves (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 70.

⁴¹⁵ Gordon, “*Philosophy, Sociology, and Gender in the Enlightenment Conception of Public Opinion*,” 900.

Rousseau and neohumanism were the main intellectual, philosophical and aesthetic creators of this expansive discourse.⁴¹⁶ In practical terms, despite the book-dependent print culture, *information* had not yet fully devalued *storytelling* in the South: in my period of study, there was no alienated—hence mediated and diluted—individual experience with fragmentary space and time, only *reflections* on it (3.3.4.1, chapters 2, 4). In Godzich’s chronology, this capitalist spread of information from *memoir writing* and *the epistolary novel* to *the novel of manners* paralleled the increased demand for freedom of the aesthetic function of art as supplementary mediator. By the third genre, the organicist fragmented experience–totality binary was presupposed. But in the South at this time, there were few books, either produced or read, that would classify as novel of manners. Thus, the South was on the threshold of commodified and objectified culture of print following the explosive change, but sensitivity to southern difference about constraining aesthetic freedom—an issue until now much ignored to my knowledge—is critical.⁴¹⁷ The major exception would be the reading of Scott as romancer that was not unanimous (chapter 2). Such a “literary anthropology” I can only outline here is needed to come to grips with the dynamics of southern literary “discourse” as Other.

Violent southern attacks on authors as social critics who were influenced by Romanticism and modern history also indicate this. As in case of Thomas Dew (chapter 5), slavery exposed the extent of southern difference from modern history concerning lack of books: the antislavery words inside English novelist Anne Marsh’s North–printed *Tales of the Woods and Fields* (1836) passed on to southern readers unnoticed. Angered, Beile, as well as the partner of Fogartie, W. R. Babcock & Co., announced they would withdraw the book and urged their tighter preview up North, a neglect that “has been too often repeated of late.” Marsh was only one example of historians, educators and novelists denouncing slavery: New England’s Samuel Goodrich initiated the tendency in the late–1820s, but it was the mid–1830s that witnessed a spate of Charleston censorship: among New Englanders, Francis Wayland’s *Elements of Moral Science* (1835), Catharine Sedgwick’s *The Linwoods* (1835), Cooper’s *The Monikins* (1835), and Goodrich’s journal *The Token* (1836). Among the British, historian John Howard Hinton’s *The History and Topography of the United States of North America* (1834)—dedicated to Irving and “assisted by several literary gentlemen in England and America” including New England lawyer Samuel Lorenzo Knapp (3.3.1)—and Marsh.⁴¹⁸

A Yankee newspaper dedicated an entire column to ridicule the issue and grafted it on national politics. The context was John Quincy Adams’s recent defeat in Congress over antislavery legislation in Arkansas. The headings read “The Arrogance of Slavery” and

⁴¹⁶ Labio, *Origins and the Enlightenment*, 113-19.

⁴¹⁷ Walter Benjamin, “The Storyteller: Reflections on the Works of Nikolai Leskov,” in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, by Walter Benjamin, trans. Harry Zohn, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken, 2007): 87-89; Godzich, *The Culture of Literacy*, 101-103. I have added organicism to this context. On Scott’s power in what she names *nouvelle histoire*, see Rigney, *The Rhetoric of Historical Presentation*, 1-4.

⁴¹⁸ *Beriah Green*, *Things for Northern Men to Do: A Discourse Delivered Lord’s Day Evening, July 17, 1836, in the Presbyterian Church, Whitesboro, N.Y. ([?]: New York, 1836)*, 16 note *.

“Literature *adversus* Slavery.” The editor contrasted Marsh’s Rousseauian “natural sentiments of the human heart”—well within confines of Evangelicalism—with corrupt slavery. Further, he also made a point about the sacredness of artistic genius that cannot be violated for the good of community—a romantic axiom—and ridiculed the sensitivity of the dissenters. He named the attempt “*Index Expurgatorius*,” a reference to the Catholic list of banned books, and sarcastically suggested the Declaration and Milton would lead such a southern list.⁴¹⁹ There was very little regard to the difference print culture—only a fledgling in Charleston—and the Declaration made across the regions.

3.2 From romance to confidence

In this shorter section, covering the time around the 1830s, I have two points of interest. First, northern religious theorists of language began to modify SAE and open up to mysticist interpretations as radicalizations of German Idealism. This was even more at odds with southern aesthetics and pragmatics of language as attested by the journal *Virginia Literary Museum and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts &c.* of the University of Virginia. Second, a modified WAE view of history made a transition in the South in the form of author John Pendleton Kennedy. Like Wirt but with far less rhetoric and erudition, Whig Kennedy set out to criticize Virginia’s toryist culture. His stance would become harder later in the decade. Kennedy’s aim was to laugh the humanists in Virginia off and advocate a more moral ethos. However, he still did not offer a solid history as distinct from literature. History is not, even for him, a separate entity. This period was calm before the storm: the confidence in language by northern authors would soon find its counterpart in history in forms that would actually strengthen SAE.

3.2.1 Northern linguistic modification of SAE

Northern theologians finally began to criticise Lockean linguistics more in the late-1820s. However, they diverged even more from southern views: instead of classicism, philology, the Middle Ages, humanism, poetics or rhetoric, they turned their eyes to imagination grounded in Calvinist religion. Skepticism was rejected with Locke.

Theologian James Marsh—teacher at Hampden–Sidney and Harrison’s teacher (chapter 2)—was a noted figure in the change. Already in 1820, Marsh had become dissatisfied with the Unitarian view of language as a—poetic and rational, so he moved to study under the Trinitarian Stuart. Marsh immersed himself with Samuel Coleridge’s theologisation of Schiller.⁴²⁰ In 1821, Marsh wrote how imagination—manifest in nature, not in words, nor in rationality—had led to a happy conjunction of religion and imagination among ancient peoples. Under the guidance of religion as intuitive faith, imagination would recuperate the gap between a too rational people and nature in a joyous reunion. The job of linguistics

⁴¹⁹ “*The Arrogance of Slavery*,” *New-York American*, July 1, 1836, n.p.

⁴²⁰ *Gura*, *Wisdom of Words*, 38-42.

was to elucidate this spiritual truth of mankind by careful precision in the terminology of words. Semantics was a problem, but capable of sure solution with and within the Christian–spiritual realm of Reason. Marsh’s views, stated in the preface to Coleridge’s *Aids to Reflection* in 1829, greatly influenced the *transcendentalists*, the powerful northern, mainly New England –based radical liberal group of artists and thinkers. Ironically, Gura contends Marsh never intended to woo them, but return the Unitarians back to the fold of Calvinism. He was never a transcendentalist and felt increasingly uneasy about them through the 1830s. Nevertheless, by aid of Coleridge, the linkage between the word and the thought was restored without their implosion to the rationality of the utilitarian classicists (chapter 2), and a focus on language was introduced to northern audiences for the first time in a poetic sense.⁴²¹ Frederic Henry Hedge, the principal organizer of the group,⁴²² and Parker wrote influentially about the new German philosophy through the 1830s.⁴²³ Hedge, who had lived in Germany, was in his writings in 1833 more knowledgeable about Idealism than Coleridge reception.⁴²⁴ But from a viewpoint of critical thought about history, victory over Locke was far from beneficial. Clemmer maintains that the emerging hyperindividualistic spiritualism in New England that backed away from common sense was even more antagonistic to it.⁴²⁵

Philosophically, this was a variant of the German romantic liberals, grounded in Kant, and therefore modern organicist bourgeois social philosophy of the free–but universally dependent and organistically as well as nationalistically united–aesthetic mind (chapter 5). Schiller had gone beyond Kant to see historical process *itself* as an ever higher spiral that causes greater good through evil. Being neohumanist, he contrasted the wholeness of Classical Greece with fragmentary modernity and, inspired by Adam Ferguson, noted the negative aspects of the business world by contrasting bourgeois life with natural organic society and allegiance with permanent institutions. For him, as one of the most central tenets of Romanticism, only art, the imaginative faculty, could reconcile this disintegration.⁴²⁶

Through his Coleridge reading, Marsh went further than Schiller, because he constrained Schiller’s pantheist and comparatively secular “aesthetic anthropology” to religion, dismissed the ironic side of romantic theory, underplayed art as freedom and, contrary to the Europeans, paradoxically restricted language into analytic instead of practical reason. Marsh therefore anticipated the U.S. version of Hegel’s philosophy of

⁴²¹ *Up to the late–1840s, the basis of Marsh’s thinking in Coleridge was lost on the majority of theologians except such groups as liberal Unitarians and transcendentalists. ibid., 40–51.*

⁴²² *ibid., 177n55.*

⁴²³ *C. Robert Cloninger, Feeling Good: The Science of Well–Being (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 173.*

⁴²⁴ *René Wellek, “The Minor Transcendentalists and German Philosophy,” The New England Quarterly 15 (1942): 656–58. For Herder influence, see for example ibid., 678.*

⁴²⁵ *Clemmer, “Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania,” 581.*

⁴²⁶ *Abrams, Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971), 206–12; de Man, The Rhetoric of Romanticism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 262–65.*

history and enabled the synergy between major northern historians and transcendentalists (3.3.2, 3.3.5). For southerners, Marsh made a radical move. On the one hand, Marsh subscribed to modern individuality as ungrounded and the heightening of aesthetic freedom they were not ready for (chapter 2, 3.1.3). On the other hand, Marsh limited even the resulting synthetic-collectivist freedom to reason and Calvinism, thereby severely compartmentalizing and disciplining the empirical realm of being. Although southerners knew about Kant as well in history (chapters 2, 6), fairly few were ready for his romantic renovation in history. Hence, I somewhat depart from O'Brien⁴²⁷ and claim that especially before the early-1840s, Coleridge was little welcomed in Virginia and South Carolina at the period under study outside the Marsh-Harrison duo in connection with history. Notably, Wilson of *Blackwood's* had also attacked Coleridge's theses strongly for their mysticism, excessive egotism and an idealism that simply mirrors the self. In addition, he called the original Lake School of poetry members like Wordsworth arrogant.⁴²⁸ Poe echoed the sarcasm of Wilson's critique that compared the "[s]o deplorable a delusion" of Coleridge's to a "divine afflatus" by using the same expression as parody in his poem "Lionizing" he submitted to Baltimore in 1833.⁴²⁹ Though admiring both, Poe discerned the difference between his own symbolic musical aesthetic and Coleridge's idealism. He also criticized Coleridge for being too philosophical and programmatic about poetry.⁴³⁰

3.2.2 History and Virginia around 1830

Northern novelists of history, after the historical romance tradition, were already operating along Schillerian lines in establishing clear boundaries between local tradition and

⁴²⁷ O'Brien claims southern writers "admired and knew about" Coleridge and that his texts were "familiar enough" in Virginia and southern discourse. CO1, 390, CO2, 1053. I argue Coleridge was not as welcomed an author in the South. Though he was familiar to Moncure Daniel Conway of Virginia, a later Union propagandist and transcendentalist who spent most of his time in New England, this was more an exception than the rule. To be sure, poet Philip Pendleton Cooke, with whom Poe found sympathy among poets, may have preferred Coleridge over Byron. But I claim that, save for Marsh at Hampden-Sidney, the philosophical-societal aspect of Coleridge did not flourish in the South anywhere like it did for Marsh and the transcendentalists. Suspensions about Coleridge persisted in the South to the Civil War. CO2, 728; Edgar A. Poe to Philip P. Cooke, August 9, 1846, in Ostrom et al., Edgar Allan Poe, 1, 594-97; CO2, 1043, 737-39. See also chapter 6.

⁴²⁸ Anonymous [John Wilson], "Observations on Coleridge's Biographia Literaria," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 2 (1817): 3-18, accessed September 4, 2013, <http://lordbyron.cath.lib.vt.edu/doc.php?choose=JoWilso.1817.BL.xml>.

⁴²⁹ *ibid.*, 6; Alterton, *Origins of Poe's Critical Thought*, 10n15, 10-11.

⁴³⁰ Poe, "Letter to B-," *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836d): 501-3. "He [Coleridge] goes wrong by reason of his very profundity., and of his error we have a natural type in the contemplation of a star. He who regards it directly and intensely sees, it is true, the star, but it is the star without a ray-while he who surveys it less inquisitively is conscious of all for which the star is useful to us below-its brilliancy and its beauty." *ibid.*, 502.

history.⁴³¹ The separation was found in the fairly secular *Virginia Literary Museum and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts &c.* (1829–1830) published by the University of Virginia, but in a more qualified and critical tone of “correct history.” There was emphasis on “a facility in seizing on the authentic” by way of Walter Scott and Kant (chapter 2). Thus, by the late–1820s, spearheaded by Harrison, modern history had gained a foothold in the state. However, it would take roughly twenty years to increase in popularity. Instead, the old emphasis on philology that was mixed with skepticism and ancient rhetoric was more prevalent. For instance Tucker maintained on its pages that history cannot be trusted to yield truthful representations of individuals. In his philological article, “Wr.” rejected the central tenet of the frontier as summing up America, soon afterwards enlarged upon by Tocqueville (chapter 2). As an example of collision of differences about history, the *Museum* rejected Bancroft’s translation of historian Arnold H. L. Heeren.⁴³² Bancroft’s study relied a lot on a German modification of enlightened history (3.3.2).

Another peep into Virginia was done by novelist Kennedy, a Marylander and a Whig like Wirt. His *Swallow Barn* (1832) was not yet serious about history. Instead, history was only one genre among a potpourri of a travel book, a diary and a letter collection. Kennedy was an admirer of Irving’s early pieces of satire and episodic novel.⁴³³ But the clear ordering into history and literature is not in place; “history” still means many plural things. Wirt did not like *Swallow Barn*, calling it “showy, shallow and pretentious,” nor the early poetry of Poe.⁴³⁴

Perhaps due to his Whig background, Kennedy ruffles some feathers compared to the symbolic modernists: unlike Legaré, he satirises the ancient historians’—“old wights”—way of narrating only what they had seen themselves by claiming that since the bulk of their argument was dependent on hearsay, he may follow in their footsteps.⁴³⁵ In the same

⁴³¹ Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, 80.

⁴³² O., “[Review:] *Norman–Saxon History*,” *Virginia Literary Museum 1* (1829): 368. This review was about a work in Anglo–Saxon history by French historian Augustin Thierry, a keen supporter of the French Revolution who was convinced that Scott’s *Ivanhoe* was more truthful history than historians’ version. Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 135. For Kant’s reconciliability with authentic in philological criticism, see Makkreel, “Confluence of Aesthetics and Hermeneutics,” 69–70. There also was a conception of history as natural history approached as an anthropological study. ϕ , “Cradle of Mankind,” *Virginia Literary Museum 1* (1830): 677–81. However, such themes seem to be the exception rather than the rule. Omicron [George Tucker], “Contemporary Fame,” *Virginia Literary Museum 1* (1830): 533; “Wr.” claims that the U.S. population is motley: some areas have witnessed constant migration, “in others but little change has occurred.” Wr., “English Provincialisms—No. 6,” *Virginia Literary Museum 1* (1829a): 361; Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 723.

⁴³³ CO2, 759–60.

⁴³⁴ William R. Taylor, *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character* (Garden City: Anchor, 1963), 158; Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 28.

⁴³⁵ John Pendleton Kennedy, *The Swallow Barn or A Sojourn in the Old Dominion*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Putnam, 1853), 374–75. I have been unable to procure the original edition. O’Brien

vein, he calls his own satire history.⁴³⁶ Kennedy's strongest metaphysical pronouncements come in sympathetic depiction of blacks who do not get their place in history. Time is linear, but History, Time's wife and step-mother of persons, is very selective: it leaves out such modest figures.⁴³⁷ Thus, Kennedy ironises the preference for ancient historians' style then current, since his own observations are not true: he imposes discourse even on the ancient world and direct observation, contrary to the mainstream. History can well be a romantic art as long as it is a utilitarian pursuit. Text is not the guarantee of historical reality though, but only one medium beside an object, a picture, and imagination.⁴³⁸ In comparison to Simms, Kennedy edges towards Civilization: marriage is the absolute stamp of moral life because it is a public institution—no ambiguity and questioning about this as there was in *Martin Faber*.⁴³⁹ But, Kennedy's civilization does not cover the toryism rampant in Virginia: he lists laziness, introspection, rhetoric, too much classicism, subscription to Jeffersonian views, lack of utilitarian public spirit, lack of piety, peculiar discourse formation and extravagant dress as its vices. Both plantations the novel deals with were run by Tory sympathizers.⁴⁴⁰ Kennedy hints Jefferson's only favorite newspaper, the very rhetorical *Richmond Enquirer*, was anti-intellectual in tone. This echoes the Federalist charge of Marshall about Jeffersonians as rabble.⁴⁴¹ Like Wirt, he does not reject or hate his objects, but he satirises them, at times quite heavily. However, unlike him, Kennedy goes much further, since he evokes previous 1790s New England imagery about the South when he bashes Virginia culture as a deposit of British aristocratic conceit.⁴⁴² Therefore, the book was perhaps the sharpest history-related critique on southern society by at least a semi-southern author to date, the first half of the 1830s, a time of intense cultural-historical contestation about the South.

3.3 The first “professional” histories, the first overall Virginia history, and southern reactions

Historian Peter Novick devotes only three pages, less than 0.5 per cent, to the first four American historians trained in German methods in his magnum opus *That Noble Dream*,

implies there were changes in content. CO2, 761. The very title changed from “A Sojourn in Virginia” to “A Sojourn in the Old Dominion.” CO1, 314.

⁴³⁶ Kennedy, *Swallow Barn*, 436.

⁴³⁷ *ibid.*, 482.

⁴³⁸ *ibid.*, 496-97.

⁴³⁹ CO2, 761.

⁴⁴⁰ See for example Kennedy, *Swallow Barn*, chs. 2, 6, 7 and 8.

⁴⁴¹ *One of the silly and philosophical plantation heads named Frank reads Enquirer instead of Richmond Whig. ibid.*, 32. Jeffrey L. Pasley, “The Tyranny of the Printers”: Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic, *Jeffersonian America series (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001)*, 261-62.

⁴⁴² Greeson, *Our South*, 84-85.

two of whom I will attempt to cover in this study as for their first writings.⁴⁴³ Scholarship on the quartet's historical work has been surprisingly meager.⁴⁴⁴ For my purposes, it is significant that both subscribed to Hegel's philosophy of history, or historicism, they emphasized as political history.⁴⁴⁵ Two of the men, Bancroft and Prescott, wrote in the 1830s. Therefore, I will begin this section by first canvassing how northern cosmopolitan interests about history became stacked against the South as *a desire to fit the U. S. into a transatlantic culture* that, from the first, turned a blind eye to the South as we already examined in case of Tocqueville (chapter 2). This tendency only increased in the historiography of the 1820s and 1830s. Bancroft and Prescott represented the German variant of this argument that extended to South Carolina in the person of Francis Lieber. Next, I will attempt to examine Bancroft's historical, linguistic and aesthetic backgrounds and narrative strategies around the mid-1830s. I will argue Bancroft's figuration of history was profoundly at odds with southern discussion. Nevertheless, Bancroft's book was a huge success as historical discourse: in many respects, it imitated the German roots, but its northern tweaks made it fit perfectly with new linguistic, philosophical and metaphysical northern theories *and* the previous synthesis between literary romance and SAE (chapter 2). Thus, it further cemented northern historical thinking and identity. Turning to Virginia, I will then examine initial reactions to Bancroft and the first more "general" history of Virginia that exhibited vacillation about modern history. The Whigs-WAE (chapter 2)—now became dominant in Virginian historiography instead of Charleston's more radical theories or Jefferson. However, given the ambivalences southern textual theorists had about philosophy of history and Germany, it becomes imperative to investigate the matter. Next, I will look at Prescott in more detail. He was poor as a figural and aesthetic scholar of history, and he used history more as a means for politicking in the present, something many southerners abhorred. Like Bancroft, he drew from Americanized *Universalhistorie* his epistemology of history. Finally, I will look at Prescott's southern reception that was

⁴⁴³ Novick, *That Noble Dream*, 44-46.

⁴⁴⁴ *Best well-known remains Levin, History as Romantic Art, but see also John Spencer Bassett, The Middle Group of American Historians (New York: MacMillan, 1917), chs. 3, 4. Ironically, Bassett himself was a southern postwar intellectual. On Francis Parkman's novels as histories, see Florian Schwieger, "The Spaces of History: Francis Parkman's Literary Landscapes and the Formation of the American Cosmos," (PhD diss., Georgia State University), 2011.*

⁴⁴⁵ *Monika Baár, "From General History to National History: The Transformations of William Guthrie's and John Gray's A General History of the World (1736-1765) in Continental Europe," in Cultural Transfer through Translation: The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation, ed. Stefanie Stockhorst, Internationale Forschungen zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft series (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi BV, 2010), 68. For Bancroft and other—I argue mainly northern-intellectuals as Hegelians, see Scott L. Pratt, Native Pragmatism: Rethinking the Roots of American Philosophy (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 4, 62-64. On the quartet's reception, see for example Tyrrell, "Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire," The Journal of American History 86 (1999), The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History: A Special Issue, 1016, 1020; Schwieger, "Spaces of History," 71.*

surprisingly quiet at first. When it was praised, it was done functionally, as a part of metahistorical criticism of New England romance history. This criticism was likewise acutely aware of functional dangers and institutional power of history.

3.3.1 The over-all context: the South as an anomaly to New England's cosmopolitan schemes of history and culture

When the U.S. was welcomed as a part of cosmopolitan culture, it was done by dismissing the South, particularly the Plantation South. The *yeoman*, non-slaveholding small farmer, as a figure was a fictive production and renovation of the planter disseminated by Tory-leaning J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur that addressed U.S. postwar nationalist ends through epistolary novels. Planter life was the past, something aberrant and southern, from the vantage point of yeoman New York and Pennsylvania. Such yeoman as “new man,” unlike the southerner, was untainted by history and its evils.⁴⁴⁶ By dedicating the piece to scholar Guillaume Thomas François Raynal, and by stating such an American farmer was a far-flung but natural representative of ultra-bourgeois *cosmopolitan ideal* of the *philosophes* and not some degenerate rabble, de Crèvecoeur contributed to the growing European tide of more sympathetic reception of the U.S. as the terminus point of history and civilization that was later affirmed by German scholars. Raynal had still had doubts, compounded by the illustration of his history of American southern degeneracy.⁴⁴⁷ Crèvecoeur's view had been agreed on by Kant to be America's basis⁴⁴⁸ and it was reconfirmed by Tocqueville. This tide had been avidly seized upon by SAE: by Noah

⁴⁴⁶ Greeson, *Our South*, 20-28. Crèvecoeur had not even visited the South. *ibid.*, 29.

⁴⁴⁷ J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, dedication to *Letters from an American Farmer*, by J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1957), xxxi-xxxii. Schlereth defines *cosmopolitan ideal* as having “certain intellectual premises (for example, the Newtonian cosmology or the natural-rights philosophy), certain psychological dispositions (perhaps a self-conscious individualism or a strong cultural awareness), and certain historical realities (for instance, the development of world commerce or the exploration of the Western Hemisphere) combined in conditioning the Enlightenment philosophe in the direction of the cosmopolitan ideal. At the same time, the ideal also had since antiquity a historical life of its own which enabled the philosophe, who was aware of the classics and the intellectual climate of the eighteenth century, to confront social, economic, and political realities of that period in cosmopolitan terms.” Thomas J. Schlereth, introduction to *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire, 1694–1790*, by Thomas J. Schlereth (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), xiv, cited in Frank Ejby Poulsen, “Schlereth: The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought,” Frank Ejby Poulsen's Blog, accessed October 29, 2013, frankejbypoulsen.wordpress.com/2008/11/03/schlereth-the-cosmopolitan-ideal-in-enlightenment-thought/; Gerbi, *Dispute of the New World*, 45-48, 129, 141. For Raynal's degenerate illustration of America in his history, see Greeson, *Our South*, 47-48.

⁴⁴⁸ Lloyd, “Foundations of Diversity,” 28.

Webster⁴⁴⁹ and John Quincy Adams.⁴⁵⁰ Tellingly, there is *pantheism*—great metaphysical force behind Transcendentalism and Idealism—already in de Crèvecoeur.⁴⁵¹ This interpretation differed from southerners, especially Jefferson and his tradition, as well as southern social dynamic.⁴⁵²

The suprahistorical *cosmopolitan—civilized unity* was suspect to several southerners, because it was reconcilable with SAE, which meant it rejected older history, older ways and, in its American variant, the problem of language. It even flew in the face of Hume's notion of the public sphere that was different from an enlightened cosmopolitan elite commonwealth (chapters 2, 5). Although, as Hettle reminds, there is very little solid historical evidence about yeomanry's political thinking, it has been persistently used for the purpose of continuity by many later liberal theorists of southern history and even southern regionalist sociology as well.⁴⁵³ The extreme liberal bias of the 1930s made even

⁴⁴⁹ Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston: Atlantic, 1979), 82.

⁴⁵⁰ Levine, *Opening of the American Mind*, 109.

⁴⁵¹ de Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, "Letter XII," 221-24. Tocqueville noted mysticism of pantheist nature was particularly attractive to democracies: by effortlessly and without regard for particulars uniting the material and the immaterial beneath a single system, it destroyed (aristocratic) individuality. de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2, 426. Unlike in New England, many protests against this tendency to dilute presence and the individual appeared in the South.

⁴⁵² In context of history, I would thus I disagree with Levine's cultural—political conclusion that Jefferson agreed. Levine, *Opening of the American Mind*, 109-10. Though no Jacksonian, Jefferson was not a cosmopolitan either in Crèvecoeur's sense. Specifically, he saw the Constitution not as a guarantor of cosmopolitan culture, i.e., Lockean federal liberalism and a new bond with enlightened transatlantic capitalism rooted in the soil. Instead, it was a pragmatic measure to politically, not culturally, disenfranchise from Europe. The two were not conflated in the South, more to the contrary. The Constitution for most educated southerners was not a revolution or new ground of history. For Jefferson, the meaning of the Constitution was subjective. At issue was not sacred internal unity within cosmopolitan order but an internal instrument for secure, historically variegated and even anti-historical libertarianism. Jefferson, "Anas," 157. Legaré agreed the Revolution was fought to secure the "primordially" republican character of America from outside forces. Legaré, *Writings*, 1, 135, cited in Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, 166n42.

⁴⁵³ Wallace Hettle, *The Peculiar Democracy: Southern Democrats in Peace and Civil War* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2001), 2. The Genoveses miss this side of the emplotment, taking only the proslavery ideologues to the task of such performance. Fox—Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 318. On its more modern uses by liberals, see for example Warren I. Susman, *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century*, 2nd ed. (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 190; Ruland, *Rediscovery of American Literature*, 84; Carl N. Degler, *Place over Time: The Continuity of Southern Distinctiveness* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 3, 7. For criticism of middle class uses of yeomen in southern cultural theory see for example Woodward, *Origins of the New South 1877–1913*, 374; David Potter, "Enigma of the South," 143-44. However, even Woodward succumbs to the continuation thesis according to Potter. *ibid.*, 145-46. The leading Chapel Hill regionalists and noted historian Charles Beard also

some conservatives adopt the same attitude. Until very recently, some well-established scholars have evoked it. This flexible but at the same time dangerously scientific metaphorology and corresponding epistemological and literary dearth annexed to historical continuity in the South—the scientism extended at least to the 1960s according to Grantham—may benefit from criticism.⁴⁵⁴

Cosmopolitan history was related to the cosmopolitan ideal as social ontology. Typical cosmopolitan history a) was detached about nationalism, opting for the approach of a *philosophe* b) emphasized civilization, and c) had no faith in referential narrative language instead of rhetoric. Already for Joseph Addison in the 1710s—co-founder of the bourgeois *Spectator* and hero for Virginia SAE representatives (chapter 2)—history was to be a spectacle of the imagination, a picture to be admired. The “enchanted” romance reading of Scott had generally subverted this approach by the 1820s. Unlike in Romanticism, writer’s and reader’s spectatorships never fully converge, and the writer as the observer never becomes a participant. Importantly, cosmopolitan history was ironic, a notion several northern-minded historical scholars missed (3.3.5, chapters 4, 5).⁴⁵⁵ This is a critical epistemological difference to southerners, who seldom ignored referentiality. Besides SAE (chapter 2), the Yankee tendency may derive from de Crèvecoeur’s explicit devaluation of rhetoric for simple true language of an honest, industrious northern farmer to whom sign and speech are equally true, unlike for the learned Europeans.⁴⁵⁶ Such an attitude did not prevail among major Virginia and South Carolina theorists and philologists however, and was not concurred to even by the comparatively progressive Wirt (chapter 2).

Moving to the 1800s, we encounter a furthering of the unity in Hinton’s history in the 1830s, written with help from New England scholars, that came out the same year as Bancroft’s history (3.3.2). This *outsider* treatment of recent American history was supposedly founded on strict objectivity. Its aims: to serve the American public, offer a continuation of American schoolbook history, and a corrective to memory. However, covertly, the message was polemical: slavery was an obstacle to the blessed union of commerce between the United States and her “older sister” England. According to Green, slave owners in Charleston forced Hinton to alter his history.⁴⁵⁷ The South diverged from the Federalist SAE agenda in history (chapter 2). Hinton’s argument was founded on philologist Sir William Jones’s invented allegory from Polybius about Athens presented to

praised the yeomen in the interwar years. King, A Southern Renaissance, 42-48; Potter, “Enigma of the South,” 143.

⁴⁵⁴ *Ellen Fitzpatrick, History’s Memory: Writing America’s Past, 1880–1980 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 164-65; For recent endorsement, see Bellah et al., Habits of the Heart, 41-42; Fredrickson, “Nineteenth-Century American History,” in Molho and Wood, Imagined Histories, 164. For a good summary of southern theorists themselves jumping in, see Malvasi, Unregenerate South, 6. Dewey W. Grantham, “The Regional Imagination: Social Scientists and the American South,” The Journal of Southern History 34 (1968): 3-11. For its attempted reduction of history to natural science, see Tindall, The Emergence of the New South 1913–1945, 585.*

⁴⁵⁵ *Compare with O’Brien, Narratives of Enlightenment, 2, 7, 5-6, 9, 8.*

⁴⁵⁶ *de Crèvecoeur, Letters from an American Farmer, “Letter I,” 4-6, “Letter II,” 30, 33.*

⁴⁵⁷ *Green, Things for Northern Men to Do, 16 note *.*

Franklin—alluded to later by Dew (chapter 5)—on the one hand, and the Treaty of Ghent signed by Washington, on the other hand.⁴⁵⁸ It, thereby, fully obscured southern anomalies in relation to such capitalist–imperialist discourse and historical theory (chapter 2). The South misfitted, but simultaneously had to reckon with, the Whig and northern cultural imperative of character and with it, the new philosophical way of thinking about humanity as a central part of modern history, its aesthetics and philosophy, aspects that were made more intense by shared Evangelicalism among the opposition.⁴⁵⁹ Moralism about literature had increased in the North: earlier, Everett, Bancroft and other northern scholars had condemned Goethe for being a–political, impractical and morally neutral.⁴⁶⁰ Similarly, Poe’s collection never took off⁴⁶¹ possibly because of its pessimistic symbolism.

The first pioneers of the German renaissance in the North became attracted by a variant of cosmopolitan history named *Universalhistorie*, especially as it was represented by Heeren. Like the Yankees, Heeren, a main expositor of modern history, exited history for social science: The ambition of Montesquieu to analyse history to its empirical causes Wirt had flashed but secretly abandoned, the Scottish philosophers’ focus on social science, and the new philological criticism all influenced a Göttingen man such as Heeren. The state became the objective, not as an abstract form, but as an empirical entity reducible to facts of geography, climate, economics and societal structures. *Staatengeschichte*, “state history” as unique and constantly developing, became the focus. “The people” was one such major force of development. *Universalhistorie* hailed religion as a positive good and absolute truth in human life. Further, reason could now affirm faith, unlike for the skeptical and atheist universal historians and *philosophes*, but its progress was not linear or ascending.⁴⁶² A third characteristic was ignorance of language as a concern in historiography.

Heeren claimed Greek sciences had been independent, and this instructs modern states.⁴⁶³ He borrows Montesquieu by grounding European political freedom in “a germ” with innumerable forms.⁴⁶⁴ His main argument is syllogistic: since the measure of intellectual culture is science, and since its branch political science is inseparable from state and its institutions as a utilitarian pursuit, state guarantees, at least in some cases,

⁴⁵⁸ John Howard Hinton, *The History and Topography of the United States of North America* Volume I, *A New and Improved ed.* (Boston: Samuel Walker, 1834), “Advertisement,” [n.p.], 290-91 note *, 347 note *.

⁴⁵⁹ See the contemporary debates between Democrat Robert Y. Hayne against Daniel Webster, though also Hayne subscribed to the northern hierarchic race theory, later reinforced also by Dew (chapters 2, 5). *ibid.*, 388-89 note *.

⁴⁶⁰ Henry A. Pochmann, *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences 1600–1900* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), 330.

⁴⁶¹ Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 18.

⁴⁶² Breisach, *Historiography*, 219-21; Baár, “From General History to National History,” 68.

⁴⁶³ Arnold H. L. Heeren, *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, trans. George Bancroft (Boston: Cummings, Hillard & Co., 1824), 73.

⁴⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 2.

history's scientific status like philosophy guarantees the legitimacy of the state. Although history cannot do without tradition, including poetry and religion, one can discern between them, and history is reducible to the state. Even ancient history had nothing to do with symbol: when its form switched from poetry to prose, this simply marked an improvement in historical writing. Herodotus became the first independent scientific historian, a progenitor of *Universalhistorie*.⁴⁶⁵ "Not the historian, History herself seems to address us" in Herodotus. When Greek liberty fell, rhetoric and style clouded this.⁴⁶⁶ Modern historical science of the state is able to pick this project up and reconnect to it.

The South was not outside this new tendency to universalize history. In the 1830s, it had a Hegelian historicist in the person of Franz "Francis" Lieber.⁴⁶⁷ Early on, Lieber implied Niebuhr was pro-Yankee and anti-Virginia, thereby ignoring the latter's coolness about romantic liberalism (chapter 2).⁴⁶⁸ In 1836, at his inaugural in South Carolina, Lieber had revealed his Hegelian bias by 1. linking a positive appreciation of religion with history, and 2. contending history "has a more elevated aim" that annuls individual histories, deaths and skepticism about it. A study of history as history of the masses, supported by inquiries into institutions and causes, would reveal this aim. In support of my argument about southern difference, in his review of the inaugural address editor Daniel Whitaker (chapter 6) disagreed with such social policy, preferring individual leaders, rhetoric and a privately-owned press as catalysts. Yet, by the 1850s Lieber was taking part in directing American history away from toryism, and during the Civil War, he propagated for a full-scale Hegelian philosophy of history founded on yeomen as America's national ground.⁴⁶⁹ To him, federalism and German liberalism were interchangeable as philosophy

⁴⁶⁵ *ibid.*, 285, 305-312.

⁴⁶⁶ *ibid.*, 315, 317-318, citation on 315.

⁴⁶⁷ For Lieber and Hegelian political history, see for example Ross, "On the Misunderstanding of Ranke and the Origins of the Historical Profession in America," 155-56. For Lieber in the South more generally, see O'Brien, "The Stranger in the South," in Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind, eds. Charles R. Mack and Henry H. Lesesne (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2005), 33-41. Lieber thought of himself as a political philosopher. CO2, 622.

⁴⁶⁸ Francis Lieber, Reminiscences of an Intercourse with Mr. Niebuhr the Historian (Philadelphia: Cary, Lea and Blanchard, 1835), 42.

⁴⁶⁹ Anonymous [Daniel K. Whitaker], "From Our Arm-Chair," The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine (hence: SLJMM) 2 (1836a): 74-77, citation on 75; Fox-Genovese and Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class, 19; Grant, North over South, 165-66. In the middle of the war Lieber effortlessly mixed Connecticut and Jackson democratic vitriol in his philosophy of history. My claim is such rhetoric was, in one of its functions, anti-intellectual about history and nationalism. Lieber, Slavery, Plantations, and the Yeomanry (New York: C. S. Westcott & Co, 1863). For such rhetoric in Connecticut against Jefferson-appointed neo-Federalists, see for example Pasley, "Tyranny of the Printers", 376-78, specifically Michael Servetus, "The Age of Improvements, No. IV," Hartford Times, March 11, 1817, repr. in Original Discontents: Commentaries on the Creation of Connecticut Constitution of 1818, eds. Richard Buel Jr. and George J. Willauer (Hamden: The Acorn Club, 2007), 28. Cf. O'Brien who claims Lieber was more Anglophile than German in sympathy and philosophy. However, obviously the German influence was not confined to

of history.⁴⁷⁰ Under this remarkably enduring metaphysical umbrella about yeomanry as antithetical to planters and (toryist) aristocrats—a myth at first peculiar to New England—yeomen were valorized for sake of historical continuity. Lieber had been a student at Jena just after Hegel had left the place. Parrington contends his liberalism was strengthened by the Greek Revolution. I claim Lieber’s doctrine of historical development shared with *Universalhistorie*. Lieber, like Bancroft, Prescott, Heeren and Tocqueville, took the Montesquieu trope of history from the perspective of organicist evolution as “germs” of freedom manifest in institutions against the backdrop of the state.⁴⁷¹ But philosophically, equally important is the overlap of *Universalhistorie* and Hegelian historicism in the U.S. (3.3.2, 3.3.5).

3.3.2 Bancroft

Ross is among the few scholars who have noted Bancroft’s history as a romance, and even she is content to mention this from the perspective of structuralism of Frye and White.⁴⁷² She states romancing and grand narrativising of history took their “most popular and compelling” forms in Bancroft. Breisach contends Bancroft was the most influential 19th–

history but on the contrary extended to philosophy of history through his knowledge of Heeren and, as Whitaker’s report reveals, early explicit emulation of Hegel’s dialectic. CO2, 1045.

For Jackson’s use of yeomen against Whigs, see for example Culver H. Smith, The Press, Politics, and Patronage: The American Government’s Use of Newspapers, 1789–1875 (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1977), 84-85. In 1832 Jackson also used a theory about gullibility of southern citizens due to ignorance when he condemned the South Carolina nullifiers. The same trope about misleading the masses by the elite was perpetuated in many liberal-minded post-Civil War explanations about southern motives to fight. Dan Monroe, The Republican Vision of John Tyler (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003), 58; Richard N. Current, Northernizing the South, Lamar Memorial Lectures No. 26 (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1983), 70-71.

⁴⁷⁰ *Cf. Gerhard Weiss who claims Lieber was a staunch Federalist but not much of a Hegelian. Gerhard Weiss, “The Americanization of Franz Lieber and the Encyclopedia Americana,” in German Culture in Nineteenth-Century America: Reception, Adaptation, Transformation, eds. Lynne Tatlock and Matt Erlin, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture series (New York: Camden House, 2005), 282. However, Weiss’s extrapolation from space accorded to Hegel in one of Lieber’s works is perhaps too bold. Also O’Brien claims Lieber’s German sympathies lessened in the late-1830s and early-1840s. CO2, 1046. However, metaphysically, Lieber used Hegelian tactics, unprecedented in the South, to argue for a dialectic continuity of history.*

⁴⁷¹ *Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought, 2, 94-97. I have added Heeren and Tocqueville.*

⁴⁷² *Ross, “Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing,” 652-53. For critique of Bancroft’s social philosophy see for example Eric Foner, “American Freedom in a Global Age,” The American Historical Review 106 (2001): 8.*

century historian in America.⁴⁷³ The scant attention despite massive influence is a good opportunity to examine “industry, industry—prodigious and indefatigable.”⁴⁷⁴

Bancroft adopted German liberalism full-scale. He was maybe the first American to be present at Hegel’s lectures in 1820, and his “later views closely parallel Hegel’s philosophy of history.”⁴⁷⁵ In addition, former philologist Bancroft had the same mentors as Johann Gustav Droysen, maybe the most Hegelian historian (chapter 5). A staunch Democrat and one-time schoolmaster, Bancroft had become an active contributor to the *North American Review* edited by Everett, publishing seventeen articles between 1823 and 1834.⁴⁷⁶ In the 1820s, he translated one historical work in full and another in part from German into English written by his Göttingen mentor of history Heeren.⁴⁷⁷ Bancroft treated history in the old way of plural meanings in the early-1820s.⁴⁷⁸ Why, then, did he come to refer to Heeren’s department as “science” and thus the work as scientific?⁴⁷⁹

Bancroft probably liked Heeren’s explicit *ascendant* Eurocentric version of the Scottish stadialist model northerners were already familiar with (chapters 2, 5) that emanated from Göttingen. Unlike Heeren, he was an anti-historicist, believing in God’s plan of history. Like Heeren, he highlighted religion and race theory. Like many New England intellectuals, Bancroft was a Spencerian social Darwinist, and his assistant had an extreme natural scientific bias as well.⁴⁸⁰ *Universalhistorie* was extremely universalistic and abstract: it emphasized the necessity of “a universal principle” and transatlantic ties at the cost of obscuring concrete empirical differences and relativity,⁴⁸¹ i.e., paramount southern concerns.

Heeren’s metaphysics and politics were profound, but from a southern perspective, exceedingly problematic. First, I claim Bancroft’s ethos was relatively close to the Workingmen parties in New York and Philadelphia of the 1820s. This is significant, because they were possibly the first to claim that the Revolution and the Declaration were about middle class and humanitarian reform ideals to be realized in the future, an enduring

⁴⁷³ Ross, “Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing,” 653; Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 3rd ed. (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), 256.

⁴⁷⁴ M. A. DeWolfe Howe, ed., *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft, Volume I* (New York: Charles Scribner’s, 1908), 204.

⁴⁷⁵ *ibid.*, 92; Pratt, *Native Pragmatism*, 63. O’Brien erroneously claims Harrison to be the first in 1832. CO2, 1043-44.

⁴⁷⁶ Howe, *Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, 1, 181.

⁴⁷⁷ *ibid.*, 180.

⁴⁷⁸ See for example Bancroft’s diary, September 2, 1820, cited in *ibid.*, 79.

⁴⁷⁹ *George Bancroft, preface to Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, by Arnold H. L. Heeren, v.

⁴⁸⁰ For example, Heeren, *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, 1-11. Susan Jacoby: *The Age of American Unreason* (New York: Pantheon, 2008), 70; Ross, “Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing,” 654-55.

⁴⁸¹ Baár, “From General History to National History,” 69, 81, citation on 69.

narrative in America.⁴⁸² Accordingly, the first public speech of Bancroft, a few years after his German experiences, was on the Fourth of July, 1826, when Jefferson, like John Adams, was dying. Blatantly ignoring translatedness (3.1), Bancroft claimed Virginia's principles are the same as the Federal government's and guide American political history as *Universalhistorie* in a worldwide progress of civil liberty. The meaning of civil liberty, however, he now reinscribed as Jackson–esque popular democracy: the popular voice of the people is the voice of God, and this voice is grounded in the Constitution.⁴⁸³ As I will elaborate (3.3.3), such talk was unsettling heresy to many southern intellectuals, and indicates a deep paradigm shift about history towards modernity and away from skeptical and particular. Second, Bancroft followed his master closely and gave as good as he got: the United States are “an essential portion of a great political system” of all civilized nations. The states are leaders of the world in morality, democracy and equality. The constitution was for the people by the people and of the people (this he stresses by repeating it twice). Equal justice turns to prosperity, free competition feeds utilitarian inventions, labor is surely rewarded. Army is minimal, commerce cosmopolitan, diplomacy friendly and equal, national resources developed peacefully, fruits of industry enjoyed by all, freedom of publication for every individual is absolute. The Constitution can be changed whenever the will of the people and time want and this will keep it pure. America is a progressive nation: new states form in the wilderness, canals for commerce are opened, manufacturers are prospering, steam power on ships and railroads shortens distances. Wealth cumulates, population cumulates, treasury is full, debt is zero, religion is civilized, intelligence amazingly diffused with unparalleled universality, the press is free and cosmopolitan with more journals than in all the rest of the world put together so that every individual is a part of its network. Ever more immigrants are coming, sorted to harmonious union by principles of liberty manifest as equality of law. The Constitution, as a product of the affections of the people, renders external influences neutral and is an asylum to all virtuous, oppressed and unfortunate persons. Thanks to “a favouring Providence, calling our institutions into being,” God has guided the country to its present glory and prominence.⁴⁸⁴ Hegelian dialectic is visible already in this work: for instance, Bancroft speaks of dialectic as a rational instrument against excessive religion and an illuminating guide in dim and dark speculative science.⁴⁸⁵

Bancroft's sources were fully textual and thus, he thinks, authentic: no memory or oral speech was allowed. He wanted to weed American *History* of myth, hearsay, authorial subjectivism and poesy and bring its political structure to the fore. Authority is now the original records.⁴⁸⁶ Thus he finished *bona fide* what Wirt had attempted and ironically realised was futile on a much smaller scale nearly twenty years earlier. Like in Wirt, the

⁴⁸² Mintz, *Moralists and Modernizers*, 17-18. For example, multiculturalist spokespersons have applied roughly the same argument in the 1990s. Hollinger, *Postethnic America*, 83.

⁴⁸³ Howe, *Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, 1, 185-86.

⁴⁸⁴ Bancroft, *A History of the United States*, Volume I (*Boston: Charles Bowen, 1834*), 1-4, citations on 1, 4.

⁴⁸⁵ *ibid.*, 409.

⁴⁸⁶ *ibid.*, 203.

project was utilitarian, but purportedly stripped of all rhetoric Wirt had relished. But already in the next sentence Bancroft speaks of “spirit,” “stern[ness],” “love,” “independence.” Such rhetorical flourishes of anthropology and romance he proceeds to affix on places. There is Montesquieuan scientist jargon of “cause” and “nature” and *Universalhistorie* rhetoric of “commercial,” “policy,” “will,” “germ” and “institutions.” He contends “[t]he spirit” manifest in colonies “demanded freedom from the beginning” and “the germ” to American institutions was already present in its first moments. More rhetoric from them follows: “The maturity of the nation is but a continuation of its youth.” He informs the reader of his desire “to give unity” to historical narrative about New Belgium as the romantic aesthetic of the novel demanded. He aims to “give a full picture of the progress of American Institutions” using the conventional bourgeois romantic metaphor of canvas instead of speech, figurality, poetics and rhetoric.⁴⁸⁷ Tellingly, for Bancroft, moral becomes scientific and history assists humanity in moral judgments. Moral has become liberalized and, in this form, universal.⁴⁸⁸ It easy to deduce: a) moral is scientific, b) *Universalhistorie* is political, c) political is moral, therefore history is scientific.

Certainly the ethos of Jackson would support this chain of reasoning.⁴⁸⁹ Bancroft–like Cooper, Bryant, and writers Nathaniel Hawthorne, James Kirke Paulding, later Walt Whitman among others—much admired Jackson. Overtly, Jackson’s ideology was strongly anti–intellectual, anti–classicist and utilitarian.⁴⁹⁰ Bancroft was among the few intellectuals he liked.⁴⁹¹ Jackson was of Presbyterian faith, and thus only implicitly Jeffersonian: he lacked Jefferson’s appreciation of Antiquity and humanism as well as his secularism and intellectual pursuits. Bancroft’s focus on political structure and his arguments would point to Jackson. However, the belief, then and now, in Jackson as a bringer of positive democracy was ironic. His covert strategy, to the contrary, was the strengthening of the might of the Constitution.⁴⁹² The transition from Jefferson and toryism to Jackson has not been often focused on in the literature and its implications for the South even less. Rather, there has been a tendency to valorize Jackson that has cracked only since the 1970s.⁴⁹³ The continuum from Jefferson to Jackson was already envisioned

⁴⁸⁷ *ibid.*, *preface to A History of the United States, Volume I, by George Bancroft, v-viii, citations on vii, viii.*

⁴⁸⁸ *ibid.*, 408-9, 81, 190.

⁴⁸⁹ Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Vintage, 1963), 155.

⁴⁹⁰ See for example Winterer, *Culture of Classicism*, 46-47; Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, 155-56, 159.

⁴⁹¹ *ibid.*, 156.

⁴⁹² Peter J. Parish, “Nationalism and the Constitution,” in *The North and the Nation in the Era of the Civil War*, eds. Adam I. P. Smith and Susan–Mary Grant, *The North’s Civil War series 25* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003), 77-78.

⁴⁹³ For recent valorizing, see for example Cohen, “On the Body and Passion of History and Historiography,” 522-23. On revisionism, see for example Karen Halttunen, *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 29. Jackson’s later admirers include poet and novelist Herman Melville, writer Mark Twain,

by Jacksonians themselves.⁴⁹⁴ Especially for historical theory, the difference is significant however (3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.3). Bancroft's work was a dumbed-down Wirt. But Everett and Heeren loved the first volume of *A History of the United States*. Further volumes would continue to appear almost throughout the century. Heeren applauded his approach that was warmly statist but still without poesy as he wanted. The work was "thoroughly complete," Bancroft "*the* historian of the United States."⁴⁹⁵ Some northerners, such as his Whig brother-in-law, criticized the work mildly for ideological implications: it strayed from recording the past. Other northern Democrats loved the work for being thoroughly imbued with American democratic principles.⁴⁹⁶

3.3.2.1 Bancroft in the northern context

Bancroft united two separate threads of historical thinking. First, by becoming immersed in political science away from philology, he provided grounds for history as political science, not language, rhetoric, figuration, aesthetics, literature and so on. More concretely, as Lieber had misread Niebuhr to be a romantic liberal about history, so Bancroft misread Ranke who, critically for my purposes, was definitely closer to Niebuhr than Hegel.⁴⁹⁷ Hegelian philosophical "liberalized" history, or historicism, was separate in degree from Rankean history as hermeneutical and philological criticism, or historism. What SAE as political science meant up North was, in Lyman Beecher's words, God's Moral Government. Beecher was the leading figure of New England Presbyterian evangelicalism at the time. He thundered about America's moral welfare in explicitly nationalist rhetoric. The American nation, he contended, must be grounded in God and was in fact so grounded. This meant the restoration of Puritan *theory of the covenant*, i.e.,

critics Stuart Pratt Sherman and Matthiessen. Sherman contended Emerson saw the value of Jackson as coeval with his own thinking. Cultural theorists Irving Babbitt, Elmer More and H. L. Mencken all condemned Jackson. Ruland, Rediscovery of American Literature, 248, 69, 85, 112. However, they are of little help to me, since the first two rejected romanticism tout court and the third, though sympathetic with southern humanists, focused on sarcasm about the South.

⁴⁹⁴ Monroe, Republican Vision of John Tyler, 72.

⁴⁹⁵ Howe, Life and Letters of George Bancroft, 1, 205-10; Arnold. H. L.. Heeren to George Bancroft, September 1, 1835, in Howe, Life and Letters of George Bancroft, 1, 210, *emphasis added*.

⁴⁹⁶ John Davis to George Bancroft, April 2, 1835, in Howe, Life and Letters of George Bancroft, 1, 211; *ibid.*, 212.

⁴⁹⁷ Bancroft saw, like Emerson, that history is essentially, objectively, democratic. When Ranke suggested to him this was "just" subjective history, history written with a premise of democracy, Bancroft was hurt. He thought his history was objective, not subjective. Thus I claim the naturalisation of democratic history and its alliance with scientific, socially inclined history became strengthened. Levin, History as Romantic Art, 24-26. Ranke outlined his opposition to such liberal romantic metaphysics in several essays, fragments and addresses. See Roger Wines, ed., trans., The Secret of World History: Selected Writings on the Art and Science of History, by Leopold von Ranke (New York: Fordham University Press, 1981).

the Old Testament as the law in New England. This was radicalized by Beecher to cover the whole nation. If one broke the law of the Old Testament, it led straight to the floundering of nationalism. Everyone needed to be moral, or the laws of God—American society, its morals and political structure—would be broken.⁴⁹⁸ By the late-1820s, Beecher had connected his political science with an unbroken continuum of American history.⁴⁹⁹

Second, the shift of history to political science fueled the neohumanism of the transcendentalists.⁵⁰⁰ Many of them such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, student of Everett, being Unitarians, made the line between religion and neohumanism fuzzy, a tendency Heeren's *Universalhistorie* reinforced. To them, the two were not really in conflict in history. Powerful transcendentalists Emerson and Theodore Parker praised Bancroft. Emerson said almost every page brings him to tears while Parker named it the most splendid and noble history of all time. By 1878, the first volume had reached its 26th edition.⁵⁰¹

Emerson is relevant for my immediate purposes as a close friend to Bancroft and the positive influence his "Historical Discourse" address on history—delivered in 1835 in Concord, Massachusetts—had on Bancroft in his revision of the *History*.⁵⁰² Transition from neoplatonic thought (chapter 2), specifically, Proclus⁵⁰³ to romantic liberalism, specifically, Coleridge and Carlyle, in Emerson, and from Emerson into history as their synthesis has been pretty much neglected. Similar to Marsh, Emerson had shed himself of Lockean linguistics, only a decade later. Gura states Emerson's long 1832–1833 trip to Europe made his abandonment of Locke final, but even before the trip he had been influenced by influential theologian and mystic Emanuel Swedenborg. Swedenborg's anthropocentric mysticism was represented in America by Sampson Reed, whose admirers included Parker and Channing. Emerson would come to disavow his links to Swedenborg in 1850 for the latter's too narrow an application of his theory, but Reed still had made a strong impact on him. Reed had pretty much travelled the path of Marsh and his argument. What was new was the ever nearer approximation to God through spirit manifest in nature where everything was a symbol of Him. *The signifier covered the signified*, so one could one day dispense with signs altogether. This provided another metaphoric recuperation between Christian rationalist and idealist Reason and reality. Unlike Swedenborg, Reed radicalized this into a general semiotic theory, and this impressed Emerson. Another contemporary influence was French Catholic priest Guillaume Oegger. To Oegger, worldly objects

⁴⁹⁸ Marsden, *Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience*, 21-23.

⁴⁹⁹ Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, 79.

⁵⁰⁰ See for example Winterer, *Culture of Classicism*, 65-66. Winterer fails to spot the link between religion and Hellenism in Emerson however.

⁵⁰¹ *ibid.*, 53; Bassett, *Middle Group of American Historians*, 182-83.

⁵⁰² *George Bancroft to Ralph Waldo Emerson, February 29, 1836*, in Howe, *Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, 1, 222-23; *Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Historical Discourse," repr. in Complete Works, Volume XI: Miscellanies, by Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed. J. E. Cabot, Riverside ed. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1878), 33-97.*

⁵⁰³ *The Transcendentalists' take on Plato and Neoplatonism derived mainly from Thomas Taylor's translations*. Bregman, "Neoplatonic Revival in North America," 101.

originated from God as extensions of Logos: everything visible was spiritual and moral. The split in consciousness had destroyed this unity. Once restored, one could speak like Christ, conventionally *and* universally. Emerson would reject Oegger for the same reasons as Swedenborg, but keep the core idea. Nature as manifested God accessible via Reason meant transcendence of man to a higher spiritual plane. Emerson's *Nature* (1836), where this view of language was introduced, shattered the authority of Locke on linguistics in the North, and was to occupy Emerson for the next decade.⁵⁰⁴ Thus, it is no surprise Emerson's trip to Europe was done mainly to meet such figures as Wordsworth and Coleridge who, broadly speaking, shared his concerns. Carlyle was also a figure of interest. While Heeren deduced history from the state and its institutions, Emerson dialectically deduced reality from God. In other words, by rejecting Locke Emerson also rejected rhetoric, discourse, modernism and other critically idealist language use in terms of philosophy. Language, manifest as reality and God, was to close the gap between man and God like Christ closed the gap between man and God in theology. Like in Coleridge, the theory could be extended to ethics and aesthetics. I argue Emerson extended it to history as well. Everyone could rejoice in a natural history, where facts were rejoined symbolically to God. The ideal of uniting natural law and moral law so dear to northern SAE was now in sight: a return to Eden.⁵⁰⁵

The crucial difference to even Coleridge, Simpson points out, is this radical—perhaps nonsensical and ethically dangerous—aspiration to realism transcendentalists shared⁵⁰⁶ that thus made it more relevant for history. While critical southerners pondered the relationship between natural science and history, Emerson tried to *collapse* history into natural science in tune with SAE (chapter 2). Specifically, at this time he tried to establish “the correspondence between the laws of physics and those of ethics” added with “validity of moral law,” “divinity of man” and “faith in self-reliance.”⁵⁰⁷ Arguably, both southerners and Emerson shared considerations with Kantian epistemology (chapter 2). Emerson got his Kant mostly from Carlyle. This is unfortunate, because Carlyle's Kant was even less sophisticated than Coleridge's. Carlyle tried to collapse understanding and practical reason—the empirical dimensions of Kant—into analytic reason that now was the source of religion, poetics and virtue besides science.⁵⁰⁸ Carlyle thus drew conclusions from Kant

⁵⁰⁴ Gura, *Wisdom of Words*, 78-90; Ken Paradis, “American Theory and Criticism: I. Nineteenth Century,” in Groden et al., *Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*, 31-32. Pochmann mentions Emerson had become scientific-minded in orientation before the trip. Specifically, he was influenced by Kant and Goethe at the time, but Coleridge became “his best instructor in German philosophy.” Pochmann, *German Culture in America*, 170, 172, citation on 172.

⁵⁰⁵ Compare with Gura, *Wisdom of Words*, 90-98. On Emerson's motivation for the trip, see Ralph L. Rusk, *The Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1949), 192. On Coleridge, Marsh and Wordsworth's effect on Emerson see Pochmann, *German Culture in America*, 163.

⁵⁰⁶ Simpson, *Politics of the American English*, 236.

⁵⁰⁷ Pochmann, *German Culture in America*, 175.

⁵⁰⁸ *ibid.*, 172, 181.

exactly opposite to Schopenhauer: time and space are illusory, and it is reason so defined that has to be eternal. Similarly, Marsh and Emerson try to fit analytic reason into the realm of practical reason and disparage “dirty” antinomical understanding, a category mistake. Since to Carlyle Kant had taught all matter was illusory, Emerson embarked on sterile speculation in his philosophy as well.⁵⁰⁹ For Emerson, empirical understanding was now only the middle part of an optimistic, reason-guided metaphysics that he grounded, incredibly enough, in Jesus and Paul.⁵¹⁰ This is significant for history, because Emerson consistently proposed “that history must be read and written for the purposes of realizing the human potential resulting from the influx of a Universal Mind” where “a Divine Mind permeates humanity and nature” and embraced “a presentist, sympathetic, moral, all-inclusive, and self-revealing approach to the study of the past.”⁵¹¹ Bancroft’s Kant was the same as Emerson’s and Marsh’s.⁵¹² Ironically, although even Emerson’s hierarchy in literary and historical discourse was too elitist to the critics who favored their vocational, practical and societal dimensions, Emerson’s language views had become almost compulsory for all except the most conservative, critical and skeptical by the end of the decade. Gone were even the vestiges of Cooper’s ironies. In place was “the literary and philosophical correlative of the mythology of manifest destiny.”⁵¹³ Northerners, by borrowing liberally from Idealism, extended their might from SAE to philosophy, language and historical epistemology into a core structure supported by a network of commitments. Bancroft drew light “on the philosophy of society in the United States; light drawn from history, and shed into all the present relations of races and parties to each other.”⁵¹⁴

3.3.2.2 Bancroft and Emerson in tandem on history

In his speech, Emerson cites from Bancroft⁵¹⁵ and pulls no punches: he compares historical time to the voice of Jesus and historical judgments to those of God.⁵¹⁶ America’s

⁵⁰⁹ *ibid.*, 182, 183. On this category mistake see for example Allison, Kant’s Transcendental Idealism, 369-72.

⁵¹⁰ Pochmann, German Culture in America, 184. Emerson richly sacralised Kant. On this see Wellek, “Emerson and German Philosophy,” *The New England Quarterly* 16 (1943): 47.

⁵¹¹ Jordan Watkins, “‘Philosophy is the Only True Historian’: Emerson’s Philosophy of History,” (conference paper presented at the Southwest Regional Phi Alpha Theta Conference, April 2010), accessed September 7, 2013, http://history.unlv.edu/pat/Journal/Entries/2010/6/11_2010_Psi_Sigma_Journal_Special_Edition_files/Watkins.pdf, 6.

⁵¹² Levin, *History as Romantic Art*, 26.

⁵¹³ Jacoby, *Age of American Unreason*, 37-38. Compare with Simpson, *Politics of the American English*, 231-32, 237, citation on 231.

⁵¹⁴ Harriet Martineau, *Retrospect of Western Travel*, Volume I ([?]: [?]), 53, cited in Howe, *Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, 1, 222.

⁵¹⁵ Emerson, “*Historical Discourse*,” 47n1, 60n1.

population is number one historically thanks to the wise actions of the State of Massachusetts. Massachusetts is an organicist harmony between wholes and parts that grew out of natural circumstance with zero invention. Man's nature and his condition formed the State "for the first time within the period of certain history." Emerson wants to turn history into anthropological truth by referring to a Revolution veteran as "ancient friend" who embodies history. He deals with the Revolution in the rhetoric of political science: it was a predictable experiment grounded in nature, with nothing artificial about it to anyone who knows about "the spirits and habits" of the God-fearing community. The war was actually a sermon to God. The men who are present bring the past nearer, they are the representatives of Puritanism and messengers of history run by God. Both history and God have ennobled the veterans. His own sketch of *history* was an incomplete one, but there is an unpublished *History* of it he had used. "I hope that History will not long remain unknown." Emerson combines Christian and philosophical rhetoric when he states this work of kindness lives on in posterity and its method was wisely that of political and economic history of Heeren. Town records Emerson had examined "must ever be the fountains of all just information respecting your character and customs," "they *are the history*" of it. The records of the town, or *any* American town,

should be printed, and presented to the governments of Europe; to the English nation, as a thank-offering, and as a certificate of the progress of the Saxon race; to the continental nations as a lesson of humanity and love. Tell them, the Union has twenty-four States, and Massachusetts is one. Tell them, Massachusetts has three hundred towns, and Concord is one; that in Concord are five hundred ratable polls, and every one has an equal vote.

Emerson, "Historical Discourse," 53.

The records exhibit a picturesque agricultural community "where no man has much time for words, in his search after things." The annals are "marked with uniform good sense." The more dignified the event, the holier the tone of the archive. "These soiled and musty books are luminous and electric within." The will of the people comes through despite bad grammar and syntax. The town is "in many respects, a financial corporation": holiness and business are both necessary. Time is the enemy of history and of "the two great epochs of public principle," i.e., the founding of the colony and the Revolution. Their spirit has infused Concord of purest men and their consecrating presence and activity among other snow-white towns. The people of Concord were excellent, pious, meek walkers of the paths of common life, God-serving, man-loving and ever hoping for immortality. The public leaders "fill a space in the world's history"—join *Universalhistorie*—borne forward by the weight of thousands. Again a mixture of religion and philosophy: "The benediction of their prayers and of their principles" is around everyone like a spirit. Religion, history as political history, philosophy: "The acknowledgement of the Supreme Being exalts the history of this people," it "brought the fathers" and "delivered their sons" "[i]n a war of

⁵¹⁶ On Emerson's religious rhetoric in the speech more generally, see Harriet Rodgers Zink, Emerson's Use of the Bible, *University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature and Criticism series Volume 14* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1935), 28, 33, 42.

principle.” The spark of this faith needs to be kept alive for all time to come.⁵¹⁷ History is political science and economics, certain, anthropological, democratic, scientific and grounded in philosophy, God and religion. It is *Universalhistorie* with God and philosophy, i.e., neoplatonic total light, at the helm.

3.3.3 Virginia’s paradigm shift and responses: strong version of Whig history (SW) and weak version of Whig history (WW)

Remarkably, up to Bancroft, history is not to my knowledge once mentioned in the same breath as science by any theorist in Virginia or South Carolina. Momentously, however, in Virginia, Federalist Whigs—not the Jeffersonian humanists—had taken the lead of historical discourse by the early–1830s. The cosmopolitan discourse about history many of them represented took its toll on Virginia history and social ontology (chapter 5). Like Jefferson supporters more generally,⁵¹⁸ the theorists of history influenced by his university, suspicious of Jackson, were compelled to more or less adapt to Whig ways. Caught between the rock and a hard place, Jackson’s anti-intellectualist “hyperdemocracy” as applied to history was a *greater* menace than northern business interests. This was logical, since Jefferson never approved Princeton extreme Presbyterianism, an SAE variant (chapter 2). As Genovese reminds, the republicanism and aristocratic ethos held up to the Civil War.⁵¹⁹ Neither Whigs nor Jeffersonians would accept the changes in language, tone and mood the Evangelicals introduced to politics toward the uncompromising, utopian and visionary moral reductionism on a national level⁵²⁰ that formed an integral part of modern history. As Bancroft had showed, liberalism about/in history was a Democratic thing.⁵²¹ Jackson was interpreted in the South as supporting a “popular,” in my context Bancroftian, reading of the Constitution, when he reacted against the radical anti-tariff protest led by the formidable South Carolina statesman John C. Calhoun.⁵²² In South Carolina, “Tory”

⁵¹⁷ *ibid.*, 33, 46-47, 77-79, 85-89, citations on 47, 77, 78, 85, 86, emphasis added, 86-87, 87, 88, 89.

⁵¹⁸ *Wingfield*, *A History of Caroline County, Virginia*, 198. Cf. *Richard J. Carwardine*, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997)*, 118. *Carwardine contends Federalism and toryism were ethnically found mainly in New England and formed an antithetical force to the Scotch-Irish in Virginia among other places. They thus rallied behind Jackson. For the theorists of and about history, however, the question seems more complex as I have tried to show. In addition, Kelley claims the Scotch-Irish were Whig because the Irish Catholic were Democrat. Kelley, Cultural Pattern in American Politics, 173-74. For Virginia’s resistance, see also Arthur Charles Cole, The Whig Party in the South, Prize Essays of the American Historical Association series (Washington: American Historical Association, 1913), 19-20.*

⁵¹⁹ *Genovese*, *The Southern Front: History and Politics in the Cultural War (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995)*, 56-57.

⁵²⁰ *Carwardine*, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*, 35-36.

⁵²¹ *For similar rhetoric in the Democrat ranks, see ibid.*, 94.

⁵²² *Cole*, *Whig Party in the South*, 19.

became a slogan that signaled anti-liberty while “Whig” meant liberty.⁵²³ Generally, eastern Virginians distanced themselves from Jackson’s nationalism and were more supportive of Calhoun, while even the poorer western part later joined in the renunciation of Jackson’s anti-bank policies.⁵²⁴ Thus, the view about the Constitution being philosophically wrong (chapter 2) had decayed as well: what remained was the liberal Whig interpretation of Calhoun balanced with concern about premodern history (chapter 5), versus the liberal Democrat interpretation of Bancroft that saw the Constitution as establishing bourgeois universality that functioned like Hegelian idealist dialectic but greatly upped the ante from Hegel concerning religion, rationalism, and science.

The editor of the *Enquirer*, Thomas Ritchie, initially backed Jackson,⁵²⁵ though at least initially more in hopes of reviving Jeffersonian republicanism through Jackson.⁵²⁶ Similarly, Randolph became a Democrat, but his motives were not nationalistic either, let alone statist as in Bancroft, but to protest against the Federalist–oligarchic decay of the former Jeffersonians. This motif was probably familiar to many southerners from ancient Athens and Sparta, but they did not draw the Yankee and neohumanist conclusions from it (chapter 5). Randolph disliked the federalism of the Whig Adams from the start.⁵²⁷ Thus, the democratic theory of Bancroft was categorically different from such Virginia Democratic positions in Virginia as in Jefferson’s time (chapter 2).

In the volatile confusion, Jefferson’s supporters were no longer a monolith, nor behind Jackson, but not Whigs or Federalists either. For my concerns, this would translate to a tension about history as God-grounded, utilitarian political science or romance (the position of northern and North-sympathetic Whigs and many Democrats) vs. history as textual figuration, rhetoric and philology (Jefferson humanists, the first Charleston critics, the early Simms, Grayson). I thus distinguish between *Strong Whig* (SW) and *Weak Whig* (WW) realignment. The difference is in the amount modern history—that now had been bolstered by Bancroft’s historicist interpretation of Idealism—was criticized as historical figuration, language, aesthetics and style and in how strong the emphasis on textuality, philology, irony and figuration as well as personal experience remained.

The organization established in 1831 became the Virginia Historical and Philosophical Society (VHPS). It was apparently run by Jonathan P. Cushing but, strikingly, its president was Marshall. Not only had Marshall been Jefferson’s nemesis about history (chapter 2), northern-born scientist Cushing was no humanist nor historian about history.⁵²⁸ Marshall was “perhaps the most reactionary man in America” at the time. Strong Federalist, he was a businessman to boot, a hater of democracy, and a very controversial

⁵²³ *ibid.*, 18.

⁵²⁴ *Monroe*, *Republican Vision of John Tyler*, 59-60, 67.

⁵²⁵ *Monroe*, *Republican Vision of John Tyler*, 61.

⁵²⁶ *Pasley*, “Tyranny of Printers”, 390.

⁵²⁷ *Garland*, *Life of John Randolph of Roanoke*, 2, 311, 233, 235, 241. Also *Weaver*, “Two Types of American Individualism,” 81.

⁵²⁸ See for example *Jonathan P. Cushing*, “President Cushing’s Address,” repr. in *Collections of the Virginia Historical & Philosophical Society*, 1 (1833): 3-4, 21. I must abandon a more detailed analysis of this speech.

figure within Virginia especially among supporters of Jefferson and Randolph.⁵²⁹ The Whig dominance is therefore explainable as rejection of the far more intellectually radical history at Jefferson's university (chapter 2) as misfitting the desired institutionalized nationalistic level. In addition, it seems probable the strongly Whig organizing was an anti-democratic measure⁵³⁰ that contributed to lessening of Jeffersonian concerns. It had significant, even dramatic metaphysical consequences for southern history (chapter 5).

Despite such an organizing and its northern-derived antiquarian mode and purpose, initial emphasis was still on texts in a way that accommodated premodern history. The earliest pieces submitted were a memoir of the Revolution and a record of a witchcraft trial from the first years of the 18th century with its old language intact. For the memoir writer, Charles A. Stuart, truth about history was intimately connected with personal experience and observation. Since his father John, the narrator in the memoir, did not experience and observe the happenings, the narration was probably imperfect. Marshall had got his history of the event from George Washington's oral narration, whose superior position would, the son thought, *probably* guarantee the veracity of Marshall's history. The source for his father's tale emanated from direct, that is physical, comprehension of the event done by General Andrew Lewis. It was true, because John Stuart had a felicitous station in society, good character, and tradition supported it. Textual criticism of the text assures this—at least to the son—since many amusing anecdotes he told to his acquaintances and associates for “recreation” had been “pretermitted.” Quoting Shakespeare, Stuart muses the written sign rescues from the total extinction that belongs to time and life. But the difference between it and oral speech is made explicit.⁵³¹

⁵²⁹ Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*, 2, 23-26.

⁵³⁰ *De Tocqueville observes the purpose of political organizations in the United States was to defy majoritarian rule. I argue the observation is applicable here. De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, I, 184-85.*

⁵³¹ “There may be, and I think probably are, some historical inaccuracies in it, in respect to transactions, at a distance from the scene of his own experience and observation. I say ‘probably are,’ because there are some slight discrepancies between his statements and those of Gen. Marshall's history, touching the same incidents. The latter is doubtless, founded upon Gen. Washington's relation of the facts, who, from his situation, may readily be supposed to be more accurately informed than Gen. Lewis was. But, be this as it may, my father's narrative of such details is, unquestionably, as he received them from Gen. Lewis; and as little question can there be, that the latter related them precisely as he apprehended them. As to the facts stated as within the observation of the narrator himself, his station, his character, and the traditions still current throughout the region of their occurrence, abundantly sustain them. Indeed, the modesty with which the narrative proceeds, pretermitted numerous amusing anecdotes which he used to relate to his acquaintances and with which I have often known him and his associates to recreate themselves, is strong internal evidence, at least to me, of the scrupulous care with which he has related this history of his experience. It will be obvious, from the texture of the narrative, that he was uneducated and unaccustomed to indite history.” Charles A. Stuart, letter accompanying “Memoir, &c.,” *Collections of the Virginia Historical & Philosophical Society I (1833)*: 67-68.

Though Charles Stuart thereby politely ends up trusting in Marshall's history, his own notion of history is much older and treats printed history with deep irony. In addition, Stuart's history is far from the political science of Bancroft. It is dependent on live narration, space, status, metonymy and morality just like in organic—in modern history's context, "premodern"—society. Text is inferior to oral recounting, but still philologically interesting. In such a situation, history is a dialectical tension, far from a stable object and simply one of the dialects of the symbolic, with no necessary priority over others such as speech, and with no mimetic imperative as a sign.⁵³² As in case of Jefferson (chapter 2), immediacy as a guarantor of history is not grounded in philosophy, but in present experience and philology. This makes Stuart WW about history, because history for him was not knowledge for its own sake or a (social) scientific object of study, unlike for Bancroft. In addition, as narrative, it was dependent on live experience—in—community, not on anthropological romance or individual aesthetic freedom like in modern history. Since the Stuart piece was a memoir, this argument also agrees with Godzich's typology about the evolution of prose (3.1.3).

3.3.3.1 Tucker's rejection, Kennedy's sympathy

Corroborating the differing dynamics of history, I could not locate in—depth discussion about Bancroft in the South before the late—1840s.⁵³³ However, *The Southern Literary Messenger* had launched in Virginia the year Bancroft's study came out. Illustrative of the different but overlapping criticism between the Jeffersonians and the Whigs, *The Messenger* became an extension of VHPS and, in format and model, imitative of the Tory *Blackwood's*.⁵³⁴ On its pages appeared a critical review of Bancroft's *History* by author and Judge Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, second cousin to George Tucker and half—brother to Randolph.⁵³⁵ Historians have generally focused on its ideological content.⁵³⁶ However, I claim such a reading is too hasty and equivocal, because it is not sensitive enough ontologically, conceptually or figurally. Critically for me, Tucker's views about history had earlier pleased Jefferson in the former's uncompleted history of Virginia.⁵³⁷

⁵³² Compare with *Humphries*, *Metamorphoses of the Raven*, 31, 32.

⁵³³ Cf. CO2, 638-39. O'Brien contends Grigsby helped Bancroft with the latter's history. However, the correspondence he appeals to shows this happened only much after the Civil War. William B. Hesseltine and Larry Gara, eds., "The Historical Fraternity: Correspondence of Historians Grigsby, Henry, and Draper," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 61 (1953): 450-71.

⁵³⁴ *Minor*, *Southern Literary Messenger*, 19; CO1, 542, 547.

⁵³⁵ Tucker, "A History of the United States," 587-91.

