

The Making of Racial Sentiment

Ezra Tawil



CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE

www.cambridge.org/9780521865395

This page intentionally left blank

THE MAKING OF RACIAL SENTIMENT

The frontier romance, an enormously popular genre of American fiction born in the 1820s, helped redefine “race” for an emerging national culture. The novels of James Fenimore Cooper, Lydia Maria Child, Catharine Maria Sedgwick and others described the “races” in terms of emotional rather than physical characteristics. By doing so they produced the idea of “racial sentiment”: the notion that different races feel different things, and feel things differently. Ezra Tawil argues that the novel of white-Indian conflict provided authors and readers with an apt analogy for the problem of slavery. By uncovering the sentimental aspects of the frontier romance, Tawil redraws the lines of influence between the “Indian novel” of the 1820s and the sentimental novel of slavery, demonstrating how Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* ought to be reconsidered in this light. This study reveals how American literature of the 1820s helped form modern ideas about racial differences.

EZRA TAWIL is Assistant Professor of English at Columbia University.

Editor

Ross Posnock, *New York University*

Founding Editor

Albert Gelpi, *Stanford University*

Advisory Board

Alfred Bendixen, *Texas A&M University*
Sacvan Bercovitch, *Harvard University*
Ronald Bush, *St. John's College, University of Oxford*
Wai Chee Dimock, *Yale University*
Albert Gelpi, *Stanford University*
Gordon Hutner, *University of Kentucky*
Walter Benn Michaels, *University of Illinois, Chicago*
Kenneth Warren, *University of Chicago*

Recent books in this series

150. ARTHUR RISS
Race, Slavery, and Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century American Literature
149. JENNIFER ASHTON
From Modernism to Postmodernism: American Poetry and Theory in the Twentieth Century
148. MAURICE S. LEE
Slavery, Philosophy, and American Literature, 1830–1860
147. CINDY WEINSTEIN
Family, Kinship and Sympathy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature
146. ELIZABETH HEWITT
Correspondence and American Literature, 1770–1865
145. ANNA BRICKHOUSE
Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere
144. ELIZA RICHARDS
Gender and the Poetics of Reception in Poe's Circle

THE MAKING OF RACIAL SENTIMENT

Slavery and the Birth of the Frontier Romance

EZRA TAWIL



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521865395

© Ezra Tawil 2006

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2006

ISBN-13 978-0-511-23946-5 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-10 0-511-23946-7 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-86539-5 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-86539-5 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Sally Tawil and Fred Tawil

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	page viii
Introduction: Toward a literary history of racial sentiment	I
1 The politics of slavery and the discourse of race, 1787–1840	26
2 Remaking natural rights: race and slavery in James Fenimore Cooper's early writings	69
3 Domestic frontier romance, or, how the sentimental heroine became white	92
4 "Homely legends": the uses of sentiment in Cooper's <i>The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish</i>	129
5 Stowe's vanishing Americans: "negro" interiority, captivity, and homecoming in <i>Uncle Tom's Cabin</i>	152
Conclusion: Captain Babo's cabin: racial sentiment and the politics of misreading in <i>Benito Cereno</i>	191
<i>Notes</i>	209
<i>Index</i>	239

Acknowledgments

It has been a great pleasure to work at Columbia these past few years while this book took shape, influenced, I hope, by the proximity of brilliant colleagues. I owe a great debt in particular to Jonathan Arac, Marcellus Blount, Andrew Delbanco and Ann Douglas for substantial advice on the manuscript, and in many cases interventions at a critical stage of its development. I am grateful to the readers chosen by Cambridge University Press, one of whom is Cindy Weinstein, for such rigorous and thoughtful responses to the manuscript, and for making suggestions that were as satisfying as they were challenging to implement. I am especially thankful to Ray Ryan at the Press, and to Ross Posnock, editor of this series, for their steady support in shepherding this project along. Thanks as well to Maartje Scheltens and Elizabeth Davey at Cambridge University Press for their editorial and production assistance, and to James Woodhouse for copy-editing the manuscript. The Columbia University Council for Research in the Humanities supported my work with summer grants in 2002 and 2004.

I owe an incalculable debt to my teachers during the earliest stages of this project: Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, who shaped my thinking and exhaustively critiqued my writing, and James Egan and Philip Gould, who also advised and encouraged my work. All of them provided inspiring models of scholarship. During that period, I received the financial support of Brown University's Graduate Council Dissertation Fellowship and a Grand Army of the Republic Fellowship. My brief time as a Lecturer in History and Literature at Harvard University gave me the opportunity to work on the book while surrounded by esteemed scholars and wonderful colleagues. For their help and collegueship during that period I would like in particular to thank Steven Biel, Ruth Feldstein, Stephen Greenblatt, Daniel Itzkovitz, Philip Joseph, Jeanne Follansbee Quinn and Bryan Waterman.