⁵³⁶ See for example Grant, *North over South*, 29. I would disagree the South perceived history in dialectically opposite terms to the North on grounds of the different take on history from German *Universalhistorie* as I have tried to show. Also Fox—Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 179.

⁵³⁷ *Van Tassel*, *Recording America's Past*, 85.

First, Tucker's review is a synecdoche of the synthesis between the two impulses. His Tory Virginians are humanely chivalrous and as faithful to the king as seraph Abdiel in *Paradise Lost* to God and the servant in Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* that are used as allegories.⁵³⁸ These positive, anthropological associations with chivalry emanate from Whigs Wirt and Kennedy: most Charleston critics had *not* made the connection. Tucker is overtly a strong critic of Romanticism, but still crosses swords with it dialectically.⁵³⁹ Second, Tucker uses *concrete* spatial and parallel metaphors (“[Sterne’s] servant . . . advanced three paces . . . others found themselves drawn more closely toward [Charles I’s] exiled son”) against Bancroft’s *abstract* claims of Virginia having been roundhead in sympathy. Looking contemporary authorities for “traditions and histories that have come down on us” as Bancroft has done is narrow.⁵⁴⁰ Third, Tucker is alarmed that this new approach to history will “crush and obliterate” with its epistemology “every trace of what our ancestors were, and what we ourselves have been.” In other words, a) history of Virginia before Bancroft, b) the way society is now structured, c) its “hereditary prejudices and prepossessions,” d) the unique qualities of a Virginian as a royalist: the whole fabric is under threat. The underlying metaphysics of reason is of a wrong kind. Tucker argues, by close attention to the texts and philological erudition, the whole metaphysicality of freedom, independence and germ—the ground of modern history—is a sickness.⁵⁴¹ A related inconvenience is internal and discursive. There are those who think toryism is arrogant, those who think it is undemocratic, and those who think, illogically enough, both.⁵⁴² This exhibits the identity crisis to toryism Jackson launched and the existence of its countercurrent. Fourth, symbolical criticisms: Bancroft’s book proves that public records are essentially inadequate. Even Hening’s appreciated law history was made of such “tattered manuscripts” that “the loss of the whole or a part of any document is quite common.” Besides, collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society are susceptible of veracity.⁵⁴³ This view can be compared to Emerson’s to see how much the views about signs were at variance, though the southern one is not even a method. Fifth, most of Tucker’s criticisms are directed at the sign that evaporates presence: one cannot infer truth from written archival sources. A session act “is evidence enough of a *new order* of things, and yet it is not so very clear what that new order *was*.” Reality is not reducible to what is written in statutes or articles, and so Charles II continued to be the king of Virginia in practice. It is the exemplary moral ethos the king’s supporters had, not

⁵³⁸ Tucker. “A History of the United States,” 587, 591. *A middle point is represented by writer William Alexander Caruthers of Alabama. For him, history is a romance to be sure, but cavaliers are not described in romantic or religious–humanitarian terms. They were instead “fox–hunting, wine–drinking, dueling and reckless.” Anonymous [William Alexander Caruthers], The Cavaliers of Virginia, or The Recluse of Jamestown, Volume I (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1832), 3, 4, citation on 4.*

⁵³⁹ Tucker, “A History of the United States,” 591.

⁵⁴⁰ *ibid.*, 587, 588, citations on 587.

⁵⁴¹ *ibid.*, 587–88. “Prejudice” is here used in its positive meaning.

⁵⁴² *ibid.*, 587.

⁵⁴³ *ibid.*, 588, 589, citations on 588.

chronological rewinding of time to Adam, that is more worthy in history. Political or emotional states of single individuals are irreducible to societal peace and institutional positions. History as political science and its syllogisms just are not adequate and subtle enough.⁵⁴⁴ This shows the more spatial and physical way southerners went about history and existence that preceded modern history. Sixth, Bancroft becomes another instance of modern history's misrepresenting. Tucker gives Robertson the moderate Scot most recognition of them. Bancroft purposively ignores written evidence, contrary to what he claims. One such misstep would not be so bad, but his mistreatment of the sources is connected with this strange metaphysics, his "drift" to "liberalise" Virginia. Something is "fishy"—to use a modern phrase—here.⁵⁴⁵

What is the meaning of this strange attempt to pervert the truth of history, and to represent Virginia as being as far gone in devotion to the parliament as Massachusetts herself? Why does it come to us, sweetened with the language of panegyric, from those who love us not, and who habitually scoff at and deride us?

ibid., 591.

The confusion and suspicion before the German apparatus is audible, as is the animosity felt at northern domination, to which is connected historical and ironic symbolist attitudes. Similar to Nietzsche's philology, it is not a philosophy in a modern sense.⁵⁴⁶ Tucker makes this more explicit in what follows:

Is it intended to dispose us to acquiesce in the new notion, "that the people of the colonies, all together, formed one body politic before the revolution?" Against this proposition we feel bound to protest. We hold ourselves prepared to maintain the negative against all comers and goers, with tongue and pen; and to resist the practical results, if need be, with stronger weapons.

Tucker. "A History of the United States," 591.

Here, the clash is almost at its most complete. Neither Virginian toryism, nor liberty, is a question of discourse that modern history presupposed. There is no identity conflict from Charles II to the present. Metaphysical speculations on liberalism or popular democracy simply are no questions to be considered in history. For Tucker, in other words, historical identity is not derived from *Universalhistorie*, or from the underlying anthropological principle of unity.⁵⁴⁷ Therefore, it was perhaps even less amenable to the Yankee radicalizations (chapter 2) Bancroft and Emerson built on. Seventh, Tucker finishes his

⁵⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 588, 589, citation on 588, emphasis added and original.

⁵⁴⁵ Also 590.

⁵⁴⁶ Compare with the remarks in Martin Heidegger, *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, trans. John van Buren, *Studies in Continental Thought series* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), §3, 14-16.

⁵⁴⁷ Caruthers agrees the same manners still prevail in Virginia society. Caruthers, *Cavaliers of Virginia*, 4.

critique by connecting these speculations to a general criticism of Bancroft's romantic style exactly as Poe, Legaré and others had argued. Bancroft's style is "proud," and Tucker is aware by such description he has condemned the historian. I think the adjective points to, at least, two sources: Milton and Cicero. For both authors, if on different levels, pride was *hybris*, arrogance. Tucker's reaction resembles the resolve of Abdiel and his views on pride.⁵⁴⁸ Like the others had maintained: "An ambitious style is certainly not the style of history." Painstaking erudition has been sacrificed for ornament, and the tone itself is puzzlingly distrustful, using a lot of declamation, antithesis and epigram. This, once more, suggests the very different way of looking at historical language. Tucker concludes:

If this is the way to write history, we fear we shall have to leave our northern neighbors to tell the story their own way . . . Let them write our books, and they become our masters. But we cannot help ourselves. We cannot contend with those who can write history in this style. Our only defence is not to read. A more effectual security would be, not to buy. In that case they would not write; and we should not only avoid being led into error, but might escape the injury of being misrepresented to others. But Mr. Bancroft's book is in print, and we must abide the mortification of having all who may read it, think of our ancestors as he has represented them. We have comfort in believing that they will not be very numerous.

Tucker. "A History of the United States," 591.

This shows the agony felt about history as discourse and the struggle, not dialectical but rather fairly asymmetric, against northern power structures, the incommensurability of history as figure, metaphysics and discourse between the sections. Bancroft's *History* seems wrong on many levels. To my knowledge no intellectual in the South praised the work at this time.

A year later, in his novel *The Partisan Leader* (1836), Tucker would return to his satirical and ironically symbolic criticism of modern history and Romanticism. The book's emplotment of history—southern partisan group waging a civil war in America in the future—was scandalous at the time and tragic in retrospect. Given the widespread character of romance as history, it seems a protest. Again the protestation is couched in philosophy. In a clever allegory, Tucker compares the romantic Arthur who only looks for the grand view to "an epicure about to feast on turtle, who will not taste a biscuit beforehand lest he should spoil his dinner" and keeps on ascending a hill, never looking back: reference to

⁵⁴⁸ "So spake the Seraph Abdiel faithful found, / Among the faithless, faithful only hee; / Among innumerable false, unmov'd, / Unshak'n, uneduc'd, unterrifi'd / His Loyaltie he kept, his Love, his Zeale; [900] / Nor number, nor example with him wrought / To swerve from truth, or change his constant mind / Though single. From amidst them forth he passd, / Long way through hostile scorn, which he susteind / Superior, nor of violence fear'd aught; [905] / And with retorted scorn his back he turn'd / On those proud Towrs to swift destruction doom'd." John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book VI, accessed September 11, 2013, http://www.dartmouth.edu/~milton/reading_room/pl/book_5/index.shtml.

Plato and idealism seems obvious. His companion Schwartz, in contrast, continuously looks back and stops to chat away and seems indifferent to the scenery. This attitude seems to resemble Cicero's critique of Epicureanism. Tucker comments: "Arthur was vexed to see such indifference, and wondered whether this was the effect of use, or of the total absence of a faculty of which poets so much delight to speak." At the summit, while Arthur is in extasy about the view, forgetting his difference to his companion, Schwartz cannot "see anything at all rightly" but "[i]n the spring of the year, when you cannot see the cabins for the shaders, and the corn, and oats, and meadow is all of a color, it looks mightily like a little green snake." This seems to echo the physicality and concreteness, economy of metonymy rather than metaphor, of southerners that has little philosophical in a modern sense about it. Same here: Down below "there is something there, to be sure, but what it is, I am sartain I could never tell, if I did not know. And as to the distance I hear some folks talk about—why the farther you look, the less you see, that's all; until you get away yonder, t'other side of nowhere; and then you see just nothing at all." It is pointless to speculate using romantic or idealistic language, death lies that way: far better to see personally. The generalized language *is* death.⁵⁴⁹ In another ironic moment, Arthur disparages Schwartz that his eyes are bad when in the next moment Arthur himself cannot see the road except as connected to the mountain. Schwartz needs to lend him his rifle sights so he can see more clearly. Finally Arthur is able to "correct his preconceptions by the testimony of his own senses."⁵⁵⁰ This is surprisingly Heideggerian and modernist. For Heidegger, we recall, things present-at-hand were ontologically different than things on display. The path—another of Heidegger's favorites—is something very different from a climb to the summit. In short, the conditions for knowledge are at variance. Tucker's comments give credence to the communality in Virginia different from that of a romantic aesthete or a modern "rational" philosopher, more akin to the ancients and the Middle Ages but modern in terms of irony.⁵⁵¹ Romanticism in/as history is simultaneously affirmed and denied in modernist ways that suggests the condition of the symbolic and history as figural. The rhetorical space of history is made visible, and there is very little Presbyterian SAE sternness about it. There is the WAE interest into its causes, but also the

⁵⁴⁹ "'But the vastness of the view !' said Arthur. 'The idea of immensity !' 'As to that,' replied Schwartz, 'you have only just to look up, and you can look a heap farther, and still see nothing. All the difference is, you know it is nothing ; and down there, you know there is something, and you cannot see what it is.'" Tucker, *The Partisan Leader*, Volume I, repr. ed. (New York: Rudd & Carleton, 1861), 26.

⁵⁵⁰ *ibid.*, 25-28, citations on 25, 26, 28.

⁵⁵¹ Compare, for example, Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture," repr. in *idem.*, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977) 115-54, esp. 127-33. On the difference, but arguably not conflict, with Derrida, see for example Caputo, *Radical Hermeneutics: Repetition, Deconstruction, and the Hermeneutic Project*, *Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy series* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 4-5, and on Heidegger and horizon see *ibid.*, 99-102.

skeptical subtlety not to have faith in them.⁵⁵² Tragically, northerners missed the trees for the forest and referred to the book on the eve of the war as “A Key to the Disunion Conspiracy.” Things can hardly get more tragic in terms of figuration. To sum up, Tucker is WW.

Kennedy, in contrast, was SW and giving in to Bancroft and Emerson: in *Horse–Shoe Robinson* (1835), set somewhere between Virginia and the Carolinas at the time of the Revolution, he has cut from satire and play and sharpened his Tory criticism from *Swallow Barn*. Unlike in Tucker, one finds such sobering remarks as: “History tells of many a rebound from despondency, so sudden and unreckoned, that the wisest men could see in it no other spring than the decree of God.”⁵⁵³ The Emersonian mixture of history with philosophy and religion is there. He attempts “to furnish a picture, and embody the feelings . . . during the progress of the American War of Independence”: history is teleological painting driven by feelings as text and a part of *Universalhistorie*. The war’s incidents were frequently “the most picturesque and romantic.” Kennedy has fallen prey to Bancroft’s style. Personal, that is individual, adventures have been overlooked, and these have become “the lawful property of our story–telling craft.”⁵⁵⁴ The subtlety of Wirt is much lacking, but history is serious: Kennedy begins with geography like Montesquieu and Bancroft.⁵⁵⁵ George Washington is “written down by some future nation”—the word nation is emphasized; history’s pages are the “brightest” and the revolutionary actors—heroes who “worked out a nation’s redemption”—are remembered by far–off posterity as of yesterday. Just as in Emerson, parallels to Pauline tribulations of Christianity and the early Christian church are echoed. The nation “was rejoiced to hear the brilliant passages of arms” of the heroes. It is a shame America lacks ballads about them.⁵⁵⁶ Such anthropologism and Neoplatonism thus combine, as in Emerson, with American history, forming a seamless whole or structure, a signification of identity.

Kennedy is a transitional figure, because for him, history is now both a metaphysical structure of light and an individual event.⁵⁵⁷ In addition, he uses history and chronicle haphazardly as if to make the distinction trivial and, thus, the associated epistemological problem moot.⁵⁵⁸ Such carelessness in use of words is another Emersonian trait and in a sharp opposition to the southern philologists. The combination of romance, SAE, anthropologism and religion *is* authentic history.⁵⁵⁹ Though the narrating is conscious,

⁵⁵² Tucker writes for example: “[I]n this true history [I am writing, unlike in a novel], I am unfortunately bound down by facts, and I lament, that to the best of my recollection, I shall not have occasion to speak of a single female, in the progress of my narrative, whose beauty can be made a theme of just praise.” Tucker, *Partisan Leader*, 60. Also *ibid.*, 61, 128.

⁵⁵³ Kennedy, *Horse–Shoe Robinson* ([?]: [?], [?] [1835a]), 63.

⁵⁵⁴ *idem.*, *preface to Horse–Shoe Robinson*, by John Pendleton Kennedy, vii, viii.

⁵⁵⁵ *idem.*, *Horse–Shoe Robinson*, 1.

⁵⁵⁶ *ibid.*, 201, 214, 215–16, citations on 201, 214, 215.

⁵⁵⁷ For the latter use of the term see for example *ibid.*, 75, *passim*.

⁵⁵⁸ *ibid.*, 181, 201.

⁵⁵⁹ For example, see *ibid.*, 95. Kennedy refers to his own work as “this history.” *ibid.*, 201.

unlike in Tucker, there is not a trace of irony about the telling of history. Translatedness is not a concern.⁵⁶⁰

The first edition was in one volume, and the second that appeared in the same year, in two. The first edition did not have the accentuating subtitle: *A Tale of the Tory Ascendancy*. The second edition includes the motto “I say the tale as ‘twas said to me” from “Lay of the Last Minstrel,” a poem by Scott.⁵⁶¹ This would suggest Kennedy was securely anchored in the romance tradition that did not conflict with Bancroft’s history. It was much different from ancient histories Kennedy continued to ridicule that pushes him close to SAE: the intellect who read books for inquiry without utilitarian use, even when they are not bragging about it, are Tory sympathizers, enemies to American history. This is made explicit later in the story. Such a reader, like Philip Lindsay, “pores over” the ancients’ “secrets,” “obsolete subtleties,” “speculations of an abstract age.” Antiquity intellectuals were “eccentric,” their problems “wondrous,” Plato had “reveries,” the coryphaei were aberrant (Kennedy is either heavily satirical or revealing his lack of knowledge by implying there was a school of “Coryphæans”), Pythagoras had to do with “imagination” and “land of visions,” Epicurus was a wanderer. This “knowledge” is then put side by side with gnostics (they “had their attractions for him”), judicial astrology and its “wild phantasmagoria,” “apparatus of conjurations,” “charms and invocations,” “hallucinations” and “ancient Pythia and modern witchcraft.” Kennedy assures such knowledge of the ancients, these “cabalistic studies,” is nothing—mumbo—jumbo in today’s phrase—and only incites “the germ”—Bancroft and Montesquieu again—of superstition. It stands opposed to reason, Americanized *Universalhistorie*’s reason, as “pernicious and false philosophy.”⁵⁶² This stinging anti-intellectualism is surely more Jackson than Whig in style, but it is hard to say whether Kennedy is serious and lacks the personal interest or ability to distinguish between different kinds of knowledge, or if he is consciously lumping all intellectual pursuit to anti-Americanism. I incline toward the former option. For example, Kennedy collapses Nature fully to Civilization: to him, even Tory Philip is a German romantic (romantic “scenery,” fresh “soil,” healthy “climate”). Philip’s wife exercised “refined art with advantage over nature” in the interior decorations while “the great western wilderness smiled with the contentment of a refined and polished civilization, which no after-day in the history of this [American] empire has yet surpassed, perhaps not equaled.”⁵⁶³ Even Philip believes American political leadership in the

⁵⁶⁰ For example, *ibid.*, 182.

⁵⁶¹ Kennedy, Horse Shoe Robinson; *A Tale of the Tory Ascendancy*, Volume II, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Blanchard, 1835b), n.p. Even Kennedy’s typography of the subtitle is satirically ancient-looking.

⁵⁶² Kennedy, Horse-Shoe Robinson, 129-30, 125. On ridicule on Polybius and Xenophon and their view of history, see *ibid.*, 19. “History has not yet merited Clarke and his companions their merited tribute of renown. Some future chronicler will find in their exploits a captivating theme for his pen . . . in the midst of the nation’s despair, until Fortune . . . [enabled] them to subdue and destroy the Tory Ascendancy in the South.” *ibid.*, 228-29.

⁵⁶³ *ibid.*, 130, 131. Kennedy’s treatment of women advances Victorian sensibilities. For example, see *ibid.*, 79.

Revolution was anti-royalist just like the roundheads were in the English Civil War, while his even more royalist companion insists history must be read aright.⁵⁶⁴ Since the purists of historiography were SAE Evangelicals, not torysts, Kennedy is mixing attitudes very boldly, resembling Emerson's style.

A bit surprisingly at first, the work was praised in the *Messenger*, suggesting the German thinking about history had become more prevalent in Virginia by this time. The reviewer mentions "one *proper* whole" of a narrative connected by "connecting chain" the romantic *credo*. The reviewer prefers novels like *Horse-Shoe* that amuse throughout like Schiller's play. "We enter *at once* into the spirit and meaning of the author—we are introduced *at once* to the prominent characters—and we go with them *at once*, heart and hand, in the various and spirit-stirring adventures which befall them." No ambiguity here about idealistic spirit, humanitarian anthropology, and figuration. Kennedy's mix also worked stylistically: "We have called the style of Mr. K. a style simple and forcible, and we have no hesitation in calling it, at the same time, richly figurative and poetical." Besides, Kennedy has morals, thus nullifying the ambiguity about history and morality. The only problem is punctuation.

However, this review was written by WW Poe.⁵⁶⁵ Why would Poe write a glorifying review about a novel so unlike his own aesthetic? The answer may not lie in aesthetic kinship with Kennedy. Rather, Poe probably felt lifelong personal gratitude to Kennedy for practically having saved his life from absolute poverty only a few months before. Further, Kennedy had acted one of the judges who awarded Poe's "Lionizing"—that, ironically, satirized Coleridge, one of Kennedy's favorites in the piece—the main prize in 1833. Poe was well aware of Kennedy's social thinking at the time and could manipulate it to his ends in language.⁵⁶⁶

Poe's glowing review was perhaps even a well-hidden parody. Poe satirises rationalism, Neoplatonism, utilitarianism and middle class German Romanticism in "Lionizing". In a revised version, published only in 1845, Poe has added a criticism about the quest for originality and changed the title into "Some Passages in the Life of a Lion." Possibly the piece, written sometime before the contest, was inspired by seal of a lion that Kennedy used in his letters. It had a motto Poe interpreted as "il parle par tout*" or "il parle partout" [he speaks for all,* he speaks everywhere].⁵⁶⁷ Since Kennedy was radically wealthier than Poe, a utilitarian enemy of classicism, and a fine specimen of German

⁵⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 162-63.

⁵⁶⁵ Anonymous [Poe], "[Review:] Horse-Shoe Robinson," *Southern Literary Messenger* 1 (1835): 522-24, citations on 523, emphasis added and original, 524. That Poe is the author is maintained at <http://www.eapoe.org/works/criticism/slm35k01.htm>, accessed September 13, 2013.

⁵⁶⁶ Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy. ca. November 19, 1834 and note; Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, December 19, 1834; Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, March 15, 1835; Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, March 15, 1835 and note, in Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 78-83. For Kennedy and Coleridge, see Kennedy, *Horse-Shoe Robinson*, 129. Apparently, Kennedy read both Coleridge and Scott the New England way.

⁵⁶⁷ For the seal, see Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, February 11, 1836, in Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 126 and note.

middle class Romanticism Poe and many other southern intellectuals were wary of, Poe who loved language puzzles was perhaps alluding to Kennedy as the artist and protagonist.⁵⁶⁸ In the review, Poe calls Horse–Shoe Robinson a character “fully entitled to the character of ‘an original.’ He is the life and soul of the drama—the bone and sinew of the book—its very breath—its every thing which gives it strength, substance, and vitality.”⁵⁶⁹ Given how Poe felt about the signifier and moralizing, pronouncements like this, though echoing a lion, should be taken with a grain of salt. They indicate Poe’s similarity to Derrida as well.

3.3.4 The first “general history” of Virginia

At the same time, in 1835, there appeared the first more “general” history of Virginia since Jefferson’s more than half a century earlier. Its gazetteer part was done by Joseph Martin, while William H. Brockenbrough wrote its historical prose part and was the editor. Martin is obscure to posterity, but probably he had sympathies with SAE Evangelicalism, since the only other publication by him I am aware of was a reprint of nonconformist Philip Doddridge’s *Sermons to Young Persons* from the 1730s. It vacillated about the imperative for plain, rigorous language and style. Brockenbrough was a distinguished lawyer and a future Democrat in Florida, where he moved soon after. I seriously doubt Democrats–Bancroft’s party–were much welcomed in Virginia’s historical scene at the time. His great–uncle was William Brockenbrough, one of the key organizers of Jefferson’s university. The younger Brockenbrough studied law, and his father was architect and proctor. Brockenbrough was not mentioned.⁵⁷⁰ Dedicated to VHPS, the work

⁵⁶⁸ “‘What will you take for it?’ asked the artist. ‘For his nose!’ shouted her Grace. ‘A thousand pounds,’ said I, sitting down. ‘A thousand pounds?’ inquired the artist, musingly. ‘A thousand pounds,’ said I. ‘Do you warrant it?’ he asked, turning the nose to the light. ‘I do,’ said I, blowing it well. ‘Is it quite original?’ inquired he, touching it with reverence. ‘Humph!’ said I, twisting it to one side. ‘Has no copy been taken?’ he demanded, surveying it through a microscope. ‘None,’ said I, turning it up. ‘Admirable!’ he ejaculated, thrown quite off his guard by the beauty of the manoeuvre. ‘A thousand pounds,’ said I. ‘A thousand pounds?’ said he. ‘Precisely,’ said I. ‘A thousand pounds?’ said he. ‘Just so,’ said I. ‘You shall have them,’ said he. ‘What a piece of virtue!’ So he drew me a check upon the spot, and took a sketch of my nose.” At the end, the champion of “nosology” loses in popularity to a German without a nose the protagonist had shot away. Poe, “Some Passages in the Life of a Lion,” *Broadway Journal*, March 15, 1845, 165, accessed September 14, 2013, <http://www.eapoe.org/works/tales/liond.htm>, emphasis original. For Poe’s characterization of Kennedy as a bourgeois romantic, see for example Poe, “Autography,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836b): 210.

⁵⁶⁹ Poe, “Horse–Shoe Robinson,” 523.

⁵⁷⁰ I have been unable to obtain much information on Joseph Martin. Apparently he lived in Albemarle County, i.e., near the university at Charlottesville, operated as a publisher, and was probably related to General Martin. Edgar Woods, *History of Albemarle County, Virginia* (Charlottesville: The Michie, 1901), 101. For Doddridge and language, see Robert Strivens, “The Thought of Philip Doddridge in the Context of Early Eighteenth–Century Dissent,” (PhD diss.,

was an interesting conglomeration:⁵⁷¹ a revised edition of a travelbook by Martin that promised a “Comprehensive Description of Virginia” and came out in 1830. Now history was a supplement.⁵⁷²

The function of a gazette in general and especially the relationship between a gazette and a history remain little studied areas in the English language.⁵⁷³ Gazettes in America more broadly were applied to lure people to the West, situated close to the romance tradition⁵⁷⁴ and were therefore very utilitarian. Gazette was by now an archaic form of historical representing, and Martin was innocent of history’s theoretical concerns. As Belo insists, such hybridity is “intrinsically inhabited by a tension between both forms.”⁵⁷⁵ The work’s vacillation between a gazetteer and a history refers to a time *before* Addison, to the late-17th century. History was *ipso facto* a-figural because, since history was auxiliary science at the time, skepticism about it was fairly low (chapters 5, 6). Voltaire had dichotomized between histories as syntheses and gazettes as compendiums. He was unhappy with gazettes, because they refrained from painting the minds of nations and substituted to this task a flood of facts. De Mably, his contemporary, saw the task of the gazetteer, in contrast to historian, as overpleasing the public: they wanted nothing more

*University of Stirling, 2011), 187-88. For Martin being the publisher of Sermons, see for example “Hurley Books,” accessed September 14, 2013, http://www.hurleybooks.com/?page=shop/flypage&product_id=96839&keyword=Thomas&searchby=keyword&offset=200&fs=1. For the strong anti-Federalist and pro-Jackson feelings at the time in America generally, see for example Ronald P. Formisano, *The Transformation of Political Culture: Massachusetts Parties, 1790s–1840s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 17-18. For the Brockenbroughs see for example Minor, “Judge William Brockenbrough,” 735; “The Hutchins/Chapman Family Home Page: Information about William H. Brockenbrough, Judge,” accessed 13 September, 2013, <http://familytreemaker.genealogy.com/users/h/u/t/Christopher-F-Hutchins/WEBSITE-0001/UHP-0154.html>; “The Hutchins/Chapman Family Home Page: Information about Arthur Spicer Brockenbrough,” accessed 13 September, 2013, <http://familytreemaker.genealogy.com/users/h/u/t/Christopher-F-Hutchins/WEBSITE-0001/UHP-0089.html>. Brockenbrough must have moved to Florida soon afterward since he was a Democrat in Florida by 1837. “Rootsweb Message Boards,” accessed 15 September, 2013, <http://boards.rootsweb.com/topics.obits2/52173/mb.ashx>.*

⁵⁷¹ Joseph Martin [and William H. Brockenbrough], *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of Columbia* (Charlottesville: Moseley & Tompkins, 1834).

⁵⁷² “Barnes and Noble,” accessed September 15, 2013, <http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/comprehensive-description-of-virginia-joseph-martin/1100280390?ean=2940017041703>.

⁵⁷³ On the general phenomenon, see Brendan Maurice Dooley and Sabrina Alcorn Baron, eds., *The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe* (London: Routledge, 2001). For history and gazetteer in English, see Lavoinnie, “Journalists, History and Historians”; André Belo, “Between History and Periodicity: Printed and Hand-Written News in 18th-Century Portugal,” *e-journal of Portuguese History* 2 (2004): 1-11.

⁵⁷⁴ Van Tassel, *Recording America’s Past*, 54-55.

⁵⁷⁵ Belo, “Between History and Periodicity,” 6.

than to be complacent public servants, refined entertainers with a dull litany of facts.⁵⁷⁶ Ironically, even Voltaire's—a prototype historian of new philosophy against the ancients and philology—approach was very far from linguistic and erudite.⁵⁷⁷ So methodologically, Martin is winding back the clock to a time when gazettes were read and produced *bona fide* as histories, i.e., roughly *before* Voltaire, as the core of the work. This arguably devolves to Fontenelle's application of Descartes and natural science to history, with only modifications as to comparison as method⁵⁷⁸ familiar to the Yankees (chapter 2). It completely sidesteps the argument between skepticism and romance about history. Still, it is not in conflict with his genre choice. To the contrary, Cassirer has shown the complicity between Voltaire and Fontenelle. For both, the terminus point is the encyclopaedists' trust in progress of culture. This resulted from the impact increases in refined manners and urban knowledge will make on morality. The public sphere became a self-serving agent or "intrasociety" of *salon* of political, theoretical, ethical and aesthetic ideals.⁵⁷⁹

However, here the comparisons break down like in the incoherence of VHPS. Despite Cushing, VHPS still clung to an aristocratic–humanistic—and not bourgeois–public sphere. Martin refers reverently to "their cynical Lordships" whose name he meekly asks for protection and "venture[s] to ask the protection of [their] countenance." To this nobleman jargon is juxtaposed the need for consorted historical collaboration, but no mention is made of any societies. Tone is exceedingly reverential, yet fully serious.⁵⁸⁰ The Virginians' work abstains from rupturing the aristocratic–humanistic fabric by subjectivism, let alone by presenting a contesting philosophy of history by way of Bancroft. Bancroftian romantic metaphysical proclamations are kept to a minimum.⁵⁸¹

⁵⁷⁶ Lavoinne, "Journalists, History and Historians," 208.

⁵⁷⁷ Momigliano, "Ancient Historian and the Antiquarian," 307-8.

⁵⁷⁸ Belo, "Between History and Periodicity," 4. Pflug, "Development of Historical Method in the Eighteenth Century," 1-2; Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, trans. Fritz A. Koelln and James P. Pettegrove (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 16. Cassirer maintains Fontenelle's *Conversations on the Plurality of Worlds (1686)* became "a part of the general culture of society." *ibid.*, 80.

⁵⁷⁹ *ibid.*, 268.

⁵⁸⁰ Martin and Brockenbrough, *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer*, 3-4, citation on 3, 4. Compare with his closure in *ibid.*, 4:

"And remain, gentlemen.

With the greatest respect.

Your most obedient

And most humble Servant,

JOSEPH MARTIN."

⁵⁸¹ The closest is the depiction of Native Americans: the author is puzzled "the savages were not living together as one nation, and did not have, for most purposes, unity of action" and his description how the people of Virginia after Bacon's Rebellion "exhibited towards the king's commissioners in one of the boldest defences of privilege which the records of any nation can exhibit, and shows how strongly imbued with the spirit of freedom the people must have been." *ibid.*, 568, 611. For cautious Bancroft recommendation, see *ibid.*, 595n.

By comparison, the format of a gazette and the status of a gazetteer were “not considered a source of social pre-eminence and authorship in the royal ‘Republic of Letters’” of Portugal. José Freire de Monterroyo Mascarenhas, editor of a Portuguese gazette in the early-1700s, appealed to the utility of his work as a justification for his being busy with it but maintained in his application for the institution that he was, nevertheless, an erudite historian. However, he was denied access to the new powerful academy of direct royal connections of eminent men, probably for the reason he was a mere gazetteer. Self-denial was common among periodical editors because of lower prestige they had to a book writer.⁵⁸² Use became the justification for publication as well as the criterion according to which material was sorted.⁵⁸³

The biggest discrepancies deal with genre, epistemology and semiotics that parallel the conflicting status of history and VHPS. The gazetteers saw their products as histories and Monterroyo thought of himself as good a historian as the elite. A book of history was the lower-ranked gazetteer’s model in the 1600s.⁵⁸⁴ By contrast, Martin has no pretensions to be a historian—contrary to the gazettes, the word “history” only appears at the end of the baroque title: . . . *To which is Added a History of Virginia from Its First Settlement to the Year 1754. With an Abstract of the Principal Events from that Period to the Independence of Virginia, Written Expressly for the Work.* He emphasizes deeply the imperfections of his work as history.⁵⁸⁵ In addition, he claims to be almost penniless as a result of research of two years.⁵⁸⁶ Martin’s history was a “hasty composition which is called rather from its length than its character, a History of Virginia,” “hasty sketch . . . infinitely too humble for criticism” . . . “hasty composition of *little more than a fortnight*” . . . “his hasty sketch was not written with the expectation of meeting with approbation as a philosophic treatise upon the history of Virginia.”⁵⁸⁷ Martin thus reverses course from Monterroyo: his work is more a gazette than history, and he is no historian. Interestingly, distance from the elite

⁵⁸² Belo, “Between History and Periodicity,” 4, 5, 6, citation on 4.

⁵⁸³ For example: “[W]ith the hope that the information here collected may not be altogether useless, I venture to ask the protection of your countenance” . . . “The almost innumerable contributions when received had to be examined and arranged, and such parts as were thought either useful or interesting, culled from the mass of unnecessary matter which sometimes encumbered the communications. When this was done, and the publisher thought he had obtained such an amount of information as would be highly useful . . .” *Martin and Brockenbrough, A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer*, 4, 5.

⁵⁸⁴ Belo, “Between History and Periodicity,” 4-6.

⁵⁸⁵ “[T]his imperfect essay constitutes the first fruit . . . “[I]t is considered by critics to be an act of unpardonable impertinence to obtrude an imperfect work upon the notice of the public, and then apologize for its imperfections” . . . “They need not whet their beaks at our announcement of its imperfections” . . . “[I]t would not form a perfect Gazetteer of Virginia” . . . “[The Publisher] now presents the work to the public, if not as perfect as it might be, yet certainly as perfect as he could at this time make it.” *Martin and Brockenbrough, A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer*, 3, 5, 5-6.

⁵⁸⁶ *ibid.*, 5-6, 8.

⁵⁸⁷ *ibid.*, 7, 8, *emphasis original*.

is *greater* than in royalist Portugal a century earlier, since Martin would never have the audacity to think of himself a VHPS member, one of the “hawks.”⁵⁸⁸

Epistemologically, the book is a curious mix: on one hand, there is the influence of Fontenelle, the Yankee preference: “it is believed that very few of [the typographical errors] effect the sense, and still fewer falsify statements of fact.” It “describe[s] Virginia as it exists at the present day.” “The system” is complete: it “present[s] to the mind each separate portion of country at once, in a connected view, so that the reader at a distance might form as good an idea of the state of improvement in each county, as if he were on the spot.”⁵⁸⁹ The work operated like the mind and the stereo vision of the eyes: first the general part, then the east and the west simultaneously. But Martin incongruously mixes to this absolute stereo vision “*hope* of presenting a succinct and faithful narrative.” “[I]f on any subject, all is not said which might have been said, or all which is said is not true, he at least feels sure that he has respectable authority for every word he utters, and that he *believes* all to be true.”⁵⁹⁰ He thus falls back on the school of Christian Thomasius, whose heyday was at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries. It insisted on simple good faith on tradition in history without any skepticism.⁵⁹¹

Gazetteers were often in a hurry resulting in delay and thus made less ideal historians.⁵⁹² Similarly, Martin is very specific about his hurry.⁵⁹³ Interestingly, he connects his hurried state to the a-figural state of the narrative. The author could not “pay any attention whatever to his language or style, or to digress upon the many topics which so invitingly offered, or turn his eyes for a moment to other colonies or countries. He was compelled to proceed with the single isolated narrative of Virginia history.”⁵⁹⁴ This is another old-school sidestep from the aporias of ironic symbolism, romance narrative and the immediacy of the ancients. Still, the author insists no less than five times that the work

⁵⁸⁸ *ibid.*, 5, 7-8.

⁵⁸⁹ *ibid.*, 9, 10. As Pflug explains, if the separation between uniqueness and generality is extended to temporality and timelessness, and the timeless put as a source of all temporal or particular characteristics, it means annihilation of scientific pretenses about history. Pflug, “Development of Historical Method in the Eighteenth Century,” 16.

⁵⁹⁰ *Martin and Brockenbrough, A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer*, 8, *emphasis added and original*.

⁵⁹¹ Momigliano, “Ancient Historian and the Antiquarian,” 297.

⁵⁹² Belo, “Between History and Periodicity,” 6.

⁵⁹³ “[A] work which I am compelled to throw upon the world under the most inauspicious circumstances,” “[T]his method of collecting matter, although it produced considerable delay,” “At length, however, a young man who had no experience in such matters was induced to undertake it, but his occasional absence and necessary attention to other business, added to a most illegible chirography caused many errors of the press which it was out of his power to correct. The printers also were new in their business, and not prepared for conducting it with that attention to neatness and accuracy which was desirable,” “[T]he time was of course too limited, being written as fast as three active compositors could print.” *Martin and Brockenbrough, A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer*, 3, 6, 7.

⁵⁹⁴ *ibid.*, 7.

will be received well, especially by travelers, businessmen and literary men.⁵⁹⁵ However, none of this was directed to VHPS. In sum, Martin is a stand-in for confusion between SW and WW: his position is irrelevant as a criticism of history. Its form and content have a stronger pull to SW than WW. But he lacks even the rudiments of perceiving history as a skeptical enterprise and thus the apparatus of a bourgeois dynamic. He seldom reaches beyond Addison in radicalism.⁵⁹⁶

Brockenbrough, for his part, is even far more cautious epistemologically, but more figurative. Though he rises Virginia to the level of civilization like Bancroft boldly did with America, the cosmopolitan historian's irony takes over. Instead of visionary idealism, it is mixed with poetics. Brockenbrough knows "our feeble wing" cannot be allured "to essay a flight so daring as would be necessary to survey the broad field which now expands before us." "We leave it rich, tempting and beautiful as it is, to be painted by some master whose skill will enable him to exhibit the grandeur and symmetry of the whole, and yet present upon the same canvass a detail of each separate beauty." Indeed: "For ourselves, we cannot be so barbarous as to disfigure so magnificent a subject by daubing it over with the same wretched colors, which we have laid on the preceding piece, in such extreme haste that we fear it will be difficult to distinguish the characters or design." The outline is very general and brief and not true.⁵⁹⁷ This is romantically informed but author-abnegating and thus differs from Bancroft.

The book made no waves. The *Messenger* took months to even review it. Poe mentions the public has been indifferent to the work and that, unlike in many other civilized countries, there is no public sphere in Virginia. Yet, Poe wishes well to the brave effort and seems to condone its powerful utilitarianism. It is invaluable even "indeed to the general reader."⁵⁹⁸ Such unrestrained backing of middle class utilitarianism may seem strange. However, it is possible Poe, now the editor, saw the theoretical harmlessness of the book as a performance. Gazettes were seen at this time in the South as easy points of

⁵⁹⁵ "[A] generous public, which will be thankful to the enterprise," "[H]e trusts that the subject itself is so interesting that it will be read even in his hasty sketch," "All the circumstances of the case, we doubt not with a liberal public, will ensure this first attempt to describe Virginia as it exists at the present day, a favorable reception and it will respect the disposition and the enterprise which has given them so much," "It is unnecessary to enlarge upon the necessity which existed for such a work, it has been felt by every traveller, man of business, and literary man in the community," "With a hope that what is already accomplished

will meet the expectations and approbation of those who have so liberally patronized him." *ibid.*, 5, 7, 8, 9.

⁵⁹⁶ Habermas distinguishes two necessities for bourgeois discourse: 1. Rational-critical public debate and 2. Subjective individual privacy of the literary novel. Martin partook in neither, and neither was established in the South in the period. Habermas, *Structural Formation of the Public Sphere*, 28-30.

⁵⁹⁷ Martin and Brockenbrough, *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer*, 618.

⁵⁹⁸ Anonymous [Poe], "[Review:] Martin's Gazetteer," *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836a): 180.

access to bourgeois public sphere of aesthetic pleasure,⁵⁹⁹ but such aims were of northern origin. Perhaps Poe was feeling touchy about bourgeois pursuits because of lawyer Lucian Minor's sarcastic "Liberian Literature," published in the same volume. Minor implied civilized debating societies and literary criticism, recently constructed by the American colonizers of blacks (chapter 5), were possible even in Africa. A literary culture "necessarily implies" "comforts, virtues, and pleasures" that form an absolute borderline between civilized and savage.⁶⁰⁰ Minor was no historian, nor ironist. Instead, he joined the Bancroftian *Universalhistorie* and was heavily middle class and progressive SW.⁶⁰¹ Since Minor strongly endorsed northern cultural politics, the essay may have been interpreted as a burlesque on southern lack of such discourse. Poe censored it heavily without consulting Minor that suggests the two had different views about discourse.⁶⁰² Poe apparently never corresponded with Minor on his own accord.⁶⁰³

3.3.4.1 Cultural-poetic differences about history in the late-1830s

Soon afterwards in the famed "The American Scholar" essay, Emerson proclaimed—understandably from the rationalist point—that history had always been a Cartesian natural science and comparable to it. History's conclusions must be preserved and communicated, and its object was individual experience and popular culture that must be focused on by such a method.⁶⁰⁴ But in the South, WW skepticism continued. In 1837, the *Messenger*

⁵⁹⁹ See for example Daniel Kimball Whitaker, "Condition and Prospects of American Literature," *SLJMM* 1 (1835a): 2.

⁶⁰⁰ Minor, "Liberian Literature," *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836a): 158-59, citation on 158.

⁶⁰¹ Minor admired New England's social policies and had connections to its influential members. See for example A Virginian [Minor], "Letters from New England—No. I," *Southern Literary Messenger* 1 (1834): 86; Edgar A. Poe to Lucian Minor, March 10, 1836, in Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe, 1*, 129-30. Minor's *Universalhistorie* sympathies are revealed, for instance, in his appealing to a "universal practice of nations," a construct Poe questions. Minor, "Chief Justice Marshall," 186, emphasis original and note. For a particularly middle class SW literary theorist around this period, see Anonymous, "[Review:] Dr. Bird's New Novel," *Southern Literary Messenger* 5 (1839): 420-29.

⁶⁰² Edgar A. Poe to Lucian Minor, February 5, 1836, in Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe, 1*, 122-23.

⁶⁰³ *ibid.*, 241 note.

⁶⁰⁴ "[S]ince the dawn of history, there has been a constant accumulation and classifying of facts. But what is classification but the perceiving that these objects are not chaotic, and are not foreign, but have a law which is also a law of the human mind? The astronomer discovers that geometry, a pure abstraction of the human mind, is the measure of planetary motion. The chemist finds proportions and intelligible method throughout matter; and science is nothing but the finding of analogy, identity, in the most remote parts. The ambitious soul sits down before each refractory fact; one after another, reduces all strange constitutions, all new powers, to their class and their law" . . .

quoted the views of French lawyer and politician Pierre–François Réal that confirm ancient history, though only a collection of anecdotes, is superior *both* to modern history manifest in philosophy, *and* romantic narrative based on philosophy. All modern history is discursive, and all can be only coherently true. Things get even worse when a historian is dishonest, because to the dishonest, truth does not bend according to logic, it is thrown out “to make room for lies.” As in F. Schlegel, the anecdotal, fragmentary history is the truest. Such histories are not causal: they are free from narrative romance form, and thus free from logic. Being isolated, they are more easily verifiable.⁶⁰⁵ Simms likewise continued criticizing romance symbolically in his border romances like *Richard Hurdis* (1838). Such narratives are *incoherent* instead of *dialectic*: Good and evil, civilization and nature, continue to co–exist. What is lacking is the bourgeois and capitalist individual vs. civilization scheme where nature is a resource for aesthetics, progress or Puritan manifest destiny. While Emerson was demanding from history individual mystic gnostic experience he identifies with “the common” and natural scientific presenting, Simms held on to the metonymic communal pattern even in the frontier.⁶⁰⁶ As Genovese has convincingly argued, southern cultural theory was free from the capitalist/romantic trope of an individual alienated.⁶⁰⁷ Unlike in novel liberal theories, existence was not reducible to the individual. But social relations were not abstract or discursively structural either. Similarly, from lack of emphasis on the individual did not follow socialism, but a more aristocratic individuality based on a metonymic whole, humanism and Christianity. Not so in the North: Longfellow, who had criticized Poe as early as 1832, consciously abandoned Byron by 1839. New England poetry was turning Heaven, morals and historical–national progress as a theory of the maturity of man into metaphors.⁶⁰⁸ Longfellow’s poetic prescription to be moral, take one’s time to study the rules wisely and listen to all ages and all people mixes democracy, anthropology, *Universalhistorie* and Plato. Like Burckhardt, Poe had claimed the time of myth was irreplaceably behind in the age of science, but Longfellow proclaimed poetry progresses with history.⁶⁰⁹

“History and exact science he must learn by laborious reading.” Emerson, “The American Scholar,” accessed February 24, 2009, <http://www.emersoncentral.com/amscholar.htm>; Watkins “‘Philosophy is the Only True Historian,’” 27. Ironically, Emerson’s proclamation has been hailed as America’s “Intellectual Declaration of Independence,” by the revered Oliver Wendell Holmes.

⁶⁰⁵ Anonymous [Pierre–François Réal] “Thoughts on the Manner of Writing History,” trans. ?, repub. in *Southern Literary Messenger* 3 (1837): 156-57, citation on 156.

⁶⁰⁶ For Simms, see Nakamura, *Visions of Order* in William Gilmore Simms, 106-7.

⁶⁰⁷ Genovese, *Southern Front*, 66-67. The same was found in Simms. Nakamura, *Visions of Order* in William Gilmore Simms, 42.

⁶⁰⁸ Hovey, “Critical Provincialism,” 342, 344-46.

⁶⁰⁹ *ibid.*, 346-47. For Burckhardt on myth, see Joseph Mali, *Mythistory: The Making of a Modern Historiography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 107-108, 121-28.

3.3.5 Prescott and his poetic and philosophical differences to southerners

Like Bancroft, Prescott began by writing essays, reviews and articles. Of those published in the middle of the Civil War, all except one appeared in the *North American Review*.⁶¹⁰ He had trouble with eyesight.⁶¹¹

In his first essay, Prescott embarks on a rigid search for authorial intention, complaining about the mass of poetry in the way. He declares Turpin's chronicle is a "lying" one full of "ridiculous eccentricities." Sacred topics cannot be ridiculed, yet this occurs even in supposedly moral works such as "the solemn deformities" of ancient French and English drama. Purci's epic is a fraud and, though pious, "tainted with the same indecent familiarities." Indecency is a bad thing and belongs not to modernity. Through parallelism, Prescott claims Byron is a modern representative of such disgusting tropics. He moralises Machiavelli on too frivolous pastime pursuits the latter failed to notice in him but did in others. English fiction and poetry serve utilitarian purposes of practical and religious truth as romance and metaphor. Most of Italian writing is not such: no useful information, no practical truth, no moral truth, no just portraits of character, no sound ethics, no wise philosophy. Some sonnets and canzone are "animated by an efficient spirit of religion or patriotism; but too frequently they are of a purely amatory nature, the unsubstantial though brilliant exhalations of a heated fancy." "Our position" about this is just. Aesthetic sensibility to the beautiful has led Italians astray "from the substantial and the useful." Rhetoric in history, "in this practical age," is only used by an Italian for effect that misguides. Only recently, thanks to English literature, have Italians thankfully become more philosophical and grave. History is fully separate from fiction and contains truth, while fiction is the sphere of the imagination. Among ancient historians, Tacitus is the most sententious.⁶¹²

Though "foundational" of Prescott's textual career, strangely enough, only one recent scholar has paid attention to this piece to my knowledge.⁶¹³ Already very early, in 1822 before he had published anything of note, Prescott had been putting much emphasis on German theorists for several years. History was another point of focus. Disdain of Italy—a position in diametric contrast to Jefferson—closely follows Hegel's argument, supplied by nationalist bass notes from Crèvecoeur.⁶¹⁴ No trace of the Charleston critics' more subtle and sympathetic ponderings remains as to the status of medieval chronicles. Prescott

⁶¹⁰ William H. Prescott, *preface to Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, by William H. Prescott, *New ed.* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1864), n.p.

⁶¹¹ "William H. Prescott," last modified February 18, 2015, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_H._Prescott.

⁶¹² Prescott, "Italian Narrative Poetry," repr. in *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, 423-24, 430, 479-81, 482-83, 424, 481, citations on 423, 424, 480-81, 482.

⁶¹³ K. P. Van Anglen, "Before Longfellow: Dante and the Polarisation of New England," *Dante Studies* 119 (2001): 155-86.

⁶¹⁴ George Ticknor, ed., *Life of William H. Prescott, Illustrated Cabinet Ed.* (New York: Merrill and Baker, 1863), 64-65; Gerbi, *Dispute of the New World*, 430-431; de Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, "Letter I," 6-8.

brazenly, if not arrogantly, looks at the Italian world through his interpretations of Madame de Staël's German interpretations he refers to. That is, he knows before he knows. The Schillerian aesthetic divide is in place. The difference between the more nuanced, classicist, ironic and symbolic southerners is profound. Further, Prescott's conduct is liable for ethical criticism in a metaphysical sense, because he refuses to accommodate Italian culture except for ethereal beauty, or the Middle Ages in other forms than the liberal and capitalist reason–understanding divide. Rapaport's reading of Derrida's "On an Apocalyptic Tone," though discussing Christian eschatology, is illuminating in this context. Using irony, it names mystics those who believe in a neutral, objective and rational tone "since they unthoughtfully compress and focus textual effects which, in fact, cannot be easily disentangled from a metaphysical and theological contest of intuitions, postures, and styles." The purity of modernity and history touted by Prescott are a problem, because unlike for southerners, translation is of no concern. Philosopher-theologian Emmanuel Levinas notes language offers a respite for being and history. This is exactly contrary to Prescott, who thinks Italian tuneful language is insubstantial, deformed and "in heat" in contrast to the purity, decent and useful language of English. Derrida radicalizes Levinas: even tonal resonance is non–immediate, and the bundle of the tone is not homogenous or harmonious. Tonalities in the bundle "exist only in proximity to one another, a proximity which reveals itself as other, as from an other place." An apocalyptic tone cannot be known or calculated in advance. Apart from its blendedness, noisiness and dissonance are its second characteristic. For Prescott, dis–sonance is shelved away as ethereal and immoral beauty in the apparatus of mind run by reason. It enforces a univocal tone. For Derrida, the question is how the detection of the "bundle–ness" of voice is a threat for reasoned voice's metaphysics and thus reaches, in a condition of a man's and philosophy's end, from beyond epistemology and history. This recognition "takes place outside, beyond or exterior" to man as a historical man on a timeline of past knowledge and future foreknowledge.⁶¹⁵ As with southerners, such an existence knows itself *beyond* metaphor and romance and thus deconstructs history in/as temporality. It is *an outside discourse* many southern theorists glimpsed but Prescott missed.

Another southern resource—the classicist freedom and openness *outside* Plato's transcendence and especially Neoplatonism (chapter 2)—also vanishes. Greek/pagan *vision and visibility* involve *distance*, while *dazzling light* involves *presence*, tactility, immediacy, a primary belonging to Other that goes beyond theory, as in case of Emerson. All certainty was visibility–based for Greeks, and for many southerners. But for Prescott, *hearing* comes first, and a correct hearing at that. Hearing predetermines, puts into question or surpasses, seeing for Judaism and Christianity.⁶¹⁶ Ironically, Prescott

⁶¹⁵ Herman Rapaport, *Heidegger & Derrida: Reflections on Time and Language* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 202-207, citations on 203, 205, 206.

⁶¹⁶ Compare with Blumenberg, "Light as a Metaphor for Truth," 45-47. Emerson states for example: "I embrace the common, I explore and sit at the feet of the familiar, the low" . . . "The dread of man and the love of man shall be a wall of defence and a wreath of joy around all. A nation of men will for the first time exist, because each believes himself inspired by the Divine Soul which also inspires all men." Emerson, "American Scholar."

concludes in his next published essay that English language gives most freedom for “entering into the spirit of foreign letters.”⁶¹⁷

About the same time, 1825, Prescott shows knowledge of Bancroft’s fresh translation of Heeren. In a letter, he has already inserted the tropes of *Universalhistorie* into place. His hatred for Italian history continued: its antiquities were “barren” and “latent.” What he wanted was “to embrace the *gift* of the Spanish subject, without involving myself in the unwieldy, barbarous records of a thousand years.” This was a very presentist approach to history. His topics could include “reigns,” “Constitutions,” “exploits,” “discovery,” “policy,” his epistemological concerns “causes” and his genre “romance as well as history.” Resorting to Bancroft’s Heeren, Prescott maintains the age of Ferdinand “contain[ed] the germs of the modern system of European politics.” Further, “the three sovereigns . . . were important engines in overturning the old system.” He noted in 1847: “This was the first germ of my conception of Ferdinand and Isabella.”⁶¹⁸ Here we have another American romantic Heeren. Not too much erudition or philology, rhetoric or figural analysis: what count are “the gift” and “the germ,” political science that helps history *be* a science.

Accordingly, history is a science for him in his review of Irving’s *Conquest of Granada* in 1829.⁶¹⁹ This work was yet another romance history posing as true history.⁶²⁰ Prescott boldly declares ancient historians were mere amusers who “filled their pictures with dazzling and seductive images,” they seldom reflected—apparently, idealist—liberal philosophy is now a must—and “bestowed infinite pains on the costume, the style of their history, and, in fine, made everything subordinate to the main purpose of conveying an elegant and interesting *narrative*.” Herodotus, Livy, early chroniclers all were such. Prescott mixes to this the *Universalhistorie* trope of infancy—maturity of nationhood. Usefulness is bound to Christianity without question, and the poetic is strictly within its separate sphere. Historians have “theorems” and probability, a victory for philosophy more than a loss for poetry. Utilitarian science is possible only now, science of government, political science and education. 16th century historians like Mariana were “most incompetent chroniclers” *because* not cosmopolitans, and wrongly educated. Their narratives are useless, because they are distorted by prejudice and credulity unlike Italian renaissance historians who were public men *and* eyewitnesses. Of the moderns, Voltaire was not a good historian: though he advocated freedom from prejudice, he was skeptical and implied chance controlled the world. Voltaire’s new revolution in historical presenting is artificial, but it helps the expeditious reader “*to arrive more expeditiously at the results,*

⁶¹⁷ Prescott, “*Da Ponte’s Observations*,” repr. in *idem.*, *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, 638.

⁶¹⁸ Prescott’s diary, ca. spring of 1825; Prescott’s comment in 1847, cited in Ticknor, *Life of William H. Prescott*, 72.

⁶¹⁹ Prescott, “[Review:] *Irving’s Conquest of Granada*,” repr. in *idem.*, *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, 89.

⁶²⁰ Richard L. Kagan, “*The Spanish Craze in the United States: Cultural Entitlement and the Appropriation of Spain’s Cultural Patrimony, ca. 1890–ca. 1930*,” *Revista Complutense de Historia de América* 36 (2010): 47.

for which alone history is valuable” while the Voltairean model gave more power to the historian as to certainty and facility. Prescott applauds Montesquieu precisely because he left history, i.e., facts, out for theorems that can only serve as ingredients for its “spirit,” though the results of this method turned out questionable and politically charged hypotheses. He finally discourages skepticism he finds in Gibbon—otherwise a good narrative historian free from theorems, apart from his rhetoric and anti-Puritan views. One needs a sympathetic hero for history that gets approached with warmth as fits a Christian—the American *desideratum*.⁶²¹ Again with rich unconscious irony, he speaks of “independence” in history and “sap and vitality,” ignoring his own desire to gather only the fruits he likes and as he likes them.⁶²²

This essay was influential among southern thinkers of and writers about history as well (chapters 4, 5, 6). However, it is anachronistically romantic and lacks sophistication in comparison to other southern views. Prescott reduces history and its relationship with other arts to his version of Romanticism. Further, besides his prescription history matters only for its useful results, Prescott seems fully ignorant of the philosophical difference between cosmopolitan history and *Universalhistorie*. As O’Brien counters, rhetoric was not antithetical in the former, but “a discursive adjunct to the construction of narrative.”⁶²³ Prescott mixes cosmopolitan history and *Universalhistorie*, a category mistake in this sense, and argues against politicized history while openly supporting liberalized history, a contradiction. Such “philosophical history” would take into account “system adopted . . . for the administration of . . . colonies,” “regulation of trade,” “moral and political consequences of the discovery of America,” “genius, social institutions, and civil polity.” In Prescott’s dichotomy, narrative history as a harmonious romance is different from a philosophical history of theorems.⁶²⁴ His reasoning resembles more Bancroft’s take on Hegel than the cosmopolitans because of his liberal-Christian apriorism. These Yankees insist on meaning that is necessarily within a postulated metaphysical and paradigmatic process of history that Niebuhr, Kant, most historians and the cosmopolitans lacked.⁶²⁵ If Bancroft’s approach was narrow to southerners, Prescott’s seems even more so in this setting. For Prescott, romance history is already one big canvas, only in need of revival of the colours—a notable difference to Simms’s *Faber*. But he treats romance history condescendingly, a contention he would later radicalize as I explore below.⁶²⁶

⁶²¹ Prescott, “Irving’s Conquest of Granada,” 89-107, citations on 89, emphasis original, 94, 95, 99, emphasis added; Hazlett, “Literary Nationalism and Ambivalence,” 562.

⁶²² Prescott, “Irving’s Conquest of Granada,” 109.

⁶²³ O’Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 9.

⁶²⁴ Prescott, “Irving’s Conquest of Granada,” 108, 109, citations on 108, 109.

⁶²⁵ On Niebuhr and Hegel see for example David D. Roberts, *Nothing but History: Reconstruction and Extremity after Metaphysics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 30-31. Legaré contends even August von Schlegel, the less radical of the Schlegel brothers, disliked Niebuhr. Legaré, *Writings*, 1, 114ff., cited in Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 16.

⁶²⁶ Prescott, “Irving’s Conquest of Granada,” 122, 119. Here one also finds the word “chronicle” misused a few years before Kennedy. *ibid.*, 116. For more condescendence to romance

Late in 1837, Prescott published his *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*. At the outset, he proclaims the value of history is dependent on its materials. We encounter Fontenelle's rigor: "I have endeavored to present [the reader] with such an account of the state of affairs, both before the accession, and at the demise of the Catholic sovereigns, as might afford him the best points of view for surveying the entire results of their reign." And later: "The present and the following chapter will embrace the mental progress of the kingdom . . . in order to exhibit as far as possible its entire results, at a single glance, to the eye of the reader." Like Wirt, he confesses only after the event could he understand the difficulty of his goal and, like Martin, is fully conscious of his inadequacies. But instead of simple good faith in his sources as in Martin, he at least is exempt from party spirit or nationalism—a dubious claim—as he confesses being honest and in sympathy with the principal actors.

The Bostonians' (chapter 2) and Heeren's clear dichotomy between civilized and barbaric in history is again in place: in the problem with his sight, the process with the work had become irksome for him and his assistant, at least "till my ear accommodated to foreign sounds, and an antiquated, oftentimes barbarous phraseology, when my progress became sensible, and I was cheered with the prospect of success." Similarly, the manuscripts contained "doubtful orthography and defiance of all punctuation." Even after the publishing of the book, he refers to it as "a work filled with facts dug out of barbarous and obsolete idioms." With further richly unconscious irony, he quotes Johnson that loss of sight in historical research compels one to seek for more skilful and attentive help than it is usually possible to obtain. The irony, bordering on hypocrisy, is that Prescott's own attitude seems not very respectful despite such necessary help: the tonal and semiotic biases linger beside the metaphysical bias. Yet, the worst thing would have been if blindness had led him on to a path to literature and aesthetics. Thus, Prescott seems sincerely to think his work is free from poetics despite lack of sight, i.e., lack of empiricism. This judgment is stronger than Heeren's commitment, resembling positivism in its hostility to metaphysics. Paradoxically, almost in the next sentence we read how on this path God finally had restored his eyes sufficiently for him to conduct his studies more effectively. As in Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* (1740), Prescott believes his tortuous journey is awarded with added truth against criticism. This already is deeply metaphysical and betrays his deep confusion with the *philosophes* and Heeren: Diderot's *Jack the Fatalist* was one representative that showed one cannot seriously have the cake and eat it too in a mechanist–naturalistic human thought Prescott's epistemic ideal pertains to.⁶²⁷ But as a result of his catachretic confusion between cosmopolitan history and *Universalhistorie*, he still insists official documents "we are accustomed to regard as the surest foundations of history." Emerson's message had got him. To be sure, in this

history see *idem.*, "Memoir of Charles Brockden Brown, The American Novelist," repr. in *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, 28-29.

⁶²⁷ *idem.*, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, Volume I, 3rd ed. (New York: A. L. Burt, n.d. [1838a]), 6, 7, 377, 8-9, 8n, citations on 7, 377, 8-9, 9. William H. Prescott to George Ticknor, January 6, 1838, in Ticknor, *Life of William H. Prescott*, 110. On Diderot see for example Cassirer, *Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, 70-72.

instance there is serious and quite astute and honest skepticism about constructing a historical narrative.⁶²⁸ But Prescott simply refuses to draw skeptical conclusions from it: we can still “receive with full confidence” private contemporary correspondence “which, from its very nature, is exempt from most of the restraints and affectations incident more or less to every work destined for the public eye.” These messages “come like the voice of departed years” and when they are linked to authorial personal observation, their value is inestimable: instead of showing simply the result, “they lay open the internal workings of the machinery” so we “enter into” the minds of the writers. The only problem is interruptions in the causal link, *but* this only happens when not “designed” for historical uses.⁶²⁹ This analogy comes almost straight from Fontenelle.⁶³⁰ But now added is neoplatonic metaphysics that emanate probably from Transcendentalism: despite interruptions, the sources “shed so strong a light as materially to aid us in groping our way through the darker and more perplexed passages of the story.”⁶³¹ Like in Emerson’s relation to Neoplatonism, light engulfs the being of the sources. We can perceive an analogy with his assistant: though he insists on aid, the sources are transformed and reduced—without a problem or respect to their *difference*—to aid his own ends. History as political science for Prescott is akin to the 17th century natural science: both are epistemologically grounded in Descartes. For example, he speaks of the necessity of “completing the view” to “show [the administration’s] operation on the intellectual culture of the nation” that constitutes “a principal end of all government [and] should never be altogether divorced from any history” and uses a lot of empirical terms such as survey and “map of history.”⁶³² Prescott valorizes causality (“circumstances which immediately led to these results”), “germ” and especially “institutions”—it appears in the singular or in the plural almost 80 times—and history is capitalized in reference to his own work.⁶³³ In sum, he follows the footsteps of Heeren and cohesively connects history, science, liberalism, Christian morals, government and the state. To this Prescott then tries to fit his demand for voice on his terms, for his own ends, to give credence for his quasi–Hegelian metaphysics.

The Christian–civilized–liberal judging continued: for instance, the literary world of John II was “an elegant culture,” conducted “on more scientific principles than had been hitherto known.” However, accidental outpourings of fine sentiment in its products—done without any design—were dearly purchased “in the more extended pieces, at the expense of such a crude mass of grotesque and undigested verse, as shows an entire ignorance of the principles of the art.” The late–15th century was a “miserable medley of hypocrisy and superstition,” a corrupt age of European courts whose politics were so characterised.⁶³⁴ In addition, Prescott may be the first American historian to dichotomise between history, or

⁶²⁸ Prescott, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, Volume II, 3rd ed. (New York: A. L. Burt, n.d. [1838b]), 195.

⁶²⁹ *ibid.*

⁶³⁰ Cassirer, *Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, 50–51.

⁶³¹ Prescott, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, 2, 195.

⁶³² *idem.*, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, 1, 377, 41, 47, citations on 377, 47.

⁶³³ *ibid.*, 24, 25, 34.

⁶³⁴ *ibid.*, 76, 139.

his catachretic construction of it, and romance. It is the former “philosophical spirit” that gives life to such a history as his.⁶³⁵ However, even about this he is internally inconsistent: history can only be Cartesian knowledge of what is “natural and obvious” in humans who follow natural laws and have principles grounded in nature. But, it must *not* be philosophical, because romance lies that way.⁶³⁶ His rhetoric about minds, machineries, complete view, or his focus on political science, correct voice and Christian liberalism now have nothing philosophical about them. Though admitting *Universalhistorie* can be joined using historical fiction and romance, these have only added to confusion and error. Ironically, he contradicts himself even here: he insists fiction writers represent “shining qualities” and “dazzling” descriptions of Gonzalo Hernandez de Cordova [sic!] but seems blind to his own neoplatonic metaphors. He anachronistically praises Córdoba, whose character “might be said to have been formed after a riper period of civilization than the age of chivalry” because he “had none of the nonsense of that age,—its fanciful vagaries, reckless adventure, and wild romantic gallantry”: Córdoba was prudent, cool, had steady purposiveness and intimate knowledge of men. Chivalry was about cruelty and licentiousness. Prescott hoists up Córdoba’s prudent sexual morals as a virtue as if brought by a time machine from New England to the 16th century and gathered around him the most “enlightened and virtuous” friends in the community. Thus, the New England preference for character instead of chivalry in the form of letters is effortlessly stamped on Córdoba and filled with New England content.⁶³⁷ In addition, Prescott loves to moralize and politicize about history heavily without a problem.⁶³⁸ Yet, “history has no warrant to tamper with right and wrong, or to brighten the character of its favorites by diminishing one shade of the abhorrence which attaches to their vices. They should be rather held up in their true deformity, as the more conspicuous from the very greatness with which they are associated.” Prescott believes, like Fontenelle, his account is *the* true one while holding, incongruously enough, that history is discursive.⁶³⁹ Otherwise it would be hard to explain this.

⁶³⁵ *ibid.*, 201, 224. *That this is the case is corroborated by his claim that Asiatic peoples’ history, “as might be expected,” had little philosophical about it and hence contained “little for the edification of a European reader on subjects of policy and government.”* *ibid.*, 229, 230, citations on 229, 230. *For the difference, see also idem., History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, 2, 228.*

⁶³⁶ *ibid.*, 196.

⁶³⁷ *ibid.*, 330, 331, citations on 330, 331. *Prescott had done the same for Scott. See Levin, History as Romantic Art, 235n51.*

⁶³⁸ *On this, see for example ibid., 10-11.*

⁶³⁹ *Prescott, History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, 2, 331. He continues right after that sentence: “It may be remarked, however, that the reiterated and unsparing opprobrium with which foreign writers, who have been little sensible to Gonsalvo’s [sic] merits have visited these offences [betraying the trust of his friends], affords tolerable evidence that they are the only ones of any magnitude that can be charged on him.”* *ibid.*

3.3.5.1 *The southern reception*

Prescott's history was a stunning success. The *North American Review* spent no less than ninety pages on it at its publishing. According to Prescott himself, it received unconditional praise at home and abroad.⁶⁴⁰ However, not a single copy of the first edition was shipped to the South—the Other from “home”—“the publishers not choosing to strip the market while they can find such demand here [in New England].” Prescott doubted the book would get as warm a welcome in the South.⁶⁴¹

The attention paid to the book in the South was lukewarm at best. In the *Messenger* a very short review by Thomas W. White, who had replaced Poe as editor, appeared soon after the second edition came out. Interestingly, it was practically silent about the work's pros and cons as history or as literature. It promised a more complete review that apparently never appeared.⁶⁴² Full quiet lasted year and a half in the *Messenger* and should be listened to. To me, the silence tells of the differences southerners continued to have about history. It was broken by a northerner very briefly in a criticism of Boston letters Prescott was exempt from, mixed with nationalism about the rise and progress of American letters.⁶⁴³

Only in 1841, more than three years later, came more words of praise. However, even this was mainly in the form of a single individual, Severn Teackle Wallis, a noted Spain specialist in Maryland and a good acquaintance to fellow-Whigs Wirt and Kennedy.⁶⁴⁴ The context of the praise is very interesting as to criticism of history. Wallis roundly criticized the distortions of the cottage industry of romance around Spain and Spanish culture in American letters and history.⁶⁴⁵ This industry was pretty much the creation of respected northern authors and poets and a New England creature, with Ticknor leading the way.⁶⁴⁶ But neither did he subscribe to the condemnation of Spain that was modish in

⁶⁴⁰ William H. Prescott to George Ticknor, January 6, 1838; Prescott, *private Memoranda*, April 30, 1838, in Ticknor, *Life of William H. Prescott*, 110, 112.

⁶⁴¹ William H. Prescott to George Ticknor, January 6, 1838, in *ibid.*, 110, 111.

⁶⁴² Thomas W. White, “[Review:] *Bibliographical Notes*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 4 (1838): 341-44.

⁶⁴³ Probus [Park Benjamin], “*Letters from New-York, Number II*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 5 (1839): 629. That the author was Benjamin is asserted in Robert S. Freeman, “*Harper & Brothers Family and School District Libraries, 1830–1846*,” in *Libraries to the People: Histories of Outreach*, eds. Robert S. Freeman and David M. Hovde (Jefferson: MacFarland & Co., 2003), 49n57.

⁶⁴⁴ James Grant Wilson and John Fiske, eds., *Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography*, Volume VI (New York: D. Appleton, 1889), 338-39, entry for “*Severn Teackle Wallis*.”

⁶⁴⁵ Anonymous [Severn Teackle Wallis], “*Navarrete on Spain*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841a): 231-39; Anonymous [*idem.*], “*Spain, Part II*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841b): 441-51.

⁶⁴⁶ Kagan, “*Spanish Craze in the United States*,” 47. Kagan lists Irving, Longfellow, Alexander Slidell Mackenzie and Caroline Cushing. *idem.*, “*Prescott's Paradigm: American Historical Scholarship and the Decline of Spain*,” in Molho and Wood, *Imagined Histories*, 330.

New England education.⁶⁴⁷ More SW than WW, Wallis accepted Prescott's philosophy of history by praising it as "those glorious events, which gave a new world . . . to civilization and freedom."⁶⁴⁸ However, Wallis exhibits strong influences of WW that suggest it had spread to WAE: the focus was not on the Montesquieu-type of history any longer, but on discursive source criticism of history. Though insisting on the nationalism of American letters Prescott furthered, Wallis also practiced alert metahistorical functional-rhetoric criticism of Irving that, he claims, was totally unheard of in the northern media and northern institutions such as education. Wallis contends Irving was actually only allegorizing the much more industrious work of Spanish historian Martín Fernández de Navarrete without giving the latter adequate recognition. This "leads the mind of the American reader, to a notion of independence and originality which do not exist." As a text critic, he comes to the side of the ironic symbolists by chiding northern educators for simply believing in what is written and romancing the rest. Such "ardor of State enthusiasm" that was uncritical and "resorted to imagination for facts" leaves out the erudition of philological literary criticism. In addition to "circulars, newspapers, and legislative reports," even Bancroft, who should by profession know better, joins the distortions.⁶⁴⁹ Wallis also criticizes the *North American Review's* and the *American Quarterly's* depiction of Spanish history and historians.⁶⁵⁰

This indicates the southern upholding of Kantian ethos and Nietzschean praxis in history that was at odds with the new Yankee take on *Universalhistorie*.⁶⁵¹ Indicative of Wallis's aversion of German Romanticism is the less spatial metaphor of sculpting instead of painting about history.⁶⁵² The greatest difference to Nietzsche is in Wallis's idealistic hope that America could be free from such muddied European waters. This showed his Whig WAE roots still lingered.⁶⁵³ However, he becomes more pessimistic about this in the second article, entertaining the possibility, close to Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, that the whole—especially northern and romantic—"liberal spirit" is fallacious. He finally backs away from this in ways comparable to European critics of modernity. Wallis even predates Charles Beard almost a century in his pessimistic remarks about commerce as a value in American history.⁶⁵⁴ Prescott's effort is just since besides being a resource to American

⁶⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 326.

⁶⁴⁸ Wallis, "Navarrete on Spain," 231.

⁶⁴⁹ *ibid.*, 233-36, citations on 235, 236.

⁶⁵⁰ See for example Wallis, "Navarrete on Spain," 232, 236; *idem.*, "Spain, Part II," 444.

⁶⁵¹ For instance, Wallis refers to such utter lack of source criticism as "pious acquiescence" and propagating. Wallis, "Navarrete on Spain," 236, 237, citation on 236.

⁶⁵² *ibid.*, 237-38. He continues his pictorial criticism in *idem.*, "Spain, Part II," 442-43.

⁶⁵³ *idem.*, "Navarrete on Spain," 238.

⁶⁵⁴ "We therefore leave our last quotation to stand naked, in its wholesale misrepresentation [of Spain seen through the northern liberal educators' eyes], for the present—simply marking, that its accuracy of statement is only equaled by its liberality of spirit." *idem.*, "Spain, Part II," 441-42, 448, 449-50, citation on 448. For Beard, see *ibid.*, 450.

nationalism, he gives credit to Navarrete and is a more critical historical scholar than the romancers, the masses and the institutions that follow the depictions.⁶⁵⁵

A shame Wallis apparently had only stopped at rigorous methodology and not read close into Prescott's covert questionable ethics considering Spain. For instance, while Prescott had fully discredited Mariana's history, Wallis enthused it was "conceded by all the world to be a classic," a "full history."⁶⁵⁶ Important for me is Wallis's ontological astuteness and institutional critique that "knowledge" in a romantic mode may turn out to be unethical though posing as educational and moral.⁶⁵⁷ Like Simms, Wallis reminds that "[e]very nation, like every individual, has its moments of elevation and depression, of trial and weakness and sin." Wallis points out generalizing out of negative stereotypes must be avoided in education. It already had been common in America at least since Goodrich the moralist whose "pictorial geography" and its utilitarian valorisation—the pinnacle of the alliance of SAE and romance in education—is quoted as a prime example.⁶⁵⁸ He notes besides the conflation of literature to civilization, Emerson's brother Joseph meddled in such racist depictions of history in education.⁶⁵⁹ Noah Webster's friend Jedediah Morse had already established this about Spain.⁶⁶⁰ Emerson's older brother William was a Göttingen graduate who had studied under Johann Blumenbach,⁶⁶¹ the major advocate of racism. Wallis also condemns the hypocrisy of religion in New England against Native Americans and their cruel treatment.⁶⁶² He shows an equal perception to Simms in his strong criticism of the American romance of the frontier as being illusory.⁶⁶³

⁶⁵⁵ *idem.*, "Navarrete on Spain," 236, 237; *idem.*, "Spain, Part II," 441. *White concurred: Prescott's book was "the first historical work yet written by an American."* Bancroft apparently was not that big of a deal. *White*, "Literary Notices," *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841b): 592.

⁶⁵⁶ *Wallis*, "Spain, Part II," 444.

⁶⁵⁷ *ibid.*, 441-42, 449.

⁶⁵⁸ *ibid.*, 442-44, citations on 443.

⁶⁵⁹ *ibid.*, 444-45.

⁶⁶⁰ *Fitzgerald*, *America Revised*, 49-50.

⁶⁶¹ *Krumpelmann*, *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, 27.

⁶⁶² *Wallis*, "Spain, Part II," 447.

⁶⁶³ "Where are the tribes which we have reclaimed from barbarity to civilization, from ignorance and paganism, to the knowledge and worship of true God?" Though his solutions are bourgeois, he exclaims: "Alas! our humanity has been, to contract them by treaties which they little understood—for territories whose value they did not know—to encroach on them until they felt the burden of our neighborhood—and then to favor them with our wrath for their resistance, and a removal, for their turbulence. We have given them civilization, to the extent of its vices and crimes. We have entailed on them its diseases, and made them feel its power. Even now we are engaged in 'rooting them out' from the miserable swamps, which they have sought as a last refuge, in all the magnificent land, which once blazed with none but their council-fires, and knew no print but their moccasins. If they were false, they did not go to the homes of our fathers, to obtrude their faithlessness. If they were fierce and cruel, they did not go abroad to practise those traits of character. The conflicts in which they suffered—the colonization of which they were the victims—were

The role of Spain as a socially dialectical antithesis of history to America was inaugurated by Prescott as a topos. Its power was formidable: it was philosophically perpetuated, astonishingly, more than a century, to the late-1960s, by the Yankees and the establishment of historical profession,⁶⁶⁴ illuminating the extent of critical dearth as to its “foundations.” It is important to observe a difference to this philosophy of history having existed in the South.

the choice of the Europeans only—and such objections and justification have therefore no weight. So much for our mother country and ourselves—enlightened—liberal—wise and free.” *ibid.*

⁶⁶⁴ Kagan, “Prescott’s Paradigm,” 331-37.

4. Beginnings of erosion of southern difference about history and historiography: discussion in Virginia, 1838–1844

In this chapter, my focus is on Virginia's historical discussion around 1840. Compared to the others, the chapter is shorter in length. The motive is to better highlight a series of dramatic contrasts.

The first contrast is *across* New England and the South at levels of institutions and poetics that pertained to history, philosophy and poetics. In the first locale, the German renaissance continued to increase in strength, because it was compatible with SAE. What was new was the application of this dyad to institutions, social ontology, and poetics. In the South, this turn to Idealism was much less appreciated for a long time. To the contrary, as I shall examine, it was rebuked—at least as social ontology and poetics—by undermining modern philosophy and northern moralism itself. The pressing issue was slavery, but the underlying philosophical issue was the weight German Idealism added to the rationalist–scientific–religious cocktail about history and society: it pushed these folks, previously sympathetic to SAE, away.

The second contrast is *within* Virginia: on the one hand, German philosophy had still penetrated the place very little. I shall pause to examine more a Virginia graduate, educator George E. Dabney about history as an example. Even internationally, Dabney's views were alien to the historical scene by this time, but they demonstrate how historicity practiced at the university (chapter 2) was carried into historiography. Noteworthy is how Dabney entrusts women to deal with history better, a scandalous estimate in the bourgeois and Victorian world order. Philosophically, it reaches out to Nietzsche and Derrida. But on the other hand, the marriage of history and German romantic theory entered the discussion as well. This was a result of one individual—in ethos and life, far more northern and cosmopolitan—Jane Tayloe Lomax. It was the ironically obscure Lomax—female writer, musician and poet in oblivion, and at birth a Virginian—who youthfully introduced in more depth the new, up-to-date romantic philosophy of history to the southern discussion (chapter 6). Interestingly, Lomax's poetics represent vertigo about her changes of place. For this reason as well, she is an illustrative figure to examine.

A third question, between these two antithetical forces, emerges when I examine Dabney in context of contemporary U.S. history. On the one hand, the philosophical and poetic differences about history are nationally striking. On the other hand, the difference to VHPS about history (chapter 3) is discussed. VHPS began to exert a strong pull for other folks toward northern–German historical theory and cosmopolitan history as an imperialist discourse (chapters 2, 5).

4.1 History as educator and the overlap of social ontology and poetics compared

As we saw, Federalist emphasis in the field of education and its language theories were not in conflict with SAE, American historiography, American romance, or Transcendentalism that combined to produce a solid “American way” to look at history. As Bancroft had demonstrated, being a Democrat was also not objectionable (chapter 3). Thus Callcott is able to pronounce that after the mid–1820s when Bancroft and his liberal–democratic ideals first emerged, history in education—I would insist *northern* education—was first and foremost “to buttress certain accepted truths.” More specifically, this history was grounded in *ideals*, the Gnosticism especially the Virginia critics questioned (chapter 2). History was “to reveal and prove such ideals as morality, God, progress, American superiority and democracy—absolute truths which men believed in beyond the shadow of a pragmatic doubt, principles around which they could safely and deliberately arrange the facts of history.”⁶⁶⁵ In the number of history books published for education, the preference of American history over any other history, especially ancient history, peaked in the 1830s and after this, books on modern history increased at least 600 % in the 1840s. The rise of nationalistic historiography was done at the expense of the classical world in the 1830s, but the situation was restored to roughly equal attention in the 1840s and 1850s.⁶⁶⁶ As romance had taught, that virtue would triumph over vice was a certainty. History would only illustrate this with facts chosen for the worthy purpose. All the other facts would be cast aside, and probably were not facts in any case. In accordance with northern literary criticism (chapter 2), history was not about mulling over it critically, but instead about developing character. “And by fortifying in all men the ideals which society accepted to be right and good, thereby all society would be elevated.”⁶⁶⁷

To this theory, SAE linked conveniently: encouraged by the revisionist interpretations of the Declaration Bancroft had helped popularize, northern SAE grounded egalitarian social policies in reason as a mixture of rationalism and idealism.⁶⁶⁸ Finally, the aesthetic aspect of history was about rational amusement.⁶⁶⁹ In education, this evangelical side was now softened and linked to romantic “natural” desire to fill a civilized individual student up with warm, elevating, wise knowledge. As German Idealism had had it, everyone naturally approached history philosophically and, indeed, to know and think along these lines was now an *a priori* necessity. Wise melancholy about life was its end product.⁶⁷⁰ Curiously, the German side of such cultural poetics in relation to history has not been researched although idealist thought and art was dynamic, optimistic and collective—

⁶⁶⁵ George H. Callcott, “History Enters the Schools,” *American Quarterly* 11 (1959): 478. *The earliest sources Callcott draws on were published in 1825.*

⁶⁶⁶ *ibid.*, 473n12.

⁶⁶⁷ Compare with *ibid.*, 478, citation on *ibid.*

⁶⁶⁸ Marsden, *Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience*, 97.

⁶⁶⁹ Callcott, “History Enters the Schools,” 480, 482.

⁶⁷⁰ *ibid.*, 482-83.

Hegelian key themes⁶⁷¹—in the North. In addition, it had a decisive impact on the South. The Genoveses maintain southerners were aware of the dubious German connection among the transcendentalists and the group's insufficient knowledge of it. A noted southern scholarly publication, the *Southern Quarterly Review* (6.2.2), even actively censored philosophically idealist articles in the 1840s and 1850s.⁶⁷² The historical aspect—the most related one for me—has, still, been ignored.

Hegel's power grew in the North in the 1840s. A full-scale Hegelian Idealism launched in Pennsylvania education circles from 1840, became positively received at Yale, and received well by intellectual Orestes Brownson, the foremost Kant scholar among the transcendentalists.⁶⁷³ Ironically, any historical criticism in the North was conducted only within this framework. Despite Prescott, New England was still not ready for even such a discursive approach in 1842. For Parker for instance, early church history was a romance: a confirmation of specific truths he already knew *a priori*.⁶⁷⁴ In other words, SAE precluded a need for a discursive history. But, as I argued (chapters 2, 3), Neoplatonism was not outside history for Emerson for example, nor was history outside Neoplatonism in Bancroft and Prescott. Rather, it combined with Idealism. In the mid-1840s Emerson explicitly hooked up Hegel with Proclus, the major neoplatonic source for the group (chapter 2), on the one hand, and the theory of evolution as history already familiar to Bancroft and great many New Englanders, on the other hand, to underpin a dialectic of history. Thus, I disagree with Wellek that Emerson thought Hegel was contained in Germany.⁶⁷⁵ Pochmann counters the Idealism–evolution dyad was also found in New York in 1848 in a book by scientist J. B. Stallo. The book made Emerson dwell even more in German philosophy, especially Friedrich von Schelling and Hegel, going beyond Coleridge and lured by the prevailing *Zeitgeist*. By decade's end, Emerson engaged Hegel seriously through Schelling. The transcendentalist magazine *The Dial* even had a correspondent of sorts in Germany by 1842.⁶⁷⁶

Stallo was a part of *Cincinnati group* of Hegelians, a colony of Hegel enthusiasts in Ohio.⁶⁷⁷ Though this group may have been the first coherent—but often overlooked—Hegelian group in America,⁶⁷⁸ the influx of Idealism was not confined to it. Parker

⁶⁷¹ Ernst Gombrich, "'The Father of Art-History': On the Influence of Hegel," in *The Symbolic Order: A Contemporary Reader On The Arts Debate*, ed. Peter Abbs (Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005), 86.

⁶⁷² Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 574 and note 19.

⁶⁷³ The first Hegelian work appeared in Pennsylvania in 1841. Clemmer, "Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania," 583-87; Wellek, "Minor Transcendentalists and German Philosophy," 659. On Brownson, see *ibid.*, 673, *passim*.

⁶⁷⁴ Clemmer, "Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania," 589.

⁶⁷⁵ Wellek, "Emerson and German Philosophy," 56-58.

⁶⁷⁶ Pochmann, *German Culture in America*, 194-95, 199, 197.

⁶⁷⁷ CO2, 1053.

⁶⁷⁸ Loyd David Easton, *Hegel's First American Followers: The Ohio Hegelians: John B Stallo, Peter Kaufmann, Moncure Conway, and August Willich, with Key Writings* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1966).

continued to be interested in German thinking and misread Kant by way of Marsh and Emerson that reason is superior to understanding and a primordial gateway to revealed religion. Even Brownson refused to go beyond Carlyle's interpretation. Idealism still had a great effect on him: Brownson converted to Catholicism in 1844.⁶⁷⁹ As I will explore (chapters 5, 6), Catholic faith was an additional entry point of Idealism as history in America. Hedge's translations of Schelling's German lecture⁶⁸⁰ and Johann Gottlieb Fichte⁶⁸¹ appeared in *The Dial* at the period as well.

For example philosopher Theodor W. Adorno claims Hegel's relevance cannot just be shelved away. Rather, it needs to be met head-on as a vast interconnecting totality of commitments about bourgeois society's fundamental contradictories as a universal and dynamic principle that, unlike in Kant and Niebuhr for example, was at work *in* and *as* history. Hegel's diagnosis turned the tables on southern society's preference for metonymy, rank and dynamic communal-bodily but still un-idealized presence by elevating the discontinuity of every individuated part necessarily "aboard" one big reflection.⁶⁸² Further, both the transcendentalists (chapter 3)⁶⁸³ and Hegel were very concerned about truth as a Platonic totality so that every subject got its identity deductively from the absolute.⁶⁸⁴ An organicist, "philosophized" society in which every-one is theoretically mutually identical both within themselves and with each other-but where the "unreconcilable violence" of such thinking in practice is quietly tucked away-is what southerners certainly refused in history, philosophy and semiotics. But such a society is one that has, ironically from their viewpoint, prevailed as a bourgeois and (post)statist system Hegel foresaw, largely due to liberalism.

The South was not a society reducible to ideology and discourse, because these, Adorno maintains, entail a "philosophized" society⁶⁸⁵ where A and B are de-ontologized or, in history, de-historialised, to the "same level" of thought and History. As we recall, especially historicity was far from a romantic conception of history as a totality of interrelated parts. In historicity, the parts are not unified as history: there is no scientific method, nor philosophy, to ground the logic of development. Rather, spatial linearisations are fictions of a logos-driven-I would add pantheist-Christian-process.⁶⁸⁶ Thus, if

⁶⁷⁹ Wellek, "Minor Transcendentalists and German Philosophy," 668-69. I think Wellek's notion that Parker abandoned German philosophy is moot since he was already far immersed in it metaphysically.

⁶⁸⁰ *idem.*, "Emerson and German Philosophy," 50.

⁶⁸¹ Pochmann, *German Culture in America*, 195.

⁶⁸² Adorno, *Hegel: Three Studies*, trans. Shierry Weber Nicholsen (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993), 2, 3, 4. I have inserted Kant and Niebuhr to indicate their differences in degree.

⁶⁸³ Robert Wilson Lawrence, "Essays on epistemology in American Transcendentalism," (PhD diss., The University of Nebraska, 1990).

⁶⁸⁴ Adorno, *Hegel*, 6.

⁶⁸⁵ *ibid.*, 27-31, citation on 27.

⁶⁸⁶ Hans-Jörg Rheinberger, "Experimental Systems: Historicity, Narration, and Deconstruction," *Science in Context* 7 (1994): 69-72. Harootunian: "I am proposing then a conception of the future that is simply unknowable in advance. The future that we have long

southerners were wary about modern history that had SAE as extreme manifestation (chapter 2), historicity is related to southern historiography as scientific rhetoric of spatiality that has corresponding shifts and conflict in semiotics, aesthetics and philosophy.

Poetically, this represents a slide away *both* from Byronic tragic existence *and* more vulgar social existence that, critically for me, still flourished in the South in ways that are comparable to antidemocratic polemic of poet Alexander Pope.⁶⁸⁷ The aim was now more refined, urban and moral reductionism to reason. In other words, the march of mind (chapter 2) as the transition from concrete and dynamic communal–libertarian presence to more roundabout and abstract way of social thinking was for southerners more problematic and tragic than northerners and leading western thought.

This change was noted even at Yale. In a discussion between “Pulito,” “Nescio” and “Tristo,” Pulito makes a distinction between *moralizing poetics* and *tragic poetics* in reactions of two brothers to their mother’s death. The first brother who has kept on the path of “moral rectitude” draws comfort from his meekness and has a metaphorical belief comparable to Cowper that he may yet reunite with his mother and recuperate the loss. The second, who has been constantly “making wider and wider deviations” from this path, undergoes a melancholy of remorse that has no such hope, only pain and tragedy. To him, memory protracts, it does not alleviate. Suckling and Byron are the poets who express his feelings. Nescio points out Byron’s poetic powers are gone, because he is not moral. Tristo corrects him and tells that immorality is not incompatible with poetic intellect. To the contrary, “a pure and unsophisticated character was essential to the *enjoyment* of this faculty in one’s self, or as displayed by others.” Nescio observes Tristo has “a higher idea of the value and interest and influence of poetry than is current now.” So, not only has tragic poetics almost vanished in the North, Nescio even ends up supporting a utilitarian, audience-oriented “everyday” reading of poetics. Such reading would be popular among the masses and would reject both Romanticism and tragedy instead of didactic, masses-oriented marketplace.⁶⁸⁸

understood and embraced is not the ineluctable result of a given historical evolution, the necessary and foreseeable product of “natural” laws of social transformation, the inevitable fruit of economic, scientific, technological progress—or, worse still, the prolongation, under more and more perfected forms, of the same, of what already exists, of an actually existing modernity and its realized economic and social structures. In this model, experience turns back to a historical present, which now remains open to a history made in the present founded on the fashioning of expectations based on an unforeseen future.” Harootunian, “Remembering the Historical Present,” 485.

⁶⁸⁷ For a penetrating and lucid contemporary southern analysis of these two spheres, see Anonymous, “Genius,” *SLJMM* 1 (1836): 337-46. It appeals to Machiavelli among others and uses a variant of Legaré’s defense of Byron against moralizers (chapter 3). It also contains anti-utilitarian critique. Just as importantly for me, it rejects Bildung. For similarities of this argument to Pope, see *Sallybrass and White, Politics and Poetics of Transgression, 113.*

⁶⁸⁸ Ego, “The Coffee Club, No. III,” *Yale Literary Magazine* 1 (1836): 199-201, citations on 199, 200, *emphasis original, ibid.*

In terms of language theory and figuration, even the northern minority outside Emerson's "realistic mysticism" included just this bias toward morality. Alexander Bryan Johnson was a New Yorker willing to modify Emerson's account. He explicitly worried that language is threatening to suck life out of things as a result of Emerson's sterility regarding the signifier–signified relation. Reversing Emerson's "ultraformalism," Johnson held that physical existence is far greater and more truthful than signs and, reminiscent of Saussure and modernism, even held that signs configure a sort of formal prisonhouse where signifier and signified could never join. However, he was unwilling to follow this discovery to the end: instead, he grounded Scripture in the positive or at least affirmative feeling in the mind for example the word "God" generated. This feeling would then unite, as in conventional metaphor, "God" with truth. It was the same with other words.⁶⁸⁹ I would call this "positive Lockeanism" about language, since it locates truth in the empirical mind without settling on Humean skepticism. In contrast, many, if not most, southerners had accepted Hume for decades on the irreconcilability between language and mind (chapter 2).

Despite their strictness about history in the person of King by 1843⁶⁹⁰ that still was not hostile to humanism, more to the contrary, southern SAE representatives protested against northern reason–guided social policy on ontological and ethical grounds. They included powerful South Carolina theologian–philosopher James Henley Thornwell. Strikingly, like Heidegger, Thornwell undermined the basis of modern philosophy on Aristotelian grounds. Cartesian, empiricist and German idealist philosophies all fared poorly compared to Aristotle. Modern speculation is a reduction to consciousness. It confounds "thought with existence, reality with knowledge" where "the laws of thought [are made] the regulative and constitutive principles of being." Closely paralleling Heidegger, Thornwell argues human Being (person in his vocabulary), like God, is *irreducible* to thinking and representation. Thornwell goes further than Heidegger towards Kant: substance and force (power in his vocabulary) are similarly irreducible. Thornwell maintains that there is an absolute difference between separate Beings that is analogous to the difference between Being and God.⁶⁹¹ He explains:

There is the subject knowing, and the object known. A man believes his own existence only in believing the existence of somewhat that is distinct from himself. He affirms his personality in contrast with another and a different reality . . . An absolute Being [i.e., the Hegelian Absolute] cannot be a person. The God of Pantheism cannot say, " I will " or " I know"—and the notion of such a being ever reaching the stage of what the absolute philosophers call self–consciousness is a flagrant contradiction in terms. When subject and object are identified, there can be no consciousness, no knowledge. When they are carried up to indifference, the result is personal extinction.

ibid., 495, 496.

⁶⁸⁹ Gura, "Language and Meaning," 2-6.

⁶⁹⁰ CO2, 601-3.

⁶⁹¹ John B. Adger, ed., *James Thornwell*, The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, Volume I–Theological (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1871), 494-495, citation on 494.

Being is different from just any individuality: will, conscience and intelligence distinguish Being from other individualities of nature, such as trees and animals. Resembling Heidegger, Thornwell thinks proper morals and property grounded in morality are uniquely what belong to one, but cannot be reduced to will. Rather, equilibrium between will, intelligence and responsibility must be kept and cannot be analytically separated within Being.⁶⁹² In sum, Thornwell not only rejected the organicist metaphysics that underpinned modern history and Idealism—theologically, it was pantheist to him—he also questioned individuality that manifests as free rational mind that modern philosophy presupposed.

I believe the vast majority of historians have taken the side of reason as northern SAE had it in the debate, because such an interpretation of reason is on the side of antislavery social policy. However, as I have argued, the question is not quite that simple⁶⁹³ in a critical and figural historical analysis in the southern context. Though reason and knowledge appear to be universal necessities for morality, indeed for thinking in context of history after Hegel, such *a priori* stand fails to address actors, groups, functions of societies and relations that somehow contest this metaphysics. Elements in southern societies in Virginia and South Carolina had a very different dynamic of communication and history that still, as of yet, has not been greatly investigated. This is one such instance. Southerners, at least in Virginia, were still much more preoccupied with Byronic tragedy and simplicity of mind that did not seamlessly connect with urban bourgeois sophistication. This protean, almost Nietzschean existence has not been followed up. Many southerners joined poet John Suckling's lines the Yale dialogue quotes: "Our sins, like to our shadows / When our day is in its glory, scarce appeared: Towards our evening how great and monstrous / They are!"⁶⁹⁴

4.2 Views about history in Virginia around 1840: General

As a whole, WW still continued to hold German Romanticism relatively at bay about history in Virginia. No work based on, or notably inspired by, even neohumanism appeared on the pages of the *Messenger* by a southern male writer who lived in the South at this period.

Anonymous reported late in 1838 that Virginia still did not appreciate romance or romantic literature. Politics, in accordance with the classical republican model, continued paramount. The writer is aware that such literature is considered too feminine. "The object of belles-lettres, however, is not to reduce strong sense, but to give it the amount of polish

⁶⁹² *ibid.*, 496, 497. On Thornwell's great power in the South, see for example James Oscar Farmer, *The Metaphysical Confederacy and the Synthesis of Southern Values* (Mercer: Macon University Press, 1999), 41. O'Brien states Thornwell was a critic of German Idealism and many southerners agreed with him. Coleridge was also for Thornwell too much. CO2, 1050, 1140.

⁶⁹³ Stella Gaon, "Judging Justice: The Strange Responsibility of Deconstruction," *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 30 (2004): 97-114, accessed May 31, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0191453704039399.

⁶⁹⁴ Ego, "The Coffee Club, No. III," 200.

which it may be able to sustain, and to adapt the style of mental execution to that field of intellect” called the political arena. Thus, romance was something that diluted force—presumably including corporeal force—that the ancients and Machiavelli upheld (chapter 2). The writer complains Virginians approach literature in the manner of cosmopolitan history (chapter 3)—as a mixture of science and rhetoric—and thus with skepticism. The author regrets that they did not care for romancing about history by way of Irving and, unlike him, had put no privilege on the precious original historical sources. The writer notes the continued strong English influence across Virginia’s culture, “and this is the more to be wondered at, when we recollect that republican views of government have been universal.” Interestingly the author confuses utilitarianism with republicanism, which would suggest a disconnection from the classics.⁶⁹⁵

A year later “C. C.” noted there was no American hero worship in Virginia through romance, the key ingredient in northern histories and endorsed by the more professional ones (chapter 3). Though appreciating Europe, Virginians simply did not reflect on their own history. Thus, “in the excitements of the present, we forget the lessons of the past.” Though the context C. C. refers to is politics, such living in the present was something else from refined, urban and morally conscientious both the bourgeoisie and religion advocated. C. C. champions precisely what Nietzsche, the ancients, Legaré and Poe in their different ways cautioned *against*: fleeing to the ideal, becoming more “warm,” bourgeois and romantic: “let us quit the arena of strife and repair to the sequestered haunt of the muses; let us fly the poisoned chalice of rancor and animosity and hatred, and taste that purer banquet of nectar and ambrosia that lies neglected around us.” Yet, ironically enough, C. C.’s own approach to history is a mixture of rhetoric and natural history. This he suffuses with Swift-like mixtures of popular and refined language and, following a topos of Weems’s (chapter 2), an approving quotation from Scottish poet Tobias Smollett.⁶⁹⁶ C. C. notes the English and aristocratic tendencies prevail in Virginia, though the latter is on the decline due to republican liberty, and still disapproves romance writing (“the press teems with myriads of ephemeral fictions”), comparing it to bubbles. To this he juxtaposes a half-mocking worry about Virginia’s mouldering historical documents. Making an explicit reference to the decadence of Virginia’s religious state, C. C. states Virginia lacks a “religious care” to its past that could, and perhaps should, be altered by changing the historical attitude. However, his own essay is richly ironic since its title “The History of Virginia” is a supposedly grave, solemn topic while his figurations about it are satirical, even sarcastic, laughing even at Sir Francis Bacon, a revered figure in Scottish

⁶⁹⁵ Anonymous, “Literature of Virginia,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 4 (1838): 585, 586, citations on 585, 586.

⁶⁹⁶ C. C. [Charles Campbell], “The History of Virginia,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 5 (1839): 788. For example, Campbell writes: “Some of the Powhatan tribes refused allegiance to Powhatan. They appear to have a species of Nullifiers [supporters of Calhoun].” Also in the context of reflecting the import and selling of young women in the early colony, Campbell remarks: “However that may be, an importation of an assorted cargo of young ladies, is an affair now quite out of the question, for it is certain Mr. Clay would put ‘em in the tariff, and tax ‘em under the head of superfluities.” *ibid.*, 789, 790. For the Smollett citation, see *ibid.*

Philosophy. In addition, like Wallis and Simms (chapters 2, 3), C. C. notes with irony the fate of the Native Americans. There is no American romance about them.⁶⁹⁷ The identity of C. C. likely was historian Charles Campbell of Virginia.⁶⁹⁸ Campbell was to be a major pioneer in Virginia historiography from mid- to late-1840s, but in this study I cannot discuss the historical views he by then had adopted.

As a more Nietzschean example of WW, “C.” in 1840 reiterates the claim, made by Legaré and George Tucker among others, that even the most basic historical facts are not reliable, if taken as axioms. Though recommending Tacitus, Plutarch, Hume and Robertson, C. observes even they “have not always been ready to pluck the hoary beard of time-honored error.” What is needed is a strict philological and genealogical approach, reminiscent of Niebuhr and Nietzsche, where there is no romance about history, because romance only brings with it ironic skepticism about history “which is apt to follow, when we see the rank weeds of exaggeration and obvious error growing luxuriantly in the fair fields of history, unmolested by the hand of the philosophic historian.” Obliquely criticizing Prescott, C. notes how humanitarian, political and religious coloring, like a stricture placed on reality, affects historical truth for the worse, because it wishes to hide away, due to romantic and literary impulses, barbarity and coldness. Thus, similar to Nietzsche, C. combines severity of reasoning that is “approaching the precision of mathematical demonstration” with tragic poetics to get rid of the muck of Romanticism in history.⁶⁹⁹ C. would perhaps have, aesthetically and existentially, agreed with Heidegger the essence of nihilism is its inability to think the nihil.⁷⁰⁰ In the nihil, human reality overflows narrative, language, identity, group, concept, temporally linear logic, causality and explanation. Such a messy condition of reality has been noticed only relatively recently by American historians and is not popular.⁷⁰¹

4.3 George E. Dabney and gendered southern semiotics of history

Educator George E. Dabney, University of Virginia alumni and thus a trained classicist and philological critic,⁷⁰² reveals the general aversion of Virginians, especially among the

⁶⁹⁷ *ibid.*, 790-92, citations on 791, 792.

⁶⁹⁸ For Campbell’s probable authorship, see Edward Y. Wyatt, IV, Charles Campbell: Virginia’s ‘Old Mortality’ (Charlottesville: The Historical Publishing, 1935), 9.

⁶⁹⁹ C., “Historic Speculations,” Southern Literary Messenger 6 (1840): 606-8, citations on 606-7, 607.

⁷⁰⁰ Martin Heidegger, “Letter on ‘Humanism,’” trans. Miles Groth, accessed December 14, 2008, www.wagner.edu/departments/psychology/filestore2/download/101/martinheideggerletter_on_humanism.pdf, 365.

⁷⁰¹ See, however, James Goodman, “For the Love of Stories,” in The Challenge of American History, ed. Louis P. Masur (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 265, 268-69.

⁷⁰² “George Dabney,” last modified 24 January, 2015, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Dabney.

youth according to him, to reading historical narratives. He detected this in 1840 in a fictive series of Revolution-era letters. “With the hope of exciting some little attention to our [Virginia’s] history, I commenced these letters.”⁷⁰³ Dabney’s argument would corroborate and illuminate my semiotic view about southerners and historiography.

Dabney, WW, is aware that a narrative history dabbles with philosophy, and that is what he wants to avoid. The letter format, spiced with interesting anecdotes, tales and such “as a sort of under-current . . . to keep up the interest of the reader,” would be more interesting than a “tedious” and philosophical history. Dabney contends history is “made up” of such illustrative figurations that were different from incidents in real life: he does not take historical descriptions themselves as true. As an example of his training, Dabney treats historism with the classics and Scottish philosophy: the made-up illustrations “in every instance” picture “either those features of character which are common to all men of all ages . . . or else, such as from the circumstances and conduct . . . might have been presumed to have been peculiar [to colonial-era Virginians].”⁷⁰⁴ The fictive letters were supposedly free translations from French to avoid an uninteresting style. But Dabney also mentions that French was used, since public discussion during the Revolution did not allow speech “with perfect freedom of passing events, and the conduct of men in power,” which indicates the southern absence of a bourgeois public sphere. Strikingly, Dabney here seems to anticipate even Walter Benjamin’s refined analysis about semiotics and how books and the sign detract from storytelling.⁷⁰⁵

To ensure a natural, spontaneous descent into “inconsiderable particulars” of narrative—“and without that it is impossible to render any narrative interesting,” he decided the recipient of the letters was a sister, not a father or brother. Women, “continually engaged as they are about the petty concerns of domestic management, and excluded from all the more important business of the world, or for some other reason, which, bachelor as I am, I will not take upon me to determine, take a deep interest in little matters, such as men will hardly listen to.” This once again shows the fairly skeptical and jaded attitude towards historical narrative, but there is a particular interest paid to historical figuration as feminine, rhetorical and artistic as well. With irony, Dabney claims women are perhaps the best narrative historians, because they could better avoid the tediousness and philosophy associated with it. The realization was a remarkably romantic one. But it is also modernist, because there is no faith in romantic or philosophical history. The irony continues when Dabney notes there were almost no “authentic facts, which might serve as foundations for the tales,” and so the (Schillerian, romantic) separate sphere of the imagination from history was in fact ultimately impossible to maintain in practice: “When I would commence a tale, and become interested in it, history would for a time be almost forgotten; or when I directed my attention to the historic part, my story would ‘fall into a decline’, and before I was aware of it, would be so far gone as to be beyond my medico—

⁷⁰³ *Georgius* [George E. Dabney], “My Uncle’s Unpublished Manuscripts, Number VI,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840): 561.

⁷⁰⁴ *ibid.*

⁷⁰⁵ Benjamin, “The Storyteller.”

literary skill.” He decided to abandon the writing of the letters after a few had been written.⁷⁰⁶

The rhetoric and symbolic emplotment elements of narrative history are something resembling medicine. “Falling into a decline” was an expression used when a condition of a patient took a turn for the worse.⁷⁰⁷ “Medico–literary” is a wholly new coinage and remarkable in context of history for that. It testifies to the level of sophistication and exquisiteness of the Jeffersonian “school” about the history–language relation that was modernist and highly advanced especially in comparison with the North.

The connection of historical narrative as something feminine that acts like a physician is a fascinating trope from literary and semiotic points of view. In Spanish and British drama in the 16th and early–17th centuries, physicians would often act as bridges between desire and its object. Beecher states this motif derived from ancient authors such as Plutarch, Appian and Valerius Maximus. It is the physician who helps divert the lovesick and tragic patient—whose sickness was often literally deadly, physically symptomatic and existentially introvert—from self–destruction towards acknowledgement of the causes and unification between desire and desired. This entailed co–operation with the physician from all. The tragic party could be either male or female. At times, for example in John Fletcher’s *Monsieur Thomas* (1639), simple female presence simultaneously serves as a detector of and cause for mortal lovesickness, alleviated by her physical and mental satisfaction of the male patient. Women seldom function as subjects or the physicians, and more commonly either as objects of the tragic male sufferer, objects of the physician’s strategies and mind–play, or as force fields for male interests. However, sometimes the plot became more dialectic: lovesickness was not beyond cynical parody in James Shirley’s *The Witty Fair One* (1628), in which the doctor does not play the role of a curative bridge. For Shirley, lovesickness always contains an element of trickery. In the play, two men decide between themselves to trick a woman by feigning a patient and a doctor. The “doctor” gives to the woman the traditional council that sexual satisfaction of the patient would cure him. The woman, however, discovers this, and pulls off trickery of her own.⁷⁰⁸ This parodying undermines the simple romantic desire–fulfillment dyad. A fourth alternative according to Beecher was for a woman to trade Christian honor for unification with the man in the name of curative medicine in Philip Massinger (and Thomas Dekker’s) *The Virgin Martyr* (1622). The authors juxtapose metaphysically Christian “continence” in the desired female Dorothea and Roman “power to command”

⁷⁰⁶ Dabney, “My Uncle’s Unpublished Manuscripts, Number VI,” 562.

⁷⁰⁷ See, for examples, Anonymous, “[Review:] Gerhard on Diagnosis of Diseases of the Chest,” *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* 14 (1836): 178; Abigail (Smith) Adams to Mary (Smith) Cranch, June 23, 1797, in Stewart Mitchell, ed., “New Letters of Abigail Adams 1788–1801,” *American Antiquarian Society* 55 (1945): 210.

⁷⁰⁸ Donald A. Beecher, “Lovesickness, Diagnosis and Destiny in the Renaissance Theaters of England and Spain: The Parallel Development of a Medico–Literary Motif,” in *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama 1580–1680*, eds. Louise and Peter Fothergill–Payne (London: Associated University Press, 1991), 155–57, 159, 160–61, 162–63.

in the desirer male, fatally sick Antonius. The physicians again advise coitus, but Antonius refuses for reasons of honour, and the couple is united in Christian afterlife.⁷⁰⁹

Dabney's claim women are more attuned to the role of history's physicians is striking. By the 1790s, the Yankee SAE cultural pioneers had considered that the southern climate—thus southern society—subverted the rule of the masculine they held universal, basing their conclusions on natural history.⁷¹⁰ In case of Britain, the field of a general practitioner was a “middle-class disease” because of its androgynous pragmatics as somewhere *between* the female home and the male work place. It was among the last fields to separate into work and home.⁷¹¹ Fascinatingly, Dabney departs from such an integral component of consolidated bourgeois male power created by enlightened liberal discourse that articulated virtue not to the nobility but in the home guarded by women. Marylander Kennedy aside, Victorian attitudes were still a minority among southern views about history. Henry Nott had even evoked metaphorology about women that are *antithetical* of the home guardian image as “the site of willful sexuality and bodily appetite” that were found in Swift and Pope among others (chapter 3).⁷¹² Dabney's intensely secular intellectual background (chapter 2) is another possible source for the departure. This further shows the southern wariness about and differences from liberal discourse, including Romanticism. Indeed, if Kerber is correct that in America, women behaving deferentially in the home was one manifestation of the self in relation to the state,⁷¹³ this is one more indication that, though republicans and deferential, southerners were still *not* fully immersed in the new conception of the state as *primary* in relation to the self, as the metaphysics of modern history presupposed.

Dabney may implicitly comment tragic poetics a physician traditionally administered to in rhetorical ways that, in a modernist fashion, contest the liberal nostrums. Since (romantic) historical narrative is based on such female attributes, its status as knowledge is flimsy, but for Dabney, this is not necessarily a negative aspect of it. Strict division into fact and fiction is impossible in historical practice, if history is to be engaging. Conversely, metaphor as simple and curative—the grave aesthetic approach in the North that saw it as subservient to the true and useful—is not accepted as given. Further, the semiotic status of such narrative as medicine contains important ontological claims in regard to southern semiotics and cultural dynamic (chapters 2, 3). The format of *translated letters* that simply end—instead of *a book or a philosophical synthesis*—indicates the

⁷⁰⁹ *ibid.*, 161-62, citations on 162.

⁷¹⁰ Greeson, *Our South*, 74-75.

⁷¹¹ Marie Fitzwilliam, “‘Mr Harrison's Confessions’: A Study of the General Practitioner's Social and Professional Dis-ease in Mid-Nineteenth Century England,” *The Gaskell Journal* 12 (1998): 28-36, accessed September 19, 2014, <https://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~matsuoka/EG-Fitzwilliam-Harrison.html>.

⁷¹² Mary Poovey, *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England*, *Women in Culture and Society series* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988): 10, 9.

⁷¹³ Linda Kerber, “The Republican Mother: Women and the Enlightenment—An American Perspective,” *repr. in Maddox, Locating American Studies*, 159-60.

existence of Renaissance semiotics of presence where phonetics is important. What Derrida calls “*practical methods of information retrieval*” are still fairly undeveloped in such oral-based culture. In terms of form, such translation “could remain spoken in its integrity.”⁷¹⁴ The unwilling or simply disinterested attitudes Wirt encountered towards conserving spoken language even when uttered by Henry (chapter 2) is not ignorance, nor anything intrinsically reprehensible. Rather, it evinces a philosophical difference about language and knowledge that includes history. It should be respected, but has not to my knowledge previously.

Dabney’s translated and discontinued letters as format of history are not a delimiting of space and time by philosophy or religion. To impose laws on such figurations is a self-limiting and even unethical act.⁷¹⁵ Again, although presence is valued, it is not romanticized as sign (chapter 2). In other words, there is no debasing writing at the cost of valuing presence as an end in itself. To the contrary, presence as writing is preferable, but it is not *eo ipso* necessarily the truth, nor in any dyadic metaphysical tension. According to Derrida, “traditional” translation goes from the mind to the voice and then to the sign. It can shortcut the second stage (the voice) because correspondent with the first.⁷¹⁶ As we have seen, at least many educated southerners treated this second phase as a rhetorical problem but, importantly, *not* as a metaphysical problem of presence and authenticity (chapters 2, 3). Instead, Dabney treats it rhetorically and perhaps theatrically as engineered medicine. This indicates WW was very critical about reason-guided history and existence.

Finally, Dabney’s approach pertains to the “paganism” in the WW outlook (chapter 2): non-condemnation of writing is partly a criticism of rationalism and Christian theology over the more “pagan” empirical senses and sensuality, because writing is *not* grounded in non-problematic ideality of mind, God, or Plato’s soul in *Phaedrus*. To the contrary, the exposure of an interesting historical narrative as medicine is a functional exposure of it as literary, as “mere” metaphor. This is an ironic realization, but not a condemning one. Instead of seeing writing as secondary to these groundings as a sort of fallen, artificial, spatial and sensual *deviation* that is capable of being only derivatively literal, writing in Dabney at least holds its own in the context of history.⁷¹⁷ But romantic ideology (in its bourgeois or socialist guises), Cartesian philosophy, Christianity and natural law philosophy all disagreed, because they either affirmed or hankered after presence as some such ground.⁷¹⁸ Wirt was a pioneer of such hankering-after, but Rousseau was perhaps its Western pioneer. The idea of a *book*, in both sacred and secular senses, is a concrete manifestation of such valorized presence as totality, which turns reality external to it into ideality. As Derrida puts it: “The idea of the book, which always refers to a natural totality, is profoundly alien to the sense of writing. It is the encyclopedic protection of theology and of logocentrism against the disruption of writing, against its aphoristic

⁷¹⁴ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 10, *emphasis original*.

⁷¹⁵ *For the basis for this argument, see ibid.*

⁷¹⁶ Derrida locates this tendency already in Aristotle: *for the Aristotle of On Interpretation, voice is simply not problematic. ibid., 11.*

⁷¹⁷ *Compare with ibid., 13, 15.*

⁷¹⁸ *ibid., 15-17.*

energy, and . . . against difference in general.”⁷¹⁹ This “aphoristic energy” was a positive thing for Dabney and the Jeffersonian outlook, and differentiability was a southern cultural–poetic characteristic as well. “Aphoristic energy” was more broadly a southern “thing” in its preference for the sensual, the bodily, the individual–in–community and the passionate in contrast to the Word, the mind, and thus the book (chapter 2). Northern travelers often marveled at the scarcity of books in southern homes that confirmed to them that southerners were stunted intellectually.⁷²⁰ However, this argument is far too simplistic and even unethical as for instance Derrida’s work has shown. Scholarship has not paid any attention to the issue though. It is a critical, in a semiotic–metaphysical sense, about how southerners felt about the book and the Word and therefore, the world and history.

In addition, Dabney seems to appreciate *positively* this ambivalence women and history share as medicine. Writing as beneficial medicine (*pharmakon*) is at odds with Plato because of its chameleon qualities (chapter 2). In Derrida’s definition, *pharmakon*, whose status varies, is “the prior medium in which differentiation in general is produced, along with the opposition between the *eidōs* [form, idea] and its other.” It is not a transcendental, but it is analogous to it, though not bound to the soul. In my context, Dabney’s argument would thus again point to at least implicit knowledge of Kant (chapter 2). *Pharmakon* “belongs neither simply to the sensible nor simply to the intelligible, neither simply to passivity nor simply to activity.” Derrida claims Plato only detected this quality as existing as an enclave of opposition within virtue, not as virtue and its opposite. *Pharmakon* has no being, because it has no substance and is unpredictable, always capable of change. Therefore, it is dis–graced as philosophy “as a philter of forgetfulness.” This medium as double participation “refers back to a *same* that is not the identical.” It is a common element in any possible dissociation or difference. In writing as medicine, it is not yet ideal and, therefore, it *precedes all binarity*, such as “soul/body, good/evil, inside/outside, memory/forgetfulness, speech/writing, etc.” As play and movement, it is needed *before* any dialectic or any foundation: it precedes them as difference–production *but* is not itself “pure,” because it, too, exists in non–pointillist time. This medium is “a bottomless fund,” it “keeps itself forever in reserve even though it has no fundamental profundity nor ultimate locality.”⁷²¹ Consequently, women as history’s medicine may *be a dance–step* back from a philosophical history they are able to do. By its means, the split differentiability of all concepts, identical only in what makes them differ, is hinted at.⁷²² This realization is quite sophisticated. If Dabney’s attitudes had been Victorian, women would simply be considered pure and moral and have a fixed place. However, at least in context of history, women are far more amorphous and dynamic and what is more, they are these in a positive sense. One has to go to Nietzsche to find a similar appreciation of

⁷¹⁹ *ibid.*, 18.

⁷²⁰ Grant, North over South, 83.

⁷²¹ Derrida, Dissemination, 126–28, citations on 126, 127, *ibid.*, emphasis original, *ibid.*, 127–28.

⁷²² *idem.*, “Interview: Choreographies: Jacques Derrida and Christie V. McDonald,” *Diacritics* 12 (1982a), *Cherchez la Femme Feminist Critique/Feminine Text*, 68. See also Gasché, *Inventions of Difference*, 104–5.

such existence as a value in tension with religion, philosophy and, ultimately, the book. To it, idealist dialectic is always poor.

Dabney ends his analysis in a seemingly more conservative tone. Historical fiction must not falsely represent real personages or events. However, he refers to “authentic history” which, besides Scott and Kant (chapter 2), devolves into Samuel Johnson.⁷²³ Johnson clearly separated between reality and its description, including philosophy associated with description. A contemporary southern reviewer claims that for Johnson, history was either tradition or (humanist) personal knowledge and that he had doubts about Addison’s bourgeois output.⁷²⁴ Dabney criticizes even the romance element of Scott of this error: heroes need to be praised as wholesome individuals. This remark is accompanied by perceptive criticism about point of view used in novels: all individuals should tell their own tales from their own empirical co-incidences, their seeing, hearing and feeling, and their own knowledge. This is the most natural point of view, unlike that of a Deity or omniscient narrator. It is violence against nature to proceed beyond this particularity. Still, ironically, it gets commonly done. Though Dabney makes no mention of history here, it is no stretch to interpret that narrative history that goes beyond the historical (chapter 2) is problematic as knowledge. Taking romance as truth is strange to him, not attributable to habit alone.⁷²⁵ In tune with WW, this is a fairly Nietzschean argument, because it questions the primacy of the sign as an idea, revelation or identity instead of singular, natural(istic) and haphazard events.⁷²⁶ It rejects, or perhaps simply is unaware of, the organicist metaphysics of modern history. What Dallmayer’s analysis of philosopher Hans–Georg Gadamer’s ontology calls “a shift from contingent phenomena to true being or the truth of being”⁷²⁷ has not yet, happily from the viewpoint of criticism of Idealism, taken place.

4.3.1 Dabney in context and the northern–tinted arguments of VHPS

Such attitudes to history were getting rare in the West by this time. Pressures at odds with WW mounted within the U.S. as well. The attempt at a crude dialectic philosophy of history of Virginia vs. Massachusetts by politician Daniel Webster late in 1843 was rhetorically and with relish undermined by a southern critic. The writer used pointedly New England’s “own” arguments by Bancroft in the process. Webster’s implication that wealth enabled Virginian civility—a return to Marshall’s and Tocqueville’s condemnation

⁷²³ Dabney, “My Uncle’s Unpublished Manuscripts, Number VI,” 562.

⁷²⁴ James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, Volume V* (London: John Murray, 1835): 312-13; Anonymous, “The Literary Character of Dr. Samuel Johnson,” *SLJMM* 3 (1837): 320, 316-17.

⁷²⁵ Dabney, “My Uncle’s Unpublished Manuscripts, Number VI,” 562.

⁷²⁶ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *preface to Derrida, Of Grammatology*, xxiii.

⁷²⁷ Fred Dallmayr, “Prelude. Hermeneutics and Deconstruction: Gadamer and Derrida in Dialogue,” in *Michelfelder and Palmer, Dialogue and Deconstruction*, 80.

of its greedy origins (chapter 2)—is also questioned. I shall return to my explanation why (chapters 5, 6).⁷²⁸

Late in 1840, Fisher wrote from New York that gallery of historical paintings open for all, about which there would then be discussion and philosophical reflection, would be preferable to historical reading. “The leading events” represented visually would be much better as a basis for learned discourse than a book. The paintings

would aid the recollection, and often convey ideas more clearly than words could do; and the constant incentive they would offer would tend to make those *acquainted* with history who had merely *read* it, and those familiar who were merely acquainted. The philosophic reflections; the comparison of one time with another, and all times with our own; the application to the purposes of life, which make history valuable; —these would be educed; and the young would acquire such a pleasing foretaste and general idea as would allure them to the study, so prepared that the usual barrenness would no longer be complained of.

J. K. Fisher, “Culture of the Fine Arts,” Southern Literary Messenger 6 (1840): 845, emphasis original.

This is a remarkably different contrast to Dabney. Though both authors grapple with making history interesting to audiences, Fisher’s solution departs from Dabney’s in many and quite profound ways. Firstly, he argues visual paintings are better at conserving memory than writing. This is because visual paintings have presence while writing has not. The composition of paintings is ideas, and ideas are much stronger—scientific in the North—and therefore preferable to writing, because they are clearer about meaning than words. Surrounded by paintings as visual representation, ideas/scientific knowledge about history would bombard the visitors and propel them to constant rational debate about history. In other words, Fisher looks at history from a romantic point of view that is grafted on the Yankee science bias about it. Secondly, paintings would function as organicist and anthropological *contact* with history. No reading or text could do such a thing. Historical painting would become a sort of portal or link to attain co-presence with another world, another people, another time. *Familiarity* would emerge: identity in a single flow of time under one gigantic History. This position closely resembles that of Bancroft and Emerson’s take on *Universalhistorie* (chapter 3). Thirdly, this bombardment would give cause to be philosophical about history, and thus garner from history ideas—not words—for utilitarian use for life’s purposes. Fisher follows Prescott in this Hegelian argument: this centripetal nucleus, as process, is the only reason why history matters, and this nucleus is universal, reason-guided and dialectic. Its only relevant question is “what is in it for society as progress?” Fourthly, ideas as paintings have almost axiomatic value from which to deduce attitudes. Fisher’s word “educe” equalizes evoking, a rigorous fact-based operation, and education.⁷²⁹ “Pleasing foretaste” and “general idea” are the same.

⁷²⁸ Anonymous, “Mr. Webster’s Bunker Hill Oration (concl.),” *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (1844): 25, 26.

⁷²⁹ http://etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=educe&searchmode=none, accessed November 13, 2013.

There is only one entry–point to history as general idea, and that is through pleasure which functions as an instrument directed towards it, not as an end—a comparable difference found in Kant’s aesthetics (chapter 5) and Hegel’s to F. Schlegel (chapter 3). History is not about tasting different foods, but instead moving, using good taste, to more rigorous and epistemologically true ideas. Thus, Romanticism about history is made to serve education, a northern theme. In addition, romantic representations themselves are non–problematic: they are virtually indistinguishable from reality: “Dream, for a moment, of the temples of Egypt, restored by learned architects, and represented on canvas by excellent painters; and let them be peopled with their ancient occupants!”⁷³⁰ Further, relevant is the notion that history should be a part of (bourgeois) public sphere spatially, functionally and aesthetically. Refined, urban but, on the face of it, democratic, the gallery would have a trickle–down effect on the vulgar masses: “It would have the happiest effect on the *manners* of the less favoured portion, to be in the way of observing the educated and the refined.”⁷³¹

Even Virginia was by no means immune to such demands. Early in 1841, the governor of Virginia, Thomas W. Gilmer, approached the *Messenger* urgently with an open letter to preserve Virginia’s colonial history. Colonial history is “a subject of much interest to Virginians, and indeed to the people of our country generally” for the reason that “the early annals of Virginia constitute an important, and, I regret to add, a neglected portion of American history.” He concludes with slight desperation: “Can you suggest no means, my dear sir, by which the records and traditions of this ‘ancient commonwealth,’ which time has spared, either on this or the other side of the Atlantic, can be preserved? What has become of the ‘Historical and Philosophical Society of Virginia?’”⁷³² The cognitive dissonance is obvious, because Gilmer insists history is important to every American irrespective of region but, simultaneously, he is aware that Virginians still pay little attention to historical records, to history “in general.”

Here the two approaches to history clash, one represented by WW, classicists and common folk, the other by northerners, the SAE and SW clusters and Democrats. Gilmer had been no friend of Jackson,⁷³³ but his historical views are fairly northern as I will elaborate. The crux is that presence was not problematic to WW. Therefore, they had little faith in conjuring the past back as metaphoric figuration or desire as basis for identity. Idealism, pantheism or God in and about history was not their history. They were hesitant to engage history in so unreflective and uncritical a manner as northern romance history did. Even VHPS had practically ceased its activities by this time. The whole organization–centered approach to history, comparable to structure and system, was simply alien to many.

In reply, the editor White, who balanced between SW and WW, acknowledges that “such an association [as VHPS] cannot exist long, unless a sufficient number of its

⁷³⁰ Fisher, “Culture of the Fine Arts,” 845.

⁷³¹ *ibid.*, emphasis original.

⁷³² Thomas W. Gilmer to T. W. White, January 13, 1841, in Thomas W. Gilmer, “Colonial History of Virginia: A Plea for Its Preservation,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841): 109.

⁷³³ Monroe, Republican Vision of John Tyler, 68.

members are zealously and perseveringly devoted to its success.” He lashed out that it is shameful that literary and scientific organizations have not taken root in Virginia, in other words, that there still is no public sphere. What Virginians need is philosophy to find out why. As for causes, he offers climate, education and, revealingly for my argument, “the superior allurements of social enjoyments” as well as heated political debating. These may have “exerted a powerful agency in creating a distaste for the quiet and unobtrusive pleasures of literature,” a condition that should change.⁷³⁴ As I have argued (chapters 2, 3), there was a huge experiential difference between seeing and hearing about history. The way of the book or the Word was simply metaphysically marginal in the region even in the early–1840s. Ideal(ist) or rational mental culture of discourse, even such discourse about culture, was undeveloped.

Gilmer had been spurred to action by a letter addressed to him all the way from Missouri by co–historian William G. Minor, also published. Minor had migrated from Virginia to Jefferson City some time before.⁷³⁵ Minor was an army colonel at least by 1842 and an active member of the Episcopalian Church as one of the first vestrymen and founders of the second Episcopalian church in Missouri around the time.⁷³⁶ Like Cushing and historian Thomas Roderick Dew (chapter 5), Minor probably was a member of the church when he had close ties to VHPS, delivering a presentation there in 1835.⁷³⁷ As we will discover, the Episcopalian faith had strong influence for historical discussion in Virginia for its size and popularity.

Minor was almost as far from WW as possible in his intellectual makeup, a trend found in some other Episcopalian as well but seldom in such radical forms of criticism. The Genoveses contend southern Episcopalian included some of the most eminent American liberal theologians of the century who were very receptive to German theology and had sympathies for the transcendentalists.⁷³⁸ This is critical for me, because such liberal theology had its epistemic and semiotic roots in Locke, the very opposite of

⁷³⁴ White, “[Editor’s Reply],” [1841a], in *ibid.* For a similar observation about the impatience for persevering literary efforts, see for example Daniel K. Whitaker, “From Our Arm–Chair,” *SLJMM 1 (1835a)*: 58–59, and for existential disdain of the sign as poetry, novel or history on the plantation see for example Anonymous, “Christmas in the Parishes,” *SLJMM 1 (1836)*: 359.

⁷³⁵ Johnny Bakewell, “Cornerstone of a Red Brick Building: A History of Grace Episcopal Church,” 2010 Heritage Essay Contest, accessed November 13, 2013, <http://www.jeffcitymo.org/pps/documents/CornerstoneofaRedBrickBuildingbyJohnnyBakewell.pdf>, n.p. [2].

⁷³⁶ “Cole County Episcopal Churches,” accessed November 13, 2013, http://www.colecohistosoc.org/churches_episcopal.html; Anonymous, “Receipts by Mail&c.,” *Army and Navy Chronicle 13 (1842)*: 105.

⁷³⁷ Journals of the Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia from 1785 to 1835, *convent minutes for May 19, 1831, supplement to A Narrative of Events Connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, Volume I, by Francis L. Hawks (New York: Harper, 1836a)*, 252; J. Colburn to Benson J. Lossing, February 2, 1871, in Benson J. Lossing, *The American Historical Record 3 (1874)*: 225, “Notes and Queries.”

⁷³⁸ Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 593.

figural, rhetoric, irony, symbolism and similar concerns about history.⁷³⁹ In the “liberalized” Episcopalians shared much in common with the Unitarians, which reflects the comparative difference the reception of Locke made for *previous* Episcopalians like Jefferson about history and language.

Perhaps Minor had grown disgusted with Virginia, because his intellectual and figural positions about history were quite polemic. For Minor, similar to Emerson, the archives had had the truth as “singularly comprehensive and full of detail” before the British cruelly destroyed significant parts of them. What bothered Minor was that Virginians did not care. Virginia was “content to catch a feeble gleam of her early glories, from the uncertain narratives of tradition, the compilations of ignorance, and the probabilities of conjecture.” Virginia lacked public spirit as much now as a century ago. Sadly, there are virtually no books of history about Virginia, and Robertson’s history, with its Tory loyalty to the crown, contained little more than “lofty declamation and false panegyric” about supposed loyalty to pathetic British kings—a view precisely contrary to WW Tucker (chapter 2). Lamentably, “scattered fragments,” “imperfect and mutilated,” of Virginia’s history lay uncollected. In one of his most German phrases, Minor claims: “Tradition itself has lost the memory of the spirit—stirring legends of our fatherland.” As a result, “[t]he darkness of the darkest age of literature broods over the antiquities of Virginia; and there is not pride enough among her sons to stretch forth their hands to save one jewel from the mouldering touch of Time.”⁷⁴⁰ Minor hopes for a “spirit” among Virginians that “fondly cherishes every memorial of her greatness” that are found in the archives. A “thrilling and glorious” history waits collecting. The pagan Greece and Rome are inferior examples of heroism in comparison to homemade heroes.⁷⁴¹

Obviously, memory has now become what in Derrida’s analysis was presence in an “ontotheological” sense, a mix of idealism and Christianity where writing can, and must, do the job of presence. But added to it is neoplatonic rhetoric, conventional in the North, of an absolute chasm that exists between Light and Dark, and the northern quest for American hero. We again find the painting metaphor as well. Adam Smith had been even for Kennedy—the most anti-WW historical commentator in the Virginia scene up to this time—an imaginative historian, though he had wished Smith be praised more for his public spirit.⁷⁴² For Minor, upping the ante, Smith had had “a more vigorous and accurate hand” in painting the colony’s history than his successor William Stith. Stith only filled in what was already visible.⁷⁴³ The pictorial metaphor is very radical, because it advocates (historicist) continuity of History. In other words, it is not a question of two separate undertakings as with Kennedy. Instead, at issue was a foundational historical truth Smith had laid down epistemologically and Stith had proceeded to aesthetically colour as inferior fill-in work. Minor radicalizes Kennedy elsewhere: Kennedy’s anti-toryism that still

⁷³⁹ Gura, “*Transcendentalists and Language*,” 160.

⁷⁴⁰ Gilmer [William G. Minor], “*Colonial History of Virginia*,” 109-10, 110, 111, citations on 110, 111.

⁷⁴¹ *ibid.*, 112.

⁷⁴² Kennedy, *Swallow Barn*, 496-97.

⁷⁴³ Minor, “*Colonial History of Virginia*,” 110.

contained some satire (chapter 3) is now trumpeted as a serious historical truth: freedom from Britain is a “holy cause”: to sympathise with the crown degeneracy and slavery. That cannot be the case in Virginia though some claim so—and this is probably a barb towards Tucker (chapter 3).⁷⁴⁴

The painting trope is also interesting because Prescott had earlier spoken of Cooper mildly critically using the very same trope.⁷⁴⁵ I argue this is no accident. To the contrary, Minor sympathized with Prescott the Hegelian, so great are the parallels between the two. Disconcerting is Minor’s throwing two very different historiographical genres, with all that entails, Stith’s and Cooper’s, into the same dustbin. This strategy of gross simplification is likewise reminiscent of Prescott, who took it further. There is a mining metaphor—not sculpting—related to Hening’s deeply respected law history as well. Hening’s work was “full of rich and unworked ore; and the materials from which pages of the most intense interest might be elaborated.”⁷⁴⁶ Notable is the change from WW sculpture: paralleling Prescott, the “virginal” material is only to be mastered and exhausted as *technē* for present use without Aristotelian phronetic concerns.⁷⁴⁷ “The most intense interest” sounds transcendentalist. In addition, reminiscent of New England views is Minor’s praise for Hening as antiquarian historian. He goes so far as to assert the antiquarian paradigm—the reigning one in organizations, and of northern origin (chapter 3)—has to be *the future basis* of Virginia’s history as “the light which is to guide” “through the imperfect and mutilated records.”⁷⁴⁸ I will return to antiquarianism in the South later (chapters 5, 6). In terms of historical criticism, there was great difference between antiquarian history and WW (chapter 3). The trope of guiding light derives from Prescott, as does what constitutes history for Minor: “morals, population, religion, wars, trade, industry, enterprise, and the rise and establishment of [Virginia’s] political institutions.”⁷⁴⁹ Critically for me, this list follows what Prescott meant by philosophical history as a catachresis of cosmopolitan history (chapter 3). Let us recall Prescott’s study was practically silenced in the *Messenger* at this period. Likewise striking is Minor’s praise for Bancroft he connects with sympathy for Bacon’s Rebellion in the 17th century against the crown. Bacon had *not* been seen a hero before Bancroft who epistemologically set the record straight.⁷⁵⁰

Minor would go on to act as one of the founders of Missouri Historical Society in 1844 that named, among others, Jackson, Bancroft, powerful Unitarian historian and educator

⁷⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 111.

⁷⁴⁵ Prescott, “Irving’s Conquest of Granada,” 119.

⁷⁴⁶ Minor, “Colonial History of Virginia,” 110.

⁷⁴⁷ David P. Haney, “Aesthetics and Ethics in Gadamer, Levinas, and Romanticism: Problems of Phronesis and Techne,” *PMLA* 114 (1999), *Special Topic: Ethics and Literary Study*, 32-45.

⁷⁴⁸ Minor, “Colonial History of Virginia,” 110.

⁷⁴⁹ *ibid.*

⁷⁵⁰ *ibid.*, 111. This positive praise for Bacon had been also advocated in Caruthers’ *The Cavaliers earlier, but was apparently relatively foreign in Virginia. Taylor, Cavalier and Yankee, 191-92. Praise for Bacon often entailed advocating the liberal yeoman theory (chapter 3).*

Jared Sparks and the cosmopolite Simms honorary members.⁷⁵¹ In addition to this role, Minor was apparently very close to Thomas Reynolds, a Democrat governor of Missouri whose parents had migrated from Virginia in 1791.⁷⁵² Like Brockenbrough (chapter 3), Minor had strong Democratic sympathies in comparison to his intellectual context, an interest in history, and a desire or fate to migrate away from Virginia.

Gilmer was a VHPS member as well, delivering a speech there in 1837.⁷⁵³ Resembling the argument of Dew (chapter 5), the tone of this essay is quite non-skeptical about history for its time and context. As in Minor and Dew, Gilmer's argumentation has some significant parallels with Prescott. For instance, the ancient historians were simple adventure chroniclers and no good by comparison to the modern times. What now counts as history is something far wider in scope. Remarkably, Gilmer also perpetuates Prescott's misunderstanding of cosmopolitan history: according to him, the new philosophical element about history with its natural causal links only makes history more precise than ever. This enlightened history "investigates and establishes truth [and] discriminates justly between transient prejudice of an hour and the enduring sentiment of the ages." This procedure, beacon-like, establishes truth using "unfettered and enlightened spirit of inquiry."⁷⁵⁴ Thus, the notion flies in the face of the heterologies (chapter 2).⁷⁵⁵ Further, to Gilmer, history is all about utility, a New England theme dear to Minor. This new history ushers in a utilitarianism that touches every member of society so that they are worth its record for the country and its remembrance by posterity. As in Prescott and Hegel, what counts in history is the future and the process. Not Antiquity that-like for the northern Federalist classicists (chapter 2)-instructs through a mirror. Similar to Emerson, history is all about public virtue, and posterity hears the voice of history rightly. Then "history comes like the beam of a bright sun to dispel the cloud, and to record its verdict on the adamant of eternal truth."⁷⁵⁶ History as mirror is ultimately impartial and its vision shines

⁷⁵¹ Thomas J. Scharf, *History of Saint Louis City and County, From the Earliest Periods to the Present Day, Volume I* (Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1883), 895-96, accessed November 13, 2013, <http://lincoln.lib.niu.edu/file.php?file=scharf1.html>.

⁷⁵² William G. Livingstone and Thomas Reynolds, "The Thomas Reynolds Confusion," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 54 (1961): 424.

⁷⁵³ Thomas Gilmer, "An Address on the Value of History," *Southern Literary Messenger* 3 (1837): 97-102.

⁷⁵⁴ *ibid.*, 97.

⁷⁵⁵ As Cassirer states: "This free ideality [of discursive, abstract sign], which is the core of its logical nature, is necessarily lacking in the realm of mythic conception. For in this realm nothing has any significance or being save what is given in tangible reality. Here is no 'reference' and no 'meaning'; every content of consciousness to which the mind is directed is immediately translated into terms of actual presence and effectiveness. Here thought does not confront its data in an attitude of free contemplation, seeking to understand their structure and their systematic connections, and analyzing them according to their parts and functions, but is simply captivated by a total impression." Cassirer, *Language and Myth*, trans. Susanne K. Langer, *Dover Books on Western Philosophy series* (New York: Dover, 1946), 57.

⁷⁵⁶ Gilmer, "An Address on the Value of History," 97.

clear and keen without getting blind, interestingly enough. America luckily has no history and no Antiquity, unlike Europe—this echoes the Massachusetts men Parker and Daniel Webster.⁷⁵⁷ Gilmer contends, like Emerson and Bancroft, the little history there was in America is immortal and “our race” establishes its exemplary truths.⁷⁵⁸ His style is probably informed by Emerson.⁷⁵⁹ Dew advocated a history where the merchants were the pioneers of a new cosmopolitan culture (chapter 5), and the same argument is found in Gilmer.⁷⁶⁰

Besides language, another important difference to European cosmopolitanism is the inclusion of Christianity, by way of SAE. Gilmer is, thus, in proximity of Speece, Rice (chapter 2) and Rice’s contributors who, resembling Prescott epistemologically, wanted to be cosmopolitans about history in a way that Christianity supplants skepticism.⁷⁶¹ In other words, Christianity needs to ground public morality and improvement: unlike in Machiavelli (chapter 2), there is no ambiguity involved.⁷⁶² Ironically, while even “L.” in Rice’s paper had rightly spotted the discrepancy between cosmopolitan history and religion, there is no trace of the contradiction in Gilmer in his radicalization of Prescott. Gilmer explicitly attacks the more Machiavellian virtue prevalent in Virginia in a fairly radical—almost Emersonian—way. He renounces the concrete, physical existence—the entrenched southern sphere of freedom and liberty—as narrow and bordered. To the contrary, man’s afterlife in Paradise that gets ignored in such existence now becomes a necessity for true freedom. Lest readers forget, the controlling influence of this ideal afterworld extends to this one as well. It even allows man to escape time, Gilmer attests. The argument is not far from the northern tendency to bash the empirical world (chapters 2, 3). Important for me in the context of Dew, this argument includes an ontological claim that favors Civilization founded on Christianity instead of more savage, “bestly” existence, and it refers to history as a book.⁷⁶³ These were uncritical arguments given the precarious status of Evangelical and New England history and metaphysics in Virginia.

In more downtoned rhetoric, Gilmer had to keep arguing for his case in 1844, because even at this time, few Virginians cared about preservation of history or about the idea of history as cloistered hard work done alone. Gilmer singles out the Jeffersonian tradition as the enemy of “real” history: “this condition of things is so eloquently appealing to her

⁷⁵⁷ *ibid.*, 98; Grant, North over South, 23, 28.

⁷⁵⁸ Gilmer, “An Address on the Value of History,” 97, 98.

⁷⁵⁹ See for example *ibid.*

⁷⁶⁰ *ibid.*

⁷⁶¹ See, for example, Melancthon [Speece], “On Reading to Excess,” Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine 1 (1818b): 394-98, and for distast in the cosmopolitans and their inadequate philosophy of history that is ridiculed as sophistry, see L., “[Review:] History of Modern Europe,” Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine 1 (1818): 559-60.

⁷⁶² Gilmer, “An Address on the Value of History,” 99, 101.

⁷⁶³ *ibid.*, 101-2, 97.

rulers.” However, money was not the only obstacle to change, even in the legislature.⁷⁶⁴ Though lacking in specifics, Gilmer thus implies that the cause of the difference was irreducible to the conventional—Marshall, Daniel Webster, Tocqueville—explanation of greedy economics.

4.4 Jane Tayloe Lomax, the pioneer of romantic history in Virginia

The only partial exception at this period to rejecting more explicitly German theories about history in Virginia is Jane Tayloe Lomax (1821–1847). Inexcusably, Lomax is practically totally forgotten today. I could find only one mention of her name by historians. She was a talented poet, essayist, linguist and musician. Partial, because she was married to the son of the Governor of Ohio in 1843 and apparently lived there after first living in Watertown, Massachusetts, in 1840 and Washington, D.C. in 1842.⁷⁶⁵ Lomax possibly predates northerner Margaret Fuller as a pioneering female public thinker in America.

At first glance, Lomax was the epitome of romantic genius. At an early age, her mind was very sensitive to complex literary and philosophical arguments: before she was twenty, she wrote an elegiac poem about Korinna that included a French motto cited from Madame de Staël’s influential “Corinne.”⁷⁶⁶ So early on, Lomax knew French and about the ancients, but not in a vacuum.⁷⁶⁷ The *female elegiac genre* was engaged in softening the public sphere with bourgeois ideology of sympathy. Sympathy functioned as an unbalancing of egotism and as a binding together of nations and society. The female elegiac genre was about loss and consolatory echo.⁷⁶⁸

Nevertheless, as another indication of the difference in public sphere from the bourgeoisie in Virginia (chapters 2, 3), tragic poetics continues to predominate in Lomax’s poem, contrary to sentimentality. As in Poe’s aesthetics, there is no anthropological,

⁷⁶⁴ Anonymous [Gilmer], “The Colonial History of Virginia, Part II,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (1844): 691-99, citation on 691. For Gilmer’s other dismissals of this tradition see for example *ibid.*, 692.

⁷⁶⁵ Joseph Lomax, *Genealogical and Historical Sketches of the Lomax Family (Grand Rapids: The Bookus, 1894)*, 157; Jane T. Lomax, “The Withered Leaves,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840b): 828; J. T. L. [*idem.*], “The French Dramatists: Corneille,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 8 (1842): 766.

⁷⁶⁶ *idem.*, “Corinna’s Last Song,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840a): 716-17; Madame de Staël–Holstein, “Dernier Chant de Corinne,” in *idem.*, *Oeuvres*, Tome II (Paris: Chez Lefèvre, Libraire, 1838), 850-54.

⁷⁶⁷ For example, Lomax possibly also knew about the work of Felicia Hemans who in turn had some knowledge of Schiller. Felicia Hemans, *Records of Woman: With Other Poems (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1828)*.

⁷⁶⁸ Patrick H. Vincent, introduction to *The Romantic Poetess: European Culture, Politics, and Gender, 1820–1840*, by Patrick H. Vincent (Lebanon: University Press of New England, 2004), xxi.

idealist–romantic arena of discourse involving necessarily at least two. The closest to this novelty is the opening of the fifth stanza that reads: “I go, my friends! but let fond dreams of me, / And what I *have* been, be around ye still;” but she almost immediately insists: “Fain would I grant the final strain ye crave, / Fain would I leave an echo still to be.”⁷⁶⁹ That is, Lomax stresses that phonetic echo and historial life are *absolutely gone*. Death is not annulled, like contemporary European and northern theories insisted. Dreams are an innumerable weaker consolation to flesh–and–blood be–ing and sound, not their substitute. Cohen has explored this aesthetic side of historicity as opposed to conventional (and thus modern) historical existence that relies on the substitute.⁷⁷⁰ Recurrence (“fond dreams . . . around ye”) is about deferral: “[n]o event begins or ends—what comes again is already a part of the future of what is deferred.” This trace is “soaked in the rhetoric of paradox, the nonorigin of an origin, the existence of the nonexistent.”⁷⁷¹ In other words, temporality is a paradoxical heterological production rather than sublimation of the body into an idea along a singular temporal continuity and collective–discursive unity, like in romantic, and particularly Hegelian, theory. Historicity brings out “this differential element in all systems of sense.” It has to do with sclerosis, not some universal teleology.⁷⁷² In sum, southerners, at least in Virginia, still were not aesthetically situated to modern history even in the early–1840s.

Further, Lomax, like her precursor, New Yorker Elizabeth F. Ellet, does not rashly jump to Schiller’s neohumanism.⁷⁷³ Ellet offers a thorough comparison and contrast between “cold and classic simplicity” of Alfieri, or tragic poetics, and “energy of expression and warmth of action” of Schiller, or moralizing poetics.⁷⁷⁴ Unsurprisingly given she hailed from the North, Ellet prefers Schiller.⁷⁷⁵ But Lomax is a sharp critic of Romanticism: she is willing to read even de Staël through French tragedy, while acknowledging that de Staël fails to excel in it. That is, like Poe and Beverley Tucker, she seems to dialectically and critically engage Romanticism through her specific context that had more of an appreciation for tragedy.⁷⁷⁶ This, in turn, would corroborate the possibility of a prevalent “cool” reading of Scott in the South (chapter 2). Moralizing poetics presupposed the victory of Romanticism in senses of philosophy and poesy. However, in the South, the situation was more complex, because it is arguably misleading to reduce southern sensibilities to German neohumanism or even the essentially bourgeois and capitalist British neoclassical era (chapters 2, 3).

In an earlier Schiller article that was apparently the first public in–depth engagement with neohumanism in Virginia, however, Lomax, then living in Massachusetts, has taken

⁷⁶⁹ Lomax, “*Corinna’s Last Song*,” 716, *emphasis original*, 717.

⁷⁷⁰ Cohen, *History out of Joint* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 158–59.

⁷⁷¹ *ibid.*, 158.

⁷⁷² *ibid.*, 159.

⁷⁷³ Elizabeth F. Ellet, “*Alfieri and Schiller*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836): 702–14.

⁷⁷⁴ *ibid.*, 702.

⁷⁷⁵ *ibid.*, 714.

⁷⁷⁶ Lomax, “*Madame de Staël*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 8 (1842): 231–33.

steps beyond the tragic.⁷⁷⁷ She explicitly endorses romance history as proper history, and applies this aesthetic to Schiller: “we grasp his hand with the friendly warmth of intellectual kindred” where “the lofty, unshackled intercourse of mind connects us in one sacred brotherhood.” But she also seems conscious that a selling point of Schiller to Virginians is to dissociate him from Transcendentalism, affectation and cloudedness. Lomax spots the different dynamic of the public sphere in Germany.⁷⁷⁸ She endorses Schiller’s effect on history:⁷⁷⁹

He touches the canvas on which history had sketched the rough outline of events; and the picture, before so vague and dim, becomes instinct with the majesty of life. The star-light of imagination lends its luster; the dull scene changes to living record; and though it depict circumstances far gone, they flit before us like the deeds of yesterday, bringing silent appeals to our sympathies, bearing eloquent but voiceless memorials from times and people long past away. The prominent actors in that mental portraiture live in our memories, with the friends we had known in youth as companions, holding a claim on our gratitude for happy moments bestowed, and pleasant associations awakened.

ibid., 162-63.

Thus, Lomax in effect is a southern pioneer in advocating a full-scale idealistic and romantic, warm, anthropological, discursive and emotional approach to history the (male) WW had previously rejected and even she had poetically doubted. But she does this in rhetorically skilful ways. Schiller represents an alternative to stereotypical (northern) romancers that was completely free from egoism and fame-seeking, while being tireless in work ethic and fully moral. Schiller represents a philosophical mind that is regrettably often missing from those who are “too dependent on excitement.” “Intellectual superiority, from the very character of its being, is isolated. The man of genius rarely meets the appreciating friendship he is so willing to bestow. To be perfectly successful in his exhortions, he must abandon the common and distracting enjoyments around him, and let his soul turn inward upon itself.”⁷⁸⁰ This saint-like individualism that comes straight from Rousseau was a categorical heterodoxy to the thinking and social existence then prevalent in Virginia and elsewhere in the South.

Lomax increases her preference for such aesthetics-as-history in a later article, where she obviously looks at Pierre Corneille through Schiller. The major difference between them is that for the former, drama functions as a metonymical “spirit of a nation” and as an allegory on society, rather than naive individual genius. Lomax is concerned about audiences at the level of the nation: they are “prone to exaggerated feeling, and particularly susceptible to the charms of sentiment,” and the emotionally responsive, religious quality of a people’s sympathies.⁷⁸¹ Accompanying this are Longfellow-like

⁷⁷⁷ *idem.*, “Schiller,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841): 162-64.

⁷⁷⁸ *ibid.*, 162.

⁷⁷⁹ *ibid.*, 162-63.

⁷⁸⁰ *ibid.*, 163.

⁷⁸¹ *idem.*, “French Dramatists: Corneille,” 763, 765, citations on 763, 765.

(chapter 2) observations about first wisely studying, democratically, the minds of others before embarking on poetics. Respect needs to be paid to form and regularity as guides and superintendents on the way to maturity and perfection in drama. There is also SW rhetoric about Corneille improving his country.⁷⁸² For Lomax, informed of Schiller and northern preferences, poetic existence is in its separate “immortal” sphere, but not for every poet.⁷⁸³

In sum, Lomax is a borderline case of negotiating the place of aesthetics vs. history and reality. Gone is her previous irony about dreams as memories. Now, more in tune with Romanticism, most writers and all poets have their unique style.⁷⁸⁴ From a more cosmopolite view, and maybe as a result of personal transition, Lomax deviated from local WW dominance about history, but in terms of audiences she made little immediate change in Virginia, unlike in South Carolina (chapter 6).