I wish to thank several other people with whom I have discussed my work or who commented on or otherwise supported aspects of this project at various stages: Rachel Adams, Christopher Amirault, Joyce Chaplin, Mark Cooper, Jenny Davidson, Robert Ferguson, Sandra Gustafson, Bob Hanning, Sharon Harris, Saul Kotzubei, Karl Kroeber, Kirsten Lentz, Sharon Marcus, Melani McAlister, Edward Mendelson, Carla Mulford, Bob O'Meally, Lloyd Pratt, Bruce Robbins, Gordon Sayre, Ivy Schweitzer, Jim Shapiro, Richard Slotkin, Fred Tawil, and Jennifer Ting. The staff of the English and Comparative Literature Department, particularly Joy Hayton, Michael Mallick, Isabel Thompson, Maia Bernstein, and Yulanda Denoon, helped with various matters critical to the completion of this project. Nick Chase and Nikil Saval conducted research for me in the closing stages of revision.

Parts of the book were presented to meetings of the American Literature Association, the Society of Early Americanists, the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, The Modern Language Association, and the James Fenimore Cooper Society. I would like to thank everyone who gave me comments and suggestions on those occasions. A special thanks to Stephen Greenblatt for organizing a Harvard faculty-works-in-progress colloquium in which an earlier version of Chapter Four benefited from discussion and critique. A version of Chapter Three appears in *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 32:1 (Fall 1998), 99 – 125. My thanks to the board for permission to reprint that material here.

My deepest debts are those closest to home, with the family and friends who have supported me as I worked on this book: Adrienne Tawil, Joyce Tawil, Robin Bogart, Ira Bogart, Justin Bogart, Daniel Bogart, and Benjamin Bogart. For their inspiration and encouragement, I also wish to mention Allan Ashear, Saul Kassin, and Saul Kotzubei. Kirsten Lentz in particular has lived with this project daily, and has made countless suggestions to improve it conceptually, structurally, and rhetorically. This book is dedicated to my parents, Sally Tawil and Fred Tawil, for introducing me to the pleasures of the intellect and then supporting my impractical bid to exercise it for a living.

Introduction: Toward a literary history of racial sentiment

While we know that racial theories have been built on and engendered a range of “scientific” subdisciplines – from Lamarckianism to Social Darwinism, eugenics, degeneracy theory, anthropology, philology, and social psychology – we have not really interrogated the epistemic principles, the ways of knowing – on which racisms rely. Folk and scientific theories of race have rarely, if ever, been about somatics alone. What is so striking as we turn to look at the epistemic principles that shaped nineteenth-century enquiries into race and sexuality is that both were founded on criteria for truth that addressed invisible coordinates of race by appealing to both visual and verbal forms of knowledge at the same time . . . Racism is not only a “visual ideology” where the visible and somatic confirms the “truth” of the self. Euro-American racial thinking related the visible markers of race to the protean hidden properties of different human kinds. Nineteenth-century bourgeois orders were predicated on these forms of knowledge that linked the visible, physiological attributes of national, class, and sexual Others to what was secreted in their depths – and none of these could be known without also designating the psychological dispositions and sensibilities that defined who and what was *echte* European.

It is this combined palpability and intangibility that makes race slip through reason and rationality.

Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*

There is an important sense, then, in which the question of the color line – Are you white or black? – cannot be answered by an appeal to color.

Walter Benn Michaels, “The Souls of White Folk”

I

Perhaps the most intriguing of the multiple romance plots in Catharine Maria Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie* is the one that never materializes: the possibility of a romantic attachment between the white hero, Everell