⁷⁸² *ibid.*, 765, 764, 764-65.

⁷⁸³ *ibid.*, 766.

⁷⁸⁴ *ibid.*, 765.

5. Thomas Roderick Dew as a producer of southern historical identity: mixtures, distortions, idealities

5.1 Dew in context: extensions and convergences of Yankee imperialism

In the early–1840s, Dew put together his posthumously published lecture notes on history. Professor of Civil Law at the institution in 1827 only at twenty–five and president in 1836, Dew was the most influential social philosopher in Virginia and had “near monopoly on instruction.”⁷⁸⁵ His history teaching, delivered once a week and commencing in 1827, went against the wishes of the former president, intellectual Thomas Cooper, a staunch British materialist. The prestigious but, interestingly, until the mid–1830s thinly attended institution was fairly secular, having earlier abolished chairs of divinity and instituted modern language study by Jefferson and Episcopalian reverend James Madison. WW Beverley Tucker became his colleague in 1835.⁷⁸⁶ As I shall elaborate however (chapter 6), besides differences with Tucker, Dew was a very different creature from the more Jeffersonian Cooper on history.

But in addition, only when thirty, Dew published a noted apology on slavery in 1832. I shall focus on these texts later. My present argument is to canvass Dew’s intellectual background. Specifically, I shall argue that Dew took up a far more energetic interpretation of the Episcopalian faith than was the norm in Virginia. He followed in the footsteps of William H. Wilmer, and thereby greatly increased the influence of Episcopalian poetics and politics of culture. As social philosophy, it was in conflict with Jefferson because of a different interpretation of Locke that had consequences for semiotics and history (chapter 2). Thus, Dew in effect became an outpost for SAE in Virginia. Like the northern historians, he would incorporate German Idealism into the structure as well.

As in the cases of Wirt and Kennedy (chapters 2, 3), different approaches to Virginia history came from Maryland: Dew’s father was born there.⁷⁸⁷ But in addition, in terms of discourse, an important but to my knowledge unstudied change had taken place at the institution in 1826. Episcopalian William H. Wilmer, originally from Maryland, assumed

⁷⁸⁵ O’Brien, *preface to Thomas Roderick Dew, “Republicanism and Literature,”* in *All Clever Men, Who Make Their Way: Critical Discourse in the Old South*, ed. Michael O’Brien (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 126; Neal C. Gillespie, *The Collapse of Orthodoxy: The Intellectual Ordeal of George Frederick Holmes* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1972), 24. O’Brien believes the lecture notes to have finished roughly around 1841 or 1842. CO2, 606.

⁷⁸⁶ Stephen Mansfield, “Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary: ‘A Main Prop of That Venerable Institution’,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 75 (1967): 431, 430, 432, 435. For example, Mansfield states morning prayer services established in 1830 were scarcely attended. *ibid.*, 437.

⁷⁸⁷ John Stewart Bryan, *Thomas Roderick Dew*, (Williamsburg: [?], 1939), 4.

presidency and Dew was already a faculty member.⁷⁸⁸ Judging by a contemporary reaction, this introduction of religion into intellectual leadership was not welcomed by all the students, which could be one reason for the thin attendance. It dropped as low as eighteen in 1833, while Jefferson's university had enjoyed well over 100 students.⁷⁸⁹ But a second reason could be that the Episcopalian Church, traditionally the representative of Anglican Church in Virginia and America, had been almost abolished in 1785 when Virginia legislature had decided to repeal its legal establishment and give its lands and property, except the incumbents' private estates and church buildings, to charity for the poor.⁷⁹⁰ This was no dramatic event. Indeed, in strong contrast to New England, the church not only had overwhelmingly supported American independence from Britain, its clergy in Virginia had been almost as deistic as the Virginian revolutionaries.⁷⁹¹ Despite fine outer appearances, both pastors and their congregation were simply not interested in religion or a religious way of life. Even in the late-1840s, Virginia "abounded in temptations to doubtful pleasure, and her churchmen of the colonial period did much to cultivate this taste."⁷⁹²

In the first measure to revive the church that already began the same year, reverend Madison of William and Mary was the key organizer. Importantly for me, the idea behind the revival closely resembled SAE: an enlightened and rational society that would use religion as a resource for morality.⁷⁹³ Critically, though, reception was very weak. Any more significant sign of a revival would have to wait until the mid-1810s when the revivalist Presbyterians became active (chapter 2). By the mid-1830s, though only a fifth of the Presbyterians in popularity, or roughly 0.2 percent of the Virginia population in communicants, Virginia's Episcopalian Church was "distinguished by numerous and wealthy members, and by a pious and intelligent clergy."⁷⁹⁴ Thus, the church had strongly elitist tendencies.

Wilmer's Maryland roots were very energetically Episcopalian.⁷⁹⁵ Thus he was different from the far more secular Virginia ethos where he had moved in 1812, interestingly, around the revival.⁷⁹⁶ Key point for me is this Episcopalian appeal to reason

⁷⁸⁸ Mansfield, "Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary, 429.

⁷⁸⁹ *ibid.*, Bryan, Thomas Roderick Dew, 6.

⁷⁹⁰ Martin and Brockenbrough, *A New and Comprehensive Guide*, 76.

⁷⁹¹ David Hein and Gardiner H. Shattuck, *The Episcopalians, Denominations in America series Volume 11 (Westport: Praeger, 2004)*, 38, 42.

⁷⁹² Howison, *A History of Virginia*, 2, 151-58, citation on 158.

⁷⁹³ Hawks, *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History*, 1, 179. *In an appeal made in 1789, society talks of "advantages which civil society must receive from worship conducted on principles the most rational."* *ibid.*, 205.

⁷⁹⁴ Martin and Brockenbrough, *A New and Comprehensive Guide*, 76.

⁷⁹⁵ Alexander B. Hagner, "History and Reminiscences of St. John's Church, Washington, D. C.," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D. C. 12 (1909)*: 97-98.

⁷⁹⁶ Lyon Gardiner Tyler, *Encyclopedia of Virginia Biography, Volume II (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing, 1915)*, entry for "William Holland Wilmer," accessed October 19, 2013, <http://www.onlinebiographies.info/va/v2/wilmer-wh.htm>.

was not in conflict with SAE but to the contrary, found additional support from Germany at least in cases of Dew and also the German–pioneering Harrison as a representative of Clay’s ultra–Whig interests.⁷⁹⁷ The common nominator was the compatibility of Locke with *Universalhistorie*. This is decisive, because SAE—and thus Lockeanism—was not by all means everywhere accepted in the South in history (chapter 2), which, as a corollary, made the German tweaks to SAE (chapters 2, 3) difficult for all southerners, but particularly for Virginians.

Besides Wilmer, Dew strengthened “whiggery” in Virginia as I will explore. In Wilmer’s case, this happened because of his involvement as one of the signers of the constitution of the American Colonization Society (ACS) in 1816.⁷⁹⁸ This society was nation–wide and its “goal was to send freed blacks to Africa.”⁷⁹⁹ But besides the Lockean view of rationality, from Locke derived the concept of citizenry as ACS saw it. Lockean “state of nature is normatively regulated by traditional (altruistic, nonprudential) natural law. It is a moralized state of nature in which private property and money exist, virtually civil.” Its citizenry extended only to whites, because only they were rational enough for the status, as well as laborious and industrious enough. The rationality non–whites lacked was an argument for enslavement and lack of their citizenship.⁸⁰⁰ Accordingly, ACS was an organization formed by “citizens” in this Lockean sense. Its powerful early supporters in Virginia were Whigs such as war veteran, politician and lawyer Charles Fenton Mercer.⁸⁰¹ Incidentally, Mercer was also strongly Lockean. Krumpelmann claims also Marshall and Harrison were members.⁸⁰² Thanks to SAE and Locke reading, they blended in ACS effortlessly with such figures as New Haven, Connecticut mayor David Daggett. Daggett was one of the local opponents to a black school. After Nat Turner’s bloody slave rebellion in Virginia, the opposing frame was arrived at when phrenological testimony, among others, had showed the black character incapable of citizenship. Thus unsurprisingly, Daggett was able to quote Noah Webster—another northern combiner of reason and religion (chapter 2)—a citizen was defined in America “as someone who could vote and own property.”⁸⁰³ Based on Locke, Federalist ACS denied blacks of citizenship. This same reasoning by Daggett was appealed to in the much more famous Dred Scott case in 1857 by Judge Roger Taney.⁸⁰⁴

⁷⁹⁷ Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 67-68.

⁷⁹⁸ Henry Noble Sherwood, “*The Formation of the American Colonization Society*,” *The Journal of Negro History* 2 (1917): 227n54; CO2, 784, 802.

⁷⁹⁹ Anne Farrow, Joel Lang, and Jennifer Frank, *Complicity: How the North Prolonged, Promoted, and Profited from Slavery* (New York: Ballantine, 2005), 155.

⁸⁰⁰ Charles W. Mills, *The Racial Contract* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 67-68, citation on 67.

⁸⁰¹ Sherwood, “*Formation of the American Colonization Society*,” 226, 211-12.

⁸⁰² Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 67-68.

⁸⁰³ Farrow et al., *Complicity*, 159-62, citation on 162.

⁸⁰⁴ *ibid.*, 162.

The work of ACS was reported overseas in the Bulletins of the Geographical Society of Paris.⁸⁰⁵ These bulletins actually served an inherently ideological goal of French imperialism and trade by means of land expansion, subscription to racial hierarchy, and dwelling in phrenology, facial angles and crania.⁸⁰⁶ The relevance of imperialist tactics *within* American history thus fastens into a transatlantic alliance founded by Crèvecoeur as trope (chapters 2, 3). This alliance was between hegemonic capitalist interests and natural science ideal about society, including its people, and progress. History was only derivative as natural science and/or God-grounded. Just as importantly, ACS could incorporate *Universalhistorie* and Idealism. Specifically, Göttingen as a combination of racism, statism and social science acted as the linchpin for key American theorists of history. The usage of Locke for racist ends in history and cultural politics in New England has rarely been noted even though all the classicists, several New Englanders and even Bancroft adhered to such progressive race theories as history (chapters 2, 3). Therefore, Dew, Harrison—instrumental as organizer of Historical Society of Louisiana in New Orleans in 1835 and a willing exile from the uncouth Virginia⁸⁰⁷—and Marshall were *southern versions of imperialism as history in accord with SAE*.

The important point is that all southern opinion about history was *not* behind. Jefferson's different reading of Locke implicated history, and southerners were less enthusiastic about progress based on race hierarchy (chapter 2). Further, according to Simpson, Jefferson even flashed disagreement with the Lockean theory of citizenship ACS was founded on regarding slaves.⁸⁰⁸ Therefore, their semiotics and philosophy about history was far from identical with it. A counter-example outside Virginia would be southerner Samuel Cartwright who had no trouble reconciling SAE and race theory. However, this was a rarity position in the South about history at least until the mid-1840s. It is explainable with Cartwright's exposure to the northern classicist Rush as well as Pennsylvania-educated Charles Caldwell—a professor of Natural History active in the 1810s—from whom Cartwright apparently learned about phrenology.

Natural history was the preferred approach into history by northern physicians. It fit a natural scientific philosophy of history that was founded on race hierarchy, rationalism and religion, in other words, SAE (chapter 2). Thus I disagree with Smith that Rush only inadvertently perpetuated race theories, since his historical metaphysics was intrinsically racially hierarchical. That racism as everyday prejudice dominated more the North than the South is even asserted by an otherwise unsympathetic Tocqueville: he carefully distinguishes between equality as Lockean contract, or discursive, and inequality as natural, or non-discursive. He implies *only* the former is relevant in America. Though admitting this is *not* so in the South, he (again) makes the function of slavery in the South a misfit category compared to the standardized Lockean citizenship theory both northern

⁸⁰⁵ Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, 68.

⁸⁰⁶ Martin S. Staum, "The Paris Geographical Society Constructs the Other, 1821–1850," *Journal of Historical Geography* 26 (2000): 222–38.

⁸⁰⁷ Krumpelmann, *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, 73–74, 70.

⁸⁰⁸ Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War*, 28.

SAE and ACS subscribed to. The theory, thus, marshaled further support from Germany and France.⁸⁰⁹

Despite Jefferson and possibly others, hierarchic racism about history was to increase its strength in Virginia as well because of: 1. The institutionally dominating SW opinion about history by 1831 (chapters 3, 4) headed by the Episcopalian elites. 2. Virginia slave rebellion in 1831—soon after which Dew’s college turned a corner. I argue the rebellion was a major incentive to flock to Dew and thus to all he stood for. Although exposed to Wilmer for only a year, my claim is Dew had become much influenced by his views, fulfilling the previous—until then relatively ignored—desires of the reverend Madison. Due to the different views of Jefferson and Madison, William and Mary became a sort of symbolic watershed on southern cultural opinion about history.⁸¹⁰

5.2 Dew and southern history: “The Review”

In this section, I shall examine Dew’s apology for slavery from 1832. My argument is, Dew exhaustively tries to bring slavery as social philosophy to the same level as discourse about modern history. However, in the course of the undertaking, he departs from Virginia society’s conventions regarding history and the sign in historically and philosophically unethical ways that render his attempt a profoundly confused and metaphysically stagnating hodgepodge defense. Thus, I would not treat Dew as a representative of Virginia views on culture poetics. Rather, I see the report as a terminus point of slavery as discourse that serves as grounded defense *and* obscures competing cultural—poetic views,

⁸⁰⁹ *de Tocqueville*, *Democracy in America*, 2, 335-48; *Anonymous [Samuel A. Cartwright]*, “Canaan Identified with the Ethiopian,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842): 380. *That Cartwright is the author is asserted in CO1, 247n89. For Cartwright and race theory, see for example ibid., 247. Samuel A. Cartwright to Francis John Levert, 13 December, 1822, Levert Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, cited in ibid., 448. Reginald Horsman, Race and Manifest Destiny: Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 117. Mark M. Smith, How Race is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses, ReadHowYouWant ed., ([?]: Accessible, 2008), 13-14. For the racist ethos across places among physicians including Rush and Josiah Nott, and its curious relationship to SAE, see for example Farrow et al. Complicity, 183-87. De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, 1, 329, 2, 548-51.*

⁸¹⁰ *It is beyond this study to point out a similar difference between Hampden–Sidney and the University of Virginia but such a case could be made. Cushing, a staunch Federalist and key organizer of VHPS, was a Hampden man from the North. But in addition, he became an Episcopalian in 1829. Dame laments Hampden–Sidney was badly overshadowed by Jefferson’s university. Dame, “Sketch of the Life and Character of Jonathan P. Cushing, M.A.,” 127, 118. Another Hampden man was Harrison, the intellectual to introduce German thinking to Virginia and thus, unsurprisingly, an open admirer of Lomax over Poe. Jesse Burton Harrison, An Address Delivered before the Washington College, Lexington, Virginia, 18 June, 1850 (Richmond: H. K. Eleyson’s, 1850), 31. Harrison, in turn, was northerner James Marsh’s student. Marsh was a key founder of transcendentalism. See chapter 3.*

especially those in tension regarding modern history and its philosophical presuppositions (chapter 2).

Before the lecture–book, Dew was most famous for his review of the 1831–1832 debate about abolishing slavery in Virginia commissioned by John Floyd, Virginia’s governor.⁸¹¹ Floyd was the first Vice–President of VHPS, second only to Marshall in hierarchy. Holmes implies Dew had become Episcopalian by then.⁸¹² The difficulty of pigeonholing Dew’s output O’Brien has noted⁸¹³ is evident: he discourses almost every branch of major tradition available, and even cites J. S. Mill with approval!⁸¹⁴ Of the European history models, the text is a very eclectic mix of cosmopolitan history, mostly Scottish, and *Universalhistorie*. At first glance, it is theoretically very social scientific for its time and place given that its audience was Virginians.⁸¹⁵ Importantly for me, the review is silent about historical language and the questions of truth. Focus is social scientific more than historical: observations concerning truth derive mainly from anthropology, economics, law studies and political science.⁸¹⁶ The favorite authority, especially in the anthropological elements, is Scot Robertson.⁸¹⁷ Style is rigid or un–romantic: for example, Dew uses the analogy of mathematic precision in reasoning and cites a speech by Tory politician George Canning, where a freed slave is compared to “a creature resembling the splendid fiction of a recent romance . . . in the infancy of his uninstructed reason,” meaning Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818).⁸¹⁸ There was nothing extravagant about being enlightened and proslavery.⁸¹⁹

But the similarities to this branch of history stop here, the matter is more complex. Firstly, in contrast to cosmopolitan history, language is pretty much without any playfulness, colour, satire, tragedy, or irony several southerners knew about. Dew is much more concerned with ideas than with words, philology or metaphysical speculation. There are four explicit references to rhetoric, but they do not dominate. Only two refer to spoken instead of written or documentary language.⁸²⁰ Political speeches are quoted about a dozen different times, but several of them instrumentally, at face value, in connection with hard data that supports Dew’s position.⁸²¹ Thus, oratory for history is still present, but much subdued by a more scientific and true approach, close to SAE (chapter 2). This confusion

⁸¹¹ Mansfield, “Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary,” 434; O’Brien, “Preface,” 126.

⁸¹² David L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopalian Church* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1993), 80.

⁸¹³ O’Brien, “Preface,” 126.

⁸¹⁴ Dew, *Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature of 1831 and 1832* (Richmond: T. W. White, 1832), 87.

⁸¹⁵ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 95.

⁸¹⁶ Dew, *Review*, 17, 20, 40, 45, 48.

⁸¹⁷ For example, *ibid.*, 10–14, 29–31.

⁸¹⁸ *ibid.*, 8, 105. George Canning, “A Speech in Parliament, 16 March, 1824,” accessed October 18, 2013. <http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/mws/lastman/speech.htm>.

⁸¹⁹ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 210n47.

⁸²⁰ Dew, *Review*, 8, 11, 65, 77.

⁸²¹ Of these, see for example *ibid.*, 47, 55.

of different genres would elucidate the similar confusion in Prescott between cosmopolitan history and *Universalhistorie*. At the time, Prescott was busy writing his history. Amidst the silence in the *Messenger* (chapter 3), Dew awarded Prescott with honorary doctorate of laws in 1841 for his first history, so the men were probably not distant.⁸²² Thus, besides Minor and Gilmer, Dew was both Episcopalian and sympathetic to Prescott's idealist take on history that ignored WW.

Secondly, I would disagree with O'Brien that although Dew knew about Germans such as F. Schlegel, Niebuhr and Heeren, he only scantily absorbed German thinking.⁸²³ To the contrary, I argue a deep engagement with the Germans would illuminate his departures from cosmopolitan history in four ways.

1. Dew was informed of the northern ethnically hierarchical progress theory and of its endorsement by Göttingen's Heeren as the basis for scientific history *qua* political science Bancroft had subscribed to and popularised (chapters 2, 3).⁸²⁴ Reminiscent of Jefferson and Voltaire, Dew's begins from a taxonomic and irreligious approach to slaves, to which he combines a natural scientific bias when he refers to "human species" and, like George Tucker (chapter 2), Malthus.⁸²⁵ Natural scientific rigor was nothing out of the ordinary in the U.S. But unlike the cosmopolitans, Jefferson and Tucker, Dew *proceeds* from this premise to talk about hierarchical racial civilisation theory more in tune with Heeren and respected northerners.⁸²⁶ 2. Dew quotes from Wilhelm von Humboldt, the chief German historical and cultural revolutionary, to support his proslavery thesis.⁸²⁷ 3. What presses Dew close to Heeren's *Universalhistorie* is his strong concern with Christianity, and his linkage between hierarchical civilization and Christianity.⁸²⁸ Outside Wirt, Dew even advocates a romantic approach to love in historical theory, ahead of his context.⁸²⁹ This would separate him from the Jefferson school of opinion and cosmopolitans, and propel him toward *Universalhistorie* (chapter 3). Thus the Episcopalian synthesis of reason and religion, northern hierarchical theory of ethnicities, northern SAE as culture/power politic, and *Universalhistorie* are all incorporated. 4. Given the text "was intended for an internal Virginia audience, to (re)unify the state behind racial slavery in the wake of an unprecedented, and very divisive, debate over the future of the institution in the state," the most interesting observations about Dew's German dimension are perhaps philosophical, more specifically, dialectic.⁸³⁰ There have been speculations that Dew visited and studied

⁸²² Mansfield, "Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary," 438.

⁸²³ O'Brien, "Preface," 127. Dew wanted to order more German books in 1837. Mansfield, "Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary," 437.

⁸²⁴ Dew, Review, 5.

⁸²⁵ For Jefferson and Voltaire on this approach, see Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 225. For Dew's use of "species" to describe humans, ways of life, and slavery, see for example Dew, Review, 9, 23, 31. For Malthus in this connection, see *ibid.*, 53.

⁸²⁶ For example, *ibid.*, 5.

⁸²⁷ *ibid.*, 33-34.

⁸²⁸ For example, *ibid.*, 9, 15-16.

⁸²⁹ *ibid.*, 35.

⁸³⁰ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 95.

in Germany.⁸³¹ O'Brien dismisses this, since Dew "could not speak or read the language."⁸³² However, the pull of Dew towards Germany only increased in his lecture notes (5.3). What is common in figural and metaphysical senses between Dew and Hegel in the present piece are two things: the *desire for completeness* and *dialecticism*.

Dew's work was received as a totality, something beyond discourse, by great many southern readers and audiences. It had "cogency and coherence never previously attained," it was "[w]idely circulated throughout the South . . . repeatedly quoted and paraphrased by the Southern press," "widely read," and "reprinted several times" so that, in practice it seemed "nothing more needed to be said about the issue."⁸³³ It was a complete body, a complete corpus, a ground plan. But, it functioned as something shared and something that unites as well. For Episcopalians, Holy Communion was massively important. As Wilmer, Dew's spiritual predecessor, had declared in his posthumously published manual whose great hope was to cherish the unity of spirit beside that of faith, Eucharist was⁸³⁴

a duty incumbent on every soul that professed faith in Christ Jesus, and sought for salvation through his blood alone. And the great High Priest of our profession has showed by more than ordinary influences of his blessed Spirit on the souls of the faithful, that they had not mistaken his meaning, nor believed in vain; while by eating of that bread and drinking of that cup, they endeavoured to shew forth his death, and realize its benefits.

ibid., 128.

In other words, the communion as shared eating set by Jesus united souls with spirit, faith and knowledge about the right meaning. In its German aspects, I claim Dew's work symbolized the Last Supper as "an objective form of love," an observation similar to Hegel.⁸³⁵ In Dew, the love element the communion symbolizes is present as the southern zeal for liberty in the Revolution the Episcopalians had endorsed. It brought with it "the perfect spirit of equality so prevalent among the whites of all the slave holding states." Because the low and menial chores are done by slaves, there is no need for distinction and

⁸³¹ William E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom: A Chronicle of the Old South, The Chronicles of America series* (Toronto: Glasgow, Brook and Co., 1919), 49. Bryan claims Dew traveled in Europe in the early-1820s. Bryan, Thomas Roderick Dew, 5.

⁸³² O'Brien, "Preface," 126.

⁸³³ Erik Root, "Thomas Roderick Dew: Founder of the Positive Good Thesis," (paper presented for the Mid-West Political Science Association 65th Annual Conference Panel: Social Movements and Political Change, Chicago, Il., April 14, 2007), accessed October 19, 2013, http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/9/6/6/3/pages196632/p196632-6.php, 5.

⁸³⁴ William H. Wilmer, *preface and introduction to The Episcopal Manual. 3rd ed.*, by William H. Wilmer (Baltimore: E. J. Coale, 1829), x.

⁸³⁵ Stuart Barnett, "Eating My God," in Hegel after Derrida, ed. Stuart Barnett, *Warwick Studies in European Philosophy series*, Taylor & Francis e-library ed. (New York: Routledge, 2001), accessed October 20, 2013 <http://www.scribd.com/doc/54089515/Hegel-After-Derrida>, 138.

separation, no need for individualism especially in a competitive sense.⁸³⁶ Thus, besides harboring a romantic theory of love, Dew echoes Hegel's definition of love as: "He (is/are) you."⁸³⁷ The place for (Jefferson's) language in such love exists as food taken in as objective, true form.⁸³⁸ To be sure, Hegel distinguishes between concrete bread and wine and signs.⁸³⁹ However, such a distinction is less relevant in my context, for two reasons. First, the metaphor of knowledge as food popularized by Francis Bacon and utilized by Wirt (chapter 2) and Dew himself later was probably known to Dew, his audiences, even both.⁸⁴⁰ Second, Dew, departing from Jefferson and even Hegel, is not critically concerned about the status of language or signs. Therefore, he can jump to the concern with community. Thus, Hegel's conclusion that only the usage of the finite realm of the sign can find a community is shared by Dew.⁸⁴¹ The function of form or the sign was, thus, extremely different from historicity and WW.

It is precisely the lack of criticism about the sign as form that helps Dew reconcile between love, God, and his study. Southern readers, his equal brothers, partook in Dew's work, and thus found nourishment in (its) spirit. Beyond finite signifiers, once they are consumed, emerges "a subjective unity—which, in fact, constitutes community,"⁸⁴² *a subjection of variegated reality to a grid as it were*. Accordingly, after Dew had died in Paris in 1846, Bryan is able to declare almost a century later, "the real cause of our meeting is not the death but the life of him whom we honor; for it is not the dreadful finality of death that President Dew's name and memory speak, but of life piled on life."⁸⁴³ Dew was "above and before all," forever lying "around us," a miracle, a spiritual force, an unconquerable spirit upon a plastic world who/that made William and Mary indestructible.⁸⁴⁴ An interesting metaphysical and aesthetic comparison between such religious feeling as interplay Peter the stone/William and Mary vs. pagan sculpture—the WW medium about history—would go beyond this chapter.⁸⁴⁵ I only contend to note a *difference* between them.

⁸³⁶ Dew, Review, 112.

⁸³⁷ Barnett, "Eating My God," 137.

⁸³⁸ *ibid.*, 137-38.

⁸³⁹ *ibid.*, 138.

⁸⁴⁰ "Some books are to be tasted. others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested. That is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read, but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention." Francis Bacon, "Of Studies," in Bacon's Essays, Volume II, eds. J. W. Hales and C. S. Jerram, *The London Series of English Classics*, 7th ed. (London: Longman's, Green, & Co., 1886), 73.

⁸⁴¹ Barnett, "Eating My God," 139.

⁸⁴² *ibid.*, 140.

⁸⁴³ Bryan, Thomas Roderick Dew, 3.

⁸⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 13.

⁸⁴⁵ For Derrida and eating in this Hegelian–sacral sense, see Derrida, Glas, trans. John P. Leavey and Richard Rand (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 65-73, and for some suggestive remarks about the difference concerning stone, *ibid.*, 70-73.

O'Brien has rightly noted that cult historian W. J. Cash's analysis of the prewar South is intellectually poor and resembles Fichte.⁸⁴⁶ Having said that, I think this dimension of this famous work and its effects as absolute truth and unity in southern hearts and communities are German idealist. Deconstruction, in contrast, respects "that which cannot be eaten . . . that in a text which cannot be assimilated." Derrida reminds "[t]here is always a remainder that cannot be read, that must remain alien. This residue can never be interrogated as the same, but must be constantly sought out anew, and must continue to be written."⁸⁴⁷

However, even this cannot exhaust the text. Incongruously, the rational subject of the dialectic comes not from Hegel but from Locke.⁸⁴⁸ Dew argues explicitly—like WAE Wirt (chapter 2)—in Lockean terms for rational liberty of industry, end for idleness or licentiousness, and for productive labor and self-government, and against temptations such as crime, alcohol and debt. He also treats private property axiomatic. The difference to Wirt is Dew's SW de-emphasis on rhetoric in communication and figuration, and strong belief in causality,⁸⁴⁹ i.e., history closer to the Yankees. Dew implies slavery for southerners was not a historically contingent, discursive, institution before Turner.⁸⁵⁰ This again indicates the lack of (liberal, bourgeois, urban, individualistic, refined) public sphere and modern history. I conjecture that was novel to great many Virginians and historical theorists.

⁸⁴⁶ O'Brien, *Idea of the American South*, 213-15; *idem.*, *Rethinking the South*, 179-81. For Cash's unconscious connection to Hegel more generally, see *idem.*, "W. J. Cash, Hegel, and the South." Also Cobb, "Does Mind No Longer Matter?" 716-17.

⁸⁴⁷ Daniel Birnbaum and Anders Olsson, "An Interview with Jacques Derrida on the Limits of Digestion," trans. Brian Manning Delaney, *Expressen*, February 15, 1991, accessed October 20, 2013, http://www.e-flux.com/journal/an-interview-with-jacques-derrida-on-the-limits-of-digestion/#_edn1.

⁸⁴⁸ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 208n31. Cf. Faust, "Introduction: The Proslavery Argument in History," in *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830–1860*, ed. Drew Gilpin Faust, *Library of Southern Civilization series*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 8-9. Faust, in my view erroneously, describes Dew's position as anti-Lockean and claims Dew exhorted southerners to become organicists in their metaphysics. My thesis is Dew did not reject Locke, more to the contrary, and organicism was imported from Germany and took especially root in the North Dew responded or reacted to. Further, she claims Dew was an empiricist more than cosmopolitan. Thus, her argument is almost the reverse from mine. My position about organicism is supported circumstantially by Saxton, who states Bancroft, Emerson and Whitman all shared neoplatonic and aesthetically organist social policies which, I claim, were in tune with U.S. Romanticism (chapters 2, 3). Alexander Saxton, *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*, *The Haymarket series* (London: Verso, 2003), 146-47.

⁸⁴⁹ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 99; David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 45; Dew, *Review*, 19, 13.

⁸⁵⁰ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 16; Dew, *Review*, 6, 8, 125.

But there are also notable intellectual discrepancies within Dew's position, a price he has to pay as a great devourer and synthesizer of knowledge as stomach cramps. Dew's argument is philosophically and ethically far inferior to that of Thornwell and the critics of reason. He fails to criticize reason but, to the contrary, tries to *reconcile* three kinds of liberal theories of reason—the prevailing ethnical chauvinism of the North and, to an extent, France, northern SAE history and its revamped German form, and Locke—with southern social philosophy. He ignores that outside SW, it was not founded on reason in these senses (chapter 2). The closest point of contact was Scottish Philosophy, but I doubt Robertson or many of his southern readers subscribed to such non-moderate and revamped take on religion. Dew's position is oxymoronic, because he simultaneously endorses the Lockean theory that highlights the individual, and the Fichtean-Hegelian theory that dilutes the individual. As a political philosopher, he tries to be a classical republican via modern liberalism and approach modern liberalism through Christian faith.⁸⁵¹ Dew, unlike Thornwell, inadvertently gives weapons to his opponents by endorsing the ontological argument of the liberals that the basic instinct of slaves is war of all against all and, even in whites, individual competition. Thornwell and later his European colleague Levinas, the consciousness of Derrida, rejected this. Locke, Hobbes, Rousseau, Hegel and Tocqueville endorsed it.⁸⁵² Thereby, Dew took a decisive step towards a much *more* democratic *and* more modern notion about citizenship than was found in many areas of the South concerning the relationship between slaves and masters. Aesthetically, by reasoning slavery is mercy in comparison to death, he rejects moralizing poetics of (bourgeois) anthropologism and Romanticism (chapter 4). At the same time, he celebrates Christian love by way of (bourgeois) *Universalhistorie* and northern opinion.⁸⁵³ He thereby extrapolates southern thinking and existence from the current historical theories by pretty much excluding heterological approaches to them and WW.

Though Dew has eaten a bellyful, there are traces of the modes of thinking and existence that are far more archaic than the fine courses served. On a figural level, we can detect them in at least three instances. First, to support his proslavery thesis, Dew hoists up Rousseau to a place of a just observer of a slave's violent nature on par with Locke.⁸⁵⁴ However, of the southern intellectuals, apparently only Wirt in his Henry biography (chapter 2) had previously sympathised with Rousseau: as a general rule, Rousseau was a very unpopular figure in the South.⁸⁵⁵ Rousseau's "position" was greatly different from a proslavery one, but decisive in modern history. Second is the appeal to Humboldt, another giant of modern history, to support a proslavery position. However, Humboldt's historical outlook and political thought Dew cites were completely at odds with slavery and

⁸⁵¹ Ericson, *Debate over Slavery*, 102-3; Dew, *Review*, 16.

⁸⁵² For example, *ibid.*, 19. For Tocqueville, see de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2, 552-53.

⁸⁵³ Dew writes, for example: "Happiness is always the main design, evil is merely incidental." Dew, *Review*, 28, *emphasis original*. For slavery as mercy, see for example *ibid.*, 18.

⁸⁵⁴ *ibid.*, 19, 104.

⁸⁵⁵ CO2, 658-59. For mostly anti-Rousseau sentiment in the South, see for example Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 146, 290, 584-85; CO2, 806.

Locke.⁸⁵⁶ A third, perhaps most revealing, instance is the lifting of Canning out of context as another supporter of Dew's thesis: however, in Canning's debate, "the question was not should the slave population be liberated, but how should liberation be implemented."⁸⁵⁷ Dew thus distorts Canning's "position" to echo his own discursively archaic one. In Brion Davis's reading, Dew's slavery position devolves into "pre-Hobbesian" 16th and 17th centuries since already Hobbes had "swept away traditional distinctions based on natural merit and assigned status, and thus, undermined both the classical and Christian justifications for unquestioned dominion."⁸⁵⁸ Dew did not follow him.

How is this possible? As I have argued, southern semiotic and historical world had elements predating modern history, with no public sphere in a sense that would be functionally or metaphysically recognizable as modern. Since Dew's closest local intellectual ally was Wirt, Dew's views were among the most modern his context could functionally offer. Thus, if the most advanced theorist on slavery resides in attitudes about slavery that were found around the time of the English Civil War in the 1600s, it is plausible the institution was conceived very differently in comparison to modern history.

Dew thus, quite literally, *frames* his argument to appear discursively courant. That is, in addition to the spiritual side, there is *ipso facto* a strategically obscuring side to his argument. Derrida has explored the workings of such framing most thoroughly in Kant's aesthetics as deconstruction of aesthetics.⁸⁵⁹ Historians and materialists have neglected these insights though they enable culture criticism. The value of them is in their ability to reach beyond ideology to ontology to examine "the material and historical forces that are continually transforming representational practices and aesthetic experience." Derrida examines critically the inverse ratio between (historical) ontology of the body and de-ontologized (idealist) history of the mind. It can be extended to understand "how assertions of the autonomy and universality of the aesthetic become ever more strident as representational practices become increasingly dominated by patterns of consumption and exchange governed by the logic of commodities and the emergence of a mass public."⁸⁶⁰ The relevance of Derrida's argument for me at present is in avoidance of material, ideal, and ideal-historical reductionism instead of ontological concerns and in its performative critique of the public sphere. Given the anomalous situation of southerners to these, it can be used as a tool to deconstruct the framing. But interestingly, such a framing in Dew operates more as a chiasm in comparison to Kant: in Dew, it is less a question of encasing southerners *from* discourse, away from history, economics and politics, and more a question of establishing southern slavery—mapping it as culture—as an integral *part of* that

⁸⁵⁶ Davis, *Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*, 264-65.

⁸⁵⁷ Debbie Jean Lee, "Slavery and English Romanticism," (PhD diss., *The University of Arizona*, 1997), 121.

⁸⁵⁸ Davis, *Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*, 45.

⁸⁵⁹ Derrida, "The Parergon," in *idem.*, *The Truth in Painting*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago: *The University of Chicago Press*, 1987), 37-82; *idem.*, "Economimesis," *Diacritics 11* (1981a), *The Ghost of Theology: Readings of Kant and Hegel*, 2-25.

⁸⁶⁰ D. N. Rodowick, *Reading the Figural, Or, Philosophy after the New Media*, *Post-Contemporary interventions series* (Durham: *Duke University Press*, 2001), 110.

very discourse, selling the South out, sealing the deal. Critically though, ontological critique is still valid in the performance.

The above three figurations act “as a supplement from the lack—a certain ‘internal’ indetermination” in the very thing framed.⁸⁶¹ Southern culture is incoherent, lacks coherence, and thus lacks form. Repose, security and confidence, the equilibrium between reason and imagination, had for a time been destroyed by Turner.⁸⁶² Dew’s work sought to put matters to rest by applying the formalist ontology of modern history. Framing functions as a sort of sign-posting that arrests this lack, regulates the content by hiding but by revealing it as lack as well. What is within is an idealistic unity which, by definition, simultaneously lacks and needs frames.⁸⁶³ Because the interior is grounded in form, it is grounded in a) God as formality, purity, propriety and inside against materiality, impurity, impropriety, outside (Kant’s aesthetics and Dew’s communion), b) reason (Enlightenment, Idealism), and c) philosophy of history. These try to hide the framing is a framing. It seals off by formal control, but also walls up. The point of Derrida’s deconstruction is this framing is inseparable from the interior as a more haphazard figurative production, rather than some inherent mechanical or teleological law or harmony in a formal sense. A consequence of this insight is “a certain repeated dislocation, a regulated, irrepressible dislocation, which makes the frame in general crack, undoes it at the corners in its quoins and joints, turns its internal limit into an external limit, takes its thickness into account, makes us see the picture from the side of the canvas or the wood, etc.”⁸⁶⁴ That is, Dew’s framing was a violent operation ontologically. Its seeing as violence is itself violent, not as annihilation but as ethics.

In Kant, this ontological violence meant repression of *enjoyment* (*Genuss*), “the art of conversation, jest, laughter, gaiety, simple-minded entertainment, irresponsible gossip around the table, the art of serving, the management of music during the meal, party games, etc.” that “involves an empirical sensibility, includes a kernel of incommunicable sensation.”⁸⁶⁵ Enjoyment was ontologically reprehensible, because it was about the senses with which to consume *in actuality without ideality*.⁸⁶⁶ Instead, Kant preferred *pleasure* (*Lust*) that has no such non-purposive, non-refined function. Pleasure is production free for itself, art for art’s sake, *and simultaneously* a part of the social whole as communication and mental culture. It is social and universally communicable, something that only goes on in the mind of a free individual as intersubjectively shared reflection.⁸⁶⁷ It is not to be found in contingent sense perceptions that only eat and drink, but in the feeling for the beautiful in nature, not in the too scheming oratory or rhetoric, but in poetry.⁸⁶⁸ This latter preference is close to Blair southerners had incorporated (chapter 2),

⁸⁶¹ Derrida, *Truth in Painting*, 71.

⁸⁶² Dew, *Review*, 8.

⁸⁶³ Derrida, *Truth in Painting*, 59-60.

⁸⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 73-74, citation on 74.

⁸⁶⁵ *idem.*, “*Economimesis*,” 8.

⁸⁶⁶ *ibid.*, 16.

⁸⁶⁷ *ibid.*, 8.

⁸⁶⁸ *ibid.*, 16, 17.

which makes Kant a romantic aesthetically. But the distinctive point is that up to now, southerners had *not* underplayed enjoyment, because they had not made such a (modern, capitalist) dichotomy between the two. But Kant's position was not only followed by Dew in an existential sense, it also was strongly reminiscent of Fisher (chapter 4) and shared by, for example, New Englander Rowland Gibson Hazard.

Hazard's treatise on language, published in 1836, was much admired by Unitarian Channing and transcendentalist Massachusetts educator Elizabeth Palmer Peabody. In his version of attack on the Lockean theory of language, Hazard distinguished between *persuasion* that was only narration or abstraction, and *conviction*, the language of ideality and religion. Conviction was superior of the two, because it was grounded in ideals that were eternal. It both nurtured and enabled faith as a communion with omniscience. This enabled, similar to Emerson, the poet to emerge as a liberator.⁸⁶⁹ Apparently, Hazard shared with Kant the negative aspect of rhetoric. This had ontological implications that, I claim, bear on southerners negatively.

Although Dew did not fully dispense with enjoyment, the usual but little researched way of communal existing in Virginia and South Carolina (chapter 2), his idealism and framing nevertheless took steps towards that direction as figural operations. It shows, for example, when he talks about romantic love but grants that men have "harsher tempers and more restless propensities . . . that savage and brutal feeling" female love as reflection and cultivation then smoothens. Dew, closely following neohumanism (chapter 2), extends such a romance as having existed already in Antiquity.⁸⁷⁰ Thus he renders the critical, ironic, more humanistic and more secular WW take on romance irrelevant for his idealist-bourgeois discussion. Similarly, though he grants eating—one of the non-reflective modes of existing Kant disliked but southerners enjoyed as sensuality—is a sign of hard work and prosperity in a Lockean sense, he still spends considerable amount of energy in a discussion that connects eating with savage, un-civilized society.⁸⁷¹ Thus he petrifies, materially pre-empts and rhetorically obscures these dimensions of southern existence. Wirt had begun the flirting with Romanticism in his *Letters* (chapter 2). In them, the anonymous condition of the speaker made a similar move towards discourse and, thereby, away from bodily presence. As Derrida notes in case of Rousseau's similar strategy, "the operation that substitutes writing for speech also replaces presence by value: to the *I am* or to the *I am present* thus sacrificed, a *what I am* or a *what I am worth* is preferred . . . I renounce my present life, my present and concrete existence in order to make myself known in the ideality of truth and value."⁸⁷² But since Dew rejects rhetoric as a problem at least in public, he goes much farther toward idealist history than WAE Wirt did.

In sum, though the "Review" is a very important pioneering piece of southern cultural historical discourse, we have to remember its multidimensional character, its function, and

⁸⁶⁹ Gura, "Elizabeth Palmer Peabody and the Philosophy of Language," repr. in *idem.*, *Crossroads of American History and Literature*, 179-80.

⁸⁷⁰ Dew, *Review*, 36-37.

⁸⁷¹ *ibid.*, 30, 25, 12 and notes.

⁸⁷² Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 142, *emphasis original*.

the figural and metaphysical, not just the ideological, sides, as well as the context of the author.

5.3 Dew and southern history: “The Digest”

In this section, I shall examine Dew’s lecture notes on history. First, I shall attempt to contextualize them as history. I shall claim the notes represent another paradox compared to European models about history. Further, their episteme is anomalous. Their anomalous character is in that they embrace a cosmopolitan theory of society that little existed in contemporary Virginia. A second anomaly is there is so little American nationalism about the work although the 1830s was the boom decade of nationalism (chapter 4). Next, I shall isolate the German aspects of the work that are quite strong as well. Importantly, Dew strongly sides with the Germans and northern historians rather than the language-oriented southern tradition. Regarding the Germans this shows in two ways: the mixture of German Idealism and Catholic revival Dew strongly endorsed and the Whiggery Dew likewise endorsed that ignored all criticism about liberalism as history many other southerners, especially Virginians, knew about. Dew is strongly a northern–German creature about history in comparison to his peers in terms of historical figuration and philosophy. This presents a great leap from what had been, at most, historism (chapters 2, 3, 4) to far more historicist, idealist and social scientific notions that ultimately tie Dew up with SAE and transcendentalist arguments. In practice, Dew badly distorts his own sources to construct such metaphysics of history. I shall end by considering what such distorting entailed for southern political philosophy. Especially, I shall look at how Dew deals with Sparta and Athens compared to Jefferson and political discourse he endorsed, and how Dew wraps around the ancients his Federalist and modern history biases by producing history as politics filtered through Federalist distortions.

5.3.1 Locating “The Digest”

In addition to the “Review,” Dew was a pioneer as a philosopher of history. He stated “on more than one occasion that he confined himself mainly to the philosophy of history.”⁸⁷³ Naturally, I cannot cover the whole book. Instead I will restrict myself to an analysis of some of its figural, metaphysical and discursive elements. These notes were widely influential as well: in their book form, they were perhaps the most thorough analysis of history in America at least until the late–1840s and in print even in the 1890s.⁸⁷⁴ Washington states in the 1853 preface that historical compendia were getting obsolete, but neither is the purpose of the work originality, and especially modern history books were

⁸⁷³ Mansfield, “Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary,” 433.

⁸⁷⁴ Bryan, Thomas Roderick Dew, 9.

lacking in southern education.⁸⁷⁵ This would indicate the continued preference of the classics and the possibility that the boom for modern history in the 1840s Callcott reported (chapter 4) had affected the South less. On the one hand, a stated wariness about romantic originality and an unwillingness to take Voltaire's step and just reject the compendium format by opting to modify it from within attest to a lingering reluctance to adopt the novel and romance format for history (chapter 3). Elsewhere, this had become the norm decades before. But on the other hand, the book's interests, *a digest* containing laws, customs, manners, institutions, and civilization of ancient and modern nations, are clearly within the boundaries of cosmopolitan history (chapter 3) and in this respect present a continuum to the "Review."⁸⁷⁶ O'Brien has noted this guardedness about Romanticism.⁸⁷⁷ More particularly, I would characterize the work as having *the cosmopolitan ideal* embodied in the work of Franklin, Voltaire and Hume and subscribed to by Crèvecoeur (chapter 3). Dew shared many characteristics with this group, such as a powerful emphasis on economic individualism and a strongly bourgeois ethos. Voltaire and Hume saw the merchant as the cosmopolitan.⁸⁷⁸ But interesting for my purposes is also the almost equal attention paid to the ancients and the moderns.⁸⁷⁹ This is something internationally peculiar for the time, because neither cosmopolitan history nor German historians went to such great lengths in maintaining so close equilibrium between the two. French cosmopolitan historians, though versed with the classics, were "transparently pleased" at having overcome the ancients.⁸⁸⁰ Neither was there similar equilibrium across the channel in Hume, Gibbon or Robertson, the first and third focusing on modern history, the second

⁸⁷⁵ Anonymous [Henry A. Washington], *preface to A Digest of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations*, by Thomas Roderick Dew, (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853), iii-iv. *That Washington is the author is established in Mansfield, "Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary," 433n16.*

⁸⁷⁶ "On examination, it will be found that more than ordinary labor has been expended upon it [i.e., the work]; and that the author has proceeded upon higher principles, and has had higher aims in view than compilers ordinarily propose to themselves. Instead of being, like most historical compendiums, a mere catalogue of events, chronologically arranged, it is a careful, laborious, and instructive digest of the laws, customs, manners, institutions, and civilization of the ancient and modern nations." *Washington, introduction, iii. On originality, see ibid.*

⁸⁷⁷ CO2, 609.

⁸⁷⁸ Schlereth, *Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*, 101, 103, cited in Poulsen, "Schlereth."

⁸⁷⁹ *The book contains an almost equal balance between ancient and modern times, with 320 pages devoted to ancient history, including history outside Greece and Rome, and 342 pages devoted to modern history beginning from feudalism and ending with reflections on the French Revolution. More specifically, Greece and Rome dominate in the ancient category, with only 38 pages to everything outside them. Of the modern section, English constitutional history is the most dominant with 111 pages, followed by the French Revolution, 90 pages.*

⁸⁸⁰ Bentley, "Introduction: Approaches to Modernity: Western Historiography since the Enlightenment," in *idem.*, *Companion to Historiography*, 384.

on Rome.⁸⁸¹ Dew cites Voltaire the most of the French historians, and Hume is his most used author with more than fifty mentions or citations. Dew's preference for Hume parallels that of his northern-born predecessor, Episcopalian Reverend Reuel Keith of Vermont and later Columbia, who had used Hume in his history lectures between 1821 and 1822 after which they had been discontinued.⁸⁸² My point is, so direct an application of Hume to attain a cosmopolitan ideal had not been presented in Virginia historiography previously, though he was a familiar author about political and social discourse and skepticism (chapter 2). Therefore, the work contained *a serious update of the public sphere* (5.3.4), because Hume had not subverted its more ancient dynamic (chapter 2). However, such application ironically represents a similar conundrum as the framing of the "Review." In other words, how to reconcile such "ultramodern" individualism with southern society?

5.3.2 Ties to Idealism and German philosophy of history

No major enlightened historian in Göttingen or Berlin paid much simultaneous attention to the ancients and the moderns.⁸⁸³ On the German side at first glance, Dew seems to have made little headway beyond Humboldt and particularly Heeren, the source of Bancroft (chapter 3). However, Dew's attachment to the Germans that extended to northern historians—unlike the critics in his context—is eminent.

First, Heeren is a figure only second to Hume in popularity. Second, Dew draws comparatively heavily from classical philologist August Böckh (or Boeckh) who mentored Bancroft.⁸⁸⁴ Importantly for my purposes, in a notion that derived from Humboldt—another Dew favorite—Böckh extended theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher's "warm" hermeneutics to cover an entire culture, not just individual text.⁸⁸⁵ This exhibits the slow German turn to idealism, mysticism and subjectivism in philosophy, epistemology and aesthetics in relation to history. Böckh's student Droysen was at the same time a student of Hegel. Droysen was perhaps the most Hegelian of this genealogy of German historians in the turn from philological investigations towards Idealism.⁸⁸⁶ As we have seen, northerners were also familiar with these trends, but beyond the comparatively different F. Schlegel, southerners remained more cautious (chapters 2, 3, 4). The case of Bancroft resembled that of Droysen: Bancroft was also a student of both Böckh and Hegel (chapter

⁸⁸¹ *ibid.*, 386-89.

⁸⁸² Mansfield, "Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary," 432n13, "Famous Americans: Virtual American Biographies," accessed November 8, 2013. <http://famousamericans.net/reuelkeith/>

⁸⁸³ Bentley, "Introduction," 390-91.

⁸⁸⁴ Peter N. Miller, "Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences," in *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, ed. Peter N. Miller, *UCLA Clark Memorial Library series* (Toronto: The Regents of the University of California, 2007), 24; Breisach, *Historiography*, 256.

⁸⁸⁵ Miller, "Introduction," 37.

⁸⁸⁶ *ibid.*, 38.

3). These connections would illuminate my thesis about a stronger Hegelianism and a tendency to Idealism in the North. But they likewise suggest Dew is relatively isolated in historical thinking from his surroundings. Paradoxically, he nevertheless stands in an influential position. I will return to this question below.

Third, Dew had strong interest in the originally German field of *ethnography*—he is among the first in the world to apply the word.⁸⁸⁷ This derives partly from Heeren, since Heeren combined a more anthropological approach to history with a hierarchical race theory that had already been endorsed in New England (chapters 2, 3).⁸⁸⁸ Fourth, what has gone unnoticed is the mysterious shorthand “W.” Dew appeals to “W.” plentifully, 48 times in total, surpassed only by Hume and Heeren who between them are cited almost a hundred times. These “Ws” refer to three different but for my purposes illuminating scholars: German historian Wilhelm Wachsmuth, Irish expat cosmopolite, Roman Catholic Cardinal in England and ultimately the first archbishop of Westminster, Nicholas Wiseman⁸⁸⁹ and British clergyman, traveler and church historian George Waddington. Especially the two first connect Dew with Germany.

Wachsmuth remains little researched figure especially in English language historiography or historical theory.⁸⁹⁰ Wachsmuth was among the pioneers who departed from seeing history as a mere auxiliary science attached to specific interests. These interests, we recall, were responses to more anti-Scholastic Pyrrhonism (chapter 2). They tried to evade skepticism about history, they were church historical in the Reformation controversies, and they covered, in their auxiliary function, law studies. Antiquarianism was the common nominator.⁸⁹¹ I argue the antiquarian tradition treated history very conservatively but, following Momigliano, I claim the legal auxiliary approach to history could be pyrrhonist, not antiquarian, an important distinction for me (chapter 6).⁸⁹² Wachsmuth was a pioneer in cultural history as situated between antiquarianism and more anthropological approaches.⁸⁹³ Still, Wachsmuth was not yet a social historian of

⁸⁸⁷ Brian Spooner, “Ethnography,” accessed November 3, 2013, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ethnography-I>. Spooner notes the word appeared in the 1830s based on German use of “race.”

⁸⁸⁸ For example, Dew, *A Digest*, 9-10. However, Dew ignores nationalistic conclusions from such ethnographic-linguistic observations.

⁸⁸⁹ Salvador Miranda, “The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church: Biographical Dictionary,” accessed November 6, 2013, <http://www2.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1850.htm#Wiseman>.

⁸⁹⁰ Momigliano, “Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography,” 153; Horst Walter Blanke, Dirk Fleischer, and Jörn Rüsen, “Theory of History in Historical Lectures: The German Tradition of Historik, 1750–1900,” *History and Theory* 23 (1984): 338; Miller, “Introduction,” 38, 41.

⁸⁹¹ Blanke et al., “Theory of History in Historical Lectures,” 336-37. On Wachsmuth, see *ibid.*, 338. Breisach defines Pyrrhonism as “a radical skepticism named after the ancient philosopher Pyrrho of Elis, which despaired of the human ability to gain any certain knowledge either through reason or the senses.” Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), 191. All future references to this edition.

⁸⁹² Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” 296.

⁸⁹³ Miller, “Introduction,” 38.

Antiquity by way of Karl Otfried Müller who “aimed at no less than ‘the knowledge of man in antiquity’ and portrayed how the Greek state was shaped by demographic, environmental, military, commercial, political, artistic, and intellectual forces and was constantly in flux.”⁸⁹⁴ Müller criticized Wachsmuth for being too philological without historicism conceived in this sense.⁸⁹⁵

Given that Wachsmuth was not a very idealistic historian along the German continuum of history from philology to Hegel,⁸⁹⁶ it is strange that Dew—heavily immersed in Idealism as I shall explain—draws relatively heavily on Wachsmuth. His less theoretical *Hellenische Altertumskunde* had become available in English in 1837.

Perhaps since Dew had more idealist sympathies, he returns to systematic distortion of intellectual positions that is revealing for my argument, this time more forcibly. First, he appeals to Wachsmuth as contending that Greek comedian Aristophanes harbored anti-Spartan feelings.⁸⁹⁷ But the context in Wachsmuth concerns the changes for the worse among different classes of Athenian society after the onset of plague by offering a comparison of knights and laconists. Wachsmuth immediately adds: “Still, the upright and patriotic citizens, Kalokagathoi [members of the Spartan aristocracy], were not even yet wholly extinct.”⁸⁹⁸ In other words, Wachsmuth’s Aristophanes, contrary to what Dew claims, is not acerbic to Sparta.⁸⁹⁹ Second, after Spartans kill an Athenian herald just before the war between Athens and Sparta, Wachsmuth reports that the Athenians passed a decree that “breathed the most implacable hostility”. Dew tells the Athenians “of course” declared war.⁹⁰⁰ Dew leaves out Wachsmuth’s more sympathetic assessment that the Spartans were not normally like that and that the allies to Athens had also committed outrages.⁹⁰¹ Third, Dew vilifies the Spartans further by leaving out their motives to enslave these allies, and he even leaves out the regret they felt afterwards for having done so.⁹⁰² Fourth, he omits from Wachsmuth that Athenians executed Aeginetans, Scioneans and Melians and that Athenians plotted to massacre Mytileneans and ended up killing 1,000 Spartan prisoners.⁹⁰³ Fifth, he ignores Wachsmuth’s disclaimer that the pardoning by Conon, an Athenian admiral, of a prestigious prisoner was “amongst the very rare

⁸⁹⁴ Breisach, *Historiography*, 230.

⁸⁹⁵ Miller, “Introduction,” 40-41.

⁸⁹⁶ *ibid.*, 37.

⁸⁹⁷ “Aristophanes speaks of this portion [of Laconists or radical admirers of Sparta] as chiefly fops, who aped the dress and manners of the Spartans; swaggering bullies, with coats, sticks and mustaches.” Dew, *A Digest*, 192.

⁸⁹⁸ Wilhelm Wachsmuth, *The Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, Volume II, trans. Edmund Woolrych (Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1837), §64, 189-94, citation on 194.

⁸⁹⁹ On Aristophanes’s mildness on Sparta see also David Harvey, “Laconomica: Aristophanes and the Spartans,” in *The Shadow of Sparta*, eds. Steven Hodkinson and Anton Powell (London: Routledge, 1994), 35-58.

⁹⁰⁰ Dew, *A Digest*, 193; Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, 2, 182.

⁹⁰¹ *ibid.*, 182-83.

⁹⁰² Dew, *A Digest*, 193; Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, 2, 183.

⁹⁰³ Dew, *A Digest*, 193; Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, 2, 183-84.

instances of humanity” and that he had fallen prisoner after he was exiled by Athenians, but does remember to include from Wachsmuth atrocities committed to the Athenians. Sixth, he omits the killing of Spartan ambassadors to Persia upon delivery to Athens by Athenians and misconduct of an Athenian military commander.⁹⁰⁴ Seventh, Dew omits the decrease of Athenian morals and increase of Athenian corruption.⁹⁰⁵

As I will elaborate below, even Wachsmuth himself is not anti-Spartan, which indicates the intellectual differences between Dew and Wachsmuth I pointed out. I shall argue this partiality against Sparta by citing badly out of context is related to Dew’s own metaphysical framework as well. Save for two footnotes by formidable academic classicist and philosopher of history George Frederick Holmes (chapter 6) in 1850, Wachsmuth remained completely outside the pages of the *Messenger*.⁹⁰⁶ Almost all the references to Wachsmuth in the leading southern journals come from Holmes.

Much more prevalent references in Dew are to Nicholas Wiseman. Possibly, Dew thus inadvertently helped establish *creationism* in the U.S. Wiseman was an extreme case of “how science and religion supported one another, [and how] new clerical ideas enable religion to base itself on science, and vice versa.”⁹⁰⁷ Wiseman’s personal history of attaining powerful positions young was remarkably similar to Dew’s. A Doctor of Divinity at twenty-two with special interest in the natural sciences and dogmatic and scholastic theology, supernumerary professor of Hebrew and Syro-Chaldaic at the Sapienza University of Rome at twenty-five, and Rector of the English College at twenty-six, Wiseman hoped to bring England under Catholic unity once more. His high watermark as an intellectual were the *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion*⁹⁰⁸ delivered in Rome in 1835 and published in two volumes in 1836. These lectures were written while Wiseman’s plans for Catholic unity were in progress.⁹⁰⁹ However, Wiseman’s religious or metaphysical context was insular if not ostracized, because Catholics were pretty much outcasts in British society. Yet, Wiseman played a key role in reintroducing the Catholic faith to England.⁹¹⁰ Similarly, I argue that Dew sought to metaphysically idealise and unify the Virginians’ and southerners’ thought about history. After all, it was nothing extraordinary: fellow Episcopalian Cushing had

⁹⁰⁴ *ibid.*; Dew, *A Digest*, 193.

⁹⁰⁵ *ibid.*; Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, 2, 185.

⁹⁰⁶ Anonymous [George Frederick Holmes], “[Review:] *Observations on a Passage in the Politics of Aristotle Relative to Slavery*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 16 (1850): 194 notes ¶ and §. That the author is Holmes is established in Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 191n42.

⁹⁰⁷ Maurice Olender, “*Europe, or How to Escape Babel*,” *History and Theory* 33 (1994): 9. Also *ibid.*, 13n.

⁹⁰⁸ Oswald Hunter-Blair, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume XV (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912), entry for “Nicholas Patrick Wiseman,” accessed November 7, 2013, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/15670a.htm>.

⁹⁰⁹ *ibid.*

⁹¹⁰ Lawrence F. Barmann, “[Review:] Nicholas Wiseman and the Transformation of English Catholicism,” *Church History* 54 (1985): 423-24.

operated the same way in his own rhetoric about history.⁹¹¹ In Dew, this metaphysical reorientation had been constructed around slavery as I explored above. Despite isolation, Dew's, like Wiseman's, vision began to gain more followers towards the mid-1830s.

Importantly for me, Wiseman was much drawn to the connection between Idealism and Christianity found in several prominent Germans such as Ranke, the Schlegels and Novalis among others as a critique of Protestant reason. This critique, as Wiseman saw it, grafted reason onto *culture* as literature, philosophy and art, safely away from its pagan implications. A cultured reason represented a better and more fruitful alternative that included the important sphere of history.⁹¹² It was this turn southerners were having trouble with in history, seeing it pantheist and semiotically, metaphysically and politically problematic, but the turn was not in conflict with the liberal element in Dew and the northerners' German reception (chapter 2). Such a notion of culture became a master concept under the aegis of which heterogeneous individuals had to submit. These differences had previously been seen either as spontaneous manifestations of the diversity of the human race or as part of a pre-ordained godly plan. But now, like plants in a garden, people were expected to healthily and tidily grow into a single unity of a nation as a result of both humanely and divinely appointed gardeners. Such "culture" had to do with autonomous and self-regulating nation-states historically and ideologically.⁹¹³ Its implications reached to ontology and semiotics in history in conflicting ways in the southern context as I have attempted to point out: nationalism was not just about politics.⁹¹⁴ This problem of culture would illuminate the prevalence in the South of greatly differing social theories and existence about history.

Ironically in this sense, Wiseman's hold on Dew was significant. To illustrate, we can look at the way Dew uses Wiseman. At first glance puzzling in Dew's Wiseman citations is that the page numbers in the references are widely off the mark.⁹¹⁵ In one instance, he

⁹¹¹ Cushing, "President Cushing's Address," 11.

⁹¹² Wilfrid Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, Volume I, *New ed.* (New York: Longman's, 1912): 135-37.

⁹¹³ Bannet, *Postcultural Theory*, 182-84.

⁹¹⁴ Foucault, "Truth and Power," repr. in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, Volume III, ed. James D. Faubion, trans. Robert Hurley et al., (London: Penguin, 2002): 122-23.

⁹¹⁵ For example, in Dew's first reference to Wiseman's *Lectures* he gives 178 as page number, while in the first edition, this information is on pages 297-98 and in the second on page 194. Dew, *A Digest*, 4-5, *Nicholas Wiseman*, *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion*, Volume I (London: Joseph Booker, 1836), 297-98; *idem.*, *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion*, Volume I, 2nd. ed. (London: Charles Dolman, 1842), 194. Given that Dew finished the lecture notes around 1841 or 1842 as O'Brien contended, it is unlikely he used the second edition. The next reference is to page 183, while the correct page number would be 306. The next is to page 194 while the correct number is 326. He covers in one page (198) what in Wiseman takes five pages to cover (328-33), jumps a page (199) while Wiseman moves two (335), and then moves two pages (201) while Wiseman moves four (339). Dew cites page 69 for what appears on page 90, 33 for what appears on pages 42-43, page 58 for what appears on

attributes things to Wiseman that considered together even cannot be located at all in him.⁹¹⁶ But the more common discrepancies have to do with page numbers, not content. For example, Dew gives only a page of difference (from page 193 to page 194) to what is covered in a wholly different lecture (from page 306 to page 326). One possibility is a deliberate fraud, digestion of history in the belly where things get mixed up in any case as my grandmother used to say. However, a more likely but very intriguing explanation is suggested by Wiseman. In Rome, he had delivered the lectures during the Lent (Catholic Easter) of 1835 in much shortened form “to a large and select attendance in the apartments of His Eminence Cardinal Weld.” Wiseman had had to add to some sections and subtract from and simplify others, because his audience was unfamiliar with the topic. He made these changes in writing, but he never published the lectures in that form: that is why he came to England where another editing process awaited.⁹¹⁷ He never delivered the lectures again in public before the publication. So, either Dew was present at the lectures in Rome, or Wiseman was gracious enough to copy by hand his own lecture notes to Dew or to Dew’s associate(s), which would prove Dew had very privileged contacts to Wiseman or his close associates. Still, though the room was packed and attended by select Europe’s elite, including Germans and some scholars,⁹¹⁸ Wiseman’s most thorough biographer makes no mention of him ever copying his personal lecture notes—that ran into hundreds of pages—by hand for any purpose, nor is Dew anywhere mentioned. Given that the references by Dew to Wiseman are highly accurate, it seems unlikely they were furnished from Dew’s personal notes. A third possibility is some exclusive edition of these notes, but this would again point to Dew’s very select connection to Wiseman or his associate(s) since even Ward makes no mention of it. In this study, I have not had access to the Dew papers. In them, three “transcriptions” of letters exist that cover 1835 and 1836.⁹¹⁹ However, I assume they have already been investigated. In any case, the letters would have to be very long ones if they covered the lectures so thoroughly. For my purposes sufficient is to mark this considerable interest of Dew in Catholic English revival in/as his philosophy of history and its German dimension.

That Wiseman was absorbed in German theories was no secret in the South among the few who knew about his work besides Dew. For instance Baptist scholar J. L. Reynolds who spent most of his intellectual energies in South Carolina pointed out Wiseman’s

page 88 and page 60 for what appears on pages 90-91. Dew, A Digest, 6, 7, 9-10, Wiseman, Twelve Lectures, 1, 306, 326, 328-33, 335, 339, 90, 42-43, 88, 90-91.

⁹¹⁶ Dew refers to page 290 in Wiseman when the argument he presents comes from British historian Sharon Turner. Dew, *A Digest*, 8; Sharon Turner, *The Sacred History of the World, Volume II, Harper’s Family Library series Volume 72 (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835), 250-51.*

⁹¹⁷ Wiseman, *preface to Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion, Volume I, by Nicholas Wiseman, v-vii, citation on v.*

⁹¹⁸ Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman, 1, 132-34.*

⁹¹⁹ <http://ead.lib.virginia.edu/vivaead/published/wm/viw00066.document>, accessed November 8, 2013.

heavily German tint.⁹²⁰ Importantly for me (chapter 6), Holmes knew about Wiseman's scholarship as well.⁹²¹ Striking is Dew's remarkable appreciation of Wiseman. It is unique in southern context. No other scholar in Virginia or South Carolina appreciated the cardinal to this depth to my knowledge. Indeed, very few even mention him. The next follower of Wiseman was New England-born-and-educated fellow-Episcopalian Moses Ashley Curtis.⁹²² Ironically in regard to creationism as well, even the marginal Josiah Nott, whose history ethos was among the most scientific in the South,⁹²³ heavily criticized both Curtis, who preferred Wiseman to Nott, and Wiseman. Early on, Nott was puzzled that Curtis should appeal to Wiseman's questionable scholarship. Nott would continue to criticize Wiseman in several articles.⁹²⁴ This perhaps gives some further idea how distant Wiseman, and by implication Dew, really were from southern mainstream since even Nott was marginal as a historical thinker. After a long gap, the next and pretty much the only other scholar who was even lukewarm to Wiseman in the major southern journals was proslavery Unitarian pastor Charles Manson Taggart. Taggart lived in Pennsylvania until his early twenties and finally came to Charleston after several years in the West. But Taggart's praise was faint and more upset by criticism.⁹²⁵ Excluding a brief

⁹²⁰ Anonymous [J. L. Reynolds], "[Review:] Roman Literature," *Southern Quarterly Review* 10 (1846): 352 note. That the author is Reynolds is claimed in Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 683n8.

⁹²¹ Anonymous [George Frederick Holmes], "Rome and the Romans," *Southern Quarterly Review* 6 (1844): 271 note *. That the author is Holmes is maintained in CO2, 1232.

⁹²² See especially Anonymous [Moses Ashley Curtis], "[Review:] Unity of the Races," *Southern Quarterly Review* 7 (1845): 372-84. That the author is Curtis is maintained in CO1, 244.

⁹²³ See chapter 3, note 372.

⁹²⁴ Josiah C. Nott, "An Issue with the Reviewer of Nott's 'Caucasian and Negro Races'," *Southern Quarterly Review* 8 (1845): 148-90; *idem.*, "Unity of the Human Race," *Southern Quarterly Review* 9 (1846): 1-57, esp. 24-25, 28-29. That Nott is the author is maintained in CO1, 245n86. Nott believes Wiseman is too gullible to have faith in Biblical proverbs. Nott, "Ancient and Scripture Chronology," *Southern Quarterly Review, new series*, 2 (1850): 400-1. That the author is Nott is maintained in Terry A. Barnhart, *Ephraim George Squier and the Development of American Anthropology*, *Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology series* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 399n32. In 1853 Nott proclaims Wiseman outdated—ironically the year Dew's notes came out. Nott, "Aboriginal Races of America," *Southern Quarterly Review, new series*, 8 (1853): 78. That the author is Nott is maintained in Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 190n39. Curiously, O'Brien seems to miss the alliance between Curtis and Wiseman. Instead, he juxtaposes religious truth as being inferior to scientific truth in Nott's view, and calls Curtis's critical review of Nott "clever" because it was a criticism of Nott's scientism. His argument, if I understand it right, is the Episcopalians were critical of scientific endeavors. However, the issue is more complex as I have attempted to explain. CO1, 243-45.

⁹²⁵ Anonymous [Charles Manson Taggart], "The Diversity and Origin of Human Races," *Southern Quarterly Review, new series*, 4 (1851): 458-80. The Genoveses identify the author as Taggart. Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 605n36. John H. Heywood, *Memoir*, in *idem.*, *Sermons by Charles Manson Taggart: With a Memoir* (Boston: Crosby, Nichols

mention by lawyer William Archer Cocke, a student of Dew, Wiseman stayed fully out of the pages of the *Messenger*.⁹²⁶ Nott had considered Wiseman outdated years before.

Importantly, though, Taggart's more extensive discussion indicates Wiseman's idealism as liberalism was what loosely united Unitarians and Episcopalians. My point is despite Dew, aversion to German thought and its metaphysical and political commitment was still common in Virginia history. Applying these in linguistics through Wiseman, Dew followed the SAE transition from Locke to idealism—questionable as philosophy of history for great many southerners (chapters 2, 3)—as a link between ethnography and linguistics. The point was to confirm the Old Testament as the truth.⁹²⁷ According to this neoplatonic argument, natural science and linguistics confirmed the Bible and the existence of races originally in unity. However, since even SAE was questioned, the majority of southerners disagreed: the argument was lacking in skepticism (chapters 2, 3).

Semiotically, this structure could easily accommodate the transcendentalist views about language that emerged among Boston educators at the time Dew was lecturing. They contended that “the seemingly fragmented nineteenth century had more unity to it than many had come to suppose.” With the help of such esoteric language education, it would be possible to return to pre-Babelian times when all could speak the same Christian language.⁹²⁸ Thus for instance Elizabeth Palmer Peabody had no trouble commending Wiseman in her post-Civil War publication related to education.⁹²⁹ Peabody was among the pioneers to mix, like Marsh and Emerson (chapter 3), German Idealism with Swedenborgian mysticism. By the mid-1830s, Peabody was expressing romantic views about poetry as primary after reading Johann Gottfried von Herder.⁹³⁰ The same argument was already found in Blair, Wirt had flashed it, and Kant had adopted it. But in Peabody's case, the result was *not* irony or criticism regarding knowledge, like in the gentlemen. To the contrary, she had confidence in the subject's ability to grasp this original unity as “the interaction of Reason with Nature,” that is, “the common origin of all men's thoughts in nature's reflection of the Oversoul.” This would pertain to brotherhood of man—expression familiar to Lomax (chapter 4) and borrowed by Curtis as well. It transcended politics⁹³¹ as Neoplatonism, and the whole natural, dangerously pagan, dirty, immoral empirical—world many Virginians, nevertheless, still preferred. Peabody, like Emerson, considered transcendentalism a linguistically realist language, because it had re-attained the natural

& Co., 1856), n.p. [ix], xviii. Taggart experienced a similar turn away from Calvinism to many other prominent Unitarians in the North (chapter 3). For him, even Presbyterianism was not suitable. *ibid.*, xiv, xvi.

⁹²⁶ William Archer Cocke, “[Review:] *Types of Mankind*,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 21 (1855): 24. “E-book: *The History of Jefferson County*,” accessed November 4, 2013, <http://digitalhistoryproject.pbworks.com/w/page/23768020/7%20Prominent%20Men>.

⁹²⁷ Wiseman, *Twelve Lectures*, 1, 10; Dew, *A Digest*, 9.

⁹²⁸ Gura, *Wisdom of Words*, 9. See also chapter 3.

⁹²⁹ Elizabeth P. Peabody, *The Identification of Artisan and Artist* (Boston: Adams, 1869).

⁹³⁰ Gura, “*Elizabeth Palmer Peabody and the Philosophy of Language*,” 174, 176-77.

⁹³¹ *ibid.*, 178.

unity as metaphor: the ladder of metaphor could be thrown away after climbing it.⁹³² She adopted these views in practice in education that continued to prefer things over words which led to anti-empirical, anti-corporeal conclusions⁹³³ close to Emerson.

This was absurd from a southern point of view. In all probability, close association of Dew with such a strongly Catholic revolutionary and controversial figure as Wiseman would have raised eyebrows or even caused a scandal, especially since the period witnessed a wildly anti-Catholic wave of literature.⁹³⁴ As a rule, southerners and southern planters stood opposed to the Catholic Church, even in their travels to the Continent, though they eschewed contact with northern churches in their travels to the North as well.⁹³⁵ Most Catholics—a small minority in America—were northerners, and Baltimore was their “Rome.” Their organizing in 1860 was seen by the majority as antithetical to nativism, which led to their increased self-consciousness of isolation. However, the church had its supporters, even in the South. The most relevant for me is Holmes, who focused solely on Catholic authors in the 1850s. Further, intellectual ties existed between Catholics and Protestants in the South.⁹³⁶

Dew’s application of Wiseman in theories about history and language made Dew stand close to such strands of northern opinion. Dew thus sought to synthesize religion and philosophy with science and history. Holmes was wary of the mix, but at the same time tried to painstakingly *reconcile* German Idealism with religion in history (chapter 6).⁹³⁷

⁹³² *ibid.* This argument was followed up by Boston linguist Mary Lowell Putnam in 1849. *ibid.*, 185.

⁹³³ *ibid.*, 186-88. Neither did southerners endorse the socio-politically radical implications of this argument.

⁹³⁴ Levine, *Opening of the American Mind*, 124-25.

⁹³⁵ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 635; Daniel Kilbride, “Travel, Ritual, and National Identity: Planters on the European Tour, 1820–1860,” *The Journal of Southern History* 69 (2003): 569; Randall M. Miller, “A Church in Cultural Captivity: Some Speculations on Catholic Identity in the Old South,” in *Catholics in the Old South: Essays on Church and Culture*, eds. Randall Miller and Jon Wakelyn (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983), 18n10.

⁹³⁶ *ibid.*, 11-12, 19. O’Brien states the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, published in Charleston from 1822 to the Civil War, was not only the most stable Catholic paper but perhaps among the most enduring papers in the country. CO2, 1086.

⁹³⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 1058. O’Brien only mentions “modern philosophy,” but I argue Holmes was deeply engaged specifically in post-Kantian philosophy. For example, he reviewed J. D. Morrell’s exceptionally continental *An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (1846). Morrell claims the whole project was begun to elucidate German philosophy. J. D. Morell, *preface to An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century*, Volume I, by J. D. Morell (London: William Pickering, 1846), viii-ix; H. [Holmes], “[Review:] Morell’s Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 16 (1850): 385-96.

5.3.3 Embracing (papal) Idealism and SAE

The third “W,” George Waddington, gets cited the most in the trio and is one of the most cited authors in the work. This is in the sharpest distinction to southern discussion in the journals, where Waddington is virtually non-existent.⁹³⁸ Not much scholarship exists on Waddington. He was a distinguished Trinity College, Cambridge scholar and Doctor of Divinity in Church of England, finishing as a Dean of Durham in 1840 and later becoming warden of the university,⁹³⁹ very prestigious and powerful offices in the church. To the critics of the church at this period, even the Roman Catholic Church was more reformed.⁹⁴⁰ The institution was extremely wealthy but corrupt. The divines overwhelmingly supported the British war effort in America, were the instigators of the French Revolution, supporters of slave trade and hostile to improvement in legislation.⁹⁴¹ At the time of Waddington, the church resembled the Roman Catholic Church at the height of its decadence before Luther. Durham was described by contemporaries very secluded and shadowy as if outside time and history, and its organization was very strongly hierarchical and luxurious even by English standards. Waddington refused to even encounter the poor on a topic of improvement he was forced to introduce, addressing the middle class instead: they knew more about them.⁹⁴² But there was a Liberal side to Waddington politically. He was known for his liberal sympathies that were exceptional in his context and he was a pioneer in the return of a Liberal, or Whig, element to Durham.⁹⁴³ For example, Trinity College considered character formation paramount in education. Soffer defines character in this context as “the successful assertion of rational will against every kind of vicissitude” very much centered on public life.⁹⁴⁴ Waddington probably approved this aim in its outlines. As we saw, this Victorian attitude was found in New England at the intersection of history and literature at least as early as the 1820s (chapter 3).

However, the important distinction from Yankees and Dew is that at least in his *A History of the Church, from the Earliest Ages to the Reformation* (1831) Waddington

⁹³⁸ Only Susan Walker, another apparently southern female author in oblivion, and Josiah Nott exhibit any awareness of Waddington in the journals. Interestingly, Waddington appears only as a traveler in both cases and only as a footnote in Walker. Nasus [Susan Walker], “The Sciote Captive, Part II,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (1844): 658; Nott, “Unity of the Human Race,” 39.

⁹³⁹ William Prideaux Courtney, *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900, Volume LVIII, entry for “Waddington, George (DNBoo),” last modified January 31, 2011, http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Waddington,_George_%28DNB00%29.*

⁹⁴⁰ See for example John Wade, *The Extraordinary Black Book: An Exposition of Abuses in Church and State, New Ed. (London: Effingham Wilson, 1832), 5.*

⁹⁴¹ *ibid.*, 6.

⁹⁴² Robert Lee, *The Church of England and the Durham Coalfield, 1810–1926: Clergymen, Capitalists and Colliers, Regions and Regionalism in History series (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), 23, 23-24, 25.*

⁹⁴³ *ibid.*, 127.

⁹⁴⁴ Soffer, *Discipline and Power, 14.*

refuses to blatantly mix politics with history into comic Whig liberalism. This was because he had close ties to the Oxford representatives of the German philology–historical critics of history such as bishop–historian Connop Thirlwall.⁹⁴⁵ Some of these Germans, such as Niebuhr, were less inclined towards Romanticism and Hegelian liberalism, distinction northerners and Dew missed but many southerners did not (chapters 2, 3). Thus, it is precisely the acuteness to language that separates Waddington from Dew.

For a first example of this difference, Dew at the urging of the SW portion of VHPS published a lengthy article, originally a speech planned for delivery a year after Minor’s presentation, that explicitly linked federalism, nationalism, progress of literature and character formation.⁹⁴⁶ In other words, Dew shared the same SAE aim about education as was found in New England schoolbooks (chapter 2) and extended this principle to history and literature. Unlike even for Lomax (chapter 4), it was perfectly acceptable and even preferable for Dew for a literary culture to be about money, fame and utility.⁹⁴⁷ This claim seems very bold in his context. Appealing to Madame de Staël, Dew argues strongly against style and rhetoric–elements strongly entrenched in Virginia–since they were common in the France of Louis XIV: what these elements lacked was philosophy French *philosophes* provided. Romantic literature and mathematics are grounded in monarchy: by contrast, the *philosophes* were a prerequisite for “nobler and more useful” knowledge, “moral, mental, religious and political.”⁹⁴⁸ This category apparently included history. Around it, Dew attaches valorization for urban growth: cities give rise to American national literature that is sadly lacking as of yet. Because of urban environment, Dew implies, America is the best place in the world for these studies. Remotely echoing Kennedy, he argues the ancients are little more than a hindrance in the process and immoral.⁹⁴⁹

Thus, like Prescott, Minor and Gilmer, even Dew draws the same erroneous conclusion the *philosophes* wrote epistemologically true language and that, as a corollary, a study embarking from such (misconceived) metaphysics would be what modernity is. In addition, he again argues, carelessly or strategically, out of context: de Staël discusses the *philosophes* as representatives of a more expansive and politically perceptive literary genre, *not* as a group possessed with a somehow more profound and serious epistemological truth. In addition, Dew leaves out de Staël’s appreciation of the Sun King regime in literature, her sociological analysis of an aristocratic society, and her semiotic reflections. These would have chimed better with the aspirations of many other leading southern historical theorists: indeed, de Staël encourages the emulation of the style of the

⁹⁴⁵ Breisach, *Historiography*, 249; J. W. Clark, “Thirlwall, (Newell) Connop (1797–1875),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew, online ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), accessed November 19, 2013, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27185>.

⁹⁴⁶ Dew, “An Address on the Influence of the Federative Republican System of Government Upon Literature and the Development of Character,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836): 261–82.

⁹⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 262.

⁹⁴⁸ *ibid.*, 264.

⁹⁴⁹ *ibid.*, 267 and note.

Louis XIV literature as a strategy to diffuse utilitarian works and philosophy.⁹⁵⁰ Departing from de Staël, Dew's trope of monarchy that clips the wings of philosophy, science and progress of truth derives possibly from arch-Federalist Alexander Hamilton, Jefferson's nemesis. At any rate, the argument is strikingly similar.⁹⁵¹ In addition, the influence of the Prescott essay resurfaces. Prescott, in connection with 16th century history of Italy, had condemned all monastic communities as thinkers and historians for their seclusion.⁹⁵² Dew radicalizes this by extending it as a metaphor to cover entire societies. Whether he refers only to monasteries or alludes to other countries is open to interpretation, but the strategy closely followed SAE (chapter 2). He demolishes their philosophy in contrast to his which, ironically, is a catachresis.⁹⁵³ But here he is again unashamedly dishonest given his own favorites Wiseman and Waddington, hardly representatives of openness. Yet he dares claim the whole history is behind him in his assertions.⁹⁵⁴ Dew backs away from his previous assertion in the "Review" that the natural condition of man is war: this would not be true in America.⁹⁵⁵ Instead Dew valorizes utility as "a universal desire to be useful" in America to the whole mankind—transcendentalist—idealist language—and "an ornament to our country."⁹⁵⁶ His argument, like Minor's, resembles the New England custom where those unwilling or unable to adapt to the community and its competitive institutions were assigned to asylums, almshouses and penitentiaries to regain self-control and emerge as useful citizens again.⁹⁵⁷

⁹⁵⁰ *de Staël, A Treatise on Ancient and Modern Literature, Volume II, trans. [?]* (London: George Cawthorn, 1803), 49-53.

⁹⁵¹ Alexander Hamilton, "A Full Vindication of the Measures of Congress, December 16, 1774," in *The Revolutionary Writings of Alexander Hamilton, ed. Richard B. Vernier* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2008), 13.

⁹⁵² Prescott, "Irving's Conquest of Granada," 95.

⁹⁵³ "Philosophy is the most frivolous and shallow of employments in a country where it dares not penetrate into the institutions which surround it. When reflection durst not attempt to amend or soften the lot of mankind, it becomes unmanly and puerile. Look to the literature of those deluded beings, who immured within the walls of their monasteries, separated themselves from the great society of their country, and vainly imagined that they were doing service to their God, by running counter to those great laws which he has impressed upon his creatures, and by violating those principles which he has breathed into us all. What a melancholy picture is presented to our view—what waste of time, of intellect, and of labor, on subjects which true philosophy is almost ashamed to name! What endless discussions, what pointless wit, what inconsequential conclusions—in fine, what empty, useless nonsense, do we find in that absurd philosophy reared up in seclusion, and entirely unconnected with man and the institutions by which he is governed!" Dew, "An Address on the Influence of the Federative Republican System of Government," 273. Waddington had been fully hidden from his lecture notes.

⁹⁵⁴ *ibid.*

⁹⁵⁵ *ibid.*, 276.

⁹⁵⁶ *ibid.*, 273.

⁹⁵⁷ Singal, *The War Within, 14-15*. Almost as an afterthought, Dew admits that "good and evil are always intertwined" and "nothing can be pure in this world," *WW* language inconsistent with his

For a second example that illuminates Dew's idealism, Dew also distorts Waddington to suit his agenda. For instance, Waddington paints a far more critical picture of Pope Nicholas I in a case where a former queen pleaded him to punish her husband, one of Charlemagne's descendants, for divorcing her.⁹⁵⁸ The decision the pope came to was not clear. Waddington treats the *probable* decision in favor of the queen cynically but adds it was to be expected since the Church only gave a tit for tat for Charlemagne's exploitation of it for purposes of civil government.⁹⁵⁹ Dew, by contrast, uses the incident as first proof that the pope was fighting for the people, defender of the oppressed and on the side of justice and humanity since the feudal times were "of great violence and oppression." Dew treats pope's verdict as certain and, appealing to Waddington, adds that in it, the pope "was supported by people [sic], and the justice of the case."⁹⁶⁰ Waddington's treatment is far more nuanced and avoids the whiggish liberal moralizing typical of Bancroft and Prescott. Dew gives a second proof to support his pro-pope argument by claiming Waddington contends Nicholas acted right and was supported "by king, and the people" when he restored a bishop two councils had deposed.⁹⁶¹ However, Waddington makes no such claim: to the contrary, Nicholas probably acted from self-interest, engaged in scare tactics, and used forgery to achieve his aims.⁹⁶² As third proof, Dew appeals to Waddington to claim that Philip Augustus of France "was ready to execute the pope's sentence," helping Pope Innocent III succeed.⁹⁶³ However, Waddington calls the pope a spiritual and blackmailing tyrant and points out it was he who forcibly put Philip to the English throne and Philip acted from ambitious motives. The pope even proclaimed a crusade against the former ruler John that was only averted thanks to John giving in to the

optimism. However, his context is not philosophical nor classicist but social scientific, a prediction of class conflict in America using the language of criticism of the French Revolution and divinity. Dew poses as a critic of that revolution, while his historical and philosophical arguments derive from its architects. He reduces such dangers as the French Revolution to reappraisal of his slavery theory and his political philosophy. Dew, "An Address on the Influence of the Federative Republican System of Government," 276, 277-82, citations on 276.

⁹⁵⁸ "[H]e [the pope] interfered in her favour with his usual vehemence and perseverance: the threat of excommunication was long suspended over the king . . ." George Waddington, *A History of the Church, From the Earliest Ages to the Reformation*, Volume I, *Library of Useful Knowledge series* (London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1831), 246.

⁹⁵⁹ "There is some reason to believe that the Pope, towards the end of his life, executed the menace; and if so, it may seem a strange return for the generosity of Charlemagne to the Holy See, that the first discharge of its deadliest bolt should have been directed, within fifty years from his death, against one of his own descendants . . . [T]he misapplication of the great spiritual weapon to the purposes of the state naturally led to the second abuse, which turned it, for Church purposes, against the state." *ibid.*

⁹⁶⁰ Dew, *A Digest*, 371.

⁹⁶¹ *ibid.*

⁹⁶² Waddington, *A History of the Church*, 1, 251.

⁹⁶³ Dew, *A Digest*, 371.

tyrant.⁹⁶⁴ Elsewhere, Dew claims the popes were “the most democratic potentates of Europe, and consequently their hold was strong on popular affection” as a great, non-violent force across all men.⁹⁶⁵ This resembles his Eucharist argument, and comes very close to the Unitarian-transcendentalist one endorsed by Wiseman in its effusions of Idealism. Waddington makes no such claim.⁹⁶⁶ An interesting distortion occurs when Dew claims Waddington contends early monks’ favorite biblical excerpt valorized labour.⁹⁶⁷ However, the context actually speaks *against* labour in the sense of that excerpt!⁹⁶⁸ Dew’s Lockean bias is strong here. He technically departs from Idealism, but in a way that was perfectly acceptable from a New England view (chapter 2). Critical for me is Dew’s filtering out the philologically critical elements in the German tradition towards Idealism, thus following the North and Transcendentalism (chapters 2, 3, 6).

5.3.4 Implications for American political philosophy

There is very little explicit nationalism in the work, the great contemporary (northern) theme. However, that Dew was very familiar with the first northern classicist historians and their connecting—contrary to Jefferson—classical scholarship, hierarchical ethnic theory and SAE history into one vast (Federalist) synthesis (chapter 2) is strengthened around this issue.

First, Dew brings their favorite Locke and utilitarian Bentham side by side with Plato and Aristotle in greatness as philosophers against Asian culture.⁹⁶⁹ Heeren and Prescott had also disliked Asia, and utilitarian praise was something rare in the South. Second, Dew spends the greatest sustained discussion related to the United States comparing ancient oratory in court and politics with the U.S. This reveals a great deal about his approach to language—the problematic question for southern critics of history—and what it implied for politics. Dew makes several contrastive distinctions between the ancients and the U.S. that is often dealt together with Britain, Federalist style. These contrasts are done always to the advantage of the modern systems in America and Britain. Their proceedings in court are more rigorous, to the point, and more logical. This process of common law Dew calls “genius” and “beautiful science.” The function of oratory is much different today as well, thanks to the democratic and egalitarian effect of the printing press. Here Dew argues in the way of Franklin, another northern classicist favorite.⁹⁷⁰ This positive value judgment he bases on Voltaire. Franklin and Voltaire were good friends and their second intense meeting shortly before Voltaire’s death was widely noted in France and

⁹⁶⁴ Waddington, *A History of the Church*, 1, 345-46.

⁹⁶⁵ Dew, *A Digest*, 379.

⁹⁶⁶ Waddington, *A History of the Church*, 1, 232, 361.

⁹⁶⁷ Dew, *A Digest*, 383.

⁹⁶⁸ Waddington, *A History of the Church*, 1, 366.

⁹⁶⁹ Dew, *A Digest*, 36.

⁹⁷⁰ *ibid.*, 141-43, 149. *John Adams is Dew’s example of an orator. ibid.*, 142. For the press discussion, see *ibid.*, 147-50.

hailed with joy by John Adams.⁹⁷¹ Dew idolizes Franklin in his short, less than a page-long coverage of the American Revolution, where Franklin covers half the space and is seen through the eyes of a French lady.⁹⁷²

We must again be cautious about treating Dew as a synecdoche of southern historical thinking. In contrast to Dew's unabashed praise for British common law, the Virginia school of Jefferson and James Madison (cousin to the reverend), John Taylor of Caroline, and lastly Calhoun who extended the Founders'—perhaps especially Jefferson's—views to the 1830s and 1840s, expressed reservations.⁹⁷³ The differences in system of governance and distribution of information pertain to differing role for and status of language. Dew, following northern SAE and Unitarians, prefers the tried and true Lockean view to figural considerations, be they modern or ancient. In modern times, the orator is far more responsible. Not only internally in the de-rhetorical cogency and logic of his argument, but also externally to the editor and reviewer of the press, to the leaders of the opposing political party, and to the wise republican (Lockean) citizens he represents. Rhetoric is much inferior, an insubstantial tool for clever concealing of the true substance that will emerge in critical inspection of the address, conducted by these layers. Key metaphysical element in the difference is Newtonian time, which makes self-interest the most dominant principle.⁹⁷⁴ In the U.S., economics, the topic of political wrangling, is hard to be poetic about, but Dew explicitly rejects sarcasm and sneers about this. Economics is a good thing because

our speaker must not neglect cents and quarters of cents, no matter how unfavorable to oratorical display. He is very sure that the great interests of this country will not be cheated out of their wealth, or reconciled to dangerous schemes of policy, by the mere jugglery of oratory. Thus substance is everything, ornament nothing. The modern science of political economy has of itself operated a powerful change in public speaking.

ibid., 150.

For my purposes, the interesting elements are the support granted to the press and the role of language over rhetoric. In this study, I cannot enter deeply into the first issue. Many republicans had become wealthy and virtually Federalist after the War of 1812. Jeffersonians such as Randolph and Calhoun protested against accountability to the voters and against a partisan press. Pasley states to Jefferson, parties in general were an anomaly, and Cheek mentions Calhoun thought parties distracted from less abstract *pure republicanism* or concrete libertarian freedom. However, as Pasley notes, press partisanship continued at grassroots level especially in Kentucky and New England. A shift in political culture away from physical and concrete politicking such as cudgeling,

⁹⁷¹ Phillips Russell, Benjamin Franklin: The First Civilized American (*New York: Cosimo, 2005* [1926]), 266-67.

⁹⁷² Dew, *A Digest*, 588.

⁹⁷³ On Calhoun see for example H. Lee Cheek, *Calhoun and Popular Rule: The Political Theory of the Disquisition and Discourse* (*Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001*), 59, 71.

⁹⁷⁴ Dew, *A Digest*, 149-50. For Dew on Newton, see *ibid.*, 85-90.

shooting and dueling towards more urban printed words was positively welcomed in these places in the late-1810s. Similar sentiments among editors appeared in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, New York and especially Connecticut.⁹⁷⁵ Nevertheless, in case of Henry, this transition into Federalism was not approved of by Jefferson. Weems had endorsed pure republicanism as well (chapter 2).⁹⁷⁶

Failure to materialise reform speedily enough by northern Jeffersonians led in Pennsylvania press circles to promote Jackson for president over Calhoun. This fervor only increased among newspaper-politicians as the 1820s progressed. After attaining presidency, Jackson handsomely rewarded his press patronage. It continued in the fallout between Jackson and Vice-President Calhoun when a northern paper supplanted a pro-Calhoun one with a pro-Jackson one. Indicative of the troubled relationship to such power of the printed word in Virginia were protestations against Jackson's nepotism. Jackson launched a paradigm shift in American politics, where editors and the press became instrumental in the birth of masses-based two-party system in the 1830s.⁹⁷⁷ The new power of newspaper politicians signified considerable weakening in the previous more aristocratic, rhetorical and bodily *presence culture*⁹⁷⁸ in American politics.⁹⁷⁹ Dew's applauding of this great phenomenological and semiotic change shows how far he was from Jefferson and Calhoun, and from the critics in South Carolina (chapter 3). Furthermore, it shows the difference between Jackson and the confused Jeffersonians in Virginia about print politics. The difference may have extended to the latter's views about VHPS, because at least initially, it was based on history as printed, not as personally experienced and told. That is, not on the Renaissance way of oral communication that still lingered, particularly in Virginia (chapters 2, 3, 4).

More metaphysically and figurally, Dew unsurprisingly agrees almost word for word with Heeren on the negative correlation between liberty and rhetoric in history, and the latter's opinion on ancient Greek historiography without citing Heeren.⁹⁸⁰ Such "rhetoric of de-rhetoric" Dew championed chips away at the self, because the self is now different from personal life, still recognized by Dabney for example (chapter 4).⁹⁸¹ Similar to his "Review" argument but now more openly, Dew proceeds to further a bourgeois public sphere in southern history began by Wirt (chapter 2). The functional *hoc est corpus meum* principle Dew had advocated earlier (5.2) is extended in a rational sense to "a utopian

⁹⁷⁵ Pasley, "Tyranny of Printers," 356-76. Cheek, Calhoun and Popular Rule, 63.

⁹⁷⁶ Van Tassel, Recording America's Past, 80, 81.

⁹⁷⁷ Pasley, "Tyranny of Printers," 389-92, 9, 394.

⁹⁷⁸ In *presence-culture*, "capturing the tangibility of things is of utmost importance" as opposed to meaning-culture where "interpretation of meaning is of paramount concern, so much so that the thinghood of things is often obscured." Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, "Presence Achieved in Language (With Special Attention Given to the Presence of the Past)," *History and Theory* 45 (2006), *Forum: On Presence*, 317.

⁹⁷⁹ Pasley, "Tyranny of Printers" 397-98.

⁹⁸⁰ Dew, A Digest, 126, 125.

⁹⁸¹ Michael Warner, "The Mass Public and the Mass Subject," in Habermas and the Public Sphere, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1992), 378.

universality that would allow people to transcend the given realities of their bodies and their status.” This rhetorical strategy is “a major source of domination,” because such a resource was unequally available. A simple exercising of reason was not enough to get it. Such self–abstraction was a differential resource, an act of self–conscious difference between the subject and his physical surroundings.⁹⁸² It is not Dew’s body, or that of his fictive political orator’s, that is at issue. To the contrary, *a particular body is now a humiliating positivity* that confirms masculinity as the negative and the general. Ontologically, “[t]he bourgeois public sphere is a frame of reference in which it is supposed that all particularities have the same status as mere particularity.” Such bodies are universalizable.⁹⁸³ This would illuminate the powerful theoretical interest in female adoration as particularity in Wirt and Dew, especially the latter, compared to their context and theorists like Dabney (chapter 4).

A revealing remark on such a transfer of corporeality—from white, propertied, literate male to the female—is offered by Dew when he refers to Autolycus in Xenophon’s *Symposium* that depicts a riotous banquet scene. After describing the details that praised the beauty of Autolycus, Dew remarks: “A modern could well understand all this if it had been a woman instead of a man, *Autolyca* instead of *Autolycus*.”⁹⁸⁴ Women could be marked and particular, not so men. Dew echoes a London critic’s complaint of Socrates’s ungentlemanly conduct in these scenes, but insists that his morals and philosophy were still good, something extractable regardless of the dubious corporeality.⁹⁸⁵

In addition, “for purposes of burlesque,” Dew omits Aristophanes’s dining scene from scrutiny.⁹⁸⁶ This is curious, because he claims there is only one banquet scene depicted by Aristophanes that has survived, while there are such banquet–like scenes, or symposia, in several of his surviving plays.⁹⁸⁷ His silence should be heard, because many of the dinners have to do with abnormal states of the social order. For instance, in *Knights*, slaves instead of their owners are in charge, while in *Ecclesiazusae*, women occupy positions of power instead of men.⁹⁸⁸ Dew’s willingness to skip such plays indicates further his universalistic abstractionism. But in distinction from the cosmopolitans, it is suffused with continued unwillingness to be playful that in turn indicates his Catholic sympathies for order. The negative opinion about Aristophanes and associated valorization of Socrates may partly derive from Voltaire.⁹⁸⁹ Poe, for example, strongly disagreed with Voltaire’s

⁹⁸² *ibid.*, 382.

⁹⁸³ *ibid.*, 382–83, citation on 382.

⁹⁸⁴ Dew, *A Digest*, 171.

⁹⁸⁵ *ibid.*, 172, *emphasis original*.

⁹⁸⁶ *ibid.*, 170.

⁹⁸⁷ *ibid.*; A. M. Bowie, “Thinking with Drinking: Wine and the Symposium in Aristophanes,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117 (1997): 1–21.

⁹⁸⁸ *ibid.*, 6, 19.

⁹⁸⁹ Voltaire, *The Works of Voltaire. A Contemporary Version, Volume III*, trans. William F. Fleming (New York: E.R. DuMont, 1901), Section III, *Unjust Accusation—Justification of Vanini*, accessed October 29, 2013,

interpretation.⁹⁹⁰ Dew declines to morally condemn Greek comedy, comparing Xenophon side by side with Plato and contending that for the latter, the mind always came before the body while for the former they were on par.⁹⁹¹ However, given the preference for Nietzsche–esque approach to history in Virginia and general hostility to Plato (chapter 2) it is interesting and illuminating to see Dew slightly siding with Plato against Xenophon in this context.⁹⁹² Dew’s quasi–Victorian moralising about Aristophanes is a pioneering one in Virginia judging by the *Messenger*, which would support my thesis of the relatively secular and humanistic or “unreconstructed” approach to Antiquity in Virginia. Therefore, he is drawing southern culture further away from corporeality—what Warner names physical, theatrical, oratorical representation and presence—towards a “universal” public sphere.⁹⁹³ In Virginia’s historical discussion, Dew’s vision contended against the more powerful forces of WW, southern SAE now irreducible to its northern variant, and the classicists and common folk who were not SW, had no similar religious views, or lacked cosmopolitanism. It is plausible these clusters thought differently about slavery and women intellectually and metaphysically, because Aristophanes had not previously been a problematic author in the *Messenger*. The different body and individual as well as enjoyment/merry–making are for Dew questionable “ruffianism” and indecency especially in Xenophon.⁹⁹⁴ But such unrefined and sensual, more pagan social existence arguably still was the more common one in Virginia outside SAE and resembled the relationship the Scots had to Dew’s preferred English (chapter 2).

Xenophon was “probably the most widely read and cited classical political theorist at the time of the Founding.”⁹⁹⁵ Calhoun—deeply inspired by Virginia as a locale⁹⁹⁶—followed the argument of Xenophon in his first public speech, delivered a few months after his final

http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=352&chapter=53827&layout=html&Itemid=27.

⁹⁹⁰ Anonymous [Poe], “Pinakidia,” *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836e): 580.

⁹⁹¹ Dew, *A Digest*, 171.

⁹⁹² *There is no critical commentary on Plato’s Symposium, unlike on Xenophon’s. ibid., 170-72. To the contrary, the unswerving quality of Socrates’s mind and reasoning in the former are brought up: “[Socrates’s speech] however, was the crack speech of the company.” After drinking his two companions under the table “Socrates, after having seen them all out, rises with his little Boswell (Aristodemus) to pass through the ordinary routine of the day, as if nothing had happened.” ibid., 171, emphasis original. Given Dew’s distaste for playfulness, satire and irony despite his cosmopolitanism, I interpret this passage to be more didactic than satirical. Plato is mentioned twice as often as Aristotle in the work.*

⁹⁹³ Warner, “*Mass Public and the Mass Subject*,” 388.

⁹⁹⁴ Dew, *A Digest*, 172.

⁹⁹⁵ Thomas L. Pangle, “*The Classical Challenge to the American Constitution*,” *Chicago–Kent Law Review* 66 (1990), *Symposium on Classical Philosophy and the American Constitutional Order*, 147.

⁹⁹⁶ Cheek, *Calhoun and Popular Rule*, 50.

breakup with Jackson.⁹⁹⁷ That Dew is again adding his weight to SW against which both Jefferson and Calhoun were virtually at war⁹⁹⁸ is indicated by his criticism of Xenophon's criticism of democracy—direction WAE Kennedy had satirically flashed (chapter 3)—that deserves closer inspection.

Dew had consistently endorsed the northern reception of neohumanism (chapter 2).⁹⁹⁹ Dew arrives at its conclusions about Athens against Xenophon's Sparta. He describes Athens as “the most flourishing state of Greece. Her citizens were the most enterprising, and accumulated wealth the fastest.” Dew appeals to Herodotus for the fact that the “career in wealth [of Athens] commenced immediately after the overthrow of the Pisistratidae, [thanks] to the system of equality” so that she could draw “the wealth of Greece into her lap.” By contrast, Sparta's constitution “seems fit only to make soldiers,” not even them if Thermopylae is excluded. Athens has the monuments and trophies “to prove her grandeur” as “instructress of Greece” as Pericles had put it. It was “*the school of humanity and fraternity*. Foreigners were more mildly treated there than elsewhere. Slaves were better treated there than in any other city of Greece, and there was less cruelty in the execution of her laws, and her repentance of misdeeds was often candid and cordial.”¹⁰⁰⁰

Present-day England is a great society for the same reasons: in both ancient Athens and England, democratic hegemony produces moral citizenry that is worth more than economics. In both, the whole is “a sort of senate of kings” which “inspired importance into the meanest” among the citizens.¹⁰⁰¹ In German rhetoric, Athens had “genius” and there “every citizen seemed capable of dedicating his faculties to the most multifarious objects with dexterity and grace.” Athenian culture produced “greatness” “in the arts, literature [and] statesmanship”—that of Sparta “merely produced sensuality without refinement, corruption without greatness.”

To support these claims, Dew falls back on powerful modern authorities: On the character of Greek *demus*, Dew cites Niebuhr from Thirlwall's translation. To Legaré, who has “seized the true spirit and character of Grecian civilization,” Dew attributes the claim that German historians are superior on Greece, because their interpretation is grounded in Aristotle, not Xenophon (or Plato). Though the two had “transcendent

⁹⁹⁷ For Xenophon and Calhoun, see Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 289-90, 290n77. For the final breakup in February 1831, see “United States Senate: John C. Calhoun, 7th Vice President (1825–1832),” accessed October 31, 2013, http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/VP_John_Calhoun.htm. John C. Calhoun, “The Fort Hill Address: On the Relations of the States and Federal Government [July 26, 1831],” in *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*, ed. Ross M. Lence (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1992), 373-74. Also Lence, preface to “The Fort Hill Address: On the Relations of the States and Federal Government [July 26, 1831],” by John C. Calhoun, 367.

⁹⁹⁸ Cheek, Calhoun and Popular Rule, 59.

⁹⁹⁹ In addition to the “Review” and previous analysis, see Dew, “An Address on the Influence of the Federative Republican System of Government,” 273-74. Dew also speaks of “national spirit” as having existed in Greece in the lectures. *idem.*, *A Digest*, 71.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Dew, *A Digest*, 207-8, citations on 207, 208, emphasis original.

¹⁰⁰¹ *ibid.*, 207 note.

intellects,” they “wrote in the spirit of a *reaction*.” After a full and objective analysis they lacked, Aristotle emerges as one who had “some faith in the *people*.” He had a view that the best government is “a *well-tempered popular* constitution, in which the popular element is strong and active.”¹⁰⁰² Dew concludes that since the French Revolution created a new public sphere that is more polite, refined and democratic, it is natural to fall back on German neohumanist Greece as Heeren, for instance, conceived it: a testing ground for political scientific analysis we now can appreciate.

Applying these insights to the U.S. context, Dew nods to Jackson: the most important lesson from Greece is the ability to behold “the great blessings of our federative system, which in our state governments secures all the stimulating influence of small independent commonwealths, whilst in the federal head we behold just power sufficient to keep the peace throughout the system: thereby preventing those family jars and civil wars which hastened the downfall of Greece.” Though Dew speaks of “equipoise” and cautions against consolidation of power, centralized government is the more important one, and this should be the lesson to America from neohumanist Greece. Analogous to Greece, the original U.S. as an amalgamation of individual states was much worse than “this great union.”¹⁰⁰³

This is a revealing analysis. Dew attaches to Athens attributes from Locke, something he had not done in his article regarding property in Athens.¹⁰⁰⁴ In addition, Dew goes to great lengths to prove his anti-Xenophon case in political theory. However, I seriously doubt whether Herodotus could be trusted as a historian. This was Heeren’s position (chapter 3) that Dew emulates, but one that was not universal. That Aristotle—the objective judge in Dew’s account—discredited Herodotus as a historian¹⁰⁰⁵ would already be enough to falsify Dew. But even supposing Herodotus a trustworthy historian, it is strange how Dew distorts him to support his own ideology that reflects his Franklinian and SAE imperative of ideas as primary. This exacerbates their comparatively alien character in Virginia’s history. To speak of Athens as a proto-Lockean city-state seems anachronistic, because it applies Locke to all history, a move Locke never granted but northerners were less cautious about (chapter 2). Dew claims Herodotus supports such “anti-Spartan” social theory. However, Herodotus actually reveals how the Spartans were the ones to conduct and, by their two separate armies, apparently chiefly orchestrate the first offensives against the Pisistratidae although the two groups had been friends. The motive was not wealth: these Spartans “esteemed the things of heaven more highly than the things of men.” The second, more successful, Spartan army was assisted only by a portion of Athenians, those who “wished for freedom.” After driving the Pisistratidae to a fortress, Spartans would have returned back home had not Athenians resorted to blackmail by seizing Pisistratidae children as prisoners. “Such then was the mode in which the Athenians got quit of their

¹⁰⁰² *ibid.*, 208-10, citations on 208, 209, *ibid.*, emphasis original, 210, *ibid.*, emphases original.

¹⁰⁰³ *ibid.*, 210-11, citations on 210, 210-11.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Dew, “An Address on the Influence of the Federative Republican System of Government,” 273.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Carlo Ginzburg, History, Rhetoric, and Proof, *The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures series* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1999), 45-48.

tyrants.” In Herodotus, the strength of Athens was increased using blackmail after this campaign, not Lockean enterprise. In addition, Herodotus makes no explicit comment on equality.¹⁰⁰⁶ Thus Herodotus fails entirely to agree with Dew’s idealization, but to the contrary tells the Athenians became an unthankful and insulting people from a Spartan point of view. Herodotus mentions prosperity in connection with tyranny. And while Dew claimed the Athens of Herodotus was about equality, actually Herodotus implies equality is a philosophy fit for tyranny when Thrasybulus, a tyrant ruler, destroys all the ears of corn that top the rest. Further, for example Miltiades, a tyrant, was a distinguished citizen–general of Athens.¹⁰⁰⁷

Since unlike in the North, neohumanism was far from an obvious truth about Antiquity in southern cultural centers (chapters 2, 4), it is striking how strongly Dew advocates it and how tenaciously he attacks Sparta and Spartan–minded political theory Jefferson and Calhoun preferred. Now it is Sparta that plays the role of the “wrong” kind of aesthetics of sensuality, not liberal or refined in a bourgeois neohumanist–cultural sense. This argument is all the more interesting because as Hodkinson claims, Xenophon’s Sparta was not so much about wealth or militarism as internal social order, self–control, and right moral qualities. Instead of wealth or militarism, it is the social dimension of life and promotion of freedom in the poleis that matter.¹⁰⁰⁸ These concerns chime well with Jefferson in general and perhaps southerners in particular. Still, this case is so important to make that Dew departs even from Heeren and labels Sparta conservative and oligarchic, Athens democratic and progressive!¹⁰⁰⁹ This is a notable anachronism and simplification. I cannot locate it in Heeren’s output though Dew refers to a mysterious page 296 in (apparently) Heeren to support his claim. To the contrary, Heeren points out the position and freedom of women in politics was better in Sparta than in Athens, which would already refute Dew’s typology.¹⁰¹⁰

But the difference in sophistication is even greater compared to Wachsmuth. Wachsmuth notes that even concepts such as democracy or aristocracy are perhaps unsuitable for Greek constitutional analysis. Even if they were not, there was necessarily nothing unnatural, *ad hoc* or reprehensible about aristocracy for the Greeks. “[T]ranquillity and contentment might be preserved amongst them [the people] for centuries by the beneficent indulgence of the governing body [of aristocrats], while by means of individual concessions, which involved no particular danger to the nobles as a class, the aspiring, though not the rebellious demands of the people might be satisfied.”

¹⁰⁰⁶ George Rawlinson, *trans.*, *The History of Herodotus, Book V*, accessed November 1, 2013, <http://classics.mit.edu/Herodotus/history.mb.txt>.

¹⁰⁰⁷ *idem.*, *Book VI*, accessed November 1, 2013, <http://classics.mit.edu/Herodotus/history.mb.txt>; John Hazel, *Who’s Who in the Greek World, The Routledge Who’s Who series, 2nd ed.* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 158, entry for “Miltiades.”

¹⁰⁰⁸ Stephen Hodkinson, “Was Classical Sparta a Military Society?” in *Sparta & War*, eds. Stephen Hodkinson, Anton Powell, and Jacqueline Christien, *International Sparta Seminar series Volume 6* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006): 126-27.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Dew, *A Digest*, 192.

¹⁰¹⁰ Heeren, *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, 345-46.

The character of Attic *demus* showed it had no political ends or purposes that would topple the aristocratic rule, because society did not function that way: nobody had a notion that the masses should rule. Later and self-interested advocates provide the only such allusions. Democracy that was extended too far was responsible for oligarchy. So, one has to distinguish between condemnation of the later oligarchy Wachsmuth agrees with, on one hand, and centuries-lasting contentment with the earlier aristocracy, on the other. Oligarchy was the unnatural separation, because the oligarchs “appear without any fixed or substantial character by which their condition of privilege and power could be justified and supported, but are confined to the mere relation of numbers, wherein the people naturally felt their superiority.” By contrast, the prior aristocracy was “the politically best” or *ἀριστοί* (*aristoi*), a timocracy in Plato’s terms. The subsequent oligarchy was much inferior. Aristocracy and early democracy were not antithetical and both were equidistant from oligarchy. In addition, no natural right, fixed principle or other abstract tendency governed such political thinking. Instead, execution varied between each individual and was judged by the *demus* “according to the temper with which power is employed”.¹⁰¹¹ I argue Wachsmuth’s theoretical framework situates his analysis close to that of the Jefferson school of classicist-philological history. Jefferson and Taylor were not strangers to such a theory of government of “good” aristocracy.¹⁰¹²

Even Aristotle in Spartan context is far from Dew’s champion of, or spokesman for, democracy. To the contrary, he thinks the *ephoroi*, i.e., democratic element, is corrupt because poor, and more tyrannical than monarchs. Though the people need to form one element of a constitution after the Spartan example and help keep the whole together, Aristotle laments they have deteriorated the constitution of aristocracy into democracy and behave licentiously.¹⁰¹³ To be sure, Aristotle contends the sole end of Spartan society is war.¹⁰¹⁴ Montesquieu—the Wirt favorite (chapter 2) and an inspiration for Dew as well¹⁰¹⁵—

¹⁰¹¹ Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, 1, §36, 270-76, citations on 271-72, 274, 275, 276.

¹⁰¹² Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, October 28, 1813, in *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Volume IX, 1807–1815, ed. John Leicester Ford (New York: G. P. Putnam’s, 1898), 424-30. In his critique of Federalism and British emulation of aristocracy that is somehow a natural law-like necessity instead of (Aristotelian) moral possibility, Taylor states: “We are ready to acknowledge that extraordinary virtue talents and wealth united, will govern, and ought to govern; and yet it is denied that this concession is reconcileable with the system of king, lords and commons. If a body of men which possesses the virtue, talents and wealth of a nation, ought to govern; it follows, that a body of men, which does not possess these attributes, ought not to govern.” John Taylor, *An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States* (Fredericksburg: Green and Cady, 1814), 27. Taylor’s book was “widely read in Virginia and the South.” Wingfield, *A History of Caroline County, Virginia*, 197.

¹⁰¹³ Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906), 2.1270b.20-24, 85-86. See also Philip Davies, “‘Kalos Kagathos’ and Scholarly Perceptions of Spartan Society,” *Historia* 62 (2013): 269 and note 49.

¹⁰¹⁴ Aristotle, *Politics*, 2.1271b.34-35, 88, 7.1324b.9-10, 7.1334a.5, 261, 7.1334b.6, 291-92, 8.1338b.1-7, 304-5.

at one point endorsed this and, similar to Dew, ends up praising the British constitution.¹⁰¹⁶ However, Aristotle's account that has been mostly responsible for such a view in modern times¹⁰¹⁷ is based solely on Plato's *Laws*. Curiously, Dew's account is fully ignorant of this. Given that Plato was a suspicious author in the South and many criticized or ignored reason and ideas as metaphysical guides in history, southerners probably esteemed Xenophon's less Platonic account of Sparta more, contrary to Dew. As a corollary, there is a significant difference between Dew's projected idealistic-Christian unity and what Hodkinson terms "a deep-rooted ethic of co-operative sociability" manifest in Sparta.¹⁰¹⁸ Such sociability had more to do with the senses and sensuality alongside hierarchy rather than any abstract dealings. It had to do with uniformity but *not* in the senses of individualism, Idealism or militarism. Hodkinson's examples include respect for the elderly, sociability in food and drink, and sharing of property.¹⁰¹⁹ My argument is southern society resembled these Spartan elements in its dynamic, which metaphysically extends to their difference with Christianity and Idealism in general and northern history in particular. Yet Dew takes a significant, and violent, step away from it. Thus, Dew's views depart more mainstream southern views towards a modern, Yankee synthesis. To see Sparta exclusively militaristic fully obscures this social sense. This has great relevance for me, because my phenomenological interest is in how the extreme Yankee philosophy of modern history became imposed on such an existence.¹⁰²⁰

Dew again appeals to distinguished modern scholars to support his thesis. However, the quotation he offers as capturing Niebuhr's view about Athenian populace with the disclaimer: "It is perhaps an exaggerated eulogy; but no opinion of that great man and cautious investigator [Niebuhr] can be without great weight" is very problematic.¹⁰²¹ Niebuhr and many of his southern readers were not romantic liberals about history, resembling instead the forces critical about the project similar to Nietzsche, Burckhardt, even, to an extent, Ranke despite northern and Hegelian distortions by Bancroft and Lieber (chapters 2, 3). This is where Dew's northern allegiances again emerge: he seems innocent of, or perhaps just confused about, the fact that Niebuhr was a formidable critic of Heeren and a representative of a categorically different research and political paradigm in history.¹⁰²² This confusion illuminates the difference about the philological tradition of

¹⁰¹⁵ For example, Dew follows Montesquieu regarding the importance of causal connections and causality in history. Many of Dew's chapters address causes or even strive to link separate phenomena causally together. However, though quoting also Gibbon a fair amount, Dew seems ignorant of Gibbon's criticism of Montesquieu's causal history. See O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 177.

¹⁰¹⁶ Montesquieu, *The Spirit of Laws*, Volume I, trans. Thomas Nugent, 4th rev. ed. (London: [?], 1766), Book XI, chs. 5-6, 220-37.

¹⁰¹⁷ Hodkinson, "Was Classical Sparta a Military Society?" 111.

¹⁰¹⁸ *ibid.*, 128.

¹⁰¹⁹ *ibid.*, 129.

¹⁰²⁰ Davies, "'Kalos Kagathos' and Scholarly Perceptions of Spartan Society," 275-77.

¹⁰²¹ Dew, *A Digest*, 208.

¹⁰²² Blanke et al., "Theory of History in Historical Lectures," 342.

history critical southerners embraced but leading northerners ignored or rejected. Although Niebuhr was initially received positively in New England as well when he was virtually unknown,¹⁰²³ his historical scholarship of critical philology and formal or *cool textualism* was rejected in the North in comparison to the South.¹⁰²⁴ In a collection of studies translated into English in the early-1830s Bancroft was again involved in,¹⁰²⁵ Heeren explicitly attacks ancient history as a study of words or language and points to the primacy of things instead. To this argument, he connects a strongly anti-rhetorical stand directed at some other writers of history, a quasi-Hegelian value judgment of utilitarian liberalism of the institutions as the arena proper and benefactors of history, and a neoplatonic trope of knowledge as full light.¹⁰²⁶ To northern Americans, this was nothing new (chapters 2, 3). Attitudes to history were decidedly more modernist and “pagan” in the South by comparison. Northern rejection of Niebuhr even amounted to a retreat to a “pre-enlightened” and anti-literary paradigm of history as an auxiliary science to antiquarianism, institutions and governments.¹⁰²⁷ As we saw, Minor had also embraced antiquarianism. Since antiquarianism was originally a northern¹⁰²⁸ and VHPS *modus operandi* as local history and often close to romance history in case of gazettes (chapter 3), we must be cautious not to reduce southern history to it despite Dew. Interestingly, in the *North American Review*, Niebuhr’s devaluation occurs *after* his embrace in the South and *after* Bancroft’s Heeren had been enthusiastically received in the journal. As far as criticism went, antiquarianism was perhaps history at its most conservative and thus antithetical to Niebuhr. Such a position was not what Nietzsche desired either (chapter 2).¹⁰²⁹

¹⁰²³For a glowing review, see Anonymous, “[Review:] Niebuhr’s Roman History,” *North American Review* 16 (1823): 425-44. Niebuhr was almost in full obscurity in the early-1820s’ New England. *ibid.*, 427.

¹⁰²⁴As Blanke et al. usefully observe: “While criticism originally dealt with formal aspects of texts, hermeneutics aims at understanding texts: its fundamental concern is interpretation.” Blanke et al., “Theory of History in Historical Lectures,” 342. Focus on form is a colder approach. My point is, under Heeren, Bancroft the pioneer northern historian ended up ignoring language entirely in both “cool” and “warm” senses.

¹⁰²⁵See, for example, “A List of Books Published by Chatto & Windus,” in William Hepworth Dixon, *White Conquest*, Volume I (London: Chatto and Windus, 1876), n.p. [5].

¹⁰²⁶Heeren, *preface to Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Principal Nations of Antiquity*, Volume I. Asiatic Nations. Persians, by A. H. L. Heeren, trans. [?] (Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1833), ix, xii, xvi.

¹⁰²⁷For example in a review of Gibbon, a northern writer maintains Niebuhr has nothing new to offer to historical epistemology about ancient Rome in comparison to De Pouilly and Sallier’s contributions to *Mémoires de Littérature de l’Académie Royale des Inscriptions* (1729). Instead of Niebuhr, he recommends especially the former’s work. Anonymous, “[Review:] Ancient and Modern History,” *The North American Review* 28 (1829): 327. Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” 296-97.

¹⁰²⁸Van Tassel, *Recording America’s Past*, 55.

¹⁰²⁹See also Cohen’s Nietzsche reading in Cohen, *History out of Joint*, 27.

Dew also appealed to Legaré to support his neohumanist case against Sparta. However, as we saw (chapters 2, 3) Legaré certainly did not go to such extremes. As an ironic symbolist, he was skeptical or even pessimistic about history as historicism, romance or social science. Legaré did not bash Xenophon because of Aristotle. To the contrary—and following the Wachsmuth–Jefferson–Calhoun interpretation—Legaré praises Xenophon as historian and the Xenophon–Plato duo as political philosophers. Xenophon actually is one of his examples in the chiasm involving modern historiography and its metaphysics.¹⁰³⁰ To my knowledge, Legaré nowhere stated anything to support Dew’s interpretation. Thus, as with Niebuhr, Dew either purposively distorts intellectual positions, is uninformed about their subtleties, or both. What is clear is that the resulting digestive mix is far from obvious and should be taken with a grain of salt.

I would go so far as to assert Dew’s views about history were simply alien to most southern historical commentators and critics. Nevertheless, Dew inserted influential views about history to the discussion. As I will next explore, Dew’s ignorance of criticism about historical language and its metaphysical–political implications would add their weight to the onset of criticism—wise less sceptical and more modern views about history that began to emerge in Charleston.

¹⁰³⁰ Legaré, “*Classical Learning*,” 41; *idem.*, “*The Roman Orators*,” *Southern Review* 2 (1828c): 527; *idem.*, “*Travels of the Duke of Saxe–Weimar*,” 193.

6. Beginnings of erosion of southern difference about history and historiography: discussion in South Carolina, 1835–1837, 1842–1844

6.1 Challenges to the symbolic–critical mode of southern historiography

In this section, my goal is to cover the period from mid- to late-1830s in South Carolina. I will look at discussion of history in *The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* edited by Daniel K. Whitaker. My argument is, the journal was a battleground. Significant figural and philosophic elements of northern views about history permeated it. At the same time, the journal also perpetuated the humanistic–modernistic, more critical and language-oriented approach that was resistant to modern history and imperialism. Such tension is also present in *The Partisan*, an opening to Simms’s series of historical novels I shall finally examine.

6.1.1 *The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine*

After Legaré’s departure, the *Southern Review* (chapter 3) had stopped publishing. However, just a few years afterwards, in 1835 in Charleston, there had appeared *The Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* edited by Daniel Kimball Whitaker, a journal scholars have not combed a lot so far. Whitaker himself is another very little investigated individual in comparison to his influence.¹⁰³¹ My argument is, southern historical discussion began to converge more with northern views as a result of his work.

On the one hand, Whitaker represents a major artery of South Carolina cultural opinion from 1835 until 1847 when he left the editorship of his second journal the *Southern Quarterly Review* for the Democrat John Milton Clapp of the radically Democrat *Charleston Mercury*.¹⁰³² What has been often overlooked is the extent of difference between Jefferson and the *Mercury*. Supreme Court Judge William Johnson may serve as a representative of the difference. Johnson’s cultural views echoed Tory civic humanism antecedent to the Whig rise to power in Britain at the turn of the 18th century that were still relevant in the South of the 1830s about history (6.1.1.2).¹⁰³³ Johnson was appointed by Jefferson. Apparently, Johnson was close enough to Jefferson to confide in him, firstly, about his serious doubts about recent over-stringent slavery legislation in the aftermath of

¹⁰³¹ The only more dedicated study about him I am aware of is in William M. Moss, “Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions: The ‘Southern Quarterly Review,’” *The Southern Literary Journal* 13 (1980): 72-108.

¹⁰³² *ibid.*, 85. For example Freehling mentions the *Mercury* as a major secession paper by the 1850s. William W. Freehling, “The Founding Fathers and Slavery,” *The American Historical Review* 77 (1972): 92n21.

¹⁰³³ For characterization, see Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 119.

the attempted Vesey slave rebellion of 1822 in South Carolina. Johnson thought such legislation counter-productive, “product of fear and hate,”¹⁰³⁴ position that ethically resembled Thornwell (chapter 4). But Johnson also confided in Jefferson, secondly, about the shrill and manic discourse culture in the South Carolina press his criticisms evoked. It was founded on “furious Passions and false Policy.”¹⁰³⁵ It was the *Mercury* that replied with a torrent of vehement slander and criticism on Johnson as a response in no less than seventeen letters in less than two months.¹⁰³⁶ The chief architect behind the letters was lawyer-planter Robert James Turnbull who declared that slavery was not even subject to political debate without instigating a war and that Johnson’s critique of law poisoned the body politic.¹⁰³⁷ It is important to discern the different hues of being Democrat between Jefferson, the republican Virginia-leaning Calhoun, Turnbull and Jackson to see the the internal and functional differences of cultural opinion that also pertained to discourse (chapters 2, 3, 5).¹⁰³⁸

On the other hand, Whitaker’s background and views greatly resembled the ones found in the North. Whitaker was born in Massachusetts, a Unitarian educated at Harvard, and a former editor of *Christian Philanthropist*, an abolitionist and anti-Catholic magazine. He had moved South in 1823, first to Georgia, then to South Carolina.¹⁰³⁹ In terms of linguistic intellectual background, Whitaker was thereby almost antithetical to Jefferson. By 1826 he was doing in Charleston what Channing was doing up North (chapter 3): arguing against the Trinitarian position about symbolism in Biblical language. Human reason had no quarrel with faith but, on the contrary, helped make faith plain and simple. As with northern SAE, language was not to be considered a problematic or poetic entity, and reason and religion worked in tandem for utilitarian ends.¹⁰⁴⁰ Though history proved

¹⁰³⁴ Donald G. Morgan, “Justice William Johnson on the Treaty-Making Power,” *The George Washington Law Review* 22 (1953–1954): 188, 192, *ibid.*, n12.

¹⁰³⁵ *ibid.*, 196–97n32; William Johnson to Thomas Jefferson, August 11, 1823, *Jefferson Papers MSS., Library of Congress*, cited in *ibid.* Apparently Jefferson’s reply has unfortunately not been preserved.

¹⁰³⁶ *ibid.*, 193.

¹⁰³⁷ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 82; Morgan, “Justice William Johnson on the Treaty-Making Power,” 194.

¹⁰³⁸ *The sympathies of South Carolina intellectual and philosopher William J. Grayson were with Calhoun against Jackson and in disagreement with Turnbull’s discourse strategy. This would suggest there was a difference between Calhoun and Turnbull about political philosophy. Grayson, Witness to Sorrow*, 128–32, 117. Grayson is among the most formidable southern intellectuals who either refused to look at history the modern manner or simply ignored it. See section 6.2.1.1.

¹⁰³⁹ Moss, “Daniel Kimball Whitaker (1801–1881),” in *Southern Writers: A New Biographical Dictionary*, eds. Joseph M. Flora and Amber Vogel, *Southern Literary Studies series* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006), 432.

¹⁰⁴⁰ See for example Daniel K. Whitaker, *The Unity and Supremacy of God the Father* (Charleston: W. Riley, 1826), 25–28, 30. Bearing in mind my argument about relative infidelity in the South, Whitaker launches this sermon with a perspicuous apology for Christianity and its value. *ibid.*, 7–10. Whitaker argues that since liberty is particularly strong “in this Southern section of our happy

the original unity of man and God in the Unitarian sense Christ bridged for Whitaker as well, he was unwilling to draw the conclusion of Emerson and Marsh that language is problematic. Rather, he thought like Noah Webster (chapter 2) that the move from language to reality was proven without a shadow of a doubt.¹⁰⁴¹ In sum, Whitaker's intellectual background was fairly arcane by the time and at odds with mainstream southern views.

Clapp had likewise undergone northern exposure. A Yale graduate, his brother Matthew was a northern abolitionist and preacher representative of the frontier Evangelical splinter group the Disciples of Christ.¹⁰⁴² Since Yale welcomed German Idealism in the 1840s, it is conceivable the institution had at least begun to graft it on Neoplatonism in history by the early-1830s, a process where Yale scholar Webster's neoplatonic linguistics acted as one linchpin. As a student, Clapp was perhaps subjected to idealist discourse that was much more in vogue in the North. At any rate, as an example that would point to the grafting, Whitaker became a more strident nationalist in the 1850s through Webster's work.¹⁰⁴³

When he began to publish the *Magazine*, Whitaker had become more acquainted with literary theories of the day through a South Carolina marriage.¹⁰⁴⁴ Though an active Calhoun supporter,¹⁰⁴⁵ Whitaker's arguments in the first volume fully ignore the problems of democracy and mass information Jefferson had had and Calhoun had at least acknowledged through Xenophon and Jefferson sympathy (chapter 5): England has been responsible for American literature since Americans have had political and enterprising affairs to think about first. But the English and others have also made Americans a nation of readers and the press "has proved invaluable in leading the mass of the community to think and to read."¹⁰⁴⁶ Given Jackson's bully tactics in the press at the time, the previous Johnson row, and Moss's claim that Whitaker was actively Democrat by the 1840s,¹⁰⁴⁷ I argue Whitaker fashioned a post-Jeffersonian solution to the interplay between language, semiotics and history slightly differently from Virginia. Specifically, the difference lies in the more northern-colored acceptance of modernity and the use of dialectic to tackle it. For instance, while the contemporary Simms and especially Poe rebelled against the novel modern notion of intermixing the individual and the abstract, haphazard social, Whitaker

land," it would also serve as pretext to defend Unitarian doctrines. ibid., 10. For Whitaker's language interpretation, see for example ibid., 12-25.

¹⁰⁴¹ *ibid.*, 35-38.

¹⁰⁴² Francis Atwater, *Atwater History and Genealogy (Meridien: The Journal Publishing, 1901)*, accessed in part December 18, 2013, <http://www.sidneyrigdon.com/features/RigSmth3.htm>, 299-300 note *.

¹⁰⁴³ Nelson, "Nationalism, Transnationalism, and the American Scholar in the Nineteenth Century," 374.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Moss, "Daniel Kimball Whitaker (1801-1881)," 432.

¹⁰⁴⁵ *idem.*, "Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions," 73.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Whitaker, "Condition and Prospects of American Literature," 2.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Moss, "Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions," 73.

treats the question far more positively and pragmatically.¹⁰⁴⁸ Although the press and whole culture of journalism was primarily a New England creature,¹⁰⁴⁹ Whitaker assumes its importance as a matter of course.

However, in his argument related to the *content* of a culture of letters, Whitaker exhibits Scott-like skepticism directed at northern romancers (chapter 2). That is, even he is not fully ready for *rise of society*, the multilevel change of being inaugurated by Rome, strengthened by Renaissance humanism, and radicalized by the *philosophes*.¹⁰⁵⁰ Whitaker's opposition is only different in degree, not in kind. Unlike fellow-Democrat Bancroft and New England, Whitaker believes the romance and the novel—in distinction from poetry that has spiritual elements and obviously separate from reality—detract from public morals and virtue.¹⁰⁵¹ Obviously, these senses of morals and virtue represent an older, i.e., humanistic, ideal that modern history and novel undermined and supplanted that entailed the change about book and individual authorship the South had trouble with (chapter 3). Thereby, Whitaker also departs from the cosmopolitanism of the *philosophes* and great many northerners, the major northern historians, and North-sympathetic southerners such as Dew and Lieber, even Jackson regarding democracy as yeomanry (chapters 3, 5). By admitting the realm of letters and morality, but refusing the Rousseauian implications of them for literature, he is aligned with what Simpson names the trope of the English-sympathetic *planter as the intellectual*, a Virginia figure that extends back to 1606 and that was still present in Jefferson (chapter 2).¹⁰⁵²

Like Wirt a generation earlier (chapter 2), he denounces the democratic plurality of the romance and its quality. Yet puzzlingly, this easiness of content, including history, is fortunate. Whitaker is thus more romantic than he would like to admit. Though irony never departs him fully—the quality of reading and thinking has decreased while their quantities have increased—he insists as a sort of literary equivalent to Crèvecoeur (chapter 3) that the emergence of American literature will be “a brighter intellectual day than ever

¹⁰⁴⁸ Peeples, *Afterlife of Edgar Allan Poe*, 116-17; Simms, “*The Philosophy of the Omnibus*,” *The American Monthly Magazine* 3 (1834): 153-59, esp. 157-59.

¹⁰⁴⁹ See, for example, Grant, *North over South*, 10, 82.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Simpson, *Man of Letters in New England and the South*, 233-34.

¹⁰⁵¹ Whitaker, “*Condition and Prospects of American Literature*,” 2-3.

¹⁰⁵² Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War*, 16-20, 23. As I have attempted to emphasise, this view was unidentical with SAE or Jacksonian democracy in context of history and related social theory, semiotics or metaphysics. A variant to Whitaker echoed slavery and citizenry in senses constructed and disseminated by Dew (chapter 5). However, the writer departs from them with rhetoric that is more bellicose and more influenced by a German-derived concept of a separate southern nationality. Anonymous, “*Slavery*,” *SLJMM* 1 (1835): 188-89. The writer declares that antislavery pamphlets in New York “are manifestly calculated to excite hostility between two nations in amity with each other; and united here by common ties of interest, much more intimate that can take place between England and any other country.” *ibid.*, 188, emphasis added. In such cases, the refusal to treat slavery as discursive—and therefore advocatation of social theory predating Hobbes—united the SW cluster interested in commerce and unity and southern Democrats. But the superimposed novel German ideas about cultural nationality became a disorienting addition.

yet has blessed the human race”: the Unitarian Neoplatonism lingers *but* without excessive nationalism. Only those who live in America and who “have imbibed the spirit of our institutions”—an Emersonian trope—can synchronize their works with national feeling.¹⁰⁵³ Following the Unitarian position, Whitaker demands that American literature be pure, devout and moral: that America is founded on God is evident. Ancient Greece is fully compatible with this notion in accordance with SAE, northern German enthusiasts and Webster (chapter 2).¹⁰⁵⁴

6.1.1.1 Northern influences

Whitaker’s northern bias shone through in some articles related to history. For examples: a) To a reviewer, Simms’s *Guy Rivers* was too un-Victorian in morals, irony and questionable depiction of women. This analysis exhibits a New England topos by tending to value character the most in *The Yemassee* (chapter 3) and criticizing its religious satire.¹⁰⁵⁵ In other words, Simms’s elaborate critique of American romance gets lost and creative playfulness with language is not tolerated.¹⁰⁵⁶ b) Contributor James H. Smith vastly departed from Legaré’s far more ironic, even pessimistic treatment of Grimké (chapter 3).¹⁰⁵⁷ c) The argument about confluence between science, Christianity and history Dew was disseminating appeared,¹⁰⁵⁸ as did a view that anticipated Gilmer about Christianity as conducive to progressive liberty in culture, politics and character development, whiggery close to SAE’s *Universalhistorie* reception (chapters 3, 5).¹⁰⁵⁹ d) French transcendental poet Alphonso Lamartine, who for instance Emerson was impressed with and followed, got wide coverage. Lamartine was instrumental in the formation of the

¹⁰⁵³ Whitaker, “Condition and Prospects of American Literature,” 3-4, citations on 4.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *ibid.*, 5-6.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Anonymous, “The Author of ‘Martin Faber,’ ‘Guy Rivers,’ and ‘The Yemassee,’” SLJMM 1 (1835): 43-44, 46-47. A glowing portrait of New England cultural leadership by Whitaker also appeared. Whitaker, “From Our Arm-Chair,” SLJMM 2 (1836b): 239-40, as did his positive opinion on Paulding, *idem.*, “From Our Arm-Chair,” SLJMM 3 (1836c): 238.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Anonymous, “Author of ‘Martin Faber,’ ‘Guy Rivers,’ and ‘The Yemassee,’” 48-49. Kennedy’s Horse-Shoe Robinson was accordingly praised. Whitaker, “From Our Arm-Chair,” SLJMM 1 (1835c): 206.

¹⁰⁵⁷ James H. Smith, “Eulogium of the Life and Character of Thomas S. Grimke [sic]: delivered before the Literary and Philosophical Society of South Carolina,” SLJMM 1 (1835): 61-63.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Anonymous, “On Sacred Poetry and Literature,” SLJMM 2 (1836): 9, *passim*. Anonymous, “The Christian Miracles,” SLJMM 3 (1836): 57. Protesting against cosmopolitan history, “C.” from Georgia refuses to treat miracles as allegories: in that case, history would also be an allegory. C., “On Miracles,” SLJMM 2 (1836): 448.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Anonymous, “The Influence of the Christian Philosophy on Government,” SLJMM 3 (1836): 142-45; Anonymous, “The Tendency of Revolutions,” SLJMM 3 (1837): 355-58. Kennedy’s sense of the frontier as God’s favoured paradise as testified by history and sagacious institutions (chapter 3) is repeated in A Georgian, “Western Emigration,” SLJMM 3 (1836): 257-58.

bourgeois Second Republic.¹⁰⁶⁰ Even an openly transcendentalist article appeared.¹⁰⁶¹ Interestingly, the frequency of the northern-sympathetic articles concerning history increases toward the end of the publication, which leads me to speculate whether the ending of the journal had something to do with this trend.

On a more aesthetically and figurally bourgeois note, combining arguments from Simms (chapter 3) and anticipating northerner Fisher (chapter 4)—but lacking in romantic and utilitarian liberalism, respectively—artist Charles Fraser insists that history, manifest as portrait gallery of signs, preserves memorials of “genius and skill” of ancient work as co-temporary testimony that is impervious to time. Thus Fraser, like Whitaker elsewhere,¹⁰⁶² has abolished historical skepticism from the unity of art and history. In a fourth, more transcendentalist take on this theme, “Idle Man” extols organizations, history as a book, and Christianity—a combination not many southerners cared for. The sign of history oozes with spirit, and serves as a painting. Accordingly, “[t]here should be in every household a family history.” Hearing haphazard anecdotes and tales is not enough. Such a history, linearly continuous in time, would be of interest to the community, even to the nation. Ironically enough, the page numbers in the article are erroneous just at this point.¹⁰⁶³

We are proud of a family name—should we neglect the very material from which it may have derived all the pride and character which it may happen to possess? Should we not rather seek, in order that the reputation which we claim for it may go unchallenged and unquestioned, carefully to put down those particulars of our conduct, in which, mingling with public men and public events, we have acquired a claim upon the esteem of the one, and a place in the progress of the other. No incident is too humble—no trait too trifling which goes to the illustration of the human mind in any of its ramifications; which supplies a motive for its action, or which might fill up a blank in public history. In such a book, we should remark carefully, and, if possible, day by day, the changes in all the moral aspects of the time. We should speak for our actions, and our thoughts upon the actions of others. The day has been occupied—let us say how. We have lived—let us record in what manner.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Anonymous, “Foreign Travel,” *SLJMM* 1 (1836): 437-42; Anonymous, “[Review:] *A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*,” *SLJMM* 2 (1836): 18-31. For Emerson and Lamartine see for example Cloninger, *Feeling Good*, n.p. [Chapter 2, sections “Listening to the Psyche” and “The Path of the Psyche”]; Lawrence Buell, *Emerson*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 48.

¹⁰⁶¹ A Citizen, “Christmas—A Sketch,” *SLJMM* 3 (1837): 366-80 [380].

¹⁰⁶² Anonymous [Charles Fraser], “On the Condition and Prospects of the Art of Painting in the United States, Number One,” *SLJMM* 2 (1836): 119. That Fraser is the author is revealed in McNinnis, *The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston*, 352n70. For a similar trope, see Anonymous, “Marion,” *SLJMM* 3 (1836): 192 and note. In this poem, a painting of Revolution General Francis Marion by John Blake White named “General Marion Inviting a British Officer to Share His Meal” is able to escape time. Whitaker thought the poem, written for a different context, suited the painting, and served as testimony for the feat (“we shall lose, / Nothing with time.”). The poem assures that the painting will keep “a body and a force,” “the magnanimous spirit,” and principles intact. It thus was far stronger than the sign.

¹⁰⁶³ *Idle Man*, “The Idle Man, Number Four,” *SLJMM* 3 (1836): 99, 109 [100].

Have we been affected by public change?—let us describe its bearing upon us, and its general tendency. Have we suffered in domestic vicissitudes—to say why and wherefore, may be to erect a beacon and a guide for the children we leave behind us. The most remote circumstance which move our thoughts should have their memorial, for who can possibly anticipate how close, in a future day, may be their applications to our bosoms and our business—though now, they have but little influence upon us, and no connection with our visible interests?

ibid., 109-10 [100-101].

While Jefferson had advocated freedom from linear history by the sign (chapter 2) and great many southerners, including historically-oriented ones like Dabney, held little faith in the book and the printed word about it, Idle Man argues the reverse. Idle Man has effectively caught up with Idealism in History, where voice, now reduced to thought, is problematic for presence. Thought is stored in the sign that comprises a book. This package is to be united with the flow of History in a literal reunion with living future generations, especially their hearts. While classical vision pertained to freedom, now the sign-become-flesh, “the best gift,” “the noblest heirloom in a family,” is a safeguard of presence, didactics and linear temporality, metaphorically a quasi-Bible. “Big” History would then pick up this tiny contribution. “[S]imple history” and “cold tradition” that apparently pertain to the previous, only haphazardly memorized and told non-discursive history, and history according to the ancients respectively—like the “yet colder and more speculative” future investigator—fail to have the warm, just authority the sign as presence has.¹⁰⁶⁴ Thus, combining legal pyrrhonism and romantic thinking, history is a mixture of written honest testimony and real presence. Taking cue from British philanthropist, antislavery preacher and hymn writer James Montgomery, Idle Man ends with musings about departure and reunion. Cosmopolitan travel and the greater (comic) reunion render tragic loss real but ultimately secondary, and this Idle Man affirms with a citation from Shakespeare’s *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1623).¹⁰⁶⁵

In another turn to bourgeois Victorianism related to history, a reviewer trusts novelist Edward Bulwer-Lytton’s word that his depiction of Italian statesman Cola di Rienzo in *Rienzi* (1835) was more truthful than Gibbon’s treatment. Further, this is fortunate considering the American romance history tradition Prescott was also chiding (chapter 3). The reviewer also rejects the Middle Ages as uncivilized: they were only relevant as “the dawn of the brilliant day that was to follow [that] had already begun to checker, with a thousand golden hues, the East.” Mediaeval Rome was corrupt.¹⁰⁶⁶ Although the reviewer ends with celebrating democracy in a classical republican sense,¹⁰⁶⁷ Whig liberalism and romance have conquered the classical world much in the sense of Dew (chapter 5). In

¹⁰⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 101.

¹⁰⁶⁵ *ibid.*, 101, 102-4. Still, doubts about living vs. the romanticized sign, painting or sculpture persisted in the South. See for example Anonymous, “[Review:] *The Life of John C. Calhoun*,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 3 (1843): 496-97.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Anonymous, “[Review:] *Rienzi*,” *SLJMM* 2 (1836): 215, 213, citation on *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶⁷ *ibid.*, 217-18.

other words, Rienzi and ancient Rome are both colored with the hues of Idealism, romance and Christianity, and focus is on character. Even Bulwer's depiction of Rienzi as a fierce lover gets swallowed, though with great surprise, even shock in one so patriotic. This exhibits the aesthetic confusion between old and new classicism. Indicative of such a clash, the reviewer uses both statue and painting metaphors.¹⁰⁶⁸ In an additional parallel to Dew, Bulwer—despite his promise—strategically obscured and humanized Rienzi with an idealist hue in comparison to cosmopolitan history such as Gibbon's. Unlike the Genoveses, I would thus not see Bulwer in a simple continuum with Scott in the South.¹⁰⁶⁹ Instead, I would point out the virtual disappearance of skepticism and outpouring of British bourgeois Idealism not all southerners were ready for. Indeed, Bulwer even personally criticized Scott for lack of abstract and metaphysical concerns.¹⁰⁷⁰ But the spell was effective, because even Poe held a mixed opinion.¹⁰⁷¹

6.1.1.2 *Persistences of heterological history, politics and poetics of culture*

Still, alliance with northern sentiment was far from complete. Specifically striking is aversion from romantic thinking, on the one hand, and holding onto pyrrhonic attitudes with reverence for the ancients, a pagan—skeptical combination epistemologically and metaphysically,¹⁰⁷² on the other hand. The emphasis on skeptical text criticism about history continued between humanism and antiquarianism. The more textual and far more skeptical pyrrhonism was anathema to Yankee antiquarianism (chapters 2, 3, 4).¹⁰⁷³

"T. C.," probably the aging skeptic Thomas Cooper, scientist, lawyer, political philosopher, close collaborator with Jefferson and his university, and the only major utilitarian in the South,¹⁰⁷⁴ makes the line between the two fuzzy. In an illuminating misreading in the same issue as the *Rienzi* review, Cooper suggests Niebuhr's work continued the antiquarian findings of historian Louis de Beaufort and antiquarian

¹⁰⁶⁸ *ibid.*, 213, 215, 216. For the metaphors, see *ibid.*, 213, 214.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Andrew Brown, "Metaphysics and Melodrama: Bulwer's *Rienzi*," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 36 (1981): 261-76; Fox—Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 140.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Brown, "Metaphysics and Melodrama," 274.

¹⁰⁷¹ Poe called Bulwer "a corrupter of culture" and a *fad*. However, Poe also estimated him highly in the *Messenger* and used *Rienzi* as a resource. Fox—Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 140; Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 119-20 note.

¹⁰⁷² Cf. Breisach, *Historiography*, 190-91. Breisach insists by the 17th century, classical authority was on the decline by the epistemological optimism of humanists themselves. I argue precisely such optimism was fairly unknown among southern humanists, but it did reject northern Neoplatonism and, as a corollary, Hegelian idealism.

¹⁰⁷³ Blanke et al., "Theory of History in Historical Lectures," 336.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Seymour S. Cohen, "The Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Cooper: A Previously Unpublished Manuscript of *Dumas Malone*," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 147 (2003): 42, 43. For utilitarianism, see chapter 2.

debate.¹⁰⁷⁵ Cooper's antidemocratic views and simultaneous closeness to Jefferson point to the conceptual difference about democracy between Jefferson and Jackson (chapter 2).¹⁰⁷⁶ Tellingly, SAE Rice disliked him.¹⁰⁷⁷

Though disagreeing with the northern rejection of Niebuhr, Cooper is not quite ready to join the extremity of the pyrrhonists, perhaps because of the pervading antiquarianism. However, he still approaches history in a decisively non-antiquarian manner: 1. he explicitly rejects religious history as guide and thus the *bona fide* tradition of Thomasius (chapter 3). He singles out specifically British man of letters Isaac Taylor to blame who was strongly anti-pyrrhonic in method.¹⁰⁷⁸ The *North American Review*, by contrast, was recommending Taylor for its readers and offered his works as key texts to historical text analysis.¹⁰⁷⁹ 2. Cooper fully ignores the antiquarian, more tactile history that turned from texts to material evidence.¹⁰⁸⁰ 3. Apart from Niebuhr, he also ignores all German authorities, including the anti-literary Heeren the northern paragon, preferring British pyrrhonic-legalistic approaches.¹⁰⁸¹ By exempting ancient authors from such text criticism, Cooper has not taken the step into the 19th century.¹⁰⁸² Remarkably, Cooper's ignorance of such modes that critique pyrrhonism belongs more to the 17th.¹⁰⁸³ In sum,

¹⁰⁷⁵ T. C. [Thomas Cooper], "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, as Ascribed to their Presumed Author, Number One," *SLJMM* 2 (1836a): 135, 137; Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," 296-97. Cooper was an astute observer about language: in political context, he saw clearly the difference between signifier and signified and was wary of politics on the basis of the former only. He felt sympathy for both Jefferson and John Taylor of Caroline and had been jailed by Federalist John Adams. His citizenship theory was Lockean though. *CO2*, 820, 793, 796, 819, 822.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Thomas Malone, "Manuscript," publ. in Cohen, "Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Cooper," 47, 48.

¹⁰⁷⁷ *ibid.*, 57.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Cooper, "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, Number One," 136, 132; Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," 297-98.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Anonymous, "[Review:] Genuineness and Integrity of Ancient Writings," *The North American Review* 42 (1836): 1-2.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," 296-97. In a subsequent article he advances from this position only very slightly and even then to critique luxury and centralized tyranny as in the buildings of Egypt, Europe and Britain. T. C. [Cooper], "On Historical Authenticity and the Value of Human Testimony as to Facts [On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, as Ascribed to their Presumed Author], Number Two," *SLJMM* 2 (1836b): 194-95.

¹⁰⁸¹ Cooper, "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, Number One" 134; Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," 296. Momigliano mentions only German legal scholars as adopting pyrrhonic critical text analysis but conceivably, Britain had similarly oriented scholars, though not necessarily historians.

¹⁰⁸² Cooper, "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, Number One," 136; Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," 298.

¹⁰⁸³ *ibid.*, 295-96. Most Pyrrhonic authors in Momigliano's erudite research belong to the 17th century.

Cooper represents a very different orientation to history from the North and organizations like VHPS. However, history only came fifth in Cooper's personal interests judging by his library. Philosophy was even far lower:¹⁰⁸⁴ he had evidently stopped reading it after the Scots. His British sources are rather politicians than historians. He reflects the peculiar and complex position about history at Jefferson's university (chapter 2).

In his follow-up article, Cooper exposes the utilitarian and scientific, one could say a-romantic, sides to his approach.¹⁰⁸⁵ Indeed, he is the first southerner since Josiah Nott to refer to history as a science in my material (chapter 3). Interestingly, like Nott, Cooper was familiar with Philadelphia education. Such views were marginal in the South compared to humanism and modernist engagements with Romanticism, but not in the North.