Fletcher, and the “Indian” princess Magawisca. Everell discusses his feelings for Magawisca only once, long after their union has ceased to be narrative possibility, in a conversation with the Fletchers’ servant, Digby. “[T]ime was, when I viewed you as good as mated with Magawisca,” confesses Digby; “forgive me for speaking so, Mr. Everell, seeing she was but a tawny Indian after all.” Everell responds with pique at the premise, and, we can assume, the use of the pejorative epithet: “Forgive you, Digby! you do me honour, by implying that I rightly estimated that noble creature . . . Yes, Digby, I might have loved her – might have forgotten that nature had put barriers between us.”¹ The reader understands that this is a barbed exchange between characters opposed in sensibility. While Digby clearly exhibits the familiar form of “Indian-hating” the novel marks as dangerous, Everell is one of those characters, like the eponymous heroine, who is “superior to some of the prejudices of [the] age” and counters them when they arise.² Yet Everell’s response moves in two directions at once: “Yes, Digby, I might have loved her,” on the one hand; “nature had put barriers between us,” on the other. Even as he rebukes the suggestion that loving Magawisca is beneath him, he thus grants the premise that the Indian is indeed not a suitable mate. In the transaction between Digby’s Indian-hating and Everell’s benign exposition of the laws of “nature” lies a logic central to the literary discourse of race in nineteenth-century America. For since this particular “truth” about race comes couched in the language of benevolence, we can only conclude that the suggestion that whites and Indians ought not to marry rests not on prejudice, but rather on natural law. And we are led further to wonder what is it about the Indian that renders her an illegitimate object of desire. The answer offered by the literary narratives I consider here relied substantially on character rather than biology: the races in question are understood to possess incompatible forms of subjectivity.

This book argues that the frontier romance, an enormously popular genre of American fiction born in the 1820s, helped to redefine “race” for an emerging national culture. At a moment when scientific discourse was becoming increasingly concerned with the biological differences among types of bodies, these fictional narratives about racial conflict began to distinguish the “races” on the basis of their emotional rather than exclusively physical properties. By defining the realm of feeling as the most important locus of racial difference, these novels produced what I call “racial sentiment”: the notion that members of different races both feel different things, and feel things differently. In accounting for the formation and dissemination of this idea, I place an unconventional focus on

the relationship between frontier fiction with the figure of the “Indian”³ at its center, the political crisis over slavery at the moment of the genre’s emergence, and subsequent literary treatments of slavery itself.

In the 1820s, American fiction-writers turned to the past in order to make sense of the present. If the publication of Sir Walter Scott’s *Waverley* (1814) is widely regarded as the birth of the historical romance in England, the appearance of James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Spy* in 1821 is said to mark its arrival on American shores. Ever since, the “biggest bestsellers, the favorite fictions of succeeding generations of American readers, have been historical romances.”⁴ During the rest of the decade, Cooper, Catharine Maria Sedgwick and Lydia Maria Child inaugurated what would become an immensely popular subgenre of the historical novel in antebellum America: the frontier romance. During roughly the same period in which this new type of fiction arrived and declared itself to be a distinctly American literary mode, the human sciences saw the rise of a new theory of racial difference which eventually inflected all American political thought. My purpose is to establish the historical link between these two developments in particular. While the new biological concept of race was poised to achieve its dominance in scientific thought, the frontier romances of Cooper, Child, and Sedgwick concerned themselves with the sentimental properties attached to race.

I believe that fiction addressed this question in a context defined at least in part by the contemporary crisis of slavery. By reading the frontier novels of the 1820s alongside the political debates surrounding slavery and the scientific writings on “race,” I will try to show how fictional narratives could offer narrative solutions to a political crisis during a period when political discourse was curiously unable to do so – how, by setting contemporary contradictions in a fictive past, these stories could imaginatively resolve them. In a certain respect, then, this book revisits an old question in American literary criticism: what did antebellum stories about racial conflict in the colonial past have to say about the most pressing political issues of their own time? By reading frontier fiction for its connection to the politics of slavery, I attempt to recover an important dimension of these novels that has been overlooked or at least under-emphasized. For while a large and still growing body of scholarship investigates the relationship between the emergence of frontier fiction and early-nineteenth-century racial ideology, this work generally does so in order to fathom the cultural politics of westward expansion.⁵

With a few notable exceptions, American literary criticism has yet to consider the frontier romance in relation to the politics of slavery.⁶ Apart