Still, Cooper concluded with an emphasis on language that resulted in a drastic difference about what "science" meant in history compared to northerners Bancroft and Prescott (chapter 3). Cooper frankly declares all history that is contextual, or departs from universal human nature, fundamentally untrue and suspicious: he considers even Herodotus a romancer. By contrast, Herodotus was the enlightened preference who was read in France as cosmopolitan natural historian. This reading heralded the collapse of Vossius's exemplar history of the 1620s that had been attached to Universal History (chapter 2).¹⁰⁸⁶ Contextual history was the German contribution to history (historism and historicism). Thereby, Cooper is not ready to move to modern history. Cooper admits "[n]ine tenths of all profane history must on this plan be rejected [for its inability to withstand the criticism of science]," but the remainder may fulfill the aims of Bolingbroke about philosophy teaching by example, in Cooper's terms, experience lessons, that is, exemplary history. Despite his intellectual alliance with Bolingbroke, Cooper has no trouble revealing the stand of Whig Robert Walpole that the secret of history is that it is all fiction. A skeptical reader can detect it. This is pyrrhonic.¹⁰⁸⁷ Thus, his stand on history is not really different from historicity before the German renaissance (chapters 2, 4) but with perhaps slightly more de-emphasis on Enlightenment. Similarly, Vossius's "interest in historiography was to discover principles, not to describe a development. Theory provided criteria by which to judge the ancient practice, and ancient practice gave illustrative material to the *Ars Historica*."¹⁰⁸⁸

There is no renovated History, conceived as metaphysics, in Cooper. In dramatic contrast, Heeren and, in extreme form, the Yankees, were willing to refer to *that* History as science due to its deductive, scientific nature from statist political science that included Prescott's interpretation of the *philosophes* as an integral element of SAE (chapter 3). For Cooper, history as sign is fundamentally not to be trusted, and *that* is science for him—a far

¹⁰⁸⁴ COI, 494.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Cooper, "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, Number Two," 176, 191.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Momigliano, "Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography," 154.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Cooper, "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, Number Two," 176, 189, 182, citation on 176.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Momigliano, "Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography," 154.

more Nietzschean estimate. Truthful history must either come from the ancients as rhetoric–humanistic examples,¹⁰⁸⁹ or established like a courtroom case for the pyrrhonists. True to Whitaker’s roots and the orientation towards the North, a Unitarian rebuttal to Cooper appeared later.¹⁰⁹⁰

But differences could go even much further as culture politics in illuminating ways. In an article from 1836, a writer formulates a position about history that had many strongly anti–neohumanist elements. The writer compares the American relationship to Britain with that of Thrace to Athens. The author cautions against neohumanist valorization of same language, if this gets overextended into nationalism: ignorance of Greek actually secured Thracian freedom. Such schemes ensure the (Roman) arts and liberty. These are again humanistic, classical republican aims.¹⁰⁹¹ The argument would have none of Herder’s view that language is a force that unites people. Consequently, it evades modern history. “At a time when German speakers lived in dozens of different principalities and four separate city–states, Herder’s philological inquiries supported a movement dedicated to the formation of a unified German nation–state.”¹⁰⁹² By contrast, the writer takes stock in such classical authors as Xenophon and Herodotus who have described the Thracian society in more detail. Since northerners and northern–minded scholars were very enthusiastic about neohumanism at the time, valorization of such a “barbaric” and tribal, decisively rural warrior culture and decentralized social existence provides a remarkable counterpoint.¹⁰⁹³ I would thus argue the audience of the argument was South Carolinians, not the nation. Similar to the Scots vs. the British (chapter 2), primitive barbarity is a liberty with no necessary “civilized” or Christian behavior, morals and decorum attached. Alluding to Pope, the writer attacks a recent masked ball held in Washington as very suspicious, because it explicitly emulated English corruption and decay. Rome had managed to avoid it until too much relish of Athenian influence corrupted her.¹⁰⁹⁴ Reflecting the previous pessimistic and ironic views of Legaré and others (chapter 3), the ancients were superior to the moderns in aspects such as manners, sentiment, public virtue, literature and the arts. This gets obfuscated by the English and, by implication, bourgeois culture the author describes as socially barbaric.¹⁰⁹⁵ The writer appeals here to Jean–

¹⁰⁸⁹ Bolingbroke was in agreement. Blanke et al., “Theory of History in Historical Lectures,” 335.

¹⁰⁹⁰ E. P., “Strictures on the Essay, ‘Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books,’” SLJMM 3 (1836): 81–89.

¹⁰⁹¹ Anonymous, “English Views of the Literature and Literary Men, and of the Political and Domestic Character of the People of Ancient Greece and Rome,” SLJMM 1 (1835): 415 note †. For liberty, see chapters 2, 5. I disagree with the Genoveses’ speculation the author is Whitaker. Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 292–93n83.

¹⁰⁹² Nelson, “Nationalism, Transnationalism, and the American Scholar in the Nineteenth Century,” 351.

¹⁰⁹³ On Thracians, see for example Lionel Casson, “The Thracians,” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, The Thracians, new series*, 35 (1977): 2–6.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Anonymous, “English Views of the Literature and Literary Men,” 416 note *.

¹⁰⁹⁵ *ibid.*, 417. Compare with Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, sections 252–54.

François La Harpe¹⁰⁹⁶ who according to Le Coat was semiotically anti-Lockean, anti-ideological and pro-figural. He was a belated champion of the Ancients against the Moderns in the 1790s' France. Instead of the dominant and analytic knowledge-aesthetics dichotomy which, as we have seen, in case of history pertained to social science with particular severity in northern United States and decayed history as figuration (chapter 2), La Harpe held that language had rhetorical value. It perpetuated the Kantian disdain for rhetoric instead of poetry and "essentially marginalized literature by placing it outside the central body of concerns, that is, the elaboration of positive, empirically-based methodologies in the exact and social sciences." To La Harpe, rhetoric undermined the philosophy behind such ratiocination, because polymath ancients like Aristotle, as setters of golden standards, had had no compartmentalization of such genres as history, poetry or drama for example. As one result, figure preceded philosophy, not the reverse¹⁰⁹⁷ of modern history's *credo*.

Interestingly, the reviewer singles out history as a genre that ideology and religion in general and, in the English context, poet-biographer Thomas Moore have ruined. Moore had acted wrongly as a historian by bringing to the public view embarrassing qualities about his subject. Such pestilence extended to America.¹⁰⁹⁸ In remarks that resemble Machiavelli (chapter 2), the writer states that it is fortunate ancient historians have only simple sincerity without metaphysical argumentation or deduction, and that the Spartan system never confused politics with morals.¹⁰⁹⁹ Again, like in the early-1600s and before Rousseau (chapters 2, 3), no modern historian can surpass the ancients.¹¹⁰⁰

Ironically, there are some illuminating internal inconsistencies. A "spirit" instructed and governed *both* the ancients *and* "genius" of Bacon and included Michel de Montaigne. Thus the author was not fully immune to the reigning idealist fervor and its reductionism and unaware of the phenomenological change from Montaigne's baroque Renaissance to Bacon's Universal History.¹¹⁰¹ Indeed, in this temporal vertigo that is similar to Lomax's (chapter 4), "a liberal and rational morality" was to be found in the ancients, and rhetoric's attraction is an attractive fruit of wisdom "enwreathed with flowers of an airy and elegant but ever chastened fancy."¹¹⁰² The words point to Bacon and Scottish Philosophy and-

¹⁰⁹⁶ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 417 and note †.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Nanette C. Le Coat, "Philosophy vs. Eloquence: Laharpe and the Literary Debate at the Ecole Normale," *The French Review* 61 (1988), esp. 421-26, citation on 424.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 418 and notes † and ‡. In contrast, Poe appreciated Moore's poetry greatly alongside the late products of Pope. *Poe to Tucker*, 115. Perhaps the view reflected the greater sympathy to "proto-romanticism" in Jefferson's Virginia and Niebuhr's Kantian roots (chapter 2).

¹⁰⁹⁹ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 418, 419 note †. Perhaps as another Sparta sympathizer, Cooper was against free trade in the 1800s, unlike Jefferson. *Malone*, "Manuscript," 47-48.

¹¹⁰⁰ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 426.

¹¹⁰¹ *ibid.*, 419. For the fairly great difference between Bacon and Montaigne see for example Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 28-31.

¹¹⁰² Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 421.

more curiously—English romantic feminine poetics. This again indicates the stronger impact of Romanticism in Charleston: it even raises the possibility that the author was a woman.¹¹⁰³ Another peculiar intertextual pastiche is the mixing of Herodotus with Byron's description of Iris, the messenger of gods.¹¹⁰⁴

Anticipating Heidegger and Derrida and in line with southern aesthetic of spontaneity (chapter 3), the writer is captivated by the phronetic and human aspects of an endless work-in-progress among the ancients: even their signatures did not signify finality.¹¹⁰⁵ Semiotically, this is a glimpse at the awareness of presence as non-linear continuity in time before its bourgeois/capitalist regimentalization as discursive, grid-like space. An unfinished signature functions *not* as something detachable: that would corrupt identity and singularity into (immoral) sameness and repeatability.¹¹⁰⁶ *Pace Dew*, it thus indicates the difference about time and ethics in the South. But then, as the temporal vertigo continues, to this is linked neohumanist and northern rhetoric about perfection of form and a notion that the ancient philosophers were privately far more Christian than Hume or Gibbon. Unlike for Gilmer and Dew (chapters 4, 5), their irreligious episteme is not lost on the writer. The Greek religion was superior to other pagans in its effects on society, a thought the writer gets from *philosophe* historian Scot John Gillies, Robertson's successor.

¹¹⁰³ Compare with the remark about Scottish philosophers in the context of education in *ibid.*, 421 note *. For example Mary Anne Bourne and Anna Seward used such phraseology in public and private. Anonymous [Archibald Constable], ed., *Letters of Anna Seward: Written between The Years 1784 and 1807, Volume I (Edinburgh: George Ramsay & Company, 1811)*, accessed January 15, 2014, http://brittlebooks.library.illinois.edu/brittlebooks_open/Books2009-01/sewaan0001letann/sewaan0001letannv00001/sewaan0001letannv00001_ocr.txt, Letter LXX, *passim.*; Charlotte Payne and Nancy Kushigan, eds., *The Evergreen : a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Poetry, by Mary Ann Bourne, Davis British Women Romantic Poets series (London: Whittaker & Co, n.d. [1839])*, accessed January 15, 2014, <http://digital.lib.ucdavis.edu/projects/bwrp/Works/bourmeverg.htm>, 48.

¹¹⁰⁴ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 419. Compare with Byron, Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, accessed January 13, 2014, <http://knarf.english.upenn.edu/Byron/charold4.html>, Canto IV, Stanza LXII. On Iris, see Michael Grant and John Hazel, *Who's Who in Classical Mythology, The Routledge Who's Who series, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2005)*, 191, entry for "Iris."

¹¹⁰⁵ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 419 note †.

¹¹⁰⁶ For Heidegger on phronēsis, see, for example, Clare Pearson Geiman, "Heidegger's Antigones," in *A Companion to Heidegger's Introduction to Metaphysics*, eds. Gregory Field and Richard F. H. Polt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 162-65; Derrida, "Signature Event Context." For technē criticism in the modern sense in the South, see for example Donald Davidson, "A Mirror for Artists," in *John Crowe Ransom et al., I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition, 75th Anniversary Ed. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2006)*, 28-60, and commentary in *Singal, The War Within*, 226-27.

Political writer Walter Moyle is quoted to affirm Rome's religious institution had great moral and civic, that is classical republican, ends.¹¹⁰⁷

Furthermore, interesting here is the disoriented juxtaposition of *civic humanism* with Christianity and idealist continuity in preference to refinement and courtly behavior of *politeness*. As a replacement of one ideology (refined, urban politeness) with another (Idealism and Christianity), the former cocktail functionally resembles English cultural-political discourse in the late-17th and early-18th centuries.¹¹⁰⁸ Importantly, Christianity functions in the writer in a far more subdued sense than in England, more as a resource than an end.

In the British context, there was unease about *politeness and refinement vis-à-vis a concern with individual manners and morality*. Independence, public-mindedness, martial ethos, frugality and simplicity were manners that were conducive to liberty as civic moralism. Luxury, self-indulgence, privacy, softness, sensuousness, expense and excess were antithetical values.¹¹⁰⁹ Moyle, who was sympathetic to civic moralism, celebrated Sparta. He combined concern with legislation-founded institutions and laws—the *loci* of liberty in the civic tradition—and an agrarian way of life and poverty as safeguards against decay in individual manners. Unchecked, these would decay politics. Similar to the southern writer, money and trade would act as jeopardizing forces as the examples of Sparta and Rome showed. As materials for history, either the pre-Renaissance Goths—popular among southern writers (chapter 3) as well—or similarly appropriate phase of classical culture would ensure the model will be kept alive. The model came into conflict with politeness. In short: “The peoples whose virtue was easiest to establish on civic terms were least aptly described as polite.”¹¹¹⁰ In the end, Whig Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third earl of Shaftesbury, a massively influential political writer, eclipsed this divide between politeness and manners in the early-18th century.¹¹¹¹ Shaftesbury, like Addison, was a part of a transformation of society, now founded on commercial modernity and the urban apparatuses of learning and printed sign.¹¹¹²

My claim is, this conflict we already encountered in sharp terms (chapter 3) still lingered in the South, at least in Virginia and South Carolina. Closely parallel concerns beset the writer. Though condemning English society, the writer is far from fully abandoning it. The enemy, rather, is the new society of commerce as an end result of

¹¹⁰⁷ “John Gillies,” last modified 2 January, 2015, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Gillies. Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” 308. Anonymous, “English Views of the Literature and Literary Men,” 420.

¹¹⁰⁸ Compare with Lawrence E. Klein, “Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England,” *The Historical Journal* 32 (1989): 584-85.

¹¹⁰⁹ *ibid.*, 593.

¹¹¹⁰ *ibid.*, 589, 594-95, citation on 595.

¹¹¹¹ *ibid.*, 584, 586, 597.

¹¹¹² J. G. A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Ideas in context series Number 2* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 235.

politeness. John Tyler, whose presidency Poe supported to an extent in 1842,¹¹¹³ had made a similar argument a few years earlier in the political arena.¹¹¹⁴ In America more generally, by the 1830s there was a huge gap between a) (bourgeois) politeness further cemented by the German renaissance (chapter 2) and b) such old-school liberty and humanism whose staunchest proponents in the South were probably Jefferson, Cooper and Calhoun. This discrepancy involved history regarding politics and poetics of culture. The writer, thus, is exceedingly removed from the wider context of historical discourse in the North and Europe, situating intellectually in the 17th century England, but with dislocations.

Similarly, though Whitaker's opening followed the northern reception of *Universalhistorie* (chapter 3), even he turned on his fellow-Unitarian Channing using pseudonym "Sidney" in a series of letters in terms of culture politics. This was an obvious rhetorical ploy on Algernon Sidney, the champion of the civic moralist model in England Wirt had perhaps used as well (chapter 2) but, as WAE representative, catachretically. Among other concerns, Channing's extension of the Unitarian faith to national politics deeply troubled Whitaker.¹¹¹⁵ In a later article, even a biography of Washington could not for him "supply the place of Cicero, Livy, or the Commentaries of Cæsar" as too modern.¹¹¹⁶

With an appeal to Alexander Pope, the writer rejects the idea of common humanity—popularized by Rousseau and romantic liberals—that touted comparisons across individuals that were valuable in themselves irrespective of rank, metonymic position or status. Challenging the Ancients by the Moderns is foolish, an argument Americans have regrettably revived, because no-one can dispute or bring down the ancient models. Applying this observation to social reality, another critical distinction from anthropology and psychology is the writer's concept of *having* a good person instead of *being* a good person.¹¹¹⁷ The French Revolution and decline of Rome had spelled the end for the

¹¹¹³ Edgar A. Poe to Thomas H. Chivers, September 27, 1842, in *Ostrom et al.*, Edgar Allan Poe, 1, 363-64.

¹¹¹⁴ Monroe, Republican Vision of John Tyler, 57.

¹¹¹⁵ Anonymous [Whitaker], Sidney's Letters to William E. Channing, D. D. Occasioned by His Letter to Hon. Henry Clay, on the Annexation of Texas to the United States, 2nd ed. (Charleston: Edward C. Councell, 1837), Letter I; Klein, "Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England," 589, 591.

¹¹¹⁶ Whitaker, "From Our Arm-Chair," SLJMM 3 (1836): 78.

¹¹¹⁷ Anonymous, "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men," 421-24. The writer mentions "proper man" from the viewpoint of Shakespeare's Beatrice that seems to derive from a recent article in Blackwood's. Anonymous, "[Review:] Characteristics of Women, No. IV," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine 33 (1833): 542. Also "W." argues that although a national literature is important in America, the model should come rather from France and the Continent, not out of conflict with Britain. British romantics are foolish to try comparisons between the ancient world and modern common people. Ancient art was not about utility, nor contrary to liberty. Rather, those of the British who deduce the arts from the alliance of church and state—target seems to be Coleridge—are off-base, since the arts have not been understood since the Renaissance in modern

exemplary individual of Universal History. Universal historians Descartes and Hobbes initiated the process of personhood as separate in the early-17th century as well.¹¹¹⁸ Heidegger claims they, bolstered by Edmund Husserl and Wilhelm Dilthey among others, ignore the ontological status of personhood, what a person *is*. Though I cannot outline a full-scale existential argument about southern society, the text points to the relevance of “pre-Cartesian” ontology of the person that complements the semiotic world many southerners had (chapter 2). As we saw (chapter 4), at least the powerful Thornwell was, like Heidegger, willing to undermine modern philosophy such psychological individuality and Universal History rested on.

For my purposes, the important schematic distinction is one paralleling on-hand vs. present-at-hand: A is fundamentally *never* “inside” or “with” *any* B in full unity. If everything is present-at-hand as category, like “water inside glass” A is of course capable of since A cannot evade being-in-the-world, such an existential as A will necessarily disappear. A is fundamentally factual in the Latin sense of *factum* or “has happened,” which for Heidegger means “destin-y” as well. Heidegger questions explicitly the Cartesian “*cogito, ergo sum*” principle as summing up the being of personhood. He uncouples the deductive unison from the mind to the body, and reverses the Cartesian preference for mind, or spirit, on the basis of facticity of A as possible, often communal and concrete, actions.

Heidegger’s relevance is precisely the metaphysically and epistemologically problematic obfuscation of A that takes place when addressing the relationship of A to B, most commonly as the coupling of southern existence with Christianity and when no attention is paid to the comparative lack of philosophy in the South (chapter 2).¹¹¹⁹ In other words, little attention has been paid to the thought of the categories as “mere” modes that divert from what to Heidegger is *non-discursive* fore-having A. As Heidegger poses the problem: “What needs to be decided is whether philosophy and history—just as they offer themselves to life in their self-interpretations—have grasped Dasein [“Being-there”], or whether they are as such not rather possibilities running counter to it?”¹¹²⁰ A is fundamentally *not* about an “independent” or “synthetic” “subject” or “identity” encountering an “object” in two senses. a) The relationship between the two is simultaneously more dynamic and reverse: the “subject” does not precede or master the object, but “object,” such as the world, is what happens, encounters or opens up to—is so to speak “greater” than—“the subject” “as an environing world, environs, the round-about.” b) “The subject” is not some steady, rationally analyzable or analyzing particular but more

times. W. suggests more spontaneous and perhaps concrete “notes of admiration” are better than words or ideas. I claim this is yet one more argument for rhetorics of spatiality close to historicity (chapters 2, 3, 4). W., “The Fine Arts,” SLJMM 2 (1836): 469, 468, 467, citation on ibid.

¹¹¹⁸ Kurt Danziger, “Historical Psychology of Persons: Categories and Practice,” in *Psychology of Personhood: Philosophical, Historical, Social-Developmental and Narrative Perspectives*, eds. Jack Martin and Mark H. Bickhard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 68.

¹¹¹⁹ See especially Heidegger, *Oleminen ja aika* [Being and Time], trans. Reijo Kupiainen (Tampere: Osuuskunta Vastapaino, 2000), §10, §12, and more fully, Heidegger, *Ontology*, §17.

¹¹²⁰ *ibid.*, §13, 52.

a temporal wave with no affixed, calculable or writ-in-stone permanence or teleology in temporality outside *Ereignis* or “own-ness.”¹¹²¹ I claim a) the analogy with Thrace, b) disdain of comparisons, c) understanding of person as a modality of being instead of being itself and d) absoluteness of the *exemplum* are traces of southern A existence. But of course, A is not “pure,” but rather contaminated by multiple, including very modern, concerns. Lack of faith the writer has for these supposedly “modern” idealistic forms about society, culture, history and reality can be characterized modernist.

6.1.2 Critically metahistorical aspects of Simms’s *The Partisan*

For many contributors, history still had no metaphysical and Bancroftian character as a totality: the term was applied to literature and the old way as a haphazard series of mundane events.¹¹²² At times history was used alongside geography in the way of northern classicists.¹¹²³ The reviewer of Simms’s *The Partisan* (1835) that commenced Simms’s series of historical novels about Carolina in the Revolution widely praised the work.¹¹²⁴ I shall next discuss the book and its reception in slightly more detail as the first in a series of such history–literature interplay.

The novel exhibited Simms’s agreement with Aristotle that events and empirical senses counted for more than persons, that is, like in case of many other South Carolinians (chapter 3), his emphasis is *not* on Whig character. In addition, Simms again critiques the American romance by de-idealizing the more positive and heroic tropes of American history. Particularly striking is Simms’s deconstruction of chivalry in the character Frampton, an insane backwoodsman haunting the swamps to brutally avenge his dead wife.¹¹²⁵

To the reviewer, Simms was not grim *enough*: the story should have had a tragic instead of its comic ending when an American officer Colonel Walton is rescued from Tory execution. The character is fictive, and poetic justice belongs only to fiction, not to reality. The reviewer would have preferred Sterne’s style of anguishing frustration at the conclusion, but the argument parallels tragic poetics as well, especially Byron’s tactic against Schiller to make the situation clearly hopeless without any last-minute climax

¹¹²¹ *ibid.*, 118-19n53, §18, citation on 65. Derrida’s project is not hostile to such a “theory.”

¹¹²² See, for example, Anonymous, “Progress of Temperance. Number One,” *SLJMM 1* (1835): 91; A Traveller, “Sketches of Indian Character. Number One,” *SLJMM 1* (1835): 102. A reviewer of Catharine Sedgwick’s *The Linwoods* (1835) accedes that there may not be a pure historical truth, but for the mass of mankind it is good to believe there is “at least at the bottom of a well.” Anonymous, “[Review:] *The Linwoods*,” *SLJMM 1* (1835): 176. For “history” to mean simple haphazard daily events see for example Anonymous, “Culinary Philosophy,” *SLJMM 1* (1835): 220. This article would be an interesting one regarding eating versus thinking in the South, but I cannot focus on it here.

¹¹²³ Anonymous, “*The Narrows of the Yadkin*,” *SLJMM 1* (1835): 239.

¹¹²⁴ Anonymous, “[Review:] *The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*,” *SLJMM 1* (1836): 347-58.

¹¹²⁵ Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 46-47.

(chapters 3, 4). And regarding Frampton, such a character “has often existed, even in more civilized life.”¹¹²⁶

Importantly, Simms never takes the steps of Kennedy towards untarnished—more northern—American patriotism. Instead, he again uses the more humanistic and classical intertwining of virtue and vice. Sidestepping the German foil, the Revolution in Carolina is not abstract, idealistic, religious or organicist: it is “a complex of social behavior that reveals the differences and the dark and gloomy side of a pluralistic society.”¹¹²⁷ Simms resembles Poe, Nietzsche, even Derrida when according to Pearce he argues that too much history “may lead to paralysis and collapse on the truly human or ‘life-lived’ level of existence.” Simms was aware of the philosophical and aesthetic—semiotic diluting effects of modern history for human presence and the body.¹¹²⁸ As early as 1830 in *The Tri-Color*, his anonymous sympathetic take on the French Revolution and one of the pioneering accounts of the event in America,¹¹²⁹ Simms had been interested in action that was not rational or petty. “[W]hat to a common mind would seem rashness and folly, is the result of the highest species of resolution and deliberate manhood. This, indeed, may be held that higher species of courage, which draws its influences from the moral and animal energies alike.”¹¹³⁰

The reviewer applauded Simms’s historical fidelity that, Pearce implies, was even cooler about history than the cold reading of Scott (chapter 2).¹¹³¹ Simms was never hostile to romance, but goes about it cautiously: he only changed the subtitle from “tale” to “romance” in 1854. In the later edition, he explicitly criticizes heroic history—the northern preference—for preferring individual (and fascist) mythic heroes, to whom “the best essentials of society” of communities and individual states across the social fabric have only instrumental value. Both the reviewer and Simms agree history cannot be reduced to what is in the records or to the sign.¹¹³² Simms is not against heroism in the novel, but he wants to trace its complex workings as historical myth and resist reducing history to the mythic individual, on the one hand, and Montesquieu’s temporally causal

¹¹²⁶ Anonymous, “Partisan,” 357.

¹¹²⁷ Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 71, 85, citation on *ibid.* As Simpson observes: “Paradoxically, as a modern nation develops an intense emphasis on its particularity, it tends to transform itself into an idealized version of its historical reality and thus to become an abstraction.” Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War*, 86.

¹¹²⁸ Colin D. Pearce, “History for Life: Simms and Nietzsche Compared,” *Humanitas* 20 (2007): 69.

¹¹²⁹ Keith Michael Baker and Joseph Zizek, “The American Historiography of the French Revolution,” in Molho and Wood, *Imagined Histories*, 352.

¹¹³⁰ Anonymous [Simms], *The Tricolor; or the Three Days of Blood in Paris* (London: Wigfall & Davis, Strand, 1830), 6-7.

¹¹³¹ Pearce, “History for Life,” 66.

¹¹³² Anonymous, “Partisan,” 357; Simms, *preface to The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*, Volume I, by William Gilmore Simms (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835a), x; *idem.*, introduction to *The Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*, by William Gilmore Simms, new and rev. ed. (New York: Redfield, 1854), ix.

neutral backdrop, on the other hand.¹¹³³ Thus, the problematic of Simms resembles that of Nietzsche as cultural criticism of history.

On the one hand, Kreyling contends Major Singleton represents perfection as “the struggle by which an ideally ordered vertical order subordinates diversity and mere contingency to the gleaming ideal of a single image” in the novel. He “directs the defense of order against a barbarian regime of thieves, rapists, and looters” as transhistorical myth’s struggle against ever-widening, ever more contingent history. The Tories are only a stand-in enemy: the real enemy is history.¹¹³⁴ The reviewer, in turn, notes Singleton as a fine figure, “the high-minded Carolina youth, full of daring courage, with modest deportment, warmed by all the natural impulses of affection and love; yet, having them under such control as to make them subserve his attachment for liberty and his country.”¹¹³⁵ “The best essentials” and avoidance of too much “crass” emotion are interesting echoes to Xenophon’s political philosophy (chapter 5). I claim the perfection was not a projection of the mind in propagandistic or ideological senses however. Instead, I would again refer to Nietzsche and the classical and pre-enlightened elements of history (chapter 2). By Nietzsche’s lights, Singleton’s *noble* history—his example is French 17th century critic-soldier Charles de Saint-Évremond—is alien to *ignoble* history that came after Voltaire: curiosity and access felt to and granted for everything. All perfected things have “goldenness and coldness.” Nothing can be more offensive to 19th century historical consciousness, its aversion from good taste and embrace of curiosity and more unrestrained mobility in lieu of perfection. People with ignoble historical consciousness yearn for the infinite and the immeasurable—Idealism and religion—most intensely when in danger, with no regard for “[p]roportionateness.”¹¹³⁶ Simms decided to award Singleton with the rescue of Walton and marriage to his cousin against the protests of her father so the heroic transhistorical order represented by Athens and Saint-Évremond might continue.¹¹³⁷

But on the other hand, the novel also introduces Captain Porgy, an aristocratic cook to the American troops who had transplanted “his plantation pleasures” of the flesh to camp life. At times, Porgy is figured as quite literal comparisons to a hog.¹¹³⁸ Similar to Nietzsche’s argument, Singleton makes no acquaintance with, knowledge of, or mention of Porgy in the first volume. Porgy is simply described to him by his subordinate

¹¹³³ Michael Kreyling, *Figures of the Hero in Southern Narrative*, *Southern Literary Studies series* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 38-39.

¹¹³⁴ *ibid.*, 39-40, citations on 39-40, 40.

¹¹³⁵ Anonymous, “Partisan,” 355.

¹¹³⁶ Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, section 224, *emphasis original*.

¹¹³⁷ Kreyling, *Figures of the Hero in Southern Narrative*, 42. *I have added Nietzsche to Kreyling’s analysis.*

¹¹³⁸ Mary Ann Wimsatt, *The Major Fiction of William Gilmore Simms: Cultural Traditions and Literary Form*, *Southern Literary Studies series* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1989), 74, 76. *I would depart from Wimsatt’s analysis when she claims Porgy is simply a comic, i.e., romantic, connective link between the plantation and camp life. Instead, I basically follow Kreyling and see a more nuanced antinomy related to history. ibid., 75.*

Humphries on the latter's own initiative as some accompanying "fat overgrown creature, just fit for the camp, though he fights well and is true"¹¹³⁹ and the issue is left at that. Even in the second, Porgy's first spoken words to him are a one-way street and Singleton watches "with mingled emotions of pity and disgust" as Frampton, lacking all proportion and manners, feverishly devours a meal Porgy had made that Singleton himself, in another scene, did not particularly prefer.¹¹⁴⁰ Porgy next serves Singleton a very brief way as a torch-bearer.¹¹⁴¹ Their first "dialogue" takes place when Porgy is lying down on the ground with a terrapin shell pressed to his heart. The shell is lit by sunrise. Porgy muses it makes a beautiful polish and would be fit as "manly ornament" "over humanity's most conspicuous dwelling-place" that in battle "would turn off many a bullet from that sacred, but too susceptible, region."¹¹⁴² Singleton surprises him like this and fails to comprehend Porgy's romantic-idealist problematic. The major's focus is simply and solely on proportion.¹¹⁴³ In response, Porgy rises "from the earth" respectfully to salute his superior gracefully and replies rhetorically that better little shelter than none over this most tender part, while agreeing that his body "has gone somewhat beyond proper restraints." "Take care of what we can, sir, is a wholesome rule, letting what can take care of the rest." I argue "what can" points simultaneously to God and Singleton. Yet a third heterology is introduced by Singleton's answer when he calls Porgy a philosopher.¹¹⁴⁴ Critically, Singleton's concept of philosophizing never abandons the classical sense as amusing post-meal contemplation by way of Aristophanes or Xenophon for (historical) Idealism or romance. Thus, the social theory of Singleton is able to withstand Porgy, because Porgy's answer is not a threat to Singleton's perfection. Though I agree with Kreyling Porgy represents history at odds with Singleton, I disagree Porgy's Rabelaisian *Messer Gaster* character is a figure that careens towards subverting "the official order" in a dialectical (historicist) tension.¹¹⁴⁵ Rather, as in cases of Poe, Burckhardt and Nietzsche (chapters 2, 3), I argue penchant for Rabelais and what Plank calls "sensism" need not include antagonism to noble classical culture, since that would entail unquestioned acceptance of modern liberalism, romantic thought and, thus, modern history.¹¹⁴⁶ The

¹¹³⁹ Simms, *Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*, 1, 104.

¹¹⁴⁰ *idem.*, *The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*, Volume II (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835b), 27, 28, 114.

¹¹⁴¹ *ibid.*, 28.

¹¹⁴² *ibid.*, 108. Compare with Porgy's desire to sing or talk but Singleton refusing it in *ibid.*, 229.

¹¹⁴³ "'A strange idea that, Mr. Porgy,' said the commander; 'but the shield is rather small for the part to be protected. Your figure in that neighbourhood might demand the shelter of a turtle shell rather than that of a terrapin. It has gone somewhat beyond such restraints as that.'" *ibid.*, 109.

¹¹⁴⁴ *ibid.*

¹¹⁴⁵ Kreyling, *Figures of the Hero in Southern Narrative*, 47-48. Generally, I disagree with Kreyling's philosophical analyses of southern culture.

¹¹⁴⁶ Tocqueville's illuminating comparative poetic theory of societies is in accord with this reading. *De Tocqueville*, *Democracy in America*, 2, 459. For Poe and Rabelais, see Kevin J. Hayes, *Edgar Allan Poe in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 232, *passim*. For Nietzsche and Rabelais see, for example, William Plank, *The Quantum Nietzsche: The Will to Power*

Genoveses state Rabelais, an old Charleston favorite in the 18th century, was used even by Holmes to satirize German Idealism and the social sciences.¹¹⁴⁷ These strands of thinking, though antinomies, are less in conflict with each other than with modern history. In case of *The Partisan*, while the reviewer applauds the historical fidelity in its broad empirical sweep, bringing to my mind historian Jules Michelet—a highly esteemed author among South Carolina theorists of the 1840s (6.2.2, 6.2.3)—northerners dismissed such southern sensism as vulgar and immoral.¹¹⁴⁸ This would further illuminate my argument southern classicality and communality (chapter 2) were mutually less conflicting compared to the historical theories advocated by Germans and SAE. Singleton has not been eclipsed by the German renaissance Porgy and Simms play with. Singleton “enlightens” Porgy, for which the latter is deeply grateful, and overrules Porgy’s preoccupation with particular qualities of place when announcing the location of their next departure. Kicking a gasping terrapin’s head, Porgy finally announces that its “rascally head” “seems to understand the subject of our conversation—of mine at least—and opens its jaws every instant, as if it hoped some of us would fill them.” No reaction from Singleton is recorded. Simms notes that though friendly and dutiful, Singleton never slipped into familiarity with his subordinates, always addressed them standing up, and never let his emotions take over, preferring rhetoric.¹¹⁴⁹

By contrast, in the later edition, Simms has added a brief dialogical, more elaborate and wordy interchange between Singleton and his lieutenant concerning Porgy’s character, at the end of which Humphries declares: “You’ll like him, Sir, he is a man; though he is a mountain of flesh.” Singleton answers: “Very good. I suppose you know him well, and now to other matters.” In addition, Porgy’s fighting prowess is highlighted more in this

and the Nature of Dissipative Systems (Bloomington: iUniverse, 1998), 275-77, citation on 275. Interestingly, Nietzsche praised Rabelais as a carnivore and also Porgy translates scriptural “land of milk and honey” into that of “fish and terrapin” “since nobody would desire any land in which there is no meat.” Simms, *Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*, 2, 161. For Burckhardt, see Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore, accessed August 31, 2008, <http://www.boisestate.edu/courses/hy309/docs/burckhardt/burckhardt.html>. Burckhardt compares Pietro Aretino favourably with Rabelais against Voltaire and his ilk. Aretino “had the advantage that he was not burdened with principles, neither with liberalism nor philanthropy nor any other virtue, nor even with science; his whole baggage consisted of the well-known motto, ‘Veritas odium parit’ [truth breeds hatred].”

¹¹⁴⁷ Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 759.

¹¹⁴⁸ Anonymous, “Partisan,” 355. Donald Davidson, “Introduction,” in Oliphant et al., *Letters of William Gilmore Simms*, 1, 1. Critics, apparently especially northerners, missed what Davidson names the “frontier element” in Simms, almost relegating it to the gothic and preferring Cooper instead. This trend lasted at least into the early–20th century thanks to literary critic Van Wyck Brooks. *ibid.*, xxxviii. However, I would dispute the semantics of Davidson’s characterization, because it is obviously metaphysically influenced by Turner’s “frontier thesis” of history I distrust. Kreyling reports even the famed realist William Dean Howells refused to accept Porgy. Kreyling, *Figures of the Hero in Southern Narrative*, 51.

¹¹⁴⁹ Simms, *Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*, 2, 110, 111, citations on 110.

version.¹¹⁵⁰ Scholars have not paid sufficient attention to this change I can only analyse as far as relevant for my concerns about history.¹¹⁵¹ I claim by the mid-1850s, historical sense had changed for Simms and more generally among white southerners towards a more democratic and bourgeois social synthesis. As a result, the gulf between noble perfection and ignoble, disproportionate creature has grown far smaller. In the later version, there is at least a tacit bond stretching from Singleton to Porgy as *the new insertion of discourse on Porgy* and his approval would testify. Further, there is Simms's assurance that Porgy and his motley crew are drawn as portraits from actual life. He depicts Porgy as a far more sympathetic character in-focus who had tragically wasted his wealth and education.¹¹⁵² Simms offers a psychological framework to "explain" Porgy's behavior in the revised version, a bourgeois tactic.¹¹⁵³ Lastly, *Singleton only* mentions Porgy as a philosopher in the first volume of the earlier edition, compared to a more prevalent definition of him as a philosopher—in a modern, idealist-romantic sense—early in the later edition by *Simms himself*.¹¹⁵⁴ This would support my argument about updated inclusion of Porgy in history's (historicist) dialectic. I will return to Simms's transformation from irony to romance in history (6.2.2).

6.2 The lure of modern history and SAE: early historical discussion in *Southern Quarterly Review*

In this section, my goal is to examine the origins and first few years of the second major outlet of southern historical and cultural views in journal *Southern Quarterly Review* that began publication in South Carolina in 1842. I will argue that although the *Review* had contributions from such classicist-linguist historians like Holmes, writers reckoned more with European philosophy of history. This led further away from the previous, multifarious and fairly unique critique of reason and romantic liberalism. In other words, the views were increasingly influenced by northern and German metaphysical theories about history, but with some interesting differences. Figures I intend to explore in this context in more detail are Holmes and Simms.

¹¹⁵⁰ *idem.*, *Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*, 98-99.

¹¹⁵¹ *The only study that has discussed the changes made by Simms more to my knowledge is Paula Dianne Fix Dean, "Revisions in the Revolutionary War Novels of William Gilmore Simms," (PhD diss., Auburn University, 1971).*

¹¹⁵² *Simms*, *Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*, 111, 358. *Wimsatt*, *Major Fiction of William Gilmore Simms*, 75n26. *In the revised edition, Simms gives a lengthy dedicated introductory paragraph to Porgy, while in the older edition Porgy's introduction gets lost in the description of his companion "Dr." Oakenburg. Oakenburg's character was the only character the reviewer thought developed badly. Simms*, *Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*, 115; *Anonymous*, "Partisan," 355.

¹¹⁵³ *Wimsatt*, *Major Fiction of William Gilmore Simms*, 163.

¹¹⁵⁴ *Simms*, *Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*, 110.

6.2.1 Bellicose entries and amplified northern–German views

Whitaker's second, much better known publication *Southern Quarterly Review* was launched in New Orleans in January, 1842, but moved to Charleston by April, the *Mercury* citing financial reasons. In the study, I can only look at its first years. Revealingly, though the plans for the journal were praised by both the *Mercury* and the more moderate Whig *Courier*—the principal organs in the Johnson row¹¹⁵⁵—suspicions about editorial policies in their initial stages would grow in the latter, but not in the former.¹¹⁵⁶ Three relevant themes emerge.

1. Whitaker, already imbued with Unitarian views about language and history, transcended the entire SW–WW dichotomy (chapter 3). He landed on a position that weakened the ties of southern history to humanism and philology, and updated the focus of historical discussion more on romantic liberalism, roughly a generation after the North (chapter 2). Ironically, Whitaker's arcane Unitarian semiotic was ill-equipped to tackle with Idealism in the context of history.¹¹⁵⁷ Outside Lieber, German philosophizing about history took off only now in the South, though not in Virginia until mid–to–late–1840s.¹¹⁵⁸

2. Whitaker's discourse strategy was partisan at the beginning, because it refused to tolerate political dissent.¹¹⁵⁹ In its contention “for reasons so plain and necessary, that, they need not be mentioned” to reject “articles, *commencing* a political controversy,” Whitaker re-enacted the belligerence of the *Mercury*, more specifically, Turnbull's stance in the Johnson row Whitaker seems to refer to.¹¹⁶⁰ Whitaker has upped the ante from Turnbull: for example, he uses the same metaphor of poison in the body Turnbull used against Johnson to describe the negative aspects of British thinking and culture and northern–biased letters in education.¹¹⁶¹ The apparently unconscious irony is that Whitaker's own Unitarian background continues to shine through in his metaphysics, epistemology and rhetoric even amidst the bellicose proclamation to get rid of these

¹¹⁵⁵ Morgan, “Justice William Johnson on the Treaty–Making Power,” 195.

¹¹⁵⁶ Moss, “Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions,” 75, 82, 73.

¹¹⁵⁷ For a good example, Whitaker, who is probably the author, states: “[I]n applying the principles of a proper analysis, in tracing out causes through their effects, it will be found that this false doctrine [of denying the states are separate, independent, sovereign, segregate communities and nations] had its rise, and derives its support, from the vague and unsettled ideas which have been, and still are, held in regard to the word States.” Telling is also the application of sculpture metaphor in this context, to cut away vague ideas. Anonymous [Whitaker?], “Constitution of the United States,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842b): 189, *emphases added and original*.

¹¹⁵⁸ Whitaker mentions the journal, like all American journals, reflect on the national mind and extend their influence across the whole society and even direct full national destinies. Whitaker thus explicitly embarked on a dialectic of (idealist) history against northern interests and a battle of discourses. Moss, “Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions,” 76.

¹¹⁵⁹ *ibid.*, 77–78.

¹¹⁶⁰ Anonymous [Whitaker], “The Newspaper and Periodical Press,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842a): 64, *emphasis original*.

¹¹⁶¹ *ibid.*, 60–62.

poisons. For example, he declares about the cautious study of English cultural works, provided the poison has been separated from them: “truth is single; truth is a unit; truth is powerful, in whatever soil it grows; light elicits light, wherever it springs up, and from whatever quarter it dawns over the soul. What is to hinder us from basking in its rays, and becoming brighter and better and stronger by the indulgence?”¹¹⁶² Such neoplatonic phantasmagoria obviously emanates from the Unitarians. Whitaker in effect affixes SAE metaphysics on republicanism, hardly the position of southerners as a whole as I have tried to examine, and exactly counter to Jefferson (chapter 2). Even the *Courier* saw the metonymic operation as false.¹¹⁶³ Such radicalism *within* the South has perhaps not been recognized. Since kinship with the *Mercury* was so close in these openings, it is possible there were other reasons to move to Charleston besides pragmatic ones. Though Whitaker swung to the other direction in the mid-1840s to keep the Whigs aboard, and even angered the *Mercury* at one point,¹¹⁶⁴ its rhetoric slowly became more strident and more explicitly dialectic.

3. Overlooked up to now to my knowledge is how the religious aspect of idealist-liberal history, familiar turf in the North thanks to the interaction between transcendentalists, historians and SAE (chapters 2, 3), bore on southern theorists of history. Dew’s role in combining the two was significant, as was that of VHPS as mainly an antiquarian organization of Episcopalians. Now in South Carolina, the relation between history and religion became closer. Holmes—among the very few southerners besides Dew who monitored the project of *Wiseman* in England and whom the Catholic faith fascinated—became co-editor immediately after the transfer to Charleston.¹¹⁶⁵ I argue Holmes engaged German philosophers of history as well as Michelet, of which more in a moment, because he was among the few southerners knowledgeable of the interrelationship between post-Kantian Idealism and history. The difference is drastic compared to the North, where this had been known for a generation. As with *Rienzi* (6.1.1.1), Idealism was “sold” to southerners only *alongside* considerable classical erudition and philological research Holmes also possessed as a scholar. Further, although the journal initially barred access to religious content (“We mean to place this work on the most liberal basis, and to express no theological opinions in it . . .”)¹¹⁶⁶—another richly ironic claim given Whitaker’s background—the promise was implicitly compromised from the start: not only to German theorists but also Americans like Prescott, Gilmer and Dew and northern letters at large, liberality and Christianity were by no means antithetical.

Still, it was only now, late in 1843, among all the articles that cover history in even slightly more detail, that there appeared SAE conception about history by a southerner *not*

¹¹⁶² *ibid.*, 61-62.

¹¹⁶³ Moss, “*Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions*,” 78.

¹¹⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 78-79.

¹¹⁶⁵ Moss, “*Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions*,” 82.

¹¹⁶⁶ Whitaker, “*Newspaper and Periodical Press*,” 65; Moss, “*Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions*,” 79.

exposed to the northern trade of a physician. This pioneer was North Carolina-born Baptist minister, journalist and educator William T. Brantly.¹¹⁶⁷

Christianity meets us in some shape in every region,—is blended with the customs and literature of many nations,—is incorporated into the laws and morals, and is a part, a most prominent part, of the history of the world. As a fact, or a series of facts, it meets the historian in all his researches: as a wonderful phenomenon, it stands before the philosopher and demands investigation. The statesman finds it in every attempt he makes to explore the secret springs of government and revolution. Before any man can rationally neglect or set aside this body of facts, it behoves him to account for its existence.

Brantly, "Milman's History of Christianity," 266.

An investigation into Brantly's background may explain these fairly revolutionary views about history in the southern context. Brantly's background was quite anomalous, far more in tune with a northern frame of thinking about language and, as a corollary, society and history.

In his youth, Brantly, a student at South Carolina College, had been a very close friend to Jonathan Maxcy, its president.¹¹⁶⁸ Maxcy was a hardcore New England Baptist. He contributed significantly to the entire Evangelical revival (chapter 2).¹¹⁶⁹ As a follower and major disseminator of the views of neoplatonist Jonathan Edwards¹¹⁷⁰ that contributed to the founding of the College of New Jersey¹¹⁷¹ and thus to the Princeton Scottish Philosophy reception, Maxcy probably held onto SAE's Lockean linguistics. The great impact of Maxcy on Brantly would certainly illuminate Brantly's pioneering status as a southern advocate of SAE. However, like northerners, Brantly goes further and even shows signs of transcendentalist attitudes: the time of the apostles had nothing to do with rhetoric or refinement: "Their discourse was most simple, the facts which they stated were naked and unadorned."¹¹⁷² It is almost as if words did not matter, as Marsh had held (chapter 3). In addition, Brantly is drawn to the neoplatonic idea of one common religion as the origin of history, and demands simple language from historians.¹¹⁷³ He also was an

¹¹⁶⁷ Anonymous [William T. Brantly], "[Review:] Milman's History of Christianity," *Southern Quarterly Review* 4 (1843): 261-92. That the author was Brantly is maintained in Thomas Wilson Haynes, *Haynes' Baptist Cyclopaedia* (Charleston: Samuel Hart, 1848), 78, entry for "Brantly, W. T." Tellingly, Haynes calls the article "[h]is best production" in *ibid.*

¹¹⁶⁸ William Brantly, Sr., "William T. Brantly, D. D.," in George W. Purefoy, ed., *A History of the Sandy Creek Baptist Association, from Its Organization in A. D. 1758, to A. D. 1858* (New York: Sheldon, 1859), 306.

¹¹⁶⁹ Douglas A. Sweeney, "Evangelical Tradition in America," in *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen J. Stein, *Cambridge Companions to Religion series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 227.

¹¹⁷⁰ Bregman, "Neoplatonic Revival in North America," 100.

¹¹⁷¹ Sweeney, "Evangelical Tradition in America," 227-28.

¹¹⁷² Brantly, "Milman's History of Christianity," 266.

¹¹⁷³ *ibid.*, 270, 272, 273.

avowed anti-pyrrhonist.¹¹⁷⁴ Such rhetoric probably derives from Nathaniel William Taylor of Yale, another northern *primus motor* of the awakening, and from his student Horace Bushnell, who applied Coleridge to Taylor as a synthesis of Romanticism and Transcendentalism.¹¹⁷⁵

Brantly was not just one more expositor of history on SAE basis. He was *a pioneer of “post-Marshian” language theory applied to history in the South*. That Brantly spent most of his intellectual life in Philadelphia in the 1820s and 1830s and caused internal schism even among southern Baptists when he moved to South Carolina in old age¹¹⁷⁶ indicate his anomalous status. Nevertheless, this was an important southern opening for idealist history and SAE history.

A further step to the idealist direction of history in a way that was reconcilable with the Yankees was taken in 1844 when the *Review* published a book review on the *Oxford Movement* (OM). OM was Catholic-leaning Anglican restoration in England, a project dear to Wiseman and known to Dew. This was followed by an article, though with critical commentary, by a representative of the movement in 1846.¹¹⁷⁷ OM was related to German Idealism and German historians in Wiseman (chapter 5). But in addition, it was related to a high church species of Coleridge reception.¹¹⁷⁸ Again Göttingen figures predominantly: both Coleridge—who Calvert reports took opium while studying—and Edward Bouverie Pusey, a key OM figure, had studied there.¹¹⁷⁹ The might of Göttingen began to ensnare southerners more and more about history, because now it spread from the Yankees, Harrison and Dew to the southern print discourse proper.

The book was written anonymously by George Washington Doane, a New Jersey Episcopalian. Doane reprised his earlier arguments for the cause on grounds it was not popery and wanted to dismiss the claims of Presbyterian reverend Henry Augustus Boardman of Philadelphia to the contrary.¹¹⁸⁰ While Doane wanted to firmly reject the idea the American Episcopalians have taken a step toward the negative sides of the Catholic Church, he also held that the Catholics have good qualities the restoration could reveal that Boardman should recognize.¹¹⁸¹ The reviewer, in turn, contends OM has been positively and with great interest welcomed by the Episcopalians on both sides of the

¹¹⁷⁴ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 271.

¹¹⁷⁵ Gura, *Wisdom of Words*, 54-56; *idem.*, “Elizabeth Palmer Peabody and the Philosophy of Language,” 181.

¹¹⁷⁶ Brantly, “William T. Brantly, D. D.,” 209-10.

¹¹⁷⁷ Moss, “*Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions*,” 80.

¹¹⁷⁸ Philip C. Rule, “Coleridge’s Reputation as a Religious Thinker: 1816–1972,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974): 290, *passim*.

¹¹⁷⁹ George H. Calvert, “Göttingen in 1824,” *Putnam’s Monthly Magazine* 8 (1856): 600, *cited in Krumpelmann*, *Southern Scholars in Goethe’s Germany*, 28, *ibid.*, 169n31.

¹¹⁸⁰ Anonymous [George Washington Doane], “Puseyism” “No Popery” (*Boston: Dutton and Wentworth*, 1843). That the author is Doane is revealed in Lawrence N. Crumb, *The Oxford Movement and Its Leaders: A Bibliography of Secondary and Lesser Primary Sources*, *ATLA Bibliography series* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2009), 110.

¹¹⁸¹ Doane, “Puseyism” “No Popery”, 4, 63-67.

Atlantic. The principles of OM “must lead the party and their adherents to Rome.”¹¹⁸² As a further indication of southerners’ position on the threshold of modern cultural consciousness, the writer claims that since modernity subjects even religion to philosophical discourse, religion has thankfully not only been preserved, it has actually more deeply penetrated all spheres of society. This marks a preparatory step of progressive movement to a Christian utopia.¹¹⁸³ OM offers a chance to restore the Catholic Church to the rightful place it had before England separated from it. The highest authority, unity and oneness of the purified, pre-Henry Catholic Church is impressive and, echoing Dew, champion of the weak and the people. A reunified Catholic Church of oneness would be a sociopolitical paradise, with a “larger spirit” and “brighter intelligence” thanks to the progress between the 16th and 19th centuries. The only trouble is the unfeasibility of one head, and too unrestrained an emulation of Catholicism that would include its vices. The unity and thereby conservative authority of the Catholic Church is a nice idea worth preserving, but in practice the variations between churches, sects and individuals count for more than a single head.¹¹⁸⁴ But OM is correct to sever the Catholic Church from the state: religion will proceed to its ultimate triumph regardless of it and its often negative impact.¹¹⁸⁵ The idea of unity and spirit manifest in the laudable sides of Catholicism extended to cover the whole society along history. But they need to be balanced with more American religious liberty. This turns out to be an antinomy without a conclusive answer. The author strives to only show the consequences of principles and to keep them internally consistent.¹¹⁸⁶

My point is, *pace* the foray of Marsh at Hampden–Sidney and Kennedy’s sympathies (chapter 3), this was one of the first, if not *the* first, public application of Coleridge as a theosopher in history in the South. Coleridge was “yet conscious also of vast powers of thought, and in that consciousness attempt[ed] to transmute the Spirit–forms of sacred truth as God gave them, into those thought–forms of his own reason which he could most readily apprehend. In consequence of this incessant, yet fruitless endeavour, his theology became a theosophy.”¹¹⁸⁷ For Coleridge and such Oxfordians as John Henry Newman, reason was not apart from but a necessary element of religion: they only differed in conclusions, since Coleridge shunned the Catholic faith.¹¹⁸⁸ The resulting *idea* was for Coleridge not of the mind, i.e., not forms or generalizations, but rather a conception of a thing given knowing its ultimate aim, “a principle in the process of realization through

¹¹⁸² *Anonymous*, “[Review:] Puseyism no Popery, etc.” *Southern Quarterly Review* 5 (1844): 474, 475, citation on *ibid.*

¹¹⁸³ *ibid.*, 469-70.

¹¹⁸⁴ *ibid.*, 477-81, 483, 486, citations on 478.

¹¹⁸⁵ *ibid.*, 489, 492.

¹¹⁸⁶ *ibid.*, 489.

¹¹⁸⁷ *William M. Hetherington*, *Coleridge and His Followers* (London: G. Barclay, 1853), 35.

¹¹⁸⁸ *For related sources, see for example Rule*, “Coleridge’s Reputation as a Religious Thinker: 1816–1972,” esp. 309, 311, 313-14, 317.

history.”¹¹⁸⁹ Obviously this is a theologisation of Hegel about history. The only difference is the dualistic postulate Hegel did not have in the same form.¹¹⁹⁰ Following Coleridge, the reviewer brings up religion’s close relation to philosophy, the dualism of the question, the consequences that principles have, the pervasive power of such theosophy across society, and (optimistic, idealized) history. Like Wiseman and OM, the reviewer treats Coleridgean theosophy as a manifestation of a society-wide crossroads, one end at which awaits primordial Catholicism, but without neglecting the other path.¹¹⁹¹ Like OM, the reviewer went beyond Coleridge: Coleridge in *On the Constitution of the Church and State* (1830) never sanctioned Catholics as key actors in the state–deduced religious–cultural stewardship. Further, in that study, Coleridge never abandoned the state as a necessary element in such stewardship.¹¹⁹² If Coleridge has a liberal fringe in his conservatism,¹¹⁹³ the reviewer has a conservative fringe in his liberalism because of reductionism of history to a more perfect Catholicism and simultaneous, Kantian logical antinomies about such a liberal state. OM’s revision of Coleridge was welcome, because it dispensed with the state as a necessary framework, a great difference to Yankee uses of German philosophy of history. This again brings up southern suspicions about it and, consequently, modern history. Still, this was a great step towards Idealism about history that was to increase due to Holmes (6.2.2).

6.2.1.1 Dissent

To be sure, vestiges of older humanist republicanism about history survived. For instance, a review of historian J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi echoed the Spartan political philosophy and the old guard concerns of Xenophon (chapter 5).¹¹⁹⁴ South Carolina philosopher and intellectual William J. Grayson possibly kept this tradition up the strongest, to the Civil War. He recommended Bolingbroke the anti–Whig as a philosopher *about* history. Although a friend to Simms,¹¹⁹⁵ Grayson is very distant from the solemnities of the idealists concerning such an office. He compares this side of Bolingbroke to the trickster Ephraim Jenkinson at the fair in Oliver Goldsmith’s *Vicar of*

¹¹⁸⁹ Peter Allen, “S. T. Coleridge’s Church and State and the Idea of an Intellectual Establishment,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985): 90.

¹¹⁹⁰ Momigliano, “Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography,” 161.

¹¹⁹¹ Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 1, 230–31.

¹¹⁹² Allen, “S. T. Coleridge’s Church and State and the Idea of an Intellectual Establishment,” 90–92, 96.

¹¹⁹³ *ibid.*, 95.

¹¹⁹⁴ Anonymous, “[Review:] History of the Italian Republics,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842): 157–73; Fox–Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 311.

¹¹⁹⁵ William Gilmore Simms to Evert Augustus Duyckinck, 28th February, 1855, in *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, Volume III–1850–1857 eds. Mary C. Simms Oliphant et al. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1954), 369.*

Wakefield (1766).¹¹⁹⁶ This was a radical comparison, because it conjoins the humanist tradition of history with disregard for Christian didactics about the inhumanity of appearance subscribed to by Universal History (chapter 2) and therefore—again—with a period around or even before Hobbes. Back then, neither Stoic virtue, at work in those subject to Jenkinson’s schemes, nor self-interest dominated.¹¹⁹⁷ Since even for Hobbes, neither appearances nor history could be philosophy, and philosophy could not be Christian,¹¹⁹⁸ history for Grayson by default could not be a philosophic, Christian or epistemic pursuit especially since Grayson probably agreed with Dew against Hobbes on the importance of traditional hierarchy in society (chapter 5). Thus, the secular, Renaissance humanist *Artes Historicae* tradition that preceded exemplary history was not entirely gone.

In addition, anonymous scathing criticism of the reigning bourgeois ethos prevailing across America, including its thinking and morals, appeared.¹¹⁹⁹ The writer almost certainly had read Poe’s recent criticism of the interrelationship of American letters, money, cliques and lack of satire, because the piece featured the reappearance of the term *humbug* Poe had coined.¹²⁰⁰ The writer and Poe shared similar concerns about liberal-bourgeois culture.

Poe had declared the raking satire of America by Baltimore journalist and poet Lambert A. Wilmer true and comparable to John Dryden who had heavily satirised Shaftesbury. Further, Poe even privately claimed Wilmer’s poem is “the text from which to preach a fire-&-fury sermon upon critical independence, and the general literary humbuggery of the day,” in other words, the banal culture industry, be the stripe Whig or

¹¹⁹⁶ Anonymous [William J. Grayson], “Lord Bolingbroke,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842): 104-5. That the author is Grayson is maintained in Oliphant et al., *Letters of William Gilmore Simms*, 3, 369n63. On Bolingbroke as a humanist historian, see for example Blanke et al., “Theory of History in Historical Lectures,” 335.

¹¹⁹⁷ For intellectual background and Hobbes, see Margaret Anderson, “Stoic Constructions of Virtue in The Vicar of Wakefield,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 69 (2008): 422, 424. Given the controversy around Hobbes in the South however, it is debatable whether “post-Hobbesian” Stoicism was a necessity for civic humanism like in Anderson. *ibid.*, 425. For the Christian side of Vicar of Wakefield and Jenkinson, see for example Mary Elizabeth Green, “Oliver Goldsmith and the Wisdom of the World,” *Studies in Philology* 77 (1980): 211-12. For preference of reality to appearance, see Curtis Dahl, “Patterns of Disguise in the Vicar of Wakefield,” *ELH* 25 (1958), esp. 100-1. I am indebted to these scholars for the appearances argument also in chapters 2 and 3. Grayson ignores the comic and didactic ending, where Jenkinson turns out to be “good” and Christian after all, discussed in *ibid.*

¹¹⁹⁸ Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Volume V, *Modern Philosophy: The British Philosophers from Hobbes to Hume*, *A History of Philosophy series* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 3-5.

¹¹⁹⁹ Anonymous, “History of Mormonism,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842): 398.

¹²⁰⁰ *ibid.*, Poe, “Review of The Quacks of Helicon,” *Graham’s Magazine* 19 (1841b): 90-n. p. [93], accessed February 1, 2014, <http://www.eapoe.org/works/criticism/gm41wl01.htm>; Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 299 note.

Democrat. He also echoes Pope and tragic poetics (chapter 4).¹²⁰¹ As cultural critic, Poe went even further: in his book manuscript on American literature he began to write sometime in 1844, he assaults the whole progress theory of history dear to New England and strengthened by Bancroft and Prescott. It falsely grounded cultural discrimination of the South and the West. Resembling Burckhardt, Nietzsche, and Adorno's Hegel interpretation, Poe is aware political statism brings with it increase in (platonian) Idealism and conventionalism. Though posing as liberal, as critique it is actually more conservative and manifests in cliques "whose separate *penchants* render it nearly impossible to get at the truth." Like Jefferson, he points out most magazines are controlled by such cliques, and he explicitly rejects nationalism, Philadelphia literary circles, transcendentalists including the historical romancers and, this time, Kennedy as well.¹²⁰²

Poe saw no fundamental chasm between history and cultural poetics. This is evident from his private remark that southern culture is in the margins of northern dominance and neglect and hence a fitting medium of his *Marginalia* fragments he continued to write and publish until his death in 1849.¹²⁰³ Poe disliked the masses and the increase of individual sameness in society as "liberal-democratic" metaphysics. Romantic aesthetics and the literary industry were only the most pressing sides of this trend. This illuminates his disdain for neohumanist and Yankee "originality for its own sake." Existentially, it resembles Heidegger's critique of "everyone" and its relation to publicity.¹²⁰⁴ The Wilmer review was a part of this critique. A Pittsburgh magazine had previously rejected portions of it. This leads one to speculate whether the Hegel boom there had ties to local magazines. In all probability, Poe strongly disliked modern history.¹²⁰⁵ Despite Poe,

¹²⁰¹ Poe, "Review of The Quacks of Helicon," n.p.; Edgar A. Poe to Joseph E. Snodgrass, July 12, 1841, in Ostrom et al., *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1, 297; Poe, "A Chapter on Autography [part II]," *Graham's Magazine* 19 (1841c), accessed February 1, 2014, <http://www.eapoe.org/works/misc/autogc2.htm>, 280.

¹²⁰² Burton R. Pollin, ed., trans., "The Living Writers of America': A Manuscript by Edgar Allan Poe," *Studies in the American Renaissance* 15 (1991): 152, 165-68, citation on 165. Poe was not alone in making such an argument. Grayson would make a similar case against romantic poetics in the 1850s, which is a modernist position. O'Brien points out the view had become marginal by the time. CO2, 738-39.

¹²⁰³ Edgar A. Poe to John R. Thompson, January 13, 1849, in Edgar Allan Poe, *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe Volume II: 1847-1849*, eds. John Ward Ostrom et al., 3rd rev. ed. (New York: The Gordian, 2008b), 750-51.

¹²⁰⁴ Poe, "Marginalia [part XIV]," *Southern Literary Messenger* 15 (1849) [Item 213], accessed July 13, 2013, <http://www.eapoe.org/works/misc/mar0549.htm>; G. R. Thompson, "Literary Politics and the 'Legitimate Sphere': Poe, Hawthorne, and the 'Tale Proper,'" *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 49 (1994): 183; Heidegger, *Being and Time*, §27.

¹²⁰⁵ For example, another Maryland poet and Episcopalian reverend John N. McJilton delivered a poem titled "The Sovereignty of Mind" to Pennsylvania College Philomathean Society around the time. Though I have not been able to locate the poem, there are grounds to suspect it was transcendentalist and/or idealist: a) the title, b) some Hegelians in Pennsylvania education conjoined Hegel and the mind, c) the wording of Poe's negative review of the poem, d) the Episcopalian

Wilmer remains an obscurity in U.S. cultural study. Resembling Poe's extrapolations, the *Review* writer comes close to Schopenhauer and Nietzsche in his pessimism about contemporary "liberal" American culture. My argument is this view about history was, nevertheless, on a decline by now on the whole in southern discussion.

6.2.2 Shadows of German Idealism: Holmes

Holmes was among the few southerners to have knowledge of the Cincinnati group (chapter 4) and he did not like it. Stallo, as Hegel's and Schelling's expositor—apparently widely read in the North—was not to his taste for its mysticism and complexity. However, I would modify O'Brien's implication that Holmes turned to historicism since it was more free from metaphysics than Idealism and subservient to Holmes's materialist sympathies.¹²⁰⁶ Historism is only a variant of Idealism, but there was a great difference between Niebuhr and Hegel within it (chapters 2, 3). Holmes, at least partly, missed this as I will explain. Holmes dared venture little beyond Niebuhr along the idealist spectrum. Even Michelet, modernist in method and poetic awareness¹²⁰⁷ and esteemed by Holmes and Simms, was too speculative, too infected by idealist metaphysics, in his *Histoire romaine* (1839).¹²⁰⁸ Nevertheless, Holmes continued to wrestle with Idealism and had thereby become its captive.

Holmes declares the historian of the present day "enters into the philosophy of history" to paint the signs recorded instead of just narrating facts "interesting, perhaps, but too often criminal" or "losing sight of all else" than a few prominent persons.¹²⁰⁹ Holmes quite programmatically declares rhetoric and philology as doubtful or immoral history and Grigsby's kind of history (chapter 2) outdated. Like Lomax (chapter 4)—the only other southern expositor of Romanticism as history to such an extent—Holmes spots the discrepancy between relinquishing "the fascinations of society" and cloistered, hard work—that is, history for its own sake. It still was a marginal phenomenon in the South. Holmes expresses his full confidence at the result: "The past appears with graphic fidelity, the picture stands forth with life—like reality." Thus Holmes seems to contend history becomes more real and fuller as a result of neoplatonic increase of light and anthropological

religion, and e) its delivery in Christ's Church, Pennsylvania. Ostrom et al., Edgar Allan Poe, 1, 328 note, 299 note; Clemmer, "Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania," 583-84; "Out of the Past 150 Years Ago," The Gettysburg Times, Monday, March 11, 1991, accessed February 1, 2014, <http://www.newspapers.com/newspage/45937866/>.

¹²⁰⁶ CO2, 1053, 1055-56.

¹²⁰⁷ White, foreword to *The Names of History*, by Jacques Rancière, trans. Hassan Melehy (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), xv-xviii.

¹²⁰⁸ Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 266n32.

¹²⁰⁹ Anonymous [Holmes], "[Review:] *Lives of the Queens of England*," *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842c): 330. This piece is not normally attributed to Holmes, but it would certainly fit his energetic thinking about history at the time and his later opinions.

acquaintance.¹²¹⁰ Further, significant is that the object of the article was a work by female historian Agnes Strickland, which was quite extraordinary.

In his next published article, he claims Bulwer's *Rienzi* "the best philosophy of history that has been written." Later, his Scott analysis has become colored through Carlyle into a warm romance, with Bulwer as Scott's successor. Interestingly, Holmes is still able to explicitly register and examine the metaphysical change from Scott to Bulwer. He describes the historical aspects of the change "productive of the happiest results" and, in a remarkable confusion, identifies it with mechanist, rather than organicist, explanation of interacting processes, which may derive from Prescott's confusion about philosophy of history (chapter 3). Even so, already this article indicates Holmes's sympathy with OM about longing for the purity of the first Catholic faith.¹²¹¹ I argue it was hardly coincidental that Holmes inquired his friend Simms about the Anglican Church at the period.¹²¹² The views also echo Dew (chapter 5).

But Holmes was not a total convert: even for him, the transition from Montaigne to modern philosophy was not complete. Rather, he contends Montaigne's age is only rapidly disappearing, and he and his supporters have no place in modern philosophy—or mainly German Idealism—a development he refers to as "new revolution" in progress "even now." But it is a *battled development*, or a dialectic one. The whole domain of intellect is undergoing a revolutionary renovation but still only *coming*. Like some southerners, even Holmes is only now waking up to the discursive condition of man. And his description of it either as a shock to be embraced against or bravely encountered shows the new theories were not without entrenched unease and disorientation, even skepticism. Holmes believes that time would correct *the abandoning of the good and its replacement by the false*. This is a highly interesting reversal of Kant and Schiller. It is more akin to the Scots' ironic progress theory northerners had rejected and echoes Nietzsche (chapters 2, 3). The world is getting populated by shadows or Idealism and unlike the Germans and especially New England, Holmes fretted about it. The overdose of reflection about history Simms had registered is also known to him.¹²¹³

However, unlike Legaré (chapter 3), Holmes follows Hegel and rejects F. Schlegel's philosophy of history as "lame and barren," only "nick-named Philosophy of History." The task is to describe "the main stream of the world's advance."¹²¹⁴ In other words, he prefers historicism to historism. Holmes's trope of a gigantic river of History, i.e., *Universalhistorie* (chapter 3), is significant and pioneering in southern discussion. It

¹²¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹²¹¹ Anonymous [Holmes], "[Review:] Bulwer's *Zanoni*," *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842a): 180; *idem.*, "[Review:] Bulwer's *Last of the Barons*," *Southern Quarterly Review* 4 (1843a): 218-22, citation on 221. On Catholicism, see *ibid.*, 222. That Holmes is the author is established in CO2, 1231.

¹²¹² William Gilmore Simms to George Frederick Holmes, August 15, 1842, in Oliphant et al., *Letters of William Gilmore Simms*, 1, 319. Simms replies he is "no anti-Anglican." *ibid.*

¹²¹³ Anonymous [Holmes], "[Review:] Whewell on the *Inductive Sciences*," *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842b): 193-95, citations on 194. That Holmes is the author is established in CO2, 1231.

¹²¹⁴ Holmes, *Whewell on the Inductive Sciences*, 196.

probably derived from Bancroft's Heeren translation. Heeren used the metaphor to describe the importance of tracing the sentimental stream of Homeric poetry to its origin and to characterize time as a swallowing stream. Dew took up the first meaning, (again) without citing Heeren, and added "higher principle" and a moralistic evaluation about lust. Similarly, besides his earlier observation mere writing of history is immoral, Holmes trumpeted: "We are fast outliving the reign of sensuality and sloth."¹²¹⁵ The focus should be on the giant stream of History and on an exploration and tracing of "the many tributary rivers which flow into it, and diverge from it, pointing out, at the same time, the sources whence they descended, and exposing the obstacles which caused the divergences." Rather than a dry causal record of positive growth and development—this seems directed at Montesquieu—philosophy of history should be "a philosophical exposition of the mode in which each [period] arose, and of the degree in which it was dependent upon those which preceded it." "[O]ne common spirit" "acted and reacted" within science, arts, letters and economy, i.e., *culture* though the word is unmentioned. These, in turn, were affected by both climate and historicism. We are now a category away from liberal culture of Roman sort (chapter 3, 6.1.1.2). Ironically, Holmes even here insists such a view is *not* metaphysical or deductive as in SAE and "would direct us in the path we ought to pursue" by pointing out progress or History as a universal constant in all its windings. Further, as a linear line, History would exhort optimism, confidence and enthusiasm among people and provide, in its liberal spirit, against both dogmatism and excessive doubt. This also resembles Prescott (chapter 3) and Hegel. Holmes valorizes German scholarship in this regard.¹²¹⁶ Thus, it is striking that Holmes should follow Wiseman's *desiderata* about philosophy of history so thoroughly. It raises the likelihood Holmes, like Dew, was at least open to the cardinal. After all, Holmes's wife was Roman Catholic. He also had connections to William and Mary, was in good terms with Lieber, and took up some of Dew's duties in 1846 thanks to President Tyler's influence.¹²¹⁷

Holmes thus provided crucial *topoi* about history prestigious lawyer and future Justice John Archibald Campbell would utilize early in 1843 in his review of historian François Guizot.¹²¹⁸ Campbell, married to a prestigious New Hampshire family, had probably encountered French histories in his studies of French law in Alabama.¹²¹⁹ Although Campbell took his cue from Holmes, this side of him has been very little researched: indeed, Mann states his stance as a pacifist and almost antislavery Democrat has irked and

¹²¹⁵ Heeren, *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, 107, 120; Dew, *A Digest*, 46; Holmes, "Whewell on the Inductive Sciences," 193.

¹²¹⁶ *ibid.*, 196-97, citations on 196, 197.

¹²¹⁷ Gillespie, *Collapse of Orthodoxy*, 20, 23-24.

¹²¹⁸ Anonymous [John A. Campbell], "[Review:] General History of Civilization in Europe," *Southern Quarterly Review* 3 (1843): 1-17. That the author is Campbell is established in Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of Master Class*, 287n73.

¹²¹⁹ Henry G. Connor, *John Archibald Campbell Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court 1853-1861* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920), 8-10.

mislead scholars roughly a century.¹²²⁰ This indicates that conceptualizations about southern history have been simplistic.

Historically, Campbell is somewhere between Jefferson and the French liberals. Although dismissive of Sparta, Campbell nevertheless supports the Wachsmuth–Jefferson view of an uncorrupt aristocracy as the best form of democracy.¹²²¹ Although Campbell reiterates Holmes’s metaphor of a gigantic river and its multiple tributaries, he omits the latter’s metaphysical speculation about One Spirit and instead relies heavily on Niebuhr.¹²²² This is one more indication southerners could perceive the difference between Niebuhr and paradigmatic idealists like Böckh and Heeren far more acutely than northerners or Dew. In contrast, even Michelet and Thierry had the Rousseauan postulate about an original, a–historical unity.¹²²³ Although for Campbell, there is similarly no history without division, he ignores both the metaphysics of the One and social implications of disunity save for the oppression by a Spartan oligarchy or “bad” aristocracy that obliterated the buffering middle class.¹²²⁴ The usage of the term was rare at this time in America¹²²⁵ though the phenomenon of course existed especially in the North. Contextually, it refers to uncorrupt aristocracy and thus circumvents the Rousseauan problematic idealist discourses and Romanticism depended on. Only a decade later Campbell’s–like Simms’s–historical views reflexively enter a more fully liberal phase.¹²²⁶

Despite his initial criticism, Holmes continued to engage philosophy of history in no less than two articles on F. Schlegel I shall next explore.¹²²⁷

In the first, he continues to marvel how often history’s “higher functions” and “more important and recondite aims” are missed in historical productions.¹²²⁸ This is only the second time—the pioneer being Lieber (chapter 3)—such phrasing has been applied to history in the South in *all* my investigation of hundreds of sources. Notably it fully repeats Lieber’s Hegelian phrasing.

Holmes acknowledges few southerners have heard about French historians Michelet, the Thierrys, Capefigue and their peers about such issues. To almost every reader, they are

¹²²⁰ Justine S. Mann, “The Political Thought of John Archibald Campbell: The Formative Years 1847–1851,” *Alabama Law Review* 22 (1970): 274–76.

¹²²¹ Campbell, “General History of Civilization in Europe,” 9–10, 14.

¹²²² *ibid.*, 10–17.

¹²²³ Gossman, “The Privilege of Continuity: The Bourgeois as Mediator between Conquerors and Conquered,” *History and Theory*. 15 (1976), *Augustin Thierry and Liberal Historiography*, 25–26.

¹²²⁴ Campbell, “General History of Civilization in Europe,” 9.

¹²²⁵ Stuart M. Blumin, *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760–1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 1.

¹²²⁶ *By the 1850s Campbell entertained remarkably progressive views. See Mann, “Political Thought of John Archibald Campbell,”* 284–86.

¹²²⁷ Anonymous [Holmes], “[Review:] *History of Literature*,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842d): 472–517; Anonymous [Holmes], “[Review:] *Schlegel’s Philosophy of History*,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 3 (1843b): 264–317. That Holmes is the author is established in CO2, 1231.

¹²²⁸ Holmes, “*History of Literature*,” 473–74.

fully unfamiliar. Self-critically, Holmes abstains from entering this problematic “or we might be tempted to introduce the historical inquirer into a new and most attractive field,” circumventing to focus on history of literature instead.¹²²⁹ It is possible Holmes had gone too far with his previous programmatic pieces for his audience, hence the focus on language rather than philosophy. Holmes is acutely sensitive how historical language may provide valuable functional and discursive analyses on historiography *but* he conceives of it only as an auxiliary subject to history and its proper field to be literature, which re-enacts Heeren’s position. Philosophy of history of letters is only a means “to trace back the current of that inner and more hidden energy” behind History Holmes continues to describe in supernatural, prophetic terms that are now more hyperbolic.

But unlike the northerners, Holmes is still far more alert about history and its functions. In addition, he is apparently the first southern author to slam the Yankee SAE explicitly in a philosophical sense for grounding form in scientific truth in history. Biographical intertextuality undermines the attempt. Intertextuality within biography, when compared to other historicist productions, actually forms a branch of philosophy of history for Holmes. This is a very advanced suggestion in America, and anticipates Ankersmit’s postmodern emphasis on metaphor. Holmes claims any construction of a system, be it art, science or history, is impossible trusting *mainly* on analytic methodology. This is an Aristotelian, anti-rationalist position. Holmes backs this up with Sterne. Specifically, he uses Sterne’s dismissal of Descartes’s mathematics of music. Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* was devotedly critical of rationalism throughout. This may be a clue to Sterne’s popularity about history in the South, because New England’s philosophy of history was Cartesian. But Coleridge is appealed to as well. Synthetic is preferable to the reign of the analytic, terms that imply knowledge of Kantian epistemology, as does the omnipresence of representation. Such a philosophy of history is still, alas, unknown in England and America.¹²³⁰ This interpretation of Kant was far more nuanced than in the North and that of Carlyle (chapter 3). Holmes ups the ante of more conventional and satirical critique of rationality in southern history—in distinction from the North—by adding to it the weight of Coleridge. However, obviously he thereby ignores the drastic philosophical differences between that convention and Coleridge for history. Since Holmes longs for more philosophy than he found in F. Schlegel, it is feasible he subscribes to Coleridge’s theosophy more than Sterne’s satire.¹²³¹

In the second article, Holmes uses a trope that probably was taken from Simms as I will explain (6.2.3). While repeating the painting metaphor, the view about linearity of time, and the traditionally missed big picture instead of a few individuals, Holmes launches a polemic against “dissecta membra,” i.e., fragmentoriness of the past.¹²³² The phrase comes from Horace’s *Satire* but gets transformed. While for Horace a

¹²²⁹ *ibid.*, 474.

¹²³⁰ *ibid.*, 475, 477 and note *, 478, 476, 478. On Sterne and Cartesian mathematics, see for example Deborah M. Vlock, “Sterne, Descartes, and Music in *Tristram Shandy*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 38 (1998), *Restoration and Eighteenth Century*, 517, 524–25, *passim*.

¹²³¹ Holmes, “*History of Literature*,” 478.

¹²³² *idem.*, “*Schlegel’s Philosophy of History*,” 264.

dismembered state of poet Ennius's poetry was no big deal,¹²³³ for Holmes such a condition of history is "torn and mutilated," "a heap" strung "together upon the wires of chronological succession, the blanched and mouldering bones, so as to defy all recognition of them as organist parts of a once existent body."¹²³⁴ Curiously, this brings closely to mind SAE Speece's shell trope (chapter 2) and indicates that for Holmes, organicist history had become superimposed on the previous organic concept of the body politic. Again, fragmentary history may be amusing and relaxing, satirically and rhetorically clever, but far too overrated: lessons achieved through philosophy—a very different concept from Bolingbroke now however—and mankind's progress are lost in that mode. Neither is history a simple mirror of human nature—and this is directed to the old-school classicists and Scottish philosophers (chapter 2)—nor politics, the northern focus. "[O]ne connected scheme" controls every nation upon which in "mystic, but intelligible characters, the nature, the direction and the causes of the onward march of humanity" *can* be deciphered.¹²³⁵ Although this position is close to Michelet and very symbolic,¹²³⁶ it gets a transcendentalist hue á la Peabody (chapter 5), because of its confidence to grasp *the* real. Holmes has moved from Kant to Peabody epistemologically, a bold move that leaves Schlegel and the metaphoric French behind. Accordingly, Holmes declares such a history *is* a science which, again, would be baffling to the Europeans' sensibilities, but not to the transcendentalists.¹²³⁷ Holmes repeats the Hegelian criticism that Schlegel was not profound enough.¹²³⁸

However, interestingly he still diverges from the transcendentalist and SAE position metaphysically: God is *not* at the helm of history, because that is not historicist. An individual cannot be reduced to the mass, nor are morals and Christianity indicators of progress: this is "hallucination," an interesting proto-Marxian echo. Peoples with supposedly good morals cannot beat Greece, Rome or France of the Sun King. So, his metaphysics is not totally organicist, because despite sympathies with Michelet, it reverts back to the view there is no collective guidance in history outside an individual—facilitating and haphazard change within a material context. In other words, Holmes, like Thornwell and Poe,¹²³⁹ discovers individual difference is irreducible beyond the metaphorical stand-in, realisation that goes against the grain of his time in the West and resembles historicity (chapter 2).¹²⁴⁰ As I have argued (chapter 2), the position is a precursor to Nietzsche, because it emphasizes becoming, not being, and difference instead

¹²³³ Mark Blackwell, "Disjecta Membra: Smollett and the Novel in Pieces," *The Eighteenth-Century* 52 (2011): 423.

¹²³⁴ Holmes, "Schlegel's Philosophy of History," 263, 264, citations on 263, 264.

¹²³⁵ *ibid.*

¹²³⁶ Gossman, "Jules Michelet and Romantic Historiography," accessed December 13, 2013, https://www.openbookpublishers.com/shopimages/resources/3-Gossman_Michelet_Scribner-European%20Writers.pdf, 14-15. All references to this version.

¹²³⁷ Holmes, "Schlegel's Philosophy of History," 268.

¹²³⁸ *ibid.*, 269.

¹²³⁹ Poe, "The Colloquy of Monos and Una," *Graham's Magazine* 19 (1841a): 52-54.

¹²⁴⁰ Holmes, "Schlegel's Philosophy of History," 272, 273, 286, 277-78, citation on 286.

of sameness about history. So, Holmes advocates such a stand-in in order to escape nihilism *and* to avoid the analytic and sterile social history or social science history—the northern catachretic preference. This raises the possibility of nihilism about history in the South, if organicism, i.e., the all-guiding Spirit, gets left out. But like Thornwell, or philosopher Søren Kierkegaard,¹²⁴¹ Holmes refuses to emphasise history’s ontological enervation to draw atheistic conclusions, although he argues philosophically more carelessly than Thornwell.¹²⁴² He downplays his earlier flashed sympathy with OM: instead, different aspects, including religious, of human kind should be conjoined to “form a perfect whole.”¹²⁴³ He rejects any Manichean and Gnostic antagonism between atheism and religion popular in the North: any dialectic between civilized and barbaric at the beginning of history he names “fanciful imaginations.”¹²⁴⁴ This indicates southerners did not subscribe to the hierarchical–racial progress theory of New England and northern classicist–Federalist historians, but paid more attention to the stadialist model (chapter 2).

Reverting again to the French, this time to historian Augustin Thierry, Holmes insists that civilization is a violence and a conquest *but* something that cannot be forced from without or captured as an abstraction. This seems to be a contradiction unless regarded from the nature–respecting perspective of John Tyler (6.1.1.2). Civilization is not a goal in itself. A little like in Herder—but what Holmes again misreads as mechanist—some peoples are “wholly incapable” of it along a temporal continuum, and get exterminated as a result.¹²⁴⁵ But the way to explore this continuum—that is nevertheless categorical unlike in Herder, an illuminating contradiction—is not deductive or idealist as in F. Schlegel. Rather, it is philological and inductive: Schlegel puts the chart of appearances before the horse, and thus his philosophy of history is not even philosophy. Unconscious processes, actions and monuments, every kind of phenomenon, are left out if history gets deduced. This holds true especially for deductions from mind or abstraction but, revealingly, *from the sign as well*. This is philological by way of Niebuhr and modernist by way of Michelet in its remarkable versatility of empirical subject matter. It is also Derridean in its distrust in the Platonic sign.

Holmes’s theory of the individual man in history as something enabled by the modern condition of history, its scheme of civilization, and progress of human liberty, shares premises with Burckhardt and Poe (chapters 3, 4). But the conclusion is very different: modernity as liberalism enables “the independence of the individual man against the aggregate masses” and “modern civilization is liberating each individual man from the tyranny of his fellows.” Although no inherent champion of the masses, Holmes is

¹²⁴¹ Søren Kierkegaard, “Fear and Trembling,” repr. in *The Essential Kierkegaard*, eds. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 93-101.

¹²⁴² Holmes, “Schlegel’s Philosophy of History,” 279-80. *Holmes speaks of consciousness as enabling pure voluntarism, which comes perilously close to the idealist position. ibid.*, 280.

¹²⁴³ *ibid.*, 282.

¹²⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 286-87.

¹²⁴⁵ *ibid.*, 289-90, 297. *The premises resemble Michelet. Gossman, “Jules Michelet and Romantic Historiography,”* 35.

optimistic.¹²⁴⁶ Casting aside the pessimistic symbolic irony of the earlier Charleston critics (chapter 3), Holmes ends up *valorizing the system as reason's necessary blueprint*. It guarantees history's philosophical and scientific character. It also provides an escape from material fatalism of the ancients that Michelet had pointed out.¹²⁴⁷ Thus, despite his intriguing protestations and innovations in method and metaphysics, Holmes only inverts the deductive idealism of Schlegel. Thereby, he takes a major step towards Hegel's proactive dialectic that covers all mankind. He connects to this insight a decisive division of history when Jews appeared on the scene, to which he finds support in Michelet as well. From Jews onward, all "was directly preparatory for the new system," the period 280–1300 A.D. containing developing germs. This rhetorically devolves to Heeren and Bancroft (chapter 3).¹²⁴⁸ In sum, the tendency of an increasing number of southerners to examine Idealism and even develop it further in quite avantgarde ways, but without accepting organicist conclusions "all the way down," is fairly apparent.

Also the context of this second article is interesting. To it appeared an implicit rebuttal, nominally related to Guizot, by Holmes's friend, lawyer, statesman and son of a South Carolina physician and planter David Flaviel Jamison. Jamison is quite obscure today.¹²⁴⁹ Jamison, though Holmes's mentor about philosophy of history,¹²⁵⁰ was decidedly more conservative and less discerning about history. Interestingly, Jamison is the fourth instance of a physician or physician family (after Rush, Cartwright, and J. Nott), to engage history in a discussion that has relevance to my concerns. The result follows, roughly, the same path as in the others: emphasis on race,¹²⁵¹ Christianity as guarantor of morals and civilization, and a scientific ethos.

Jamison's piece was far behind Holmes in sophistication. For example, Jamison glosses over history with Carlyle and Whig Christianity, is against Xenophon, believes questions of history can be proven true beyond dispute, and is contemptuous of all history that is not a production of the mind begun only under the great Christian reformer Charlemagne.¹²⁵² Thus, intriguingly, a physician's ethos exposed southerners to fairly northern and—ironically—intellectually simplified theories about history. Further, like

¹²⁴⁶ Holmes, "Schlegel's Philosophy of History," 295-96, 313, 306, 298, citations on 306. For Michelet's pluralism in methodology see for example White, foreword, xv; Gossman, "Jules Michelet and Romantic Historiography," 15. Also Ranci re, *The Names of History*, 49-52. Holmes has no trouble with a deistic postulate about God in his conclusion. Holmes, "Schlegel's Philosophy of History," 317.

¹²⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 299, 303-5.

¹²⁴⁸ *ibid.*, 302-3, 309.

¹²⁴⁹ For basic information, see Davidson, introduction, cxvi-cxvii.

¹²⁵⁰ Gillespie, *Collapse of Orthodoxy*, 12.

¹²⁵¹ D. F. Jamison, "General History of Civilization in Europe [part II]," *Southern Quarterly Review* 4 (1843): 164. I disagree with some sources that Jamison wrote what I attributed to Campbell above because of the name signing, the scientific-Christian approach to history as well as previous views about social philosophy that are closer to Jefferson.

¹²⁵² *ibid.*, 161-62, 168-69 note *, 168, 170-174. Jamison's article is dated May 30th while Holmes's piece came out in the April number.

Gilmer, Jamison misses the vast difference between Gibbon and Carlyle on history.¹²⁵³ Due to a lack of scholarship on Jamison it is difficult to proceed further. It may be no accident that Jamison was among the first southern authors in the major journals who signed articles with his own name.¹²⁵⁴ His relationship to discourse may thus have differed from his fellow southerners in some profound way.

Holmes continued with the theme next autumn when he shows a marked preference for Campbell over Jamison and has largely switched F. Schlegel for Michelet.¹²⁵⁵ Specifically, Holmes relies now far more on Niebuhr especially towards the end of the article, as well as philological criticism and research. Like Campbell, he has now modified and subdued the flow of history metaphor, meaning with it a genealogical study by way of Niebuhr.¹²⁵⁶ Holmes's retreat from OM continued: he grounds Catholicism in ancient Rome, and repeats this five times: both systems are strictly and totally political institutions and both are repressive systems of governance in comparison to his neohumanist interpretation of Greece. Catholicism is only a means to examine Roman society.¹²⁵⁷ However, Holmes was not rid of OM: at the very end, he declares: "to the Papacy we owe the revivification of the world" as a preserver of Christianity and initial stage of Protestantism, and "the germ and the model of our modern literature" comes from it.¹²⁵⁸

Similar conflict pervades the tropes: on the one hand, he reintroduces "the same uniform spirit" that develops, believes "singular affinity to a spiritual world" as the force behind human beauty, character and emotion, and attests cultural artifacts like poetry, literature and the arts are "works of the spirit" and "ideal creation[s]."¹²⁵⁹ But on the other hand, he relies surprisingly lot—and contradictorily—on Montesquieu without question, and applies such Fontenelle–Prescott–influenced terms as "machine" to describe the Roman citizen, "the engine" to describe the Roman army, "a State engine," "one of the component parts of a grand political device" to describe Roman religion, while Roman mythology is "an anomalous monster of State machinery" "wholly devoid of any irradiation, any enthusiasm from above."¹²⁶⁰ This last was perhaps a romantic polemic. Roman "sensual and allegorical worship" is portrayed as "disgusting rites" while Christianity was "a new and purer religion", a neoplatonic and Victorian estimate.¹²⁶¹

Obviously Holmes continues his struggles with Idealism and, like Dew (chapter 5), has come to terms with neohumanism, probably as a result of contact with Simms, Dew, or both. As we have seen, unlike in the North, this still was a rare attitude in southern historical thinkers. But Holmes also steers away from his initial hyperbolic Idealism and

¹²⁵³ *ibid.*, 161-62.

¹²⁵⁴ *CO1*, 560.

¹²⁵⁵ Holmes, "Rome and the Romans," 269-306. Holmes at the outset recommends Michelet as the best philosopher of history at the moment. *ibid.*, 269.

¹²⁵⁶ Holmes, "Rome and the Romans," 290, *passim*.

¹²⁵⁷ *ibid.*, 275, 279-80, 291, 295, 306.

¹²⁵⁸ *ibid.*

¹²⁵⁹ *ibid.*, 280, 296.

¹²⁶⁰ *ibid.*, 275, 284, 290, 291, 296

¹²⁶¹ *ibid.*, 289, 305.

his cautious approval of OM towards the more traditionally southern emphasis on “cool” philology. However, by next decade, he would only read Catholic texts (chapter 5).

6.2.3 Shadows of German Idealism: Simms

Even in 1854, Simms was not ready for a full-scale middle class utilitarian social philosophy in his novel *Woodcraft*. This is symbolically enacted by Porgy’s difficulties to adjust to peace-time society increasingly controlled by money, greed and utility.¹²⁶² However, Simms arguably was slowly, perhaps inadvertently, moving to that direction in his keen engagements with broader intellectual trends. Simms had a dislike for Whitaker.¹²⁶³ This feeling was mutual and the arena was the Whig *Courier* that was slightly biased against Simms’ romantic ventures. The irreconcilable differences about language were apparent in Whitaker’s criticism of Simms. This could be expected from the drastic semiotic difference between outdated Lockean rationalism and romantic metaphoric.¹²⁶⁴ Although Simms continued his historical pessimism about the frontier in *Beauchampe* (1842), his next tale *The Social Principle* (1843) was remarkably more conservative and Victorian in my view, if still ironic.¹²⁶⁵ It had more resemblance with Kennedy’s *Horse-Shoe Robinson* (chapter 3) in terms of values.

In the early-1840s, Simms confronted both northern literary culture and the question of history more explicitly. Thus, he also contributed to the weakening of southern idiosyncrasy about history and letters. After Biele’s death, he lobbied his publishers to work with Samuel Hart, Sr., a wealthy Jew who had bought Biele’s “Establishment” in 1841. As proprietor of “a circulating library and book shop” Charleston ladies were fond of, Hart was effectively disseminating book reading in the town.¹²⁶⁶ But in addition, Hart wanted to counter the northern pattern of producing collected volumes dedicated to single towns. Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore each already had a town book of their own. So, it was internal urban rivalry Hart wanted Charleston to pitch into, and Simms became the editor for the endeavor.¹²⁶⁷ Significantly, even Whitaker joined in to respond to the North. However, indicative of the regional differences, despite the cheap price, the book that appeared only in 1845 never sold many copies, causing Simms to abandon additional volumes.¹²⁶⁸

¹²⁶² Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 52; *Kreyling*, *Figures of the Hero in Southern Narrative*, 49-50.

¹²⁶³ Moss, “*Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions*,” 86.

¹²⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 89-90.

¹²⁶⁵ Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 130, 52-54.

¹²⁶⁶ *Simms to Carey and Hart, August 2, 1841*, 254; *Moltke-Hansen*, *introduction to The Charleston Book: Miscellany in Prose and Verse*, ed. William Gilmore Simms, repr. ed. (Spartanburg: The Reprint Company, 1983), viii.

¹²⁶⁷ *Simms, Prospectus*, “*The Charleston Book*,” in *Oliphant et al.*, *Letters of William Gilmore Simms*, 1, 268-69.

¹²⁶⁸ *Moltke-Hansen*, *introduction*, x.

Interestingly, *Godey's Magazine* ridiculed the book as a feminine effort. The editors echoed not only the previous estimate of the *Courier* about Simms, but also the older abolitionist charge, going back at least to Daniel Webster in the 1830s, that slavery weakened or feminized southern men. It overlooked the different southern attributes of masculinity from those of the North.¹²⁶⁹ It was an additional instance of refusal to look at the South as Other that connected to culture politics of power through the body and text. As in case of the *Southern Review*, South Carolina response was again *reactive*, but this time less *different*, because now it was dialectical. The project was warfare of letters *within urban civilization*. Thereby, it was decidedly more homogenizing and bordered than in the previous cases of the *Review* and censorship (chapter 3).

Out of Simms's preoccupation with history and romantic theory at the time emerged a series of lectures he was asked to deliver on history and its uses in Georgia late in 1841. He delivered them in March, 1842. They were first published as a series in journals and then included in his book *Views and Interviews in American Literature, History and Fiction* (first series) (1845).¹²⁷⁰ For the remainder of the study, I shall briefly examine their first part. Any attention to Simms as a theorist of history had to wait until the late-1970s.¹²⁷¹ Since then, attention has not been great.

Remarkably, Simms commences from the divided state of mankind and the discursive condition of history. Like Holmes and the Scots, he laments such a frame of mind has taken place that has destroyed the naïve faith in the ancients.¹²⁷² As we have seen, this endorsement of modern history was still fairly novel in the South. At this time, only Lomax had made historical consciousness into a problem in the German manner that went beyond Blair (chapters 2, 4). As a result of history's discursivity, life gets sucked out from history into empty forms. Unlike the later work of Holmes and southerners generally—and indicative of his preference for the contested German romantic liberals—Simms singles out Niebuhr to blame for the tendency and anticipates Holmes's argument about too dry, too form-centered history without organicist life, that is, phenomenality. He even uses the same tropes of a skeleton, wires and dry bones.¹²⁷³ The practical dimension of filling-up

¹²⁶⁹ "Gentlemen of the South—stop—Ladies of the South, you certainly will cherish the undertaking, and the gentlemen are bound to follow your lead." Sarah J. Hale and Lydia H. Sigourney, "The Charleston Book," *Godey's Lady's Book, and Ladies' American Magazine* 23 (1841): 190. Hinton, *History and Topography of the United States of North America*, 1, 388 note *; Silber, *Romance and Reunion*, 198-99n9. *The emasculation of southern men originates from an earlier date than in Silber.*

¹²⁷⁰ William Gilmore Simms to the Georgia Historical Society, November 25, 1841, in Oliphant et al., *Letters of William Gilmore Simms*, 1, 287-88, 300n11; Guilds, "Simms's Use of History: Theory and Practice," *The Mississippi Quarterly* 30 (1977): 506. *Guilds has 1846 but the cover says 1845.*

¹²⁷¹ *ibid.*, 505.

¹²⁷² Simms, "The Epochs and Events of American History, as Suited to the Purposes of Art and Fiction," *repub. in Views and Interviews in American Literature, History and Fiction, first series, by William Gilmore Simms, Wiley and Putnam's Library of American Books series (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845)*, 21-22.

¹²⁷³ *ibid.*, 21-22 and 22 note *.

dry fragments is art, affirmed by beauty, in a historian. Art becomes the greatest historian for the masses of mankind. Such didactics of history would result in lifting “heart of the multitude” “into gradual excellence and hope!” This was a move away from “conscious baseness”: it is *potentially better for the general welfare*.¹²⁷⁴ This is probably the first endorsement of the German liberal discursivity of history and philosophy in the South.¹²⁷⁵

History is based on and deduced from individual feeling. It is allegory on its material—not textual—remains. In American context, Simms later specifies that this subject—matter is pure, rough—hewn nature one approaches with simplicity, as if a blank slate. This prescription echoes Bushnell’s argument about essential American simplicity (6.2.1). Further, Simms contends the pure brightness of noon day is good for the American historian: “a day perfect from the beginning” with zero invention. This is another neoplatonic and transcendentalist trope but previously, only echoed by Gilmer in the South in my material (chapter 4). That is why the American archive guarantees truth, and why an American publication *equals* sight and hearing, an argument strongly influenced by Emerson (chapter 3). It is “the creative faculty” that makes humans human and the aspect that makes human known to human and ensures the possession of the past and its transmitting for the future.¹²⁷⁶

The sign has acquired its status as ontotheological presence for Simms. This is philosophy of history of an idealist kind, rather than singular facts and conjectures. Its medium is painting and the imagination,¹²⁷⁷ a statement Holmes would disagree with later. The U.S. would also be dependent on such a history and philosophy of history.¹²⁷⁸ Despite his preference for tangentiality over the sign, Simms is still not advocating antiquarian history. Rather, the idealistic construction will be passed along to the future as reality’s symbol.¹²⁷⁹ He is not rejecting the rhetorical quality of (historical) language. However, the important aspect in it is inspiration and hope, mental character composed of “just principles, generous tendencies and clear, correct standards of taste and duty.” This curiosity is composed equally of morality and humanity and offers lessons for character in such an idealist sense,¹²⁸⁰ a notion Holmes would agree with but which is also a New England topos (chapter 3). Morality’s source, thus, is put on a temporal line and is entirely independent from the empirical realm. This position is still relevant in the 21st century. True and complete history is a poetic one.¹²⁸¹

Resembling Dew’s neohumanism, Simms extends the romantic principle into a universal, but unlike him, he foils it, as well as romance literature, in nationalism. Otherwise, no—one will likely care. But the offices of romance and history are still separate in degree. Unlike for Dabney for example (chapter 4), romancing as graces, the

¹²⁷⁴ *ibid.*, 22-23, citations on 22, 23.

¹²⁷⁵ Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*.

¹²⁷⁶ Simms, “*Epochs and Events of American History*,” 24, 25, 35, 45, 46, citations on 25, 45.

¹²⁷⁷ *ibid.*, 25, 26.

¹²⁷⁸ *ibid.*, 34-35.

¹²⁷⁹ *ibid.*, 25-26.

¹²⁸⁰ *ibid.*, 26-27.

¹²⁸¹ *ibid.*, 27-30.

heart, pure affections and ennobling virtue belong firmly to home rather than to history. Both desire for something they can never attain, but along the continuum of time, some other genius may pick up where they individually leave off.¹²⁸² Scott and Shakespeare are allies better than Hume: here Simms evades the ironic and skeptical Scott reading (chapter 2).¹²⁸³ Romance, deduced from nature, outlasts the sign and the scholar of signs.¹²⁸⁴ However, Simms nods to Poe in his rejection of didactic romance and excessive contemplation common in northern letters (chapters 2, 3). Freedom should not be tempered with in such manner in either history or romance.¹²⁸⁵ In addition, idealist romancing without morality and sense of place is empty, what Cooper has missed in his too wanton generalizations.¹²⁸⁶ Religion is the most pervasive element about national feeling and poetic creating, “[a]nd he who speaks *from* the soul, we need hardly say, speaks *to* the soul.” Simms now contends even Byron followed this metaphysics.¹²⁸⁷ And poetic freedom is counterbalanced in history by the uniquely American prosaic character of the archive and the sign (!) even if Americans cannot fully be separate from England or Europe. This lack of separation pertains especially to the rural South. In education, Americans should cut loose from the English aristocratic ethos.¹²⁸⁸

In my material, this is *the first combination of German romantic liberalism and nationalism in the South that is in accord with modern history*. Simms postulates the presence–absence dyad that is remarkably modern and still relevant. But not everyone agreed as I have examined. Vestiges of southern ontological awareness of being as something irreducible to romance remain in Simms, but they are overturned by the unifying forces of religion and feeling. Departing from Pearce who finds resemblances to Nietzsche¹²⁸⁹ and Nakamura who ties Simms to Christian progress reminiscent of SAE¹²⁹⁰ I would locate Simms closest to Schiller.¹²⁹¹ The dialectic scheme: form vs. life equals play and beauty of freedom counterbalanced by necessity, is very close. The importance to be moral that is based on art as moral comes from Schiller, as does the optimism about the common humanity at the face of individual loss along history’s line. Further, Simms hooks up with Schiller in his Fichtean–Hegelian postulate about organicist anthropologism. The emphasis on nationalism resembles Schiller, and the idea of *Aufhebung*, simultaneous raising and preserving, comes from him, adopted by Hegel. Finally, the emphasis on *Bildung* that is democratic is a Schillerian concept, though known in the North also. Since only Lomax had theorized about Schiller for history at this time in

¹²⁸² *ibid.*, 31, 32, 40, 32, 31.

¹²⁸³ *ibid.*, 33.

¹²⁸⁴ *ibid.*, 35.

¹²⁸⁵ *ibid.*, 37.

¹²⁸⁶ Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 42.

¹²⁸⁷ Simms, “*Epochs and Events of American History*,” 38-39, citation on 39, *emphasis original*.

¹²⁸⁸ *ibid.*, 46, 43-44.

¹²⁸⁹ Pearce, “*History for Life*,” 65-66, *passim*.

¹²⁹⁰ Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms*, 13, 44.

¹²⁹¹ See, for example, Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*, 206-12; Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 148; Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 70-73; Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, 200-3.

the South in the journals, Simms had probably read her piece. The differences to Schiller are a less strict dichotomy into history and poetics, and the transcendentalist elements in the argument about history. Simms had joined the admirers of Michelet by 1848¹²⁹² but in this study, I cannot enter more deeply into Simms's social politics.¹²⁹³

¹²⁹² Pearce, "History for Life," 79n43.

¹²⁹³ See, however, for example Moltke-Hansen, "Ordered Progress: The Historical Philosophy of William Gilmore Simms," in *Long Years of Neglect: The Work and Reputation of William Gilmore Simms*, ed. John C. Guilds (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 126-47.

7. Results and discussion

The purpose of the study was to examine how white southerners in Virginia and South Carolina were philosophically different about history to New England at the level of historiography in the early 19th century.

A major result of the study was that especially before the early-1840s, neither Virginia nor South Carolina historiography under study actively partook in or completely endorsed the New England project about modern history. Consequently, I shall first address what the results showed about New England's take on philosophy, religion, and finally aesthetics and ideology about history. I shall then do the same regarding Virginia and South Carolina.

The New England interpretation of modern history called for a history that was rooted in natural science. Therefore, it was more social scientific than historical, because it operated more formally than contextually, and was more interested in abstract general laws (nomothetic history) than empirical particularities and change (idiographic history). A peculiar aspect was a desire to discard the traditional European skepticism about history and, as a corollary, humanism about it, and to erect a secure and essentially modern ground for the U.S. on the result. The primary philosophical characteristic was Descartes's rationalism that believed history was a scientific truth established within individual modern mind. It situated within modern Universal History of the 1600s, but in distinction from it, like in Descartes, it wanted to reject Universal History's mode about form or the signifier as a mere instrument to the signified. This pure reason could transcend space and time and, consequently, rendered both speech and writing about history true. This Cartesian insight was then applied to Enlightenment history as social science. Desiratum here was to scientifically conquer nature and achieve the goals related to freedom of all reasoning individuals. Descartes and Enlightenment progress meant knowledge about history needed to be simultaneously eternal, or God-grounded, and scientific. The Second Great Awakening bolstered this view. The Evangelicals, championing Locke, imposed Locke's individualistic-psyche empiricism on history. Absence of skepticism about history thereby continued. Locke enabled an application of modern enlightened social history across space and time, and its grounding in natural history. This created a universal standard of reason for peoples regardless of space and time that gave birth to a normative race theory within progress. Further, it grounded individuals in the material parameters of social science (physiology, economics, climate, anthropology) rather than history. The third philosophical layer began to get added in the late-1810s when the Yankees went to Germany. Many chose Göttingen, whose representative Heeren was a major linchpin. They shared the background in race theories that the appreciation of social science history had already amplified in New England. Another point of contact was a strong interest in statist history, or to see the nation as the end and the ground of scientific history. At the same time, front row U.S. historians George Bancroft and William Prescott also wanted to reform social science history. They took Hegel's German historicism to mean that history matters only as a progressive dialectic process of their version of social science history. This progress of liberalism and liberal institutions steadily and objectively conquered nature and uncivilized savagery. The novelties for them were Other as antithetical fodder

for universalized liberal progress, and compatibility of social science history with romance. Their German Romanticism was not skeptical about history. Rather, it was a resource to strengthen the other layers and solidify history as a nationalist project. In the 1840s, this version of historicism began to also spread within the northern U.S. in institutions, groups and journals.

Because history was from the beginning grounded in God in New England, it affected their philosophy of history. The Cartesian basis called for a synthesis between God and true form as history's ground. The Second Great Awakening was critical in this outcome. Extrapolating from the Bible as the truth of society and in line with the reading of Locke, it gave birth to a reader who could independently exercise reason to grasp the true idea of any text. In addition, individual spiritual feeling entailed that the individual could transcend space and time in a Gnostic manner to establish a new order of knowledge nearer God. The major pioneers of northern Evangelicalism were philosophical neoplatonists who believed in such a feat. True and scientific ideas about the signified and a new-neoplatonic and organicist-modern order of the world became simultaneously possible. This overlapped with organicist German Romanticism that likewise was indebted to neoplatonic mysticism but, critically, in a far more skeptical sense. Rejecting the skepticism, but adopting the idealist argument, romance texts of history became scientifically true for readers. Thereby, romance strengthened the nationalist, religious and scientific grounds of U.S. history, and the new individualist-though gnostically balanced by way of pantheism-utopian social order. By the late-1830s when Bancroft's study came out, the transcendentalists such as Emerson actively filtered German Idealism to these ends about history. A related ideological trajectory was the active inclusion of the U.S. into an international order of civilization through history: appearing at least as early as the 1780s, but perhaps present already in Franklin, it received a significant boost from Germany education from the late-1810s, and from encouraging commentators in Germany (Kant, Hegel, Heeren), Britain (Hinton) and France (Crèvecoeur, Tocqueville).

At first, New England history had little to do with art or poetics. It wanted to abandon humanist history as well as skeptical considerations about it for the (social) science-rationalism-religion triad. In practice, this meant accessing minds and ideas truly across time and space, then disseminating these ideas freely for utilitarian ends, to be of use for the needs in the individual minds of the new nation. The adoption of Locke by the Evangelicals reinforced this trend, because writing history was irrelevant to this system of transportation. However, by the late-1810s, new bourgeois interpretations about the ancient world, to which the Germans greatly contributed, landed to the U.S. In New England by the late-1820s, this neohumanism emphasized imagination under the guidance of Calvinist religion as an antidote to the previously rigid space of mind and reason, an aim that Heeren's *Universalhistorie* perfectly answered to in history. In addition, this broadening of space established a felt continuum from antiquity to the present and from the Old Testament to the present. It enabled to see the U.S. as a fulfillment of the liberal ancient republicanism of Ancient Greece and the Old Testament, but it also called forth American morality and American heroes in history who would improve on the ancient pagans. The new grafting of feeling on religion reinscribed character in history and romance and its essentially moralistic import. Character was no longer an exemplar figure

separate from the rest. Rather, the most useful history facilitated character development into civilized, bourgeois, urban and useful *citizenry* in the mind of the independent, rational reader. This reinscription extended to the contemporary imperative to be moral about poetics and became the chief purpose of history and institutional cultural poetics. Rather than investigating history for its own sake, or being studiously skeptical about it, history was arranged and mastered to serve this new viewpoint and ordering of the world.

By contrast, Virginia and South Carolina felt a definite disorientation about modern history. Though related to science in some cases, but very rarely reducible to it, history was less about social science, and even less about Descartes. In comparison to the New England's attempt to master nature and transcend old European history, southerners took an intense interest in both. In comparison to the New England attempt to order space and ground it in God, southerners focused on the particular and dynamism: many protested against *both* neoclassical "civilized" ordering in aesthetics *and* against history's ordering through discourse comprised of mind and God. Many, especially in Virginia, relied more on commentary than philosophical discourse about history, a strategy that antedated modern history. Even in case of Jefferson, they never *swapped* the age-old concerns with humanism and rhetoric as priorities for universality of mind that would ground the nation. Their interest was on individual phenomena as in proper idiographic history and on the *way* the signifier covers the signified. In other words how, if at all, the signifier accesses the signified. While in New England, the signifier presented a full coverage of the signified that was reified by the layers of natural science ideal, reason, romance and religion, in the South, little of this metaphysics was found, especially before the late-1830s. Not only were southerners following the humanist tradition that had trouble with the new arrangement about culture and the book, they were also alert to deep skepticism about history, how the signifier fails in time and how it deals with power. They never subscribed to Descartes. In history, they were not a culture of mind, but more mind and body, in cases even mainly body. They embarked from humanism, pyrrhonic skepticism, or enlightened Universal History that had no faith in historical language as true beyond rhetorical instrumentality and poesy. Most chose not to adapt so categorically to the refashioning of space and time as New England. Some southern philosophers, such as Thornwell, even undermined modern individuality itself by contrasting it with the vastly popular Aristotle. In sum, few southerners lost sight of what preceded modern history.

As with Universal History, southerners turned out to be far more discerning than the Yankees about the new German thinking. All but Lieber and the later Simms failed to enthusiastically embrace historicism that entailed equality of all individuals on a same level of slowly progressive dialectic discourse, the novel view that became vastly simplified in the North. Rather, at most they agreed with historicism: Idealism is important about history, but there was no overlapping metaphysical teleology attached. The Yankees, in contrast, boldly and as a result of philosophical misunderstandings and figural misreadings, streamlined Idealism for nationalist ends. In Virginia, only Lomax, who did not live in the state but was born there, embraced the German ideas. Far more commonly, idealist history was an ironic, even tragic symbol of dislocation: the vaster its extension and scope, the more deadly, the more ludicrous, and the more fictive the result. Lieber was the southern pioneer of historicism, and instrumental in bringing it to the attention of

Holmes in the early-1840s. Historicism steadily gained in popularity in the 1840s in the southern states as a byproduct of Catholic sympathies.

Since history was not just a social science, and since there was no nationalist mysticism about a unified people, as a corollary there was no race theory as a metaphysical abstraction, especially not before the impact of Dew in the 1830s. The exceptions were the Lockean Whigs and just three individuals, out of roughly a hundred. Two, Nott and Jamison, resided in South Carolina. None resided in Virginia. Each either underwent, or was familiar with, a physician's training in Philadelphia. While there, these marginal individuals probably were exposed to the Yankee racist application of natural history to social science history. The 1830s rocked this state in Virginia: Dew appeared on the scene; the Turner rebellion happened; Virginia was annexed to northern-led, Whig- and-Episcopalian run organizing antiquarian history. The outcome somewhat reified history.

Since history was not grounded in God, far more critical and secular attitudes about it flourished, particularly among the alumni of Virginia and among the first South Carolina critics. The antiquarian organization of history run by Jefferson's historical enemy Marshall lessened these Virginia voices. The Second Great Awakening included the South too of course, but made a miniscule dint on history before Whitaker and especially before the mid-1840s. Not only was the philosophical focus of history not on the Cartesian science-God dyad, even the Platonic and British neoclassical imitation or discourse did not get transplanted into religion, history and the book. The neoplatonic enthusiasm about light was less shared. The first exceptions were the Whig Marylanders: in Wirt in a more subdued sense, it was mixed to enlightened rhetoric. Kennedy embraced Emerson in his historical novel. In the late-1830s, this rhetoric was found among their fellow-Whigs and Episcopalian members of VHPS including Dew, and among some authors who published their writings in South Carolina. Finally, it became mixed with Idealism in Charleston in the early-1840s, about which New England Neoplatonism was making even Gnostic claims about reality that commingled with history and science. The new cultural leaders such as Dew and Holmes, intrigued by the British Catholic revival, though more warily in case of the latter, began to sympathize with a conservative-spiritual world order that made German Idealism applicable to it. In addition, Whitaker was a strong neoplatonist. Even then, some elements of the older Renaissance and baroque order of Montaigne remained about history. In Virginia, it was mainly the Whigs, and particularly Dew, who were concerned about including the U.S. to the international order of civilization through history: otherwise, far less enthusiasm about it prevailed. Unlike in New England, ventures to the international arena through a cosmopolitan order of history were rare: they appear only in the late-1830s a few times in Whitaker's first journal. Instead, in Charleston, Simms appreciated the organicist metaphysics of modern history from early on that dispensed with cosmopolitan history, and his views gained wider acceptance from the 1840s. Thereby, southerners preferred more the European concern with nature that organicism and modern history had rather than its erasure, mastery through reason, or its subsequent subjecting to sterile imagination, as in New England. However, it was only in the 1840s when organicism, and thereby modern history, reaches them more, and

haphazardly. But even in this change, history was metaphysically less distinct from contemporary Europe of the doubtful romantics.

Southern history had a lot to do with poetics and rhetoric in a way that for the most part was strikingly different from modern history but even less to do with romance. Jefferson's desire to write a freeing history went against the grain of the times, but in its libertarian radicalism, his university anticipated or possibly even went beyond Nietzsche in its linguistic and heavily classicist expositions of novel bourgeois trends. Even romance history was more rejected than endorsed, at least by scholars, but Whitaker's first journal made it creep more into poetics, and the early-1840s saw a real onslaught of romantic theory. Still, on the whole, more European doubt and irony than Yankee confidence attended historical romancing. The modernist dislocation about history was perhaps most explicit in Wirt, Simms, Lomax, and the unfortunately unknown author of the 1835 Charleston article examined in chapter 6.

Southern discourse about history was thereby different and even lacking in the sense of modern history. It valued presence far more, even oral exchange of story-telling that print culture began to weed out in the 1600s. Foreshadowing Derrida, most chose *not* to enter into the new bourgeois trend of a free isolated individual to whom writing was making-present. In addition, most rejected the new bourgeois trend that romanticized speech *in preference to* writing. Thus, they were not very neohumanist. The only individuals of note more captivated by the neohumanist aesthetic were Wirt, Simms, Dew, Lomax, and Holmes. Wirt was following the bourgeois novelties keenly that included neohumanism. Simms moved from sympathy to implicit rejection of southern peculiarities concerning urbanized historical discourse. Dew mixed neohumanism strongly with his complex and fairly incoherent political philosophy. It systemically left out the Jeffersonians and, mostly, humanist attitudes. In addition, Dew, upping the ante from Wirt, advocated a serious update on the southern public sphere towards a more cosmopolitan order. Lomax applied neohumanism to history through aesthetics. Holmes, following Dew, colored ancient Greece with neohumanism. Most others relied more on older, roughly pre-1750s models about the relationship between Antiquity and history that had not stirred much since the Renaissance. Even some southern women lacked the novel bourgeois status as softeners of public discourse from the home. Instead, they were more dynamic actors, not necessarily moral home guardians. At least to some males, this was good where history was concerned. Only the Whigs idealized women in connection with history, but no-one opposed them either.

What would account for this perceived difference? The study has suggested that southern societies were in tension with central tenets of modernity regarding public education and print discourse that New England, in contrast, strongly advocated and sought after as a capitalist enterprise. The study agrees with the observation of the Genoveses that especially problematic was the middleclass explosion of aesthetic freedom of the self, but specifies that it coincided with the changes in philosophy and history after Enlightenment and manifested in practical changes about the form as well as content of public discourse and its prose genre. Without phenomenological sensitivity, such issues that pertain to experience and anatomy of communication and perception are easily missed. Though the situation was not categorically different from "the Yankees," a major

bridge being the romance reading of Walter Scott, there were neither as many towns nor salons in the South and, as Wirt reported, often the few books in taverns collected dust. Certainly, the fact that slavery was still an integral part of society had a role in all this. Acceding to the new bourgeois philosophy would have meant equality of all men, including women and slaves, from the partial viewpoint of middleclass liberals. Though the idea was not completely unfamiliar, it had not yet penetrated southern culture about history. This observation would also bear on a different conception of nationalism in the South, because the bourgeois revolution required the totality of the nation–state, comprised of a united people, as a counterpart to the new, philosophically and aesthetically doubled and finite self. By comparison, the emphasis on community and a willingness to avoid decisive breaks in temporality from Europeans about history would reveal the relevance of an organic community of the body politic in the South that shattered elsewhere in the late-1750s, ironically obscured or underplayed by pioneer French analysts Crèvecoeur and Tocqueville.

The study indicates that the U.S. analytic emphasis on materialism, science and social history has obscured competing white world–views and approaches into history that, nevertheless, can still be unearthed and that should be listened to. This unearthing would not have succeeded without a thoroughgoing philosophical criticism of modernity and self–criticism. In addition, this unearthing would have failed if I had treated history as an organized discipline or topic that has nothing to do with philosophy, poetics or literature.

This study has brought to light a number of interesting individuals, some of whom are very obscure even today, and their attitudes about history and modernity. The old caricature descriptions about white southerners as mainly stupid, racist, romancers or even fanatically religious should be put to the background when discussing this time period represented by them. Even political struggles should be of secondary importance, because turning history into a weapon of ideology almost always simplifies its content. Further, by that means, modernization or progress can never be questioned. If we take stock in modernization and progress, a whole category of ethics that is not based on abstract enlightened principles will be forgotten. This ethics has come more strongly to light recently when sensitivity about the Other has increased. The study's decision to include European theories after the Second World War has therefore been a most helpful tool. Philosophically and poetically, they have made historical reality more complex than often supposed. These fields are not self–enclosed territories as traditionally perceived in the U.S., but rather present in what history is, what it means and, most importantly, how it is used or not used, thought about or not thought about, experienced and not experienced.

Perhaps the most pressing suggestion for further research that emerged is the character of Jane Tayloe Lomax. Her role in ushering in a romantic way to look at history in Virginia was decisive: though it would take almost a decade for her ideas to take root more in Virginia, after her example there appeared several male authors about history particularly in Charleston who were similarly impressed with Romanticism. Lomax's tragic life—she died of tuberculosis in her mid–20s—as well as her habit of travel would be an interesting topic. The second theme is a closer look into the relationship between Evangelicalism and southerners. This relationship has not been much studied to my knowledge in the early decades of the 19th century. On the basis of my research, the

southern evangelicals had far more middle class and New England cultural figurations, values and attitudes than average southern scholars and southern populace, at least about history. In addition, most southern intellectuals' far more cautious, in places even atheist, attitude to religion would possibly be felt as an illuminating conflict. Since the evangelicals culturally and philosophically represented the new modern individuality, their differences to the older societal model—one that preceded the Whig rise to dominance in Britain in the analogy of chapter 6—would be interesting to examine. At any rate, that such "rabble" existed that differed from middle class modernity can be inferred from many southern opinions about history: a life of action and pleasures seemed commonplace, so often are they evoked, if sometimes in moralist overtones. Of more academic interest could be: 1. the early years of the University of Virginia. Several people—alumni, faculty or students—had very creative and advanced but at the same time very ancient views about history. 2. Dew's relationship with Nicholas Wiseman, the reform-minded cardinal. The exact nature of the relationship remained a matter of speculation in the study but obviously they were linked. 3. The character and workings of Daniel Whitaker could use more fleshing out because of his key role in contemporary southern cultural discourse.

The study has aimed at systematic treatment. It has tried to be as open-minded and lateral as possible about history and its use. It aimed to resist putting history into scientific and philosophical brackets and to explore the effects that science and philosophy have exacted on and in history on the figural level and how individuals themselves reinscribe history through them. From such reading processes, intellectual, ideological, semiotic and aesthetic opinions, their relations and their interpretations have been tentatively deduced and located. In terms of reliability, the study should stand scientific repetition. Of course, some interpretation is involved on the way, because the study chose not to impose any more systematic frame of analysis on its material rather than several loosely deductive readings performed on various pieces. By loose I mean that the study is wary of causation, offering instead correlations and advanced poetic causal suggestions. The study then proceeded to group these only very cautiously together, because the study wanted to resist explanatory formalization, or "straightening out" of data, as much as possible. Because history has to do with poetics but is not all poetic, this methodological flexibility was helpful. In addition, because the object of study did not have the same philosophy as me or modernity about history, and because history often overlapped with poetics in the period, it was more reliable not to deduce the analysis from such modern basis. I also tried to evade the often-repeated analysis on the Old South where it scores poorly in terms of modernity without sensitivity to its different dynamics of culture. In terms of validity, this study is by far the largest ever taken in terms of texts auditioned and examined with a singular interest in history. In the humanities, validity can never match that of the natural sciences and today, referentiality is not so obvious as to render it an irrelevant question. Nevertheless, the humanities scholar can still make, through hard work, reflection and comparison, advanced, if partly poetic, suggestions and conjectures about texts. These overlap with reality that is not pure, or without philosophy, language and poesy.

References

Primary sources

- Adams, Abigail (Smith). Abigail (Smith) Adams to Mary (Smith) Cranch, June 23, 1797. In "New Letters of Abigail Adams 1788–1801", edited by Mitchell, 210-11.
- Adams, John. John Adams to Benjamin Hichborn, January 27, 1787, n.p. In *The Works of John Adams. Volume IX*, edited by Charles F. Adams. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1851.
- Alexander, Archibald. *A Discourse, Occasioned by the Burning of the Theatre in the City of Richmond, Virginia, on the Twenty-Sixth of December, 1811*. Philadelphia: John Welwood Scott, 1812.
- Anonymous. "A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836): 18-31.
- Anonymous. "American Naval History." *Southern Review* 2 (1828): 349-83.
- Anonymous. "Ancient and Modern History." *North American Review* 28 (1829): 312-40.
- Anonymous. "Ancient and Modern Oratory." *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 319-37.
- Anonymous. "Byron's *Doge of Venice*." *The New Edinburgh Review* 1 (1821): 237-56.
- Anonymous. "Characteristics of Women, No. IV. Characters of Intellect. Shakspeare." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 33 (1833): 539-60.
- Anonymous. "Christmas in the Parishes." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1836): 359-61.
- Anonymous. "Culinary Philosophy." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 209-20.
- Anonymous. "Dr. Bird's New Novel." *Southern Literary Messenger* 5 (1839): 420-29.
- Anonymous. "English Views of the Literature and Literary Men, and of the Political and Domestic Character of the People of Ancient Greece and Rome." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 415-27.
- Anonymous. "Foreign Travel." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1836): 437-42.
- Anonymous. "Genius." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1836): 337-46.
- Anonymous. "Genuineness and Integrity of Ancient Writings." *North American Review* 42 (1836): 1-51.
- Anonymous. "Gerhard on Diagnosis of Diseases of the Chest." *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* 14 (1836): 174-78.
- Anonymous. "History of Mormonism." *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842): 398-413.
- Anonymous. "*History of the Italian Republics*." *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842): 157-73.
- Anonymous. "Irving's *Life of Columbus*." *Southern Review* 2 (1828): 1-31.
- Anonymous. "Irving's *Life of Columbus*." *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840): 569-71.
- Anonymous. "*Life of Mary Queen of Scots*." *Southern Review* 8 (1832): 345-82.
- Anonymous. "Literature of Virginia." *Southern Literary Messenger* 4 (1838): 684-89.
- Anonymous. "Marion." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1836): 192.
- Anonymous. "Mr. Webster's Bunker Hill Oration (concl.)." *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (1844): 25-30.
- Anonymous. "Niebuhr's *Roman History*." *North American Review* 16 (1823): 425-44.

- Anonymous. "On Sacred Poetry and Literature." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836): 1-10.
- Anonymous. "Progress of Temperance. Number One." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 85-92.
- Anonymous. "Puseyism no Popery, etc." *Southern Quarterly Review* 5 (1844): 469-97.
- Anonymous. "Receipts by Mail&c." *Army and Navy Chronicle* 13 (1842): 105.
- Anonymous. "Rienzi." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836): 213-16.
- Anonymous. "Slavery." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 188-93.
- Anonymous. "Taylor's *Natural History of Society*." *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842): 303-17.
- Anonymous. "The Author of 'Martin Faber,' 'Guy Rivers,' and 'The Yemassee.'" *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 39-49.
- Anonymous. "The Christian Miracles." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1836): 50-58.
- Anonymous. "The Influence of the Christian Philosophy on Government." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1836): 142-45.
- Anonymous. "The Life of John C. Calhoun." *Southern Quarterly Review* 3 (1843): 496-31.
- Anonymous. "*The Linwoods*." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 175-76.
- Anonymous. "The Literary Character of Dr. Samuel Johnson." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1837): 315-25.
- Anonymous. "The Narrows of the Yadkin." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 239-41.
- Anonymous. "*The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution*." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1836): 347-58.
- Anonymous. "The Tendency of Revolutions." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1837): 355-58.
- Anonymous. *Proceedings and Debates of the Virginia State Convention, of 1829-30*. Richmond: Samuel Shepherd, 1830.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- Arnold, Thomas. "Early Roman History." *Quarterly Review* 32 (1825): 67-92.
- Bacon, Francis. "Of Studies." In *Bacon's Essays, Volume II*, edited by J. W. Hales and C. S. Jerram, 72-4. The London Series of English Classics. 7th ed. London: Longman's, Green, & Co., 1886.
- Bancroft, George. *A History of the United States. Volume I*. Boston: Charles Bowen, 1834.
- Bancroft, George. Bancroft's diary, September 2, 1820. In *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft. Volume I*, edited by Howe, 78-81.
- Bancroft, George. George Bancroft to Ralph Waldo Emerson, February 29, 1836. In *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft. Volume I*, edited by Howe, 222-23.
- Bancroft, George. Preface to *A History of the United States, Volume I*, by George Bancroft, v-viii.
- Bancroft, George. Preface to *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, by Arnold H. L. Heeren, v-viii.
- Benjamin, Park. "Letters from New-York, Number II." *Southern Literary Messenger* 5 (1839): 629-32.
- Blair, Hugh. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. New York: James Conner, 1832.

- Boswell, James. *The Life of Samuel Johnson. Volume V*. London: John Murray, 1835.
- Brantly, William T. "Milman's *History of Christianity*." *Southern Quarterly Review* 4 (1843): 261-92.
- Brantly, William, Sr. "William T. Brantly, D. D." In *A History of the Sandy Creek Baptist Association, from Its Organization in A. D. 1758, to A. D. 1858*, by George W. Purefoy, 304-20. New York: Sheldon, 1859.
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord. Lord Byron to John Murray, August 12, 1819. In *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: With Notices of His Life, Volume II*, edited by Moore, 104-7.
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord. Lord Byron's Ravenna Journal, entry for January 12, 1821. In *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: With Notices of His Life, Volume II*, edited by Moore, 230-31.
- C. "On Miracles." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836): 442-49.
- C. "Historic Speculations." *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840): 606-608
- Calhoun, John C. "The Fort Hill Address: On the Relations of the States and Federal Government." In *Union and Liberty*, edited by Lence, 369-400.
- Calvert, George H. "Göttingen in 1824." *Putnam's Monthly Magazine* 8 (1856): 595-607.
- Campbell, Charles. "The History of Virginia." *Southern Literary Messenger* 5 (1839): 788-92.
- Campbell, John A. "General History of Civilization in Europe." *Southern Quarterly Review* 3 (1843): 1-17
- Cartwright, Samuel A. "Canaan Identified with the Ethiopian." *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842): 321-83.
- Cartwright, Samuel A. Samuel A. Cartwright to Francis John Levert, 13 December, 1822. Levert Family Papers.
- Caruthers, William Alexander. *The Cavaliers of Virginia, or The Recluse of Jamestown. Volume I*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1832.
- Citizen, A. "Christmas—A Sketch." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1837): 366-[80].
- Cocke, William Archer. "Types of Mankind." *Southern Literary Messenger* 21 (1855): 660-68.
- Cohen, Seymour S. "The Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Cooper: A Previously Unpublished Manuscript of Dumas Malone." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 147 (2003): 39-64.
- Colburn, J. J. Colburn to Benson J. Lossing, February 2, 1871. In "Notes and Queries," by Benson J. Lossing, *The American Historical Record* 3 (1874): 225.
- Cooper, Thomas. "On Historical Authenticity and the Value of Human Testimony as to Facts [On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, as Ascribed to their Presumed Author], Number Two." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836b): 176-95.
- Cooper, Thomas. "On the Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books, as Ascribed to their Presumed Author, Number One." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836a): 132-45.
- de Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St. John. Dedication in *Letters from an American Farmer*, by J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, xxxi-xxxii.
- de Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St. John. *Letters from an American Farmer*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1957.
- Curtis, Moses Ashley. "Unity of the Races." *Southern Quarterly Review* 7 (1845): 372-448.

- Cushing, Jonathan P. "President Cushing's Address." *Collections of the Virginia Historical & Philosophical Society* 1 (1833): 9-33.
- Dabney, George E. "My Uncle's Unpublished Manuscripts, Number VI." *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840): 555-63.
- Dame, George W. "Sketch of the Life and Character of Jonathan P. Cushing, M.A." *American Quarterly Register* 11 (1838): 113-28.
- Davis, John. John Davis to George Bancroft, April 2, 1835. In *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft. Volume I*, edited by Howe, 210-11.
- Dew, Thomas Roderick. "An Address on the Influence of the Federative Republican System of Government Upon Literature and the Development of Character." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836): 261-82.
- Dew, Thomas Roderick. *A Digest of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853.
- Dew, Thomas Roderick. *Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature of 1831 and 1832*. Richmond: T. W. White, 1832.
- Doane, George Washington. "Puseyism" "No Popery". Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1843.
- E. P. "Strictures on the Essay, 'Canons of Evidence as to the Genuineness of Books'." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1836): 81-9.
- Ego. "The Coffee Club, No. III." *Yale Literary Magazine* 1 (1836): 193-203.
- Ellet, Elizabeth F. "Alfieri and Schiller." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836): 702-14
- Elliott, Samuel, Sr. "Bourrienne's *Memoirs*." *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 257-95.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Historical Discourse." In *Complete Works, Volume XI: Miscellanies*, edited by J. E. Cabot, 33-97. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1878.
- Fisher, J. K. "Culture of the Fine Arts." *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840): 842-46.
- Fitzhugh, Thomas, ed. *Letters of George Long*. n.p., The Library, University of Virginia, 1917.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind*. Boston: S. Kneeland, 1755.
- Fraser, George. "On the Condition and Prospects of the Art of Painting in the United States, Number One." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836): 118-21.
- Georgian, A. "Western Emigration." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1836): 255-59.
- Gilmer, Thomas W. "An Address on the Value of History." *Southern Literary Messenger* 3 (1837): 97-102.
- Gilmer, Thomas W. "Colonial History of Virginia: A Plea for Its Preservation." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841): 109.
- Gilmer, Thomas W. "The Colonial History of Virginia, Part II." *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (1844): 691-99.
- Grayson, William J. "Lord Bolingbroke." *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842): 87-106.
- Grayson William J. "The Character of the Gentleman." *Southern Quarterly Review* 8 (1853): 53-80.
- Grayson, William J. *Witness to Sorrow: The Antebellum Autobiography of William J. Grayson*. Edited by Richard J. Calhoun. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1990.
- Green, Beriah. *Things for Northern Men to Do: A Discourse Delivered Lord's Day Evening, July 17, 1836, in the Presbyterian Church, Whitesboro, N.Y.* n.p. New York, 1836.

- Grigsby, Hugh Blair. *Letters of a South-Carolinian*. Norfolk: C. Bonsal, 1827.
- Grigsby, Hugh Blair. "Sketches of Members of the Constitutional Convention of 1829–1830." 2nd repr. ed. *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 61 (1953): 318-32.
- Hale, Sarah J. and Lydia H. Sigourney. "The Charleston Book." *Godey's Magazine* 23 (1841): 190.
- Hamilton, Alexander. "A Full Vindication of the Measures of Congress, December 16, 1774." In *The Revolutionary Writings of Alexander Hamilton*, 2008, edited by Richard B. Vernier, 5-39. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2008.
- Harper, James and John Harper. "Biographical Sketch of William Wirt." In Wirt, *Letters of a British Spy*, 9-91.
- Harrison, Jesse Burton. *An Address Delivered before the Washington College, Lexington, Virginia, 18 June, 1850*. Richmond: H. K. Eleyson's, 1850.
- Hawks, Francis L. *A Narrative of Events Connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia. Volume I*. New York: Harper, 1836a.
- Hawks, Francis L. *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America. Volume I*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1836b.
- Haynes, Thomas Wilson. *Haynes' Baptist Cyclopedia*. Charleston: Samuel Hart, 1848.
- Heeren, Arnold H. L. Arnold H. L. Heeren to George Bancroft, September 1, 1835. In *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft. Volume I*, edited by Howe, 209-10.
- Heeren, Arnold H. L. Preface to *Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Principal Nations of Antiquity, Volume I*, by Arnold H. L. Heeren, ix-xvi. Translator unknown. Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1833.
- Heeren, Arnold H. L. *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*. Translated by George Bancroft. Boston: Cummings, Hillard & Co., 1824.
- Hemans, Felicia. *Records of Woman: With Other Poems*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1828.
- Henry, Robert. "Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*." *Southern Review* 3 (1829): 353-85.
- Henry, Robert. "Niebuhr's *Roman History*." *Southern Review* 1 (1828): 320-41.
- Hesseltine, William B. and Larry Gara, eds. "The Historical Fraternity: Correspondence of Historians Grigsby, Henry, and Draper." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 61 (1953): 450-71.
- Hetherington, William M. *Coleridge and His Followers*. London: G. Barclay, 1853.
- Heywood, John H. "Memoir." In *Sermons by Charles Manson Taggart: With a Memoir*, by John H. Heywood, ix-lxiii. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., 1856.
- Hinton, John Howard. *The History and Topography of the United States of North America. Volume I*. a new and improved ed. Boston: Samuel Walker, 1834.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Bulwer's *Last of the Barons*." *Southern Quarterly Review* 4 (1843a): 215-35.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Bulwer's *Zanoni*." *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842a): 178-87.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Lives of the Queens of England." *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842c): 330-76.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Morell's *Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century*." *Southern Literary Messenger* 16 (1850): 385-96.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Observations on a Passage in the Politics of Aristotle Relative to Slavery." *Southern Literary Messenger* 16 (1850): 193-205.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Rome and the Romans." *Southern Quarterly Review* 6 (1844): 269-306.

- Holmes, George Frederick. "Schlegel's *Philosophy of History*." *Southern Quarterly Review* 3 (1843b): 264-317.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "Whewell on the Inductive Sciences." *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842b): 193-231.
- Holmes, George Frederick. "History of Literature." *Southern Quarterly Review* 2 (1842d): 472-517.
- Howe, M. A. DeWolfe, ed. *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft. Volume I*. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1908.
- Howison, Robert R. *A History of Virginia. Volume II*. Richmond: Drinker and Morris, 1848.
- Idle Man. "The Idle Man, Number Four." *SLJMM* 3 (1836): 98-104.
- Jamison, D. F. "General History of Civilization in Europe [part II]." *Southern Quarterly Review* 4 (1843): 157-78.
- Jarratt, Devereux. *The Life of the Reverend Devereux Jarratt*. Baltimore: Walter & Hanna, 1806.
- Jefferson, Thomas. Thomas Jefferson to James Breckenridge, February 15, 1821. In *Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Volume XV*, edited by Lipscomb and Bergh, 314-17.
- Jefferson, Thomas. Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, October 28, 1813. In *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Volume IX, 1807-1815*, edited by Ford, 424-30. New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1898.
- Jefferson, Thomas. Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, August 14, 1820. In *Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Volume XV*, edited by Lipscomb and Bergh, 264-69.
- Johnson, William. William Johnson to Thomas Jefferson, August 11, 1823. Jefferson Papers MSS. Library of Congress.
- Journals of the Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia from 1785 to 1835*, convent minutes for May 19, 1831, supplement to Hawks, *A Narrative of Events Connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia. Volume I*, 252-53.
- Kennedy John Pendleton. *Horse Shoe Robinson; A Tale of the Tory Ascendancy. Volume II*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Blanchard, 1835b.
- Kennedy John Pendleton. *Horse Shoe Robinson*. n.p, n.d. [1835a].
- Kennedy, John Pendleton. Preface to *Horse-Shoe Robinson*, by John Pendleton Kennedy, vii-viii.
- Kennedy, John Pendleton. *The Swallow Barn or A Sojourn in the Old Dominion*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Putnam, 1853.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. "Fear and Trembling." In *The Essential Kierkegaard*, edited by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, 93-101. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- L. "History of Modern Europe." *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* 1 (1818): 559-60.
- Legaré, Hugh S. "Byron's *Letters and Journals* [Volume II]." *Southern Review* 7 (1831): 1-42.
- Legaré, Hugh S. "Classical Learning." *Southern Review* 1 (1828a): 1-49.
- Legaré, Hugh S. "The Roman Orators." *Southern Review* 2 (1828c): 491-540.
- Legaré, Hugh S. "Early Spanish Ballads: Charlemagne and His Peers." *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 62-99.
- Legaré, Hugh S. "Roman Literature." *Southern Review* 1 (1828b): 358-410.
- Legaré, Hugh S. "Travels of the Duke of Saxe-Weimar." *Southern Review* 3 (1829): 192-207.

- Legaré, Hugh S. Hugh Swinton Legaré to Jesse Burton Harrison, 26th August, 1830. In *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, edited by Krumpelmann, 11-12.
- Legaré, Hugh S. *Writings of Hugh Swinton Legaré. Volume I*. Charleston: Burges & James, 1846.
- Lence, Ross M, ed. *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1992.
- Lieber, Francis. *Reminiscences of an Intercourse with Mr. Niebuhr the Historian*. Philadelphia: Cary, Lea and Blanchard, 1835.
- Lieber, Francis. *Slavery, Plantations, and the Yeomanry*. New York: C. S. Westcott & Co, 1863.
- Lipscomb, Andrew A. and Albert Ellery Bergh, eds. *Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Volume XV*. Washington: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1905.
- Livingston, William. "Thoughts on Deism." *The American Museum; or, Repository of Ancient and Modern Fugitive Pieces &c. Prose and Poetical* 4 (1788): 440-42.
- Lomax, Jane T. "The French Dramatists: Corneille." *Southern Literary Messenger* 8 (1842): 763-66.
- Lomax, Jane T. "The Withered Leaves." *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840b): 828.
- Lomax, Jane T. "Corinna's Last Song." *Southern Literary Messenger* 6 (1840a): 716-17.
- Lomax, Jane T. "Madame de Staël." *Southern Literary Messenger* 8 (1842): 231-33.
- Lomax, Jane T. "Schiller." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841): 162-64.
- Madame de Staël. *A Treatise on Ancient and Modern Literature. Volume II*. Translator unknown. London: George Cawthorn, 1803.
- Madame de Staël-Holstein. "Dernier Chant de Corinne." In Madame de Staël-Holstein, *Oeuvres de Madame la Baronne de Staël-Holstein, Tome II*, 850-854. Paris: Chez Lefèvre, Libraire, 1838.
- Martin, Joseph and William H. Brockenbrough. *A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of Columbia*. Charlottesville: Moseley & Tompkins, 1834.
- Martineau, Harriet. *Retrospect of Western Travel. Volume I*. n.p., n.d.
- Michaelowitz, Edward E. "Influence of Chivalry upon Literature." *Southern Review* 4 (1829): 405-33.
- Minor, Lucian "Liberian Literature." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836a): 158-59.
- Minor, Lucian. "Chief Justice Marshall." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836b): 182-91.
- Minor, Lucian. "Letters from New England—No. I." *Southern Literary Messenger* 1 (1834): 85-88.
- Minor, William G. "Colonial History of Virginia: A Plea for Its Preservation." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841): 109-12.
- Mitchell, Stewart, ed. "New Letters of Abigail Adams 1788–1801." *American Antiquarian Society* 55 (1945), 95-232; 299-444.
- Montesquieu. *The Spirit of Laws. Volume I*. Translated by Thomas Nugent. 4th rev. ed. London: n.p., 1766.
- Moore, Thomas, ed. *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: With Notices of His Life, Volume II*. The Library of Standard Literature series. New York: G. Dearborn, 1836.
- Morell, J. D. Preface to *An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century. Volume I*, by J. D. Morell, v-xv. London: William Pickering, 1846.
- Nott, Henry Junius. "French Novels." *Southern Review* 7 (1831): 319-68.
- Nott, Henry Junius. "Paul Louis Courier." *Southern Review* 5 (1830): 139-70.
- Nott, Josiah C. "Aboriginal Races of America." *Southern Quarterly Review*, new series, 8 (1853): 59-92.

- Nott, Josiah C. "An Issue with the Reviewer of Nott's 'Caucasian and Negro Races'." *Southern Quarterly Review* 8 (1845): 148-90.
- Nott, Josiah C. "Ancient and Scripture Chronology." *Southern Quarterly Review*, new series, 2 (1850): 385-426.
- Nott, Josiah C. "Butler's *Life of Erasmus*." *Southern Review* 3 (1829): 78-124.
- Nott, Josiah C. "Unity of the Human Race." *Southern Quarterly Review* 9 (1846): 1-57.
- O. "Norman-Saxon History." *Virginia Literary Museum* 1 (1829): 367-68.
- Oliphant, Mary C. Simms, Alfred Taylor Odell, and T. C. Duncan Eaves, eds. *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume III-1850-1857*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1954.
- Oliphant, Mary C. Simms, Alfred Taylor Odell, and T. C. Duncan Eaves, eds. *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume I-1830-1844*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952.
- Ostrom, John Ward, Burton R. Pollin, and Jeffrey A. Savoye, eds. *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I: 1824-1846*, 3rd rev. ed. New York: The Gordian, 2008a.
- ϕ. "Cradle of Mankind." *Virginia Literary Museum* 1 (1830): 677-81.
- Peabody, Elizabeth P. *The Identification of Artisan and Artist*. Boston: Adams, 1869.
- Poe Edgar A. "Marginalia [part XIV]." *Southern Literary Messenger* 15 (1849): 292-96.
- Poe, Edgar A. "A Chapter on Autography [part II]." *Graham's Magazine* 19 (1841c): 273-86.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Autography." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836b): 205-12.
- Poe, Edgar A. "*Horse-Shoe Robinson*." *Southern Literary Messenger* 1 (1835): 522-24.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Some Passages in the Life of a Lion." *Broadway Journal*, March 15, 1845: 164-66.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Tamerlane." In *Tamerlane and Other Poems*, edited by Richard Herne Shepherd, 21-38. rev. ed. London: George Redway, 1884.
- Poe, Edgar A. "The Classics." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836c): 221-33.
- Poe, Edgar A. "The Colloquy of Monos and Una." *Graham's Magazine* 19 (1841a): 52-54.
- Poe, Edgar A. "The Man That Was Used Up." *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine* 5 (1839): 66-70.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Letter to B-." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836d): 501-3.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Martin's Gazetteer." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836a): 180.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Pinakidia." *Southern Literary Messenger* 2 (1836e): 573-82.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Review of *The Quacks of Helicon*." *Graham's Magazine* 19 (1841b): 90-[93].
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Beverley Tucker, December 1, 1835. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 113-16.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, February 11, 1836. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 126.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, March 15, 1835. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 82.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy, March 15, 1835. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 83.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to John P. Kennedy. ca. November 19, 1834. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 78-79.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to John R. Thompson, January 13, 1849. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume II: 1847-1849*, edited by John Ward Ostrom,

- Burton R. Pollin, and Jeffrey A. Savoye, 750-51. 3rd rev. ed. New York: The Gordian, 2008b.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Joseph E. Snodgrass, July 12, 1841. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 296-98.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Joseph E. Snodgrass, June 17, 1840. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 229-31.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Joseph E. Snodgrass, September 11, 1839. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 189-90.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Lucian Minor, February 5, 1836. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 122-23.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Lucian Minor, March 10, 1836. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 129-30.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Philip P. Cooke, August 9, 1846. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 594-97.
- Poe, Edgar A. Edgar A. Poe to Thomas H. Chivers, September 27, 1842. In *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, edited by Ostrom et al., 363-65.
- Pollin, Burton R. ed., trans. "The Living Writers of America': A Manuscript by Edgar Allan Poe," *Studies in the American Renaissance* 15 (1991): 151-200.
- Prescott, William H. "Memoir of Charles Brockden Brown, The American Novelist." In *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, by William H. Prescott, 1-56.
- Prescott, William H. "Irving's *Conquest of Granada*." In *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, by William H. Prescott, 88-122.
- Prescott, William H. "Italian Narrative Poetry." In *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, by William H. Prescott, 410-85.
- Prescott, William H. "Da Ponte's Observations." In *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, by William H. Prescott, 596-638.
- Prescott, William H. "Preface to the English Edition." In *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*, by William H. Prescott, n.p.
- Prescott, William H. *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies*. new ed. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1864.
- Prescott, William H. *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Volume I*. 3rd ed. New York: A. L. Burt, n.d. [1838a].
- Prescott, William H. *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Volume II*. 3rd ed. New York: A. L. Burt, n.d. [1838b].
- Prescott, William H. Private memoranda, April 30, 1838. In *Life of William H. Prescott*, edited by George Ticknor, 110-11.
- Prescott, William H. William H. Prescott to George Ticknor, January 6, 1838. In *Life of William H. Prescott*, edited by George Ticknor, 108-10.
- Ramsay, David. *The Life of George Washington*. London: Luke Hanford, 1807.
- Randolph, John. John Randolph to John Brockenbrough, February 23, 1820. In *The Life of John Randolph of Roanoke. Volume II*, edited by Hugh A. Garland, 131-33. New York: D. Appleton, 1850.
- Ranke, Leopold von. *The Secret of World History: Selected Writings on the Art and Science of History*. Translated and edited by Roger Wines. New York: Fordham University Press, 1981.
- Réal, Pierre-François. "Thoughts on the Manner of Writing History." Unknown translator. *Southern Literary Messenger* 3 (1837): 156-57.
- Reynolds, J. L. "Roman Literature." *Southern Quarterly Review* 10 (1846): 352-76.

- Rice, John Holt. "Domestic Intelligence." *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* 1 (1818): 94-96.
- Rice, John Holt. John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers, July 25, 1817. In "Letters of John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers, 1817-1819," edited by Moore, 308-12.
- Rush, Benjamin. "Plan of a Federal University." *The American Museum; or, Repository of Ancient and Modern Fugitive Pieces &c. Prose and Poetical* 4 (1788): 442-44.
- Sage, Evan T., ed., trans. *Livy's History of Rome. Volume X.* Loeb Classical Library series. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1935.
- Servetus, Michael. "The Age of Improvements, No. IV." *Hartford Times*, March 11, 1817. In *Original Discontents: Commentaries on the Creation of Connecticut Constitution of 1818*, edited by Richard Buel Jr. and George J. Willauer, 26-30. Hamden: The Acorn Club, 2007.
- Simms, William G. "The Epochs and Events of American History, as Suited to the Purposes of Art and Fiction." In *Views and Reviews in American Literature, History and Fiction*, first series, by William G. Simms, 20-101. Wiley and Putnam's Library of American Books series. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845.
- Simms, William G. Introduction to *The Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*, by William Gilmore Simms, v-xi.
- Simms, William G. Preface to *The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution. Volume I*, by William Gilmore Simms, ix-xii.
- Simms, William G. *The Partisan: A Romance of the Revolution*. new and rev. ed. New York: Redfield, 1854.
- Simms, William G. *The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution. Volume I*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835a.
- Simms, William G. *The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution. Volume II*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835b.
- Simms, William G. *The Tricolor; or the Three Days of Blood in Paris*. London: Wigfall & Davis, Strand, 1830.
- Simms, William G. William Gilmore Simms to Carey and Hart, August 2, 1841. In *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume I*, edited by Oliphant et. al., 254.
- Simms, William G. William Gilmore Simms to Evert Augustus Duyckinck, February 28, 1855. In *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, Volume III-1850-1857*, edited by Mary C. Simms Oliphant, Alfred Taylor Odell, and T. C. Duncan Eaves, 368-70. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1954.
- Simms, William G. William Gilmore Simms to George Frederick Holmes, August 15, 1842. In *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume I*, edited by Oliphant et. al., 319-20.
- Simms, William G. William Gilmore Simms to James Lawson, 28th May, 1835. In *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume I*, edited by Oliphant et. al., 66-68.
- Simms, William G. William Gilmore Simms to the Georgia Historical Society, November 25, 1841. In *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume I*, edited by Oliphant et. al., 287-88.
- Simms, William Gilmore. "Edgehill: A Novel." *Southern Literary Gazette*, new series, 1 (1829): n.p.
- Simms, William Gilmore. "The Philosophy of the Omnibus." *The American Monthly Magazine* 3 (1834): 153-59.
- Simms, William Gilmore. *Martin Faber; The Story of A Criminal*. In *The Writings of William Gilmore Simms. Volume V: Stories and Tales*. Edited by John C. Guilds, 18-88. Centennial ed. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974.