from the obvious thematic disconnect involved in such an inquiry, there is another simple reason why even to pose the question of slavery in the frontier romance somehow seems out of keeping with the genre's predominant concerns. For it is also at odds with the assumptions we make in periodizing nineteenth-century genres. We tend to think of the frontier novel and the novel of slavery as belonging to the first and second halves of the nineteenth century, respectively, as first the "Indian" and then the "slave" occupied the center of American cultural production (and then succeeded, perhaps, by a return to the Indian narrative in the closing decade of the nineteenth century). We might take the figures of Cooper and Stowe as the signposts of the literary genres corresponding to the first two of these historical moments. As Leslie Fiedler put it in 1960: "Cooper tells precisely the same sort of truth about the Indian that Mrs. Stowe was to tell about the Negro; in each it is guilt that speaks, the guilt of a whole community."⁷ This is a succinct formulation of a proposition that operated as a kind of critical common sense during the 1950s and 1960s: to Cooper the "red man," to Stowe the "black." Though it is the "same sort of truth" in each case, this very correspondence is based on an implied antithesis so self-evident, it need hardly be argued. This bifurcation persists today as our distinction between "frontier literature" and "the literature of slavery," a division perhaps clearest in the recent surveys of literary history, where such generic distinctions and periodizations are at a premium, for reasons of coverage and editorial organization.⁸ The thematics of the "Indian question" and slavery thus come to be treated as moments in a cultural-historical series. But by attempting to recover the actual lines of filiation between Cooper's frontier fiction (with which I begin in Chapter [Two](#)) and Stowe's sentimental novel of slavery (to which I turn in Chapter [Five](#)), I hope to demonstrate how they might be understood as belonging to the same cultural field despite differences in period, theme, and the gendering of their narrative modes.

I am by no means the first to suggest that there is something compelling about juxtaposing the work of Cooper and Stowe. One critical example which bears directly on my work here is Philip Fisher's seminal and richly layered examination of the two in *Hard Facts* (1985). *Hard Facts* takes up the "cultural work" of the mid-nineteenth century novel, reading the literary forms of Cooper, Stowe, and Dreiser in relation to "three of the central hard facts of American history," Indian removal, slavery and late-century capitalist expansion, respectively.⁹ The present work clearly parallels the first two thirds of Fisher's argument, connecting these fictions to political conflicts at their moment of production. But I cross

the wires of Fisher's account, so to speak, by linking the frontier romance to the problem of slavery and the logic of Indian removal to the sentimental novel of slavery, thus intentionally misaligning the "facts" with the usual cultural products in order to see what new insights might result.

To question the assumed ontological priority and thematic singularity of the "Indian" in early frontier romances is not, of course, to deny that the politics of westward expansion and Indian removal were central to the formation of racial categories during the early nineteenth century. Rather, it is to treat the nineteenth-century discourse of race as a system of relationships that cannot be comprehended as the simple supersession of the "white/red" dyad by the "white/black" one. I am not interested in displacing "the frontier" and installing "slavery" as the new master narrative for this period of literary history. I simply want to call attention to their interaction in the formation of American racial categories. I begin by placing my own critical emphasis squarely on the question of slavery in order to supplement the already rich critical literature on the "Indian" and the fiction of the frontier.

During the half-century between the War of 1812 and the Civil War, Anglo-Indian relations were the subject of some seventy-three American novels.¹⁰ It makes perfect sense for us to connect this thematic concern to a set of political practices in need of legitimation, or some form of cultural mediation. "Indian removal" was obviously not the only pressing political issue of the time, however. To early republican statesmen, the "Indian" did present what James Madison called in 1826 a "problem most baffling to the policy of our country." But the problem of what Madison called "the black race within our bosom," no less than that of the "red on our borders," menaced the new nation as Anglo-American politicians understood it.¹¹ The institution of slavery was an intensely divisive issue for the young republic, and never more so than in the wake of the Missouri crisis of 1819–1821, a dispute over the legality of slavery in the new state that even spawned threats of secession.¹² The most obvious historical lesson that this crisis teaches us is simply that westward expansion and slavery were political problems that could not easily be separated.¹³ I want to take this problematic into American literary history and use it to reread the frontier romances of the 1820s against the background of slavery. For as Jared Gardner has pointed out, the period following the Missouri crisis was precisely that during which Cooper wrote and published his first frontier romances.¹⁴ In general terms, it is clear that the "Indian problem" and the "slave problem" were intimately and inextricably linked at the level of cultural meanings. Both were represented as the results of conflicts

between racially incompatible groups, and both conflicts turned on the categories of property, ownership and entitlement – concepts which thereby became racialized by the context. This isomorphism between the Indian question and the slave question, I argue, made it possible for frontier romances to use the figure of the “Indian” to think about the problem of slavery in different terms.

The fiction of white-Indian warfare also engaged contemporary concerns about slavery in a more concrete sense: it raised the specter of “race war,” a fear that haunted nineteenth-century debates about slavery. It is easy to imagine how the dispossessed and potentially vengeful Indian of frontier fiction may have evoked the slave insurrections of the opening decades of the nineteenth century. Large-scale slave rebellions and conspiracies were planned and enacted with varying levels of success in Virginia in 1800, Louisiana in 1811, and Florida in 1816. Vesey’s rebellion of 1822, a conspiracy of slaves and free blacks organized in South Carolina, provided a particularly immediate backdrop to the emergent frontier novels. Though betrayed and quashed before it could be brought about, a lengthy and nationally publicized trial, followed by public hangings of the conspirators and demonstrations by local blacks that had to be contained by state militia and federal troops, all made this the most highly visible such event until Nat Turner’s rebellion some nine years later. Cooper, Child, and Sedgwick would no doubt have had these recent events fresh in their minds, along with the political fallout of the Missouri crisis, at the very moment they produced the first spate of frontier romances – Cooper’s *Pioneers* was published in 1823, Child’s *Hobomok* in 1824, and Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie* in 1827. So, too, would the readers who consumed these romances.

While I make this common-sense appeal to the historical context of the production and reception of frontier romances, I will not offer any analysis of whether authors or readers consciously made these connections. As regards the authors themselves, I am interested only in showing how their works were structured in such a way as to engage some of the contemporary questions about the issue of slavery, not in arguing that they deliberately codified those questions. And while I make passing reference to the readership of these novels, what is at issue in my account is neither individual acts of reading, nor even a general pattern of reception, but rather the “reader” implied or imaginatively addressed by the texts. Thus, while there may well have been occasions when individual authors or readers made explicit connections between the themes I discuss, what interests me are the implicit connections between the

two that it would have occurred to no one to discuss or spell out in the terms I do here. I think of this not as a disavowed knowledge, but quite oppositely as the level of the “everybody knows”: everybody knows, for example, that the vengeful Indian of frontier fiction presents a potential analogy to the historical possibility of slave rebellion. This unspoken semantic level need not be conceived as a repressed depth, but rather as something more like what Foucault has termed a “positive unconscious of knowledge,” by which I mean in this context, something that may elude explicit awareness of the reader or articulation by the author, but which nonetheless forms part of the understanding of the semantic limits of the text.¹⁵ Undoubtedly this abstract theoretical statement will become far clearer and more concrete in individual interpretive instances in the pages that follow.

Taking the recent works of Russ Castronovo and Jared Gardner as my starting point, I treat “slavery” not only as a presence in this body of writing but also as a significant absence – what we might call an eloquent silence.¹⁶ In Althusser’s terms, we might say that slavery operates as structuring absence, an unposed question to which the frontier romance addressed itself as a kind of narrative answer.¹⁷ Fredric Jameson’s notion of a “political unconscious” of literary texts famously draws on these notions of Althusser’s, along with the structuralist anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss, in order to theorize fiction as a kind of cultural thinking, a process of reworking available cultural materials to classify more adequately and thus “resolve” in symbolic form problems and contradictions within that culture which could not be resolved in real life. As Richard Slotkin has observed in a similar vein, the peculiar power of the genre of the frontier romance lay in its ability to “work out imaginary resolutions” to contemporary social problems.¹⁸

My task is thus to understand how these texts offered a powerful way of transcoding the crisis of antebellum slavery into fictional narratives of frontier violence. Yet while I will on occasion employ the language of substitution or displacement, I emphatically do *not* mean to imply that the literary “Indian” was merely the slave in disguise nor to assume a hermeneutics of depth where text conceals subtext. In discussing the connections between the literature of the “Indian question” and the politics (and later, literature) of slavery, I mean to explore the semantic, structural, and narrative connections and overlaps between the two. If I nonetheless place my focus on what the literary Indian could do for the issue of slavery, it bears repeating, it is only to emphasize the less apparent semantic work being performed and hence to supplement existing critical

work on the genre. I have chosen to do this, not by offering a comprehensive account of the genre in the antebellum period, but largely through close and thickly-contextualized readings of a select group of frontier novels from the 1820s. I then reread two major works of the 1850s, Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and Herman Melville's *Benito Cereno*, against that literary background in order to show their borrowings from the literary logic of the frontier and to cement the link between frontier romance and the mid-century literature of slavery.