- Smith, James H. "Eulogium of the Life and Character of Thomas S. Grimke [sic]: delivered before the Literary and Philosophical Society of South Carolina." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 61-63.
- Speece, Conrad. "On a Taste for Reading." In *The Mountaineer*, by Speece, 44-8.
- Speece, Conrad. "On Conversation." *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* 1 (1818a): 289-94.
- Speece, Conrad. "On Reading to Excess." *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* 1 (1818b): 394-98.
- Speece, Conrad. "On Reading with Attention." In *The Mountaineer*, by Speece, 48-50.
- Speece, Conrad. *The Mountaineer*. 3rd ed. Staunton: Isaac Collett, 1823.
- Strila. "On the Utility of Studying Ancient and Foreign Languages." *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* 1 (1818): 38-41.
- Stuart, Charles A. Letter accompanying "Memoir, &c." *Collections of the Virginia Historical & Philosophical Society* 1 (1833): 67-68.
- Taggart, Charles Manson. "The Diversity and Origin of Human Races." *Southern Quarterly Review*, new series, 4 (1851): 458-80.
- Taylor, John. *An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States*. Fredericksburg: Green and Cady, 1814.
- Thornwell, James Henley. *Report on the Subject of Slavery*. Columbia: A. S. Johnston, 1852.
- Thornwell, James Henley. *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, Volume I—Theological*. Edited by John B. Adger. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1871.
- Ticknor, George, ed. *Life of William H. Prescott*. illustrated cabinet ed. New York: Merrill and Baker, 1863.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Edited, translated and introduced by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. London: The Folio Society, 2002.
- Traveller, A. "Sketches of Indian Character. Number One." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835): 101-7.
- Tucker, George. "Contemporary Fame." *Virginia Literary Museum* 1 (1830): 533-35.
- Tucker, George. *Essays on Various Subjects of Taste, Morals, and National Policy*. Georgetown: Joseph Milligan, 1822.
- Tucker, George. "On Style." In *Essays on Various Subjects of Taste, Morals, and National Policy*, by George Tucker, 157-67.
- Tucker, George. "On the Theory of Malthus." In *Essays on Various Subjects of Taste, Morals, and National Policy*, by George Tucker, 305-336.
- Tucker, Nathaniel Beverley. "A History of the United States." *Southern Literary Messenger* 1 (1835): 587-91.
- Tucker, Nathaniel Beverley. *The Partisan Leader, Volume I*. repr. ed. New York: Rudd & Carleton, 1861.
- Turner, Sharon. *The Sacred History of the World. Volume II*. Harper's Family Library series Volume 72. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835.
- Tyler, Royall. *The Algerine Captive; or, the Life and Adventures of Doctor Updike Underhill, Six Years a Prisoner Among the Algerines*. Walpole: Daid Carlisle, 1797.
- W. "The Fine Arts." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836): 467-69.
- Wachsmuth, Wilhelm. *The Historical Antiquities of the Greeks. Volume II*. Translated by Edmund Woolrych. Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1837.
- Waddington, George. *A History of the Church. From the Earliest Ages to the Reformation. Volume I*. Library of Useful Knowledge series. London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1831.

- Wade, John. *The Extraordinary Black Book: An Exposition of Abuses in Church and State*. new ed. London: Effingham Wilson, 1832.
- Walker, Susan. "The Sciote Captive, Part II." *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (1844): 652-61.
- Wallis, Severn Teackle. "Spain, Part II." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841b): 441-51.
- Wallis, Severn Teackle. "Navarrete on Spain." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841a): 231-39.
- Washington, Henry A. Preface to *A Digest of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations*, by Thomas Roderick Dew, iii-iv.
- Webster, Noah. *Observations on Language, and on the Errors of Class-Books; Addressed to the Members of the New York Lyceum*. New Haven: Babcock, 1839.
- Weems, M. L. *The Life of George Washington*. eighth ed.—greatly improved. n.p., 1809.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "Condition and Prospects of American Literature." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835a): 1-6.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "From Our Arm-Chair." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835c): 205-8.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "From Our Arm-Chair." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 1 (1835b): 55-64.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "From Our Arm-Chair." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836a): 73-80.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "From Our Arm-Chair." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 2 (1836b): 235-40.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "From Our Arm-Chair." *Southern Literary Journal and Monthly Magazine* 3 (1836c): 229-38.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. *Sidney's Letters to William E. Channing, D. D. Occasioned by His Letter to Hon. Henry Clay, on the Annexation of Texas to the United States*. 2nd ed. Charleston: Edward C. Councill, 1837.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. *The Unity and Supremacy of God the Father*. Charleston: W. Riley, 1826.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "Constitution of the United States." *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842b): 184-219.
- Whitaker, Daniel K. "The Newspaper and Periodical Press." *Southern Quarterly Review* 1 (1842a): 5-65.
- White, Thomas W. "[Editor's Reply]." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841a): 109.
- White, Thomas W. "Bibliographical Notes." *Southern Literary Messenger* 4 (1838): 341-344.
- White, Thomas W. "Literary Notices." *Southern Literary Messenger* 7 (1841b): 592.
- Wilmer, William H. Preface to *The Episcopal Manual*, by William H. Wilmer, v-xi.
- Wilmer, William H. *The Episcopal Manual*. 3rd ed. Baltimore: E. J. Coale, 1829.
- Wirt, William. "Number X." In *The Old Bachelor*, by Wirt, 55-63.
- Wirt, William. "Number XVIII." In *The Old Bachelor*, by William Wirt, 103-10.
- Wirt, William. "Number XXIV." In *The Old Bachelor*, by William Wirt, 149-56.
- Wirt, William. "On the American Genius. Part I." In *The Rainbow*, by William Wirt, 39-44.
- Wirt, William. "On the Condition of Women." In *The Rainbow*, by William Wirt, 60-5.
- Wirt, William. Preface to *The Life of Patrick Henry*, by William Wirt, v-xvi.
- Wirt, William. *The Old Bachelor*. Richmond: Enquirer, 1814.

- Wirt, William. *The Letters of the British Spy*. 10th rev. ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1832.
- Wirt, William. *The Life of Patrick Henry*. 4th rev. ed. New York: McElrath & Bangs, 1831.
- Wirt, William. *The Rainbow*. Richmond: Richie and Worsley, 1804.
- Wirt, William. William Wirt to Dabney Carr, August 20, 1815. In *Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt. Volume I*, edited by John Pendleton Kennedy, 344-48. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Lea and Planchard, 1850.
- Wiseman, Nicholas. Preface to *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion. Volume I*, by Nicholas Wiseman, v-x.
- Wiseman, Nicholas. *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion. Volume I*. London: Joseph Booker, 1836.
- Wiseman, Nicholas. *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion. Volume I*. 2nd. ed. London: Charles Dolman, 1842.
- Wr. "Americanisms." *Virginia Literary Museum* 1 (1829b): 417-420.
- Wr. "English Provincialisms—No. 6." *Virginia Literary Museum* 1 (1829a): 361-66.

Manuscripts and letter collections

- Jefferson Papers MSS., Library of Congress
- Jefferson, Thomas. "The Anas." In *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Volume I*, edited, published, and annotated by Ford, 154-339.
- Levert Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection
Library of Congress
- Malone, Thomas. "Manuscript." In "The Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Cooper," edited, published, and annotated by Cohen, 43-64. The Papers of Dumas Malone (RG 21/7), The University Archives, The Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library.
- Poe, Edgar A. "Living Writers of America." In "'The Living Writers of America': A Manuscript by Edgar Allan Poe," edited, published, and annotated by Pollin, 163-200. (MA 624: Poe: "The Literati," folios 1-4, rectos and versos), Pierpont Morgan Library (NNPM).

Newspapers

- "Prospectus of the Southern Review." *City Gazette and Commercial Daily Advertiser*, January 1, 1828, n.p.
- Simmons, James G. and William G. Simms. "The Tablet." *City Gazette and Commercial Daily Advertiser*, June 26, 1828.
- "The Arrogance of Slavery." *New-York American*, July 1, 1836.

Secondary sources

- Abrams, M. H. "The Deconstructive Angel." *Critical Inquiry* 3 (1977): 425-38.

- Abrams, M. H. *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1971.
- Adorno, Theodor W. "Theses upon Art and Religion Today." *The Kenyon Review*, new series, 18 (1996): 236-40.
- Adorno, Theodor W. *Hegel: Three Studies*. Translated by Shierry Weber Nicholse. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.
- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology." *Church History* 24 (1955): 257-72.
- Allen, Peter. "S. T. Coleridge's *Church and State* and the Idea of an Intellectual Establishment." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985): 89-106.
- Allison, Henry E. *Kant's Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense*. rev. and enlarged ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Alterton, Margaret. *Origins of Poe's Critical Theory*. reprint ed. Hamburg: SEVERUS Verlag, 2011.
- Anderson, Margaret. "Stoic Constructions of Virtue in *The Vicar of Wakefield*." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 69 (2008): 419-39.
- Ankersmit, Frank. "The Dilemma of Contemporary Anglo-Saxon Philosophy of History." *History and Theory* 25 (1986): 1-27.
- Ankersmit, Frank. *Historical Representation*. Cultural Memory in the Present series. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Ankersmit, Frank. *Sublime Historical Experience*. Cultural Memory in the Present series. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by Willard Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Baár, Monika. "From General History to National History: The Transformations of William Guthrie's and John Gray's *A General History of the World* (1736-1765) in Continental Europe." In *Cultural Transfer through Translation: The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation*, edited by Stefanie Stockhorst, 63-82. Internationale Forschungen zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft series. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi BV, 2010.
- Baker, Keith Michael and Joseph Zizek. "The American Historiography of the French Revolution." In *Imagined Histories*, edited by Molho and Wood, 349-92.
- Baker, Meredith Henne. *The Richmond Theater Fire: Early America's First Great Disaster*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012.
- Bannet, Eve Tavor. *Postcultural Theory: Critical Theory after the Marxist Paradigm*. London: Macmillan, 1993.
- Bannister, Robert. "Scientism and American Sociology." In *Ten Years of American Studies: the Helsinki Experience*, edited by Markku Henriksson, 45-65. Helsinki: SHS, 1987.
- Barmann, Lawrence F. "Nicholas Wiseman and the Transformation of English Catholicism." *Church History* 54 (1985): 423-24.
- Barnhart, Terry A. *Ephraim George Squier and the Development of American Anthropology*. Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Barthes, Roland. "History and Discourse." In *Introduction to Structuralism*, edited by Michael Lane, 145-55. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- Bass, Alan. Introduction to *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, ix-xxiii.
- Bassett, John Spencer. *The Middle Group of American Historians*. New York: MacMillan, 1917.

- Beecher, Donald A. "Lovesickness, Diagnosis and Destiny in the Renaissance Theaters of England and Spain: The Parallel Development of a Medico-Literary Motif." In *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama 1580-1680*, edited by Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne, 152-66. London: Associated University Press, 1991.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Harper and Row: Perennial Library, 1986.
- Belo, André. "Between History and Periodicity: Printed and Hand-Written News in 18th-Century Portugal." *e-journal of Portuguese History* 2 (2004): 1-11.
- Bender, John and David Wellbery, eds. *The Ends of Rhetoric: History, Theory, Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Bender, Thomas. "The Erosion of Public Culture: Cities, Discourses, and Professional Disciplines." In *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory*, edited by Thomas L. Haskell, 84-106. Interdisciplinary Studies in History series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Benedetto, Robert. *Historical Dictionary of the Reformed Churches*, 2nd ed. Blue Ridge Summit: Rowman & Littlefield, 2010.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Storyteller: Reflections on the Works of Nikolai Leskov." In *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, by Walter Benjamin, translated by Harry Zohn, edited by Hannah Arendt, 83-109. New York: Schocken, 2007.
- Berkhofer, Jr., Robert F. "A New Context for a New American Studies." In *Locating American Studies*, edited by Maddox, 279-304.
- Berkhofer, Jr., Robert F. *Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse*. Harvard: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Berlin, Isaiah. "The Originality of Machiavelli." In *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays*, edited by Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer, 269-325. London: Pimlico, 1998.
- Blackwell, Mark. "Disjecta Membra: Smollett and the Novel in Pieces." *The Eighteenth-Century* 52 (2011): 423-42.
- Blanke, Horst Walter, Dirk Fleischer, and Jörn Rüsen. "Theory of History in Historical Lectures: The German Tradition of *Historik*, 1750-1900." *History and Theory* 23 (1984): 331-56.
- Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Blum, Mark E. *Continuity, Quantum, Continuum, and Dialectic: The Foundational Logics of Western Historical Thinking*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Blumenberg Hans. "Light as a Metaphor of Truth: At the Preliminary Stage of Philosophical Concept Formation." Translated by Joel Anderson. In *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*, edited by David Michael Levin, 30-62. Berkeley: University of California Press 1993.
- Blumin, Stuart M. *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Bonnell, Victoria E. and Lynn Hunt. "Introduction." In *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*, edited by Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, 1-32. Studies on the History of Society and Culture series. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Bové, Paul A. *Intellectuals in Power: A Genealogy of Critical Humanism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Bowie, A. M. "Thinking with Drinking: Wine and the Symposium in Aristophanes." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117 (1997): 1-21.

- Bradford, M. E. *A Better Guide Than Reason: Federalists and Anti-Federalists*, The Library of Conservative Thought series. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1994.
- Bratt, James D. "Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South." *Pittsburgh History* 73 (1990): 85-6.
- Bregman, Jay. "The Neoplatonic Revival in North America." *Hermathena* 149 (1990), Special Issue: The Heritage of Platonism, 99-119.
- Breisach, Ernst A. *American Progressive History: An Experiment in Modernization*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. 3rd ed. London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Brobjer, Thomasa H. "Nietzsche's Relation to Historical Methods and Nineteenth-Century German Historiography." *History and Theory* 46 (2007): 155-79.
- Brown, Andrew. "Metaphysics and Melodrama: Bulwer's *Rienzi*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 36 (1981): 261-76.
- Brown, David. "Attacking Slavery from Within: The Making of 'The Impending Crisis of the South'." *The Journal of Southern History* 70 (2004): 541-76.
- Bryan, John Stewart. *Thomas Roderick Dew*. Williamsburg: n.p., 1939.
- Buchan, David. *The Ballad and the Folk*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Buckley, Thomas E., S. J. "After Disestablishment: Thomas Jefferson's Wall of Separation in Antebellum Virginia." *The Journal of Southern History* 61 (1995): 445-80.
- Buell, Lawrence. *Emerson*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Butterfield, Herbert. *The Whig Interpretation of History*. London: G. Bell, 1959.
- Cabrera, Miguel. *Postsocial History: An Introduction*. Translated by Marie McMahon. Lanham: Lexington, 2005.
- Callcott, George H. "History Enters the Schools." *American Quarterly* 11 (1959): 470-83.
- Caplan, Jane. "Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, and Deconstruction: Notes for Historians." *Central European History* 22 (1989): 260-78.
- Caputo, John D. *More Radical Hermeneutics: On Not Knowing Who We Are*. Studies in Continental Thought series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Caputo, John. *Radical Hermeneutics: Repetition, Deconstruction, and the Hermeneutic Project*. Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Carmichael, Peter S. "New South Visionaries: Virginia's Last Generation of Slaveholders, the Gospel of Progress, and the Lost Cause." In *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan, 111-26. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Carpenter, Ronald H. *History as Rhetoric: Style, Narrative, and Persuasion*. Studies in Rhetoric/Communication series. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- Cartledge, Paul. "Introduction. The Anxiety of Ambiguity." In *Companion to Historiography*, edited by Michael Bentley, 2-8. Routledge: London, 1997.
- Carwardine, Richard J. *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997.
- Cash, Wilbur J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.
- Cassirer, Ernst. *Language and Myth*. Translated by Susanne K. Langer. Dover Books on Western Philosophy series. New York: Dover, 1946.
- Cassirer, Ernst. *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*. Translated by Fritz A. Koelln and James P. Pettegrove. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

- Casson, Lionel. "The Thracians." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, The Thracians, new series, 35 (1977): 2-6.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Mystic Fable, Volume One: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Translated by Michael B. Smith. Religion and Postmodernism series. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Writing of History*. Translated by Tom Conley. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Charvat, William. *The Origins of American Critical Thought, 1810–1835*. New York: A. S. Barnes, 1961.
- Cheek, H. Lee, Jr. *Calhoun and Popular Rule: The Political Theory of the Disquisition and Discourse*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.
- Child, Ben "Mapping the Democratic Forest: The Postsouthern Spaces of William Eggleston." *Southern Cultures* 17 (2011): 37-54.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Clemmer, Robert. "Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (1969): 579-92.
- Cloninger, C. Robert. *Feeling Good: The Science of Well-Being*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Cobb, James C. "Does Mind No Longer Matter? The South, the Nation, and The Mind of the South, 1941–1991." *The Journal of Southern History* 57 (1991): 681-718.
- Cobb, James C. *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Cohen, Sande. "On the Body and Passion of History and Historiography." *Rethinking History* 12 (2008): 515-35.
- Cohen, Sande. "Supplement A: Research Historians and French Theory." In *French Theory in America*, edited by Lotringer and Cohen, 289-301.
- Cohen, Sande. *History out of Joint*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Cole, Arthur Charles. *The Whig Party in the South*, Prize Essays of the American Historical Association series. Washington: American Historical Association, 1913.
- Collingwood, R. G. *The Idea of History*, repr. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Connor, Henry G. *John Archibald Campbell Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court 1853–1861*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.
- Cook, James W. and Lawrence B. Glickman. "Twelve Propositions for a History of U.S. Cultural History." In *The Cultural Turn in U.S. History: Past, Present, and Future*, edited by James W. Cook, Lawrence B. Glickman, and Michael O'Malley, 3-57. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Copleston, Frederick, S. J. *A History of Philosophy, Volume V, Modern Philosophy: The British Philosophers from Hobbes to Hume*. A History of Philosophy series. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Couch, William Terry. "Reflections on the Southern Tradition." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 35 (1936): 284-97.
- Crain, Patricia. "Print and Everyday Life in the Eighteenth Century." In *Perspectives on American Book History: Artifacts and Commentary*, edited by Scott E. Casper, Joanne D. Chaison, and Jeffrey D. Groves, 47-78. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.
- Crumb, Lawrence N. *The Oxford Movement and Its Leaders: A Bibliography of Secondary and Lesser Primary Sources*. ATLA Bibliography series. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2009.

- Culler, Jonathan. "Baudelaire on Poe." *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur* 100 (1990): 61-73.
- Current, Richard N. *Northernizing the South*. Lamar Memorial Lectures No. 26. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1983.
- Currie, Mark. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. Transitions series. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.
- Dahl, Curtis. "Patterns of Disguise in the *Vicar of Wakefield*." *ELH* 25 (1958): 90-104.
- Dallmayr, Fred. "Prelude. Hermeneutics and Deconstruction: Gadamer and Derrida in Dialogue." In *Dialogue and Deconstruction*, edited by Michelfelder and Palmer, 75-92.
- Danto, Arthur C. "Metaphor and Cognition." In *Knowledge and Language, Volume III, Metaphor and Knowledge*, edited by Frank Ankersmit and J. J. A. Mooij, 21-35. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1993.
- Danto, Arthur C. *Analytical Philosophy of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Danto, Arthur C. *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Danziger, Kurt. "Historical Psychology of Persons: Categories and Practice." In *Psychology of Personhood: Philosophical, Historical, Social-Developmental and Narrative Perspectives*, edited by Jack Martin and Mark H. Bickhard, 59-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Davidson, Donald. "A Mirror for Artists." In *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*, by Twelve Southerners, 28-60. 75th anniversary ed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2006.
- Davidson, Donald. Introduction to *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, Volume I*, edited by Oliphant et al., xxxi-lviii.
- Davies, Philip. "'Kalos Kagathos' and Scholarly Perceptions of Spartan Society." *Historia* 62 (2013): 259-79.
- Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- De Hart, Jane Sherron. "Welfare as Identity Politics: Rediscovering Nationalism, Re-viewing the American National Experience, and Recasting the 'Other' in the Post-Cold War United States." In *Roots and Renewal*, edited by Shackleton and Toivonen, 30-44.
- Dean, Paula Dianne Fix. "Revisions in the Revolutionary War Novels of William Gilmore Simms," PhD diss., Auburn University, 1971.
- Degler, Carl N. "Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis: The South, the North, and the Nation." *The Journal of Southern History* 53 (1987): 3-18.
- Degler, Carl N. *Place over Time: The Continuity of Southern Distinctiveness*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.
- Dekker, George. *The American Historical Romance*. Cambridge Studies in American Literature and Culture series. Cambridge: The University of Cambridge Press, 1987.
- Denning, Michael. "'The Special American Conditions': Marxism and American Studies." *American Quarterly* 38 (1986): 356-80.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Economimesis." *Diacritics* 11 (1981a), *The Ghost of Theology: Readings of Kant and Hegel*, 2-25.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Force and Signification." In *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, 1-35.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context." In *Margins in Philosophy*, by Jacques Derrida, 309-30.

- Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." In *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, 351-70.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The Parergon." In *The Truth in Painting*, by Jacques Derrida, translated by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod, 37-82. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The Purveyor of Truth." Translated by Alan Bass. In *The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida, and Psychoanalytic Reading*, edited by Muller and Richardson, 173-212.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Violence and Metaphysics: An Essay on the Thought of Emmanuel Levinas." In *Writing and Difference*, by Jacques Derrida, 97-192.
- Derrida, Jacques. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." In *Margins in Philosophy*, by Jacques Derrida, 207-72.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Interview: Choreographies: Jacques Derrida and Christie V. McDonald." *Diacritics* 12 (1982a), *Cherchez la Femme Feminist Critique/Feminine Text*, 66-76.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The Double Session." In *Dissemination*, by Jacques Derrida, 173-286.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Dissemination*. Translated by Barbara Johnson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981b.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Glas*. Translated by John P. Leavey and Richard Rand. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Margins in Philosophy*. Translated by Alan Bass. Brighton: The Harvester, 1982b.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 3rd ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass. Routledge Classics series. 6th ed. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Dodd, William E. *The Cotton Kingdom: A Chronicle of the Old South*. The Chronicles of America series. Toronto: Glasgow, Brook and Co., 1919.
- Dolan, Frederick M. *Allegories of America: Narratives, Metaphysics, Politics*, Cornell Studies in Political Theory series. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Dooley, Brendan Maurice and Sabrina Alcorn Baron, eds. *The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Duck, Leigh Anne. *The Nation's Region: Southern Modernism, Segregation, and U.S. Nationalism*. The New Southern Studies series. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2009.
- Duncan, Ian. "Authenticity Effects: The Work of Fiction in Romantic Scotland." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 102 (2003): 93-116.
- Dunn, Susan. *Dominion of Memories: Jefferson, Madison, and the Decline of Virginia*. New York: Basic, 2007.
- Easton, Loyd David. *Hegel's First American Followers: The Ohio Hegelians: John B Stallo, Peter Kaufmann, Moncure Conway, and August Willich, with Key Writings*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1966.
- Eley, Geoff. "Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later." In *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*, edited by Gabrielle M. Spiegel, 35-61. *Rewriting Histories* series. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Eley, Geoff. *A Crooked Line: From Cultural History to the History of Society*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005.
- Elson, Ruth Muller. *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

- Ericson, David F. *The Debate over Slavery: Antislavery and Proslavery Liberalism in Antebellum America*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
- Farmer, James Oscar, Jr. *The Metaphysical Confederacy and the Synthesis of Southern Values*. Mercer: Macon University Press, 1999.
- Farrow, Anne, Joel Lang, and Jennifer Frank. *Complicity: How the North Prolonged, Promoted, and Profited from Slavery*. New York: Ballantine, 2005.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "Introduction: The Proslavery Argument in History." In *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830–1860*, edited by Drew Gilpin Faust, 1-20. Library of Southern Civilization series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Vintage, 2009.
- Felman, Shoshana. "On Reading Poetry: Reflections on the Limits and Possibilities of Psychoanalytical Approaches." In *The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida, and Psychoanalytic Reading*, edited by Muller and Richardson, 133-56.
- Fieser, James. Introduction to *The Life of George Tucker: Excerpted from the Life and Philosophy of George Tucker*, edited by James Fieser, vii-xxix.
- Fieser, James, ed. *The Life of George Tucker: Excerpted from the Life and Philosophy of George Tucker*. Bristol: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004," *American Quarterly* 57 (2005): 17-57.
- Fitzgerald, Frances. *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century*. Boston: Atlantic, 1979.
- Fitzpatrick, Ellen. *History's Memory: Writing America's Past, 1880–1980*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Foner, Eric. "American Freedom in a Global Age." *The American Historical Review* 106 (2001): 1-16.
- Ford, Paul Leicester. Introduction to *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Volume I: 1760–1775*, by Paul Leicester Ford, xiii-xxxvii. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1892.
- Formisano, Ronald P. *The Transformation of Political Culture: Massachusetts Parties, 1790s–1840s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Foster, Gaines M. "The Legacy of Confederate Defeat." In *A Companion to the Civil War and Reconstruction*, edited by Lacy K. Ford, 423-46. Blackwell Companions to American History series. Malden: Blackwell, 2005.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." In *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984. Volume III*, edited by James D. Faubion, translated by Robert Hurley et al., 111-33. London: Penguin, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things*. Unknown translator. London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1970.
- Fox–Genovese, Elizabeth and Eugene D. Genovese. *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholder's Worldview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Fox–Genovese, Elizabeth. "The Anxiety of History: The Southern Confrontation with Modernity." *Southern Cultures* 1 (1993): 65-82.
- Frank, Manfred. "2. Limits of the Human Control of Language: Dialogue as the Place of Difference between Neostructuralism and Hermeneutics." Translated by Richard

- Palmer. In *Dialogue and Deconstruction: The Gadamer–Derrida Encounter*, edited by Michelfelder and Palmer, 150-61.
- Fredrickson, George M. "Nineteenth–Century American History." In *Imagined Histories*, edited by Molho and Wood, 164-84.
- Fredrickson, George M. *The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of the Union*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Freehling, William W. "The Founding Fathers and Slavery." *The American Historical Review* 77 (1972): 81-93.
- Freeman, Robert S. "Harper & Brothers Family and School District Libraries, 1830–1846." In *Libraries to the People: Histories of Outreach*, edited by Robert S. Freeman and David M. Hovde, 26-49. Jefferson: MacFarland & Co., 2003.
- Gadamer, Hans–Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. 2nd rev. ed. Continuum Impacts series. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Gasché, Rodolphe. "'Setzung' and 'Übersetzung': Notes on Paul de Man." *Diacritics* 11 (1981): 36-57.
- Gasché, Rodolphe. *Inventions of Difference: On Jacques Derrida*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Gasché, Rodolphe. *Views and Interviews: On Deconstruction in America*. Contemporary European Cultural Studies series. Aurora: The Davis Group, 2007.
- Gearhart, Suzanne. *The Open Boundary of History and Fiction: A Critical Approach to the French Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Geiman, Clare Pearson. "Heidegger's *Antigones*." In *A Companion to Heidegger's Introduction to Metaphysics*, edited by Gregory Field and Richard F. H. Polt, 161-82. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Genovese, Eugene. *The Southern Front: History and Politics in the Cultural War*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995.
- Genovese, Eugene. *The Southern Tradition: The Achievement and Limitations of an American Conservatism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Gerbi, Antonello. *The Dispute of the New World: The History of a Polemic, 1750–1900*. Translated by Jeremy Moyle. enl. and rev. ed. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.
- Gilbert, Felix. *History: Politics or Culture? Reflections on Ranke and Burckhardt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Gillespie, Neal C. *The Collapse of Orthodoxy: The Intellectual Ordeal of George Frederick Holmes*. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1972.
- Gillespie, Michael Allen. *Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ground of History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *History, Rhetoric, and Proof*. The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures series. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Godzich, Wlad. *Culture of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Goldfield, David. *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.
- Gombrich, Ernst. "'The Father of Art–History': On the Influence of Hegel." In *The Symbolic Order: A Contemporary Reader On The Arts Debate*, edited by Peter Abbs, 84-99. Taylor & Francis e–Library, 2005.
- Goodman, James. "For the Love of Stories." In *The Challenge of American History*, edited by Louis P. Masur, 255-74. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Gordon, Daniel. "Philosophy, Sociology, and Gender in the Enlightenment Conception of Public Opinion." *Forum. The Public Sphere in the Eighteenth Century. French Historical Studies* 17 (1992): 882-911.

- Gossman, Lionel. "History and Literature: Reproduction or Signification." In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding*, edited by Robert H. Canary and Henry Kozicki, 3-39. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.
- Gossman, Lionel. "The Privilege of Continuity: The Bourgeois as Mediator between Conquerors and Conquered." *History and Theory* 15 (1976), Augustin Thierry and Liberal Historiography, 37-61.
- Grant, Michael and John Hazel. *Who's Who in Classical Mythology*. The Routledge Who's Who series, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Grant, Susan-Mary. *North Over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- Grantham, Dewey W., Jr. "The Regional Imagination: Social Scientists and the American South." *The Journal of Southern History* 34 (1968): 3-32.
- Green, Harvey. "Myth, History, and the American Historical Romance in the Nineteenth Century." In *Roots and Renewal*, edited by Shackleton and Toivonen, 158-72.
- Green, Mary Elizabeth. "Oliver Goldsmith and the Wisdom of the World." *Studies in Philology* 77 (1980): 202-12.
- Greenson, Jennifer Rae. *Our South: Geographic Fantasy and the Rise of National Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Groden, Michael, Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman, eds. *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism: Second Edition*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Guilds, John C. "Simms's Use of History: Theory and Practice." *The Mississippi Quarterly* 30 (1977): 505-11.
- Guilds, John C. "William Gilmore Simms and the *Southern Literary Gazette*." *Studies in Bibliography* 21 (1968): 59-92.
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. "Presence Achieved in Language (With Special Attention Given to the Presence of the Past)." *History and Theory* 45 (2006), Forum: On Presence, 317-27.
- Gura, Philip F. "Elizabeth Palmer Peabody and the Philosophy of Language." In *The Crossroads of American History and Literature*, by Philip F. Gura, 174-89.
- Gura, Philip F. "Language and Meaning: An American Tradition." *American Literature* 53 (1981a): 1-21.
- Gura, Philip F. "The Transcendentalists and Language: The Unitarian Exegetical Background." In *The Crossroads of American History and Literature*, by Philip F. Gura, 157-73.
- Gura, Philip F. *The Crossroads of American History and Literature*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- Gura, Philip F. *The Wisdom of Words: Language, Theology, and Literature in the New England Renaissance*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1981b.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. MIT: Polity, 2006.
- Hagner, Alexander B. "History and Reminiscences of St. John's Church, Washington, D. C." *Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D. C.* 12 (1909): 89-114.
- Halttunen, Karen. *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Haney, David P. "Aesthetics and Ethics in Gadamer, Levinas, and Romanticism: Problems of Phronesis and Techne." *PMLA* 114 (1999), Special Topic: Ethics and Literary Study, 32-45.

- Hardin, Michael. "Is There a Straight Line in This Text?: The Homoerotics of *Tristram Shandy*." *Orbis Litterarum* 54 (1999): 185-202.
- Harlan, David. Introduction to *The Degradation of American History*, by David Harlan, xv-xxxiii. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Harootunian, Harry. "Remembering the Historical Present." *Critical Inquiry* 33 (2007): 471-94.
- Harshbarger, Scott. "Robert Lowth's *Sacred Hebrew Poetry* and the Oral Dimension of Romantic Rhetoric." In *Rhetorical Traditions and British Romantic Literature*, edited by Don H. Bialostosky and Lawrence D. Needham, 199-214. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Hart, Sally. "On Jacques Derrida: The Politics of Mourning." *Rethinking History* 11 (2007): 169-85.
- Harvey, David. "Laconomica: Aristophanes and the Spartans." In *The Shadow of Sparta*, edited by Steven Hodkinson and Anton Powell, 35-58. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Hauer, Stanley R. "Thomas Jefferson and the Anglo-Saxon Language." *PMLA* 98 (1983): 879-98.
- Hayes, Kevin J. *Edgar Allan Poe in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Hazel, John. *Who's Who in the Greek World*. The Routledge Who's Who series. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Hazlett, John D. "Literary Nationalism and Ambivalence in Washington Irving's *The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*." *American Literature* 55 (1983): 560-75.
- Heidegger, Martin. "The Age of the World Picture." In *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, by Martin Heidegger, translated by William Lovitt, 115-54. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Oleminen ja aika*. Translated by Reijo Kupiainen. Tampere: Osuuskunta Vastapaino, 2000.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Studies in Continental Thought series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Heideking, Jürgen and James Henretta. "Introduction." In *Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750–1850*, edited by Jürgen Heideking and James Henretta, 1-18. Publications of the German Historical Institute series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hein, David and Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr. *The Episcopalians*. Denominations in America series Volume 11. Westport: Praeger, 2004.
- Herman, David. "Histories of Narrative Theory (I). A Genealogy of Early Developments." In *A Companion to Narrative Theory*, edited by James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz, 19-35. Malden: Blackwell, 2005.
- Hettle, Wallace. *The Peculiar Democracy: Southern Democrats in Peace and Civil War*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2001.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The New History and the Old: Critical Essays and Reappraisals*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Hodkinson, Stephen. "Was Classical Sparta a Military Society?" In *Sparta & War*, edited by Stephen Hodkinson, Anton Powell, and Jacqueline Christien, 111-62. International Sparta Seminar series Volume 6. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Vintage, 1963.
- Hollinger, David A. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*, 2nd rev. ed. New York: Basic, 2000.

- Holmes, David L. *A Brief History of the Episcopalian Church*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Hovey, Kenneth Alan. "Critical Provincialism: Poe's Poetic Principle in Antebellum Context." *American Quarterly* 39 (1987): 341-54.
- Hulan, Renée. *Northern Experience and the Myths of Canadian Culture*. Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- Humphries, Jefferson. *Metamorphoses of the Raven: Literary Overdeterminedness in France and the South since Poe*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.
- Isaac, Rhys. "Evangelical Revolt: The Nature of the Baptists' Challenge to the Traditional Order in Virginia, 1765 to 1775." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1974): 345-68.
- Jacoby, Susan. *The Age of American Unreason*. New York: Pantheon, 2008.
- James, Alison. "Poetic Form and the Crisis of Community: Revisiting Rancière's Aesthetics." In *Thinking Poetry: Philosophical Approaches to Nineteenth-Century French Poetry*, edited by Joseph Acquisto, 167-183. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.
- Jameson, John Franklin. "The Influence of Universities upon Historical Writing." In *John Franklin Jameson and the Development of Humanistic Scholarship in America, Volume I*, edited by Rothberg and Goggin, 265-73.
- Jameson, John Franklin. "The Future Uses of History." In *John Franklin Jameson and the Development of Humanistic Scholarship in America, Volume I*, edited by Rothberg and Goggin, 304-15.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*. Translated by Michael Shaw. Theory and History of Literature Volume 3. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Jay, Martin. *Songs of Experience: Modern American and European Variations on a Universal Theme*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Jay, Paul. *Contingency Blues: The Search for Foundations in American Criticism*. The Wisconsin Project of American Writers series. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Thomas Cary. *Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty in Colonial and Revolutionary Times*. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1907.
- Jones, Anne Goodwyn. "'The Tools of the Master: Southernists in Theoryland.'" In *Bridging Southern Cultures*, edited by Lowe, 172-96.
- Kagan, Richard L. "Prescott's Paradigm: American Historical Scholarship and the Decline of Spain." In *Imagined Histories*, edited by Molho and Wood, 324-48.
- Kagan, Richard L. "The Spanish Craze in the United States: Cultural Entitlement and the Appropriation of Spain's Cultural Patrimony, ca. 1890-ca. 1930." *Revista Complutense de Historia de América* 36 (2010): 37-58.
- Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Vintage, 1993.
- Kammen, Michael. *People of Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Kamuf, Peggy. "Going Public: The University in Deconstruction." In *Deconstruction is/in America: A New Sense of the Political*, edited by Anselm Haverkamp, 95-111. New York: New York University Press, 1995.
- Kelley, Robert. *The Cultural Pattern in American Politics: The First Century*. London: Random House, 1979.

- Kerber, Linda. "The Republican Mother: Women and the Enlightenment—An American Perspective," In *Locating American Studies*, edited by Maddox, 143-61.
- Kilbride, Daniel. "Travel, Ritual, and National Identity: Planters on the European Tour, 1820–1860." *The Journal of Southern History* 69 (2003): 549-84.
- King, Richard H. *A Southern Renaissance: The Cultural Awakening of the American South, 1930–1955*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Kirby, Jack Temple. *Media-Made Dixie: The South in the American Imagination*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.
- Klein, Lawrence E. "Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England." *The Historical Journal* 32 (1989): 583-605.
- Kleinberg, Ethan. "Haunting History: Deconstruction and the Spirit of Revision." *History and Theory* 46 (2007), Theme Issue: Revision and History, 113-43.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Translated by Keith Tribe. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Kreyling, Michael. *Figures of the Hero in Southern Narrative*. Southern Literary Studies series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.
- Krieger, Murray. *The Institution of Theory*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Europhilia, Europhobia." In *French Theory in America*, edited by Lotringer and Cohen, 33-46.
- Krumpelmann, John T., ed. *Southern Scholars in Goethe's Germany*, University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures series Number 51. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, n.d. [1965].
- Labio, Catherine. *Origins and the Enlightenment: Aesthetic Epistemology from Descartes to Kant*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Lacan, Jacques. "Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter'." Translated by Jeffrey Mehlman. *Yale French Studies* 48 (1972): 39-72.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe and Jean-Luc Nancy. *The Literary Absolute: The Theory of Literature in German Romanticism*. Translated by Philip Barnard and Cheryl Lester. Intersections series. New York: SUNY, 1988.
- Lassiter, Matthew D. and Joseph Crespino. "Introduction: The End of Southern History." In *The Myth of Southern Exceptionalism*, edited by Matthew D. Lassiter and Joseph Crespino, 3-22. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lather, Patti. "Fertile Obsession: Validity after Poststructuralism," *The Sociological Quarterly* 34 (1993): 673-93.
- Lavoinnie, Yves. "Journalists, History and Historians: The Ups and Downs of a Professional Entity." Translated by David Motlow. *Réseaux, French Journal of Communication* 2 (1994): 205-21.
- Lawrence, Robert Wilson. "Essays on epistemology in American Transcendentalism." PhD diss., The University of Nebraska, 1990.
- Le Coat, Nanette C. "Philosophy vs. Eloquence: Laharpe and the Literary Debate at the Ecole Normale." *The French Review* 61 (1988): 421-28.
- Lee, Debbie Jean. "Slavery and English Romanticism." PhD diss., The University of Arizona, 1997.
- Lee, Robert. *The Church of England and the Durham Coalfield, 1810–1926: Clergymen, Capitalists and Colliers*. Regions and Regionalism in History series. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007.
- Lence, Ross M. [Editor's preface] to "The Fort Hill Address", by John C. Calhoun. In *Union and Liberty*, edited by Lence, 367.

- Levin, David. *History as Romantic Art: Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman*. New York: A Harbinger Book, 1959.
- Levine, Lawrence W. *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Lévi–Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Lincoln, Andrew. *Walter Scott and Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Livingstone, William G. and Thomas Reynolds, Jr. "The Thomas Reynolds Confusion." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 54 (1961): 423-30.
- Lloyd, David. "Foundations of Diversity: Thinking the University in a Time of Multiculturalism." In *"Culture" and the Problem of the Disciplines*, edited by Rowe, 15-44.
- Lomax, Joseph. *Genealogical and Historical Sketches of the Lomax Family*. Grand Rapids: The Bookus, 1894.
- Lotringer, Sylvère and Sande Cohen, eds. *French Theory in America*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Lowe, Donald M. *History of Bourgeois Perception*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Lowe, John ed. *Bridging Southern Cultures: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005.
- Maddox, Lucy, ed. *Locating American Studies: The Evolution of a Discipline*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Makkreel, Rudolf A. "The Confluence of Aesthetics and Hermeneutics in Baumgarten, Meier, and Kant." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 54 (1996): 65-75.
- Mali, Joseph. *Mythistory: The Making of a Modern Historiography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Malvasi, Mark G. *The Unregenerate South: The Agrarian Thought of John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, and Donald Davidson*. Southern Literary Studies series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997.
- de Man, Paul. "Time and History in Wordsworth." *Diacritics* 17 (1987): 4-17.
- de Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Rilke, Nietzsche, and Proust*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- de Man, Paul. *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Mandelbaum, Maurice. *History, Man, and Reason: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Thought*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.
- Mann, Justine S. "The Political Thought of John Archibald Campbell: The Formative Years 1847–1851." *Alabama Law Review* 22 (1970): 275-302.
- Mansfield, Harvey C. and Delba Winthrop. Introduction to *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville, xxiii-xcii.
- Mansfield, Stephen. "Thomas Roderick Dew at William and Mary: 'A Main Prop of That Venerable Institution'." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 75 (1967): 429-42.
- Marchand, Suzanne L. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Marsden, George M. *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Marshall, Peter and Ian Walker. "The First New Nation." In *Introduction to American Studies*, edited by Malcolm Bradbury and Howard Temperley, 45-92. London: Longman, 1981.

- Martin, William. "A Biographical Sketch of General Joseph Martin by His Son." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 4 (1901): 347-59.
- Mason, Mark. "Historiospectography? Sande Cohen on Derrida's Specters of Marx." *Rethinking History* 12 (2008): 483-514.
- Mason, Mark. "Exploring 'the Impossible': Jacques Derrida, John Caputo, and the Philosophy of History." *Rethinking History* 10 (2006): 501-22.
- Mason, Rayner. "John Locke and the Creation of Liberal Subjects." MA thesis, The College of William and Mary, 2013.
- Mazlish, Bruce. *The Uncertain Sciences*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Mazyck, Arthur. *Guide to Charleston Illustrated*. Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, n.d. [1875?]
- McInnis, Maurie Dee. *The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- McKelvy, William R. *The English Cult of Literature: Devoted Readers, 1774-1880*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007.
- McWhiney, Grady. *Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South*. London: University of Alabama Press, 1988.
- Megill, Allan. "'Grand Narrative' and the Discipline of History." In *A New Philosophy of History*, edited by Frank Ankersmit and Hans Kellner, 151-173. Critical Views series. London: Reaktion, 1995.
- Megill, Allan. *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Michelfelder, Diane P. and Richard E. Palmer, eds. *Dialogue and Deconstruction: The Gadamer-Derrida Encounter*. SUNY Series in Contemporary Continental Philosophy. Albany: SUNY, 1989.
- Miller, Louis. "Foucault, Nietzsche, Enlightenment: Some Historical Considerations." In *Postmodernism and the Enlightenment: New Perspectives in Eighteenth-Century French Intellectual History*, edited by Daniel Gordon, 179-200. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Miller, Peter N. "Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences." In *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, edited by Peter N. Miller, 3-65. UCLA Clark Memorial Library series. Toronto: The Regents of the University of California, 2007.
- Miller, Randall M. "A Church in Cultural Captivity: Some Speculations on Catholic Identity in the Old South." In *Catholics in the Old South: Essays on Church and Culture*, edited by Randall Miller and Jon Wakelyn, 11-52. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Mills, Charles W. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Minor, Benjamin Blake. "Judge William Brockenbrough." *Virginia Law Register* 5 (1900): 731-39.
- Mintz, Steven. *Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers*. The American Moment series. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995a.
- Mintz, Steven. Preface to *Moralists and Modernizers*, by Steven Mintz, xiii-xxii.
- Molho, Anthony and Gordon S. Wood, eds. *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Moltke-Hansen, David. "Intellectual and Cultural History of the Old South." In *A Companion to the American South*, edited by John B. Boles, 112-231. Blackwell Companions to American History series. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.
- Moltke-Hansen, David. "Ordered Progress: The Historical Philosophy of William Gilmore Simms." In *Long Years of Neglect: The Work and Reputation of William*

- Gilmore Simms*, edited by John C. Guilds, 126-47. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988.
- Moltke–Hansen, David. Introduction to *The Charleston Book: Miscellany in Prose and Verse*, edited by William G. Simms, , vii-xii. repr. ed. Spartanburg: The Reprint Company, 1983.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. “Ancient History and the Antiquarian.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950): 285-315.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. “Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946): 152-63.
- Monroe, Dan. *The Republican Vision of John Tyler*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003.
- Montgomery, Martin, Alan Durant, Nigel Fabb, Tom Furniss and Sara Mills. *Ways of Reading: Advanced Reading Skills for Students of English Literature, Second Edition*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Moore, Margaret DesChamps, ed.. “Letters of John Holt Rice to Thomas Chalmers, 1817–1819.” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (1959): 307-17.
- Morgan, Donald G. ”Justice William Johnson on the Treaty–Making Power.” *The George Washington Law Review* 22 (1953–1954): 189-98.
- Morrison, Alfred J. “The Virginia Literary and Evangelical Magazine, Richmond, 1818–1828.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 19 (1911): 266-72.
- Morrow, George. *The Greatest Lawyer that Ever Lived: Patrick Henry at the Bar of History*. Williamsburg in Character series. Williamsburg: Telford, 2011.
- Mosier, Richard D. *Making the American Mind: Social and Moral Ideas in the McGuffey Readers*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1965.
- Moss, William M. “Vindicator of Southern Intellect and Institutions: The ‘Southern Quarterly Review’.” *The Southern Literary Journal* 13 (1980): 72-108.
- Moss, William M. ”Daniel Kimball Whitaker (1801–1881).” In *Southern Writers: A New Biographical Dictionary*, edited by Joseph M. Flora and Amber Vogel, 432. Southern Literary Studies series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- Muller, John P. and William J. Richardson, eds. *The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida, and Psychoanalytic Reading*. London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.
- Munslow, Alun. *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Murphet, Julian. “Postmodernism as American Studies,” *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 25 (2006): 66-77.
- Murphy, Paul V. *The Rebuke of History: The Southern Agrarians and American Conservative Thought*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Nadel, George H. “Philosophy of History before Historicism.” *History and Theory* 3 (1964): 291-315.
- Nakamura, Masahiro. *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms: Southern Conservatism and the Other American Romance*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2009.
- Nehamas, Alexander. *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Nelson, Adam R. “Nationalism, Transnationalism, and the American Scholar in the Nineteenth Century: Thoughts on the Career of William Dwight Whitney.” *The New England Quarterly* 78 (2005): 341-76.
- Nicolaisen, Peter. “Faulkner and Southern History: A View from Germany.” *Southern Cultures* 4 (1998): 31-44.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "What I Owe to the Ancients." In *Twilight of the Idols*, by Friedrich Nietzsche. Translated by R. J. Hollingdale. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*. Translated by Helen Zimmern. Dover Thrift Editions series. New York: Dover, 1997.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Daybreak*. Translated by R. J. Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Friedrich Nietzsche: Kritische Studienausgabe. Volume XI*, edited by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980a.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Jenseits von Gut und Böse*. In *Friedrich Nietzsche: Kritische Studienausgabe. Volume XII*, edited by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980b.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Use and Abuse of History for Life*. Unkown translator. Kessinger Publishing's Rare Reprints series. n.p, Kessinger, 1998.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Dawn of Day*. Translated by John McFarland Kennedy. New York: MacMillan, 1911.
- Nisbett, Robert and Dov Cohen. *Culture Of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South*. New Directions in Social Psychology series. Boulder: Westview, 1996.
- Noble, David *Death of a Nation: American Culture and the End of Exceptionalism*. Critical American Studies series. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Norris, Christopher. *Against Relativism: Philosophy of Science, Deconstruction and Critical Theory*. Malden: Blackwell, 1997.
- Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction and the "Unfinished Project of Modernity"*. Athlone Contemporary European Thinkers Series. London: The Athlone, 2000.
- Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*. Ideas in Context series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Nye, David E. "American Studies as a Set of Discourses." *American Studies in Scandinavia* 17 (1985): 51-63.
- O'Brien, Karen. *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- O'Brien, Michael, ed. *All Clever Men, Who Make Their Way: Critical Discourse in the Old South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.
- O'Brien, Michael. [Preface] to "Republicanism and Literature", by Thomas Roderick Dew. In *All Clever Men, Who Make Their Way*, edited by O'Brien, 125-127.
- O'Brien, Michael. "The Stranger in the South." In *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind*, edited by Charles R. Mack and Henry H. Lesesne, 33-41. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2005.
- O'Brien, Michael. "W. J. Cash, Hegel, and the South." *The Journal of Southern History* 44 (1978): 379-98.
- O'Brien, Michael. "Orpheus Turning: The Present State of Southern History." In *The State of U.S. History*, edited by Melvyn Stokes, 307-24. Oxford: Berg, 2002.
- O'Brien, Michael. *A Character of Hugh Legaré*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1985.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860. Volume I*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004a.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860. Volume II*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004b.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

- O'Brien, Michael. *The Idea of the American South, 1920–1941*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Oakes, James. "From Republicanism to Liberalism: Ideological Change and the Crisis of the Old South." *American Quarterly* 37 (1985), Republicanism in the History and Historiography, 551-71.
- Olender, Maurice. "Europe, or How to Escape Babel." *History and Theory* 33 (1994): 12–22.
- Osborne, Thomas. "History, Theory, Disciplinarity." In *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences*, edited by Patrick Joyce, 175-90. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Osterweis, Rollin G. *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.
- Ostrom, John Ward, Burton R. Pollin, and Jeffrey A. Savoye. Chronology to *The Collected Letters of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I*, by Ostrom et al., xxxv-xlii.
- Pangle, Thomas L. "The Classical Challenge to the American Constitution." *Chicago–Kent Law Review* 66 (1990), Symposium on Classical Philosophy and the American Constitutional Order, 145-76.
- Parish, Peter J. "Nationalism and the Constitution." In *The North and the Nation in the Era of the Civil War*, edited by Adam I. P. Smith and Susan–Mary Grant, 71-91. The North's Civil War series 25. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.
- Parker, Christopher. "English Historians and the Opposition to Positivism," *History and Theory* 22 (1983): 120-45.
- Parrington, Vernon Louis. *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920, Volume II*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958.
- Pasley, Jeffrey L. *"The Tyranny of the Printers": Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic*. Jeffersonian America series. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Pearce, Colin D. "History for Life: Simms and Nietzsche Compared." *Humanitas* 20 (2007): 64-85.
- Peeples, Scott. *The Afterlife of Edgar Allan Poe*. New York: Camden House, 2004.
- Pepper, Stephen C. *World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Perron, Paul. "Semiotics." In *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism: Second Edition*, edited by Groden et al., 852-58.
- Pflug, Günther. "The Development of Historical Method in the Eighteenth Century [1954]." Unknown translator. *History and Theory* 11 (1971), Enlightenment Historiography: Three German Studies, 1-23.
- Plank, William. *The Quantum Nietzsche: The Will to Power and the Nature of Dissipative Systems*. Bloomington: iUniverse, 1998.
- Pochmann, Henry A. *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences 1600–1900*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History*. Ideas in context series Number 2. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Poovey, Mary. *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England*. Women in Culture and Society series. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Porter, James E. "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community." *Rhetoric Review* 5 (1986): 34-47.

- Poster, Mark. "Textual Agents: History at 'The End of History.'" In *"Culture" and the Problem of the Disciplines*, edited by Rowe, 199-227.
- Potter, David. "The Enigma of the South." *Yale Review* 51 (1961): 142-51.
- Pratt, Scott L. *Native Pragmatism: Rethinking the Roots of American Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Priest, Claire. "Creating an American Property Law: Alienability and Its Limits in American History." *Harvard Law Review* 120 (2006): 385-549.
- Ranci re, Jacques. *The Names of History*. Translated by Hassan Melehy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Ransom, John Crowe. "Reconstructed but Unregenerate." In *The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume II: 1865 to the Present*, edited by David A. Hollinger and Charles Capper, 207-18. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Rapaport, Herman. *Heidegger & Derrida: Reflections on Time and Language*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
- Renker, Fritz. *Niebuhr und die Romantik*. Leipzig: C. & E. Vogel, 1935.
- Rheinberger, Hans-J rg. "Experimental Systems: Historiality, Narration, and Deconstruction." *Science in Context* 7 (1994): 65-81.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor*. Translated by Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello. Routledge Classics series. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Rigney, Ann. *The Rhetoric of Historical Representation: Three Narrative Histories of the French Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Roberts, David D. *Nothing but History: Reconstruction and Extremity after Metaphysics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. "Exceptionalism." In *Imagined Histories*, edited by Molho and Wood, 21-40.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. "Republicanism: The Career of a Concept." *The Journal of American History* 79 (1992): 11-38.
- Rodowick, D. N. *Reading the Figural, Or, Philosophy after the New Media*. Post-Contemporary interventions series. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Rogers, Edward Reinhold. "Four Southern Magazines." PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1903.
- Ross, Dorothy. "On the Misunderstanding of Ranke and the Origins of the Historical Profession in America." In *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of Historical Discipline*, edited by Georg G. Iggers and James M. Powell, 154-169. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990.
- Ross, Dorothy. "The New and Newer Histories: Social Theory and Historiography in an American Key." In *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*, edited by Molho and Wood, 85-106.
- Ross, Dorothy. "Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty." *The American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 651-77.
- Rothberg, Morey and Jacqueline Goggin, eds. *John Franklin Jameson and the Development of Humanistic Scholarship in America, Volume I: Selected Essays*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Rowe, John Carlos, ed. *"Culture" and the Problem of the Disciplines*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Rowe, John Carlos. *The New American Studies*, Critical American Studies series. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Ruland, Richard. *The Rediscovery of American Literature: Premises of Critical Taste, 1900-1940*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967.

- Rule, Philip C. "Coleridge's Reputation as a Religious Thinker: 1816–1972." *The Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974): 289-320.
- Rüsen, Jörn. "Jacob Burckhardt: Political Standpoint and Historical Insight on the Border of Post–Modernism." *History and Theory* 24 (1985): 234-46.
- Rusk, Ralph L. *The Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1949.
- Russell, Phillips. *Benjamin Franklin: The First Civilized American*. reprint ed. New York: Cosimo, 2005.
- Saxton, Alexander. *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth–Century America*. The Haymarket series. London: Verso, 2003.
- Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*. Translated by Jefferson Chase. New York: Picador, 2004.
- Schlereth, Thomas J. Preface to *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire, 1694–1790*, by Thomas J. Schlereth, xi-xvi.
- Schlereth, Thomas J. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire, 1694–1790*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Schwieger, Florian. "The Spaces of History: Francis Parkman's Literary Landscapes and the Formation of the American Cosmos." PhD diss., Georgia State University, 2011.
- Searle, Leroy F. "New Criticism." In *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*, edited by Groden et al., 691-97.
- Segerblad, Hege R. "Transcending the Gothic: 'The Extravagancies of *Blackwood*'." MA Thesis, University of Glasgow, 2010.
- Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Shackleton, Mark and Maarika Toivonen, eds. *Roots and Renewal: Writings by Bicentennial Fulbright Professors*. Renvall Institute of Area and Cultural Studies series. Helsinki: Hakapaino, 2001.
- Shalhope, Robert L. "Republicanism, Liberalism, and Democracy: Political Culture in the Early Republic." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 102 (1992): 99-152.
- Shank, Barry. "Colouring Evidence for Experience: Imagining a Post–Structuralist History." *American Studies* 36 (1995): 81-92.
- Sherwood, Henry Noble. "The Formation of the American Colonization Society." *The Journal of Negro History* 2 (1917): 209-28.
- Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865–1900*, Civil War America series. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Simpson, David. *The Politics of American English, 1776–1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Simpson, Lewis P. *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998.
- Simpson, Lewis P. *The Fable of the Southern Writer*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994.
- Simpson, Lewis P. *The Man of Letters in New England and the South: Essays on the History of the Literary Vocation in America*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973.
- Singal, Daniel Joseph. *The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919–1945*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

- Singal, Daniel Joseph. *William Faulkner: The Making of a Modernist*. The Fred W. Morrison Series in Southern Studies. Chapel Hill: The University of Carolina Press, 1997.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Liberty before Liberalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Sloan, Herbert M. *Principle and Interest: Thomas Jefferson and the Problem of Debt*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.
- Smith, Culver H. *The Press, Politics, and Patronage: The American Government's Use of Newspapers, 1789–1875*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1977.
- Smith, Mark M. *How Race is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses*. ReadHowYouWant ed. n.p., Accessible, 2008.
- Smith, William Raymond. *History as Argument: Three Patriot Historians of the American Revolution*, Studies in American History series Volume 5. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Soffer, Reba N. *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Spanos, William V. "Retrieving Heidegger's De-struction: A Response to Barbara Johnson." *SCE Reports* 8 (1980), Deconstructive Criticism: Directions, 30-53.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. Preface to *Of Grammatology*, by Jacques Derrida, ix-lxxxvii.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Staum, Martin S. "The Paris Geographical Society Constructs the Other, 1821–1850." *Journal of Historical Geography* 26 (2000): 222-38.
- Steiger, C. Bruce. "Abolitionism and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837–1838." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 36 (1949): 391-414.
- Stephenson, Wendell Holmes. *The South Lives in History*, The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955.
- Strivens, Robert. "The Thought of Philip Doddridge in the Context of Early Eighteenth-Century Dissent." PhD diss., University of Stirling, 2011.
- Susman, Warren I. *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century*. 2nd ed. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- Sweeney, Douglas A. "Evangelical Tradition in America." In *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, edited by Stephen J. Stein, 217-38. Cambridge Companions to Religion series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Tate, Allen. "A Southern Mode of the Imagination." In *Essays of Four Decades*, by Allen Tate, 577-92. Chicago: The Swallow Press, 1968.
- Taylor, William R. *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*. Garden City: Anchor, 1963.
- Teal, Harvey S. *Partners with the Sun: South Carolina Photographers, 1840–1940*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Thompson, G. R. "Literary Politics and the 'Legitimate Sphere': Poe, Hawthorne, and the 'Tale Proper'." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 49 (1994): 167-95.
- Tindall, George Brown. *The Emergence of the New South 1913–1945*, A History of the South series volume 10. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland." In *The Invention of Tradition, Past and Present Publications*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 15-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Tyrrell, Ian. "Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire." *The Journal of American History* 86 (1999), The Nation and Beyond. Transnational Perspectives on United States History: A Special Issue, 1015-44.
- Tyrrell, Ian. *Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890–1970*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Van Anglen, K. P. "Before Longfellow: Dante and the Polarisation of New England." *Dante Studies* 119 (2001): 155-86.
- Van Tassel, David D. *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America, 1607–1884*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Vanhala, Jani. "Martin Heidegger länsimaisen metafysiikan rajalla teoksessa 'Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache.'" MA thesis, University of Jyväskylä, 2008.
- Vincent, Patrick H. Introduction to *The Romantic Poetess: European Culture, Politics, and Gender, 1820–1840*, by Patrick H. Vincent, xiii-xxv. Lebanon: University Press of New England, 2004.
- Vlock, Deborah M. "Sterne, Descartes, and Music in *Tristram Shandy*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 38 (1998). Restoration and Eighteenth Century, 517-36.
- Waldstreicher, David. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Ward, Wilfrid. *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman, Volume I*. new ed. New York: Longman's, 1912.
- Warner, Michael. "The Mass Public and the Mass Subject." In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 377-401. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1992.
- Warren, Robert Penn. *Brother to Dragons: A Tale in Verse and Voices*. New York: Randon House, 1953.
- Watts, Steven. "The Idiocy of American Studies: Poststructuralism, Language, and Politics in the Age of Self-Fulfilment." *American Quarterly* 43 (1991): 625-60.
- Weaver, Richard M. "Two Types of American Individualism." In *The Southern Essays of Richard M. Weaver*, edited by George M. Curtis, III and James J. Thompson, Jr., 77-103. Indianapolis: LibertyPress, 1987.
- Weber, Samuel. *Institution and Interpretation*. Theory and History of Literature series Volume 31. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Weiss, Gerhard. "The Americanization of Franz Lieber and the *Encyclopedia Americana*." In *German Culture in Nineteenth-Century America: Reception, Adaptation, Transformation*, edited by Lynne Tatlock and Matt Erlin, 273-87. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture series. New York: Camden House, 2005.
- Wellek, René. "Emerson and German Philosophy." *The New England Quarterly* 16 (1943): 41-62.
- Wellek, René. "The Minor Transcendentalists and German Philosophy." *The New England Quarterly* 15 (1942): 652-80.
- Wells, Jonathan Daniel. Introduction to *The Southern Literary Messenger 1834–1864*, by Benjamin Blake Minor, xi-xxx. 2nd rev. ed. Southern Classics series. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2007.
- Wells, Jonathan Daniel. *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800–1861*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Werner, Craig. "The Framing of Charles W. Chesnutt: Practical Deconstruction in the Afro-American Tradition." In *Southern Literature and Literary Theory*, edited by Jefferson Humphries, 339-66. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990.

- White, Hayden. "Formalist and Contextualist Strategies in Historical Explanation." In *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect*, edited by Hayden White, 43-65. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- White, Hayden. "The Politics of Historical Interpretation: Discipline and De-Sublimation." *Critical Inquiry* 9 (1982): 113-37.
- White, Hayden. Foreword to *The Names of History*, by Jacques Rancière, vii-xix.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Widdicombe, Toby. "Utopia, Historiography, and the Paradox of the Ever-present." *Rethinking History* 13 (2009): 287-316.
- Wiesen, David S. "Ancient History and Early American Education." In *The Usefulness of Classical Learning in the Eighteenth Century: Papers Presented at the 107th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association*, edited by Susan Ford Wiltshire, 53-69. Chico: American Philological Association, 1976.
- Williams, Leonard. *American Liberalism and Ideological Change*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997.
- Williams, Linda. "Discipline and Distraction: Psycho, Visual Culture, and Postmodern Cinema." In *"Culture" and the Problem of the Disciplines*, edited by Rowe, 87-120.
- Williams, Michael J. S. *A World of Words: Language and Displacement in the Fiction of Edgar Allan Poe*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1988.
- Wilson, Edmund. *Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870-1930*. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1959.
- Wilson, James Grant and John Fiske, eds. *Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography, Volume VI*. New York: D. Appleton, 1889.
- Wimsatt, Mary Ann. *The Major Fiction of William Gilmore Simms: Cultural Traditions and Literary Form*. Southern Literary Studies series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1989.
- Wingfield, Marshall. *A History of Caroline County, Virginia: From Its Formation in 1727 to 1924*. reprint ed. Baltimore: Regional Publishing, 2005.
- Winterer, Caroline. *The Culture of Classicism: Ancient Greece and Rome in American Intellectual Life, 1780-1910*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Wise, Gene. *American Historical Explanations: A Strategy for Grounded Inquiry*, 2nd rev. ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.
- Wise, Gene. Preface to *American Historical Explanations: A Strategy for Grounded Inquiry*, by Gene Wise, ix-xii.
- Woods, Edgar. *History of Albemarle County, Virginia*. Charlottesville: The Michie, 1901.
- Woodward, C. Vann. "The Search for Southern Identity." In *The Burden of Southern History*, by C. Vann Woodward, 3-25. rev. 3rd ed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *Origins of the New South 1877-1913*. A History of the South series volume 9. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.
- Wyatt, Edward Y., IV. *Charles Campbell: Virginia's "Old Mortality"*. Charlottesville: The Historical Publishing, 1935.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "Religion and the 'Civilizing Process' in the Early American South, 1680-1860." In *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s*, edited by Mark A. Noll, 172-95. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "William Faulkner: Art, Alienation, and Alcohol." In *Bridging Southern Cultures*, edited by Lowe, 77-99.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Zink, Harriet Rodgers. *Emerson's Use of the Bible*, University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature and Criticism series Volume 14. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1935.

Newspapers, periodicals, and advertisements

"A List of Books Published by Chatto & Windus." In *White Conquest, Volume I*, by William Hepworth Dixon. London: Chatto and Windus, 1876, n.p. [5].

"Gifts to the Library". *The Record of the Hampden–Sydney Alumni Association* 8, April 1, 1934, 14.

"Out of the Past 150 Years Ago." *The Gettysburg Times*, Monday, March 11, 1991. Accessed February 1, 2014. <http://www.newspapers.com/newspage/45937866/>

Birnbaum, Daniel and Anders Olsson. "An Interview with Jacques Derrida on the Limits of Digestion." Translated by Brian Manning Delaney. *Expressen*, February 15, 1991. Accessed October 20, 2013. http://www.e-flux.com/journal/an-interview-with-jacques-derrida-on-the-limits-of-digestion/#_edn1

Online sources

"Barnes and Noble."

"Biography: Rainer–Maria Rilke."

"Cole County Episcopal Churches."

"E–book: The History of Jefferson County." Accessed November 4, 2013. <http://digitalhistoryproject.pbworks.com/w/page/23768020/7%20Prominent%20Men>

"Famous Americans: Virtual American Biographies." Accessed November 8, 2013. <http://famousamericans.net/reuelkeith/>

"Guide to the Rice Family Papers."

"Hurley Books."

"JHBL Family Genealogy: Colonel Nathaniel Pope, Jr."

"Rootsweb Message Boards."

"Stroud Booksellers."

"The Hutchins/Chapman Family Home Page."

"United States Senate: John C. Calhoun, 7th Vice President (1825–1832)." Accessed October 31, 2013. http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/VP_John_Calhoun.htm

Atwater, Francis. *Atwater History and Genealogy*. Meridien: The Journal Publishing, 1901. Accessed December 18, 2013. <http://www.sidneyrigdon.com/features/RigSmth3.htm>

Bakewell, Johnny. "Cornerstone of a Red Brick Building: A History of Grace Episcopal Church." 2010 Heritage Essay Contest. Accessed November 13, 2013. <http://www.jeffcitymo.org/pps/documents/CornerstoneofaRedBrickBuildingbyJohnnyBakewell.pdf>

Bannister, Robert. "Odum, Howard Washington." entry in *Dictionary of American Biography*, Supplement 5 (1977), American Council of Learned Societies. Accessed October 25, 2014. <http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/rbannis1/pubs/Odum.htm>

Bannister, Robert. "Sociology and Scientism: The case of William F. Ogburn." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, 1988. Accessed

- February 16, 2015.
<http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/rbannis1/Sociology/Ogburn/ogburn.ASS.html>
- Barnett, Stuart. "Eating My God." In *Hegel after Derrida*, edited by Stuart Barnett, 131-44. Warwick Studies in European Philosophy series. Taylor & Francis e-library ed. New York: Routledge, 2001. Accessed October 20, 2013.
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/54089515/Hegel-After-Derrida>
- Bourne, Mary Anne. *The Evergreen : a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Poetry*. Edited by Charlotte Payne and Nancy Kushigan. Davis British Women Romantic Poets series. London: Whittaker & Co, n.d. [1839]. Accessed January 15, 2014.
<http://digital.lib.ucdavis.edu/projects/bwrp/Works/bourmeverg.htm>
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. Translated by S. G. C. Middlemore. Accessed August 31, 2008.
<http://www.boisestate.edu/courses/hy309/docs/burckhardt/burckhardt.html>
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord. *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*. Accessed January 13, 2014.
<http://knarf.english.upenn.edu/Byron/charold4.html>
- Canning, George. A Speech in Parliament, 16 March, 1824. Accessed October 18, 2013.
<http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/mws/lastman/speech.htm>
- Clark, J. W. "Thirlwall, (Newell) Connop (1797–1875)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew. online ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed November 19, 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27185>
- Cochran, Peter. "Editor's Introduction." In *Marino Faliero, Doge of Venice: An Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts*, by Lord Byron, edited by Peter Cochran. Accessed August 29, 2013. http://petercochran.files.wordpress.com/2009/03/marino_faliero.pdf
- Conison, Alexander. "B. G. Niebuhr's Romantic Imagination." Paper presented at a meeting of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., 2009. Accessed September 18, 2013.
<http://www.camws.org/meeting/2009/program/abstracts/06C2.Conison.pdf>
- Constable, Archibald, ed. *Letters of Anna Seward: Written between The Years 1784 and 1807, Volume I*. Edinburgh: George Ramsay & Company, 1811. Accessed January 15, 2014.
http://brittlebooks.library.illinois.edu/brittlebooks_open/Books2009-01/sewaan0001letann/sewaan0001letannv00001/sewaan0001letannv00001_ocr.txt
- Courtney, William Prideaux. *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885–1900, Volume LVIII*, entry for "Waddington, Goerge (DNBoo)," last modified January 31, 2011, http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Waddington,_George_%28DNB00%29.
- Cucen, A. Kadir. "Heidegger's Critique of Descartes' Metaphysics." Accessed April 25, 2009.
http://metaphysics2009.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=66&Itemid=37&lang=en
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "The American Scholar." Accessed February 24, 2009.
<http://www.emersoncentral.com/amscholar.htm>
- Fitzwilliam, Marie. "'Mr Harrison's Confessions': A Study of the General Practitioner's Social and Professional Dis-ease in Mid-Nineteenth Century England." *The Gaskell Journal* 12 (1998): 28-36. Accessed September 19, 2014. <https://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~matsuoka/EG-Fitzwilliam-Harrison.html>
- Frank Ejby Poulsen's Blog*, frankejbypoulsen.wordpress.com/2008/11/03/schlereth-the-cosmopolitan-ideal-in-enlightenment-thought/
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Unknown translator. Taylor and Francis e-Library ed. London: Routledge Classics, 2005. Accessed August 23, 2013. http://beautifuldata.metalab.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Foucault_The-Order-of-Things.pdf

- Gaon, Stella. "Judging Justice: The Strange Responsibility of Deconstruction." *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 30 (2004): 97-114. Accessed May 31, 2007. DOI: 10.1177/0191453704039399.
- Gossman, Lionel. "Jules Michelet and Romantic Historiography." Accessed December 13, 2013. https://www.openbookpublishers.com/shopimages/resources/3-Gossman_Michelet_Scribner-European%20Writers.pdf.
- Hall, Gary. "Why You Can't Do Cultural Studies and Be A Derridean: Cultural Studies After Birmingham, the New Social Movements and the New Left." *Culture Magazine* 6 (2004), Deconstruction is/in Cultural Studies. Accessed October 20, 2015. <http://culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/5/30>
- Heidegger, Martin. "Letter on 'Humanism'." Translated by Miles Groth. Accessed December 14, 2008. www.wagner.edu/departments/psychology/filestore2/download/101/martinheideggerletter_on_humanism.pdf
- Hollander, Martha. "Baroque Aesthetics." In *The Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, edited by Michael Kelly. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Accessed September 18, 2014. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/22141904/Baroque-Aesthetics>
- Hunter-Blair, Oswald. "Nicholas Patrick Wiseman." *The Catholic Encyclopedia. Volume XV*. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912. Accessed November 7, 2013. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/15670a.htm>
- Lafayllve, Patricia. "Thomas Jefferson, Anglo-Saxon Culture, and the Declaration of Independence." Accessed September 15, 2013. <http://www.thetroth.org/Lore/Thomas%20Jefferson%20Anglo-Saxon%20Culture%20and%20the%20Declaration%20of%20Independence.pdf>
- Marshall, Ian. "Cooper's 'Course of Empire': Mountains and the Rise and Fall of American Civilization in *The Last of the Mohicans*, *The Spy*, and *The Pioneers*." Accessed August 26, 2013. <http://external.oneonta.edu/cooper/articles/suny/1989sunny-marshall.html>
- McPherson, James M. "Antebellum Southern Exceptionalism: A New Look at an Old Question." *Civil War History* 50 (2004). Accessed August 12, 2011. <http://www.southernhistory.net/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=9408>
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*, Book VI. Accessed September 11, 2013. http://www.dartmouth.edu/~milton/reading_room/pl/book_5/index.shtml
- Miranda, Salvador. "The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church: Biographical Dictionary." Accessed November 6, 2013. <http://www2.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1850.htm#WisWise>.
- Papastephanou, Marianna. "Onto-Theology and the Incrimination of Ontology in Levinas and Derrida." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 31 (2005): 461-85. Accessed May 31, 2007. DOI: 10.1177/0191453705052981.
- Pires, Francisco Murari. "Thucydidean Modernities: History between Science and Art." Accessed September 19, 2013. <http://www.fflch.usp.br/dh/heros/FMP/ThucydideanModernities.pdf>
- MSSC Minutes, Friday, May 1 1840, Thursday, April 1 1841. Accessed December 16, 2014. <http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/catalog/lcdl:42987>
- Rawlinson, George, trans. *The History of Herodotus*. Accessed November 1, 2013. <http://classics.mit.edu/Herodotus/history.mb.txt>
- Root, Erik. "Thomas Roderick Dew: Founder of the Positive Good Thesis." Paper presented for the Mid-West Political Science Association 65th Annual Conference Panel: Social Movements and Political Change, Chicago, IL. April 14, 2007. Accessed October 19, 2013. http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/9/6/6/3/pages196632/p196632-6.php

- Scharf, Thomas J. *History of Saint Louis City and County, From the Earliest Periods to the Present Day, Volume I*. Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1883. Accessed November 13, 2013. repub. at <http://lincoln.lib.niu.edu/file.php?file=scharf1.html>
- Spooner, Brian. "Ethography." Accessed November 3, 2013. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ethnography-I>
- Tyler, Lyon Gardiner. *Encyclopedia of Virginia Biography, Volume II*, New York: Lewis Historical Publishing, 1915. Accessed October 19, 2013. <http://www.onlinebiographies.info/va/v2/wilmer-wh.htm>
- Voltaire. *The Works of Voltaire. A Contemporary Version. Volume III*. Translated by William F. Fleming. New York: E.R. DuMont, 1901. Accessed October 29, 2013. http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=352&chapter=53827&layout=html&Itemid=27
- Watkins, Jordan. "'Philosophy is the Only True Historian': Emerson's Philosophy of History." conference paper presented at the Southwest Regional Phi Alpha Theta Conference, April 2010, Accessed September 7, 2013. http://history.unlv.edu/pat/Journal/Entries/2010/6/11_2010_Psi_Sigma_Journal_Special_Edition_files/Watkins.pdf
- Wilson, John. "Observations on Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 2 (1817): 3-18. Accessed September 4, 2013. <http://lordbyron.cath.lib.vt.edu/doc.php?choose=JoWilso.1817.BL.xml>

Online databases

- <http://babel.hathitrust.org/>
- <http://digitalhistoryproject.pbworks.com/w/page/23751170/The%20Digital%20History%20Project>
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/>
- <http://en.wikisource.org/>
- <http://etymonline.com/>
- <http://fultonhistory.com/my%20photo%20albums/All%20Newspapers/New%20York%20NY%20American%20For%20the%20Country/>
- <http://jstor.org>
- <http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/>
- <http://lordbyron.cath.lib.vt.edu/>
- <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/moajrnl/>
- <http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/14881>
- <http://www.eapoe.org/>
- <http://www.rc.umd.edu/>
- <https://archive.org>
- <https://books.google.fi>