II

While the most concrete intervention I aim to make in criticism of frontier fiction is to make it speak to the politics of slavery, my more important goal is to provide a picture of what these novels contributed to their culture's conception of race. My work on this genre is thus indebted to the large body of work analyzing the centrality of race as a constitutive element of American fiction in general, from Henry Nash Smith and Leslie Fiedler on down to the recent work of Richard Slotkin, Eric Sundquist, and Dana Nelson.¹⁹

My own project has a distinct emphasis from all of these works, however, in that I am interested in exposing the ways in which fiction itself may have helped to fashion modern notions of race. My founding premise is that if we do not insist on the historicity of "race" itself, we risk succumbing to the mimetic fallacy that it must have existed prior to, and dwells outside of, its representation in writing. For this reason, I am not content to treat race as a "theme" or even constitutive element of American fiction, because to do so may cause us to neglect the possibility that fiction itself was an important cultural site of racial *formation* as much as racial representation.²⁰ To play on the subtitle of Sundquist's seminal work, *To Wake the Nations*, what concerns me here is not so much the part played by "race in the making of American literature" as the part played by American literature in the making of race. This difference in emphasis may follow in part from the different historical period under consideration here: while Sundquist focused on the period from, roughly, 1830 to 1930, my focus initially falls on the fiction produced immediately prior to this period. Hence, where Sundquist investigated an "ongoing crisis over race in American cultural and political life" during his period, I am interested in the process by which certain crises in the first quarter of the nineteenth century were coming to be understood as *racial* crises, as opposed to political or economic

ones, and indeed in the continual definition of the categories of race itself.²¹ As I will suggest, the decade of the 1820s is a particularly interesting moment in this regard precisely because of the nascence – the incomplete formation – of racial ideology so early in the century. For this reason, a focus on the racial discourse of this decade can be a useful supplement to the vast amount of work on the racial ideologies that achieved dominance by the 1840s or 1850s.

I argue that early frontier romances, which appeared merely to thematize race, were in fact an important part of the cultural processes that shaped it. Drawing on the recent work of race theorists, intellectual historians, and historians of science, I begin by charting the rise to dominance of a new scientific conception of human variety during the first half of the nineteenth century, one that differed in nearly all its fundamentals from earlier such theories. The “diversity of nations” presumed by eighteenth-century natural science and the “race” posited by nineteenth-century biology each attributed to human differences an entirely different etiology, epistemological status, and location on the body. Where eighteenth-century science presumed the original unity of the human species and the origin of all varieties in external influences, nineteenth-century scientists argued for multiple “centers of creation” and the original and natural diversity of “the races.” Where eighteenth-century thinkers emphasized continuity in the natural world and the mutability of human differences, nineteenth-century theory saw stark discontinuities among races and presumed the permanence and stability of racial essences. And where eighteenth-century natural scientists focused on the visible surface of the body, nineteenth-century biology shifted its gaze to the body’s inner structures – its bones, blood, and microscopic depths – and the interior of the subject in order to ground racial differences.

I thus stress the novelty of nineteenth-century race, and tend to speak of its “emergence” rather than its “development,” in order to emphasize critical shifts in its definition between 1750 and 1850. After tracing these shifts in general terms, however, I then focus my critical gaze on the decade of the 1820s, which I believe can be regarded as a significant interval in the larger historical period. This conviction first arose from my observation of a peculiar feature of most histories of racial science, namely, that while nearly all accounts acknowledge a sudden proliferation of racial theory in the 1840s, the period of time immediately prior to it receives almost no attention. There is no great mystery here. Stated most simply, this state of affairs indicates only the paucity of important racial-scientific work prior to the discursive explosion of mid-century racial

biology. As I have already suggested, however, I do not regard it as merely incidental that, while the 1820s constitute a decade of little consequence in scientific racialism, it did see the rise of the frontier romance, a hugely popular national literary form which can be seen to thematize questions of human difference related to those treated by science. Emerging, as the genre did, at a moment between the waning authority of an earlier natural science and a racial biology yet to become dominant, the frontier romance bears both traces of the earlier theories and anticipatory gestures towards the later ones. In this respect, the decade of the 1820s may be regarded as a kind of hinge between residual and dominant conceptions of difference.

In focusing on the Janus-faced nature of this literature vis-à-vis human difference, then, I want not only to suggest that the fiction of the 1820s reflects contemporary conceptions at this moment of historical transition, but also to take a hard look at what part this writing might have played in the larger historical and ideological processes I have highlighted here. Ultimately, however, my purpose here is not to claim that race was “born” in the 1820s, or still less that it was my selection of novels that gave it life. Rather, in examining the fictional, scientific and political discourses of human difference side by side, I want to register a change in the way difference itself was understood and how exactly it was thought to mark the human subject. And I do have reason to argue that literary texts may have had a role to play in effecting this change.

By far the most significant development, as far as my project is concerned, is the gradual reconceptualization of human difference from a matter of outward surfaces and somatic textures to an interior property, hidden within the body and revealed through its actions. During the eighteenth century, natural scientists tended to emphasize the visible surface of the body – its “form and color” – in distinguishing the nations of men. By contrast, nineteenth-century biologists shifted attention to the parts of the human body that were hidden from view. In order to differentiate the Negro from the Caucasian, for example, they examined the organization of skeletal and muscular systems, the color of the blood, and the size of the nerves. Even when they did investigate superficial features such as skin and hair, nineteenth-century scientists studied these features under a microscope in order to reveal qualities hidden from ordinary human vision. In this sense, they represented race not as a physical surface but as a physiological depth, thus endowing “race” in the nineteenth century with a kind of thickness that “human variety” did not possess in the eighteenth. So pervasive was the insistence that the truth of the body lay *beneath* its visible surface that the exterior of the body

eventually came to be regarded as an unreliable indicator of race. Over the course of the nineteenth century, mental differences gradually supplanted physiological ones as the privileged markers of racial identity. Thus, by the first decades of the twentieth century, scientists interested in identifying racial difference had moved from measuring bodies to measuring minds, and the work of H. H. Goddard, L. M. Terman, and R. M. Yerkes forged the notorious link between race and intelligence.²²

Meanwhile, US legal discourse and social custom over the course of the nineteenth century worked in tandem to define racial identity in terms of another quality thought to be present even when strictly invisible: a person's descent. The legal notion of descent provided a diachronic dimension along which a person's racial identity might be traced backwards to its familial origin in what Scott Malcomson calls "an infinitely receding past of unknown ancestors."²³ The racial logic of hypodescent – the so-called "one-drop rule" – was only the most dramatic result of this prevailing cultural logic.²⁴ My point about it here is simply that the very act of classifying someone as "negro," based not on appearance but on the presence of one or more ancestors so classified, is one further indication that the nineteenth-century discourse of race was never a simple matter of the body's complexion or morphology.²⁵

This much has already been established by histories of scientific and legal racialism. But the added emphasis I am placing on the importance of interior or unseen qualities of race goes hand in glove with my attention to the specifically literary discourse of race that was taking shape alongside scientific and legal definitions. By analyzing the literary racialism of the 1820s, I will try to chronicle the attribution of certain qualities of character and emotion to race. In so doing, I hope to complement the literary-historical work on the intersections between literary and scientific versions of anatomical race, such as Samuel Otter's *Melville's Anatomies*.²⁶

In the frontier novels of Cooper, Child, and Sedgwick, what is defined as the specific "gift" or endowment of each race is neither a physiological quality, an intellectual capacity, nor an element of a family history, so much as a psychological and emotional interior – what I call racial sentiment. To put it simply, when these authors wrote about "white people" and "Indians," they referred not only to "color" as we understand the term, but to different capacities for feeling. Frontier romances made the white person, or more particularly the white *woman*, the repository of a racially specific, and highly valued sentimental interior and, as such, the only figure capable of securing the reproduction of the middle-class household and family feeling. The "Indian," whether vengeful and

threatening (Cooper's Magua, Sedgwick's Mononotto), or impassive and reserved (Cooper's Conanchet, Sedgwick's Magawisca), tended to function as a foil to this kind of interiority and provided narrative "proof" that Anglo-American sentimentality could not take root in Indian character.

My argument is thus related in some ways to that of Julie Ellison's fascinating book, *Cato's Tears* (1999), which places racial difference very much in the midst of its history of Anglo-American emotion in order to show how "emotion makes racial distinctions" during the long eighteenth century.²⁷ In particular, her reading of the transactions of race and sentiment in the works of Sarah Wentworth Morton and Ann Eliza Bleecker explores cultural logics that directly prefigure those I find at work in the later frontier romances of Child, Sedgwick, and Cooper.²⁸ Yet Ellison also makes clear the polyvalence and plasticity of the signifier "race" in the period in question: "The category of race in the eighteenth century signified ethnicity, nationality, and tribe, as well as the ideology of color."²⁹ By putting a different kind of historical pressure on changes in the concept of race, and placing my historical focus on the cultural productions of a later period in which the concept was acquiring its more modern psychophysical denotations, I want to explore a version of sentimental literary racialism particular to the first half of the nineteenth century.

I realize, of course, that contemporary culture accustoms us to thinking of race in visual terms, that is, as something we can see. Yet the assumption that race can be reduced, in the last analysis, to an external mark on the body is the first thing we ought to call into question in order to understand how early nineteenth-century American culture understood race. Indeed, the intimate link between race and visibility may be a byproduct of the way difference is figured by a culture such as ours, mediated primarily by the image – photographic, cinematic, and televisual. And since critical race theory has emerged in relation to twentieth-century political and legal projects, much of it has had little reason to question this assumed link between race and visibility. But it is simply unwarranted to assume that our own conception of race prevailed in nineteenth-century America – a culture, we might say, mediated primarily by print. That Martin Luther King, in his "I Have a Dream" speech of August, 1963, could call so powerfully for people to be judged not by "the color of their skin but by the content of their character" implies by negative example this dominant twentieth-century emphasis on the visibility of race.³⁰ King's statement is only intelligible, that is, if one presumes

that race is purely a matter of appearance. Ironically, the racial “others” of the mid-nineteenth century *were* judged by the “content of their character,” for character itself had become linked to essential racial differences, and in a manner distinct from earlier discourses of national character or temperament. In other words, race was far more than an attribute of appearance. The visible surface of the body testified to the interior properties of the individual.

In emphasizing the shift to what might be called an “interior” definition of race during the nineteenth century, I am by no means suggesting that surface differences ceased to matter during this period. On the contrary, I am arguing that the notion of racial sentiment supplemented an older system for differentiating bodies, and, indeed, literally made those corporeal differences more “telling.” External physical differences, comprising what Colette Guillaumin has termed the “system of marks,” were caught up and transformed by a new logic of interior racial differences that was superimposed upon them.³¹ To stage the point in terms of the racial logic of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, we could say that Tom’s “full glossy black” exterior is necessary in order for Stowe to posit the uniquely “black” sentiments beneath it.³² While this external mark is necessary, however, it is not alone sufficient to produce nineteenth-century “race.” Earlier scientific classifications had identified exterior differences without systematically linking them to matters of sentimental subjectivity. On the other hand, despite the presence throughout western history of highly developed discourses for attributing different qualities of mind or heart to specific groups of people, these discourses did ground such qualities in those groups’ essential biophysical properties. Only during the nineteenth century did different subjectivities come to be understood as the property of people with different physiological natures. It is this notion of a properly racial subjectivity whose emergence I want to trace. Its story cannot be told without accounting for the cultural work of literary narratives.

As I have suggested, I believe the frontier romance was uniquely situated to perform the work of producing this form of racial truth for its readers. Yet historical fiction may seem an unlikely place to locate the production of concepts more commonly associated with scientific writing or political discourse. It is no doubt a different register of truth that the novel claims the power to represent than that towards which science or politics gestures. At the same time, “literature” was simply not the same thing to early nineteenth-century readers that it is to us. Indeed, as Jonathan Arac has demonstrated in his genealogy of American prose

genres, it was not until 1850 that “literature” took on something like its present meaning, thanks to the simultaneous elevation and “diminishment in scope” that “led the ‘literary’ to emerge as an independent realm, answerable only to the requirements of its own coherent fantasy rather than engaged in a concerned dialogue with the life of the times.”³³ Prior to this period, “literature” had not yet been clearly and definitively distinguished from other forms such as historical narrative, personal narrative, or even political oratory. As late as 1850, Arac speculates, “to the question . . . what was the greatest American literature? Bancroft’s *History* and Webster’s speeches might have proven likely answers.”³⁴

While Arac is not concerned with scientific writing, recent histories of science in general, and racial science in particular, are consistent with his argument. As far apart as literary and scientific discourse, and the truths they access, appear to us today, in the mid-nineteenth century they were more difficult to distinguish. “There was never any sharp separation between a precise scientific racialism and literary racial nationalism,” writes the preeminent historian of Anglo-Saxon racial ideology, Reginald Horsman, “for scientists discussed culture and national attitudes in the most general and impressionistic of terms, while some nonscientific writers became interested in the physical basis of racial differentiation.”³⁵ It is not simply that the arguments of fictionists, poets, historians, politicians, and scientists mutually reinforced one another, but more profoundly that these types of discourse had not been classified and hierarchized according to their ability to speak the truth. Even in the 1840s, the heyday of “scientific” racialism, “the leading American periodicals often blended ideas on race from a variety of different sources: scientific treatises, monographs on history and philosophy, novels and poems.” Nor did science always lead the way in formulating racial facts. In fact, “the creative writers often gave dramatic expression to new beliefs of racial superiority and destiny even before the scientists provided specific proofs for what had been assumed.”³⁶

But why privilege fiction, and why historical fiction in particular? Without making any sweeping claims about the agency of “literature” as such, I do believe there is good reason to think that American culture might have assigned some of the task of defining race to historical fiction at this historical moment. At the most basic level, historical romance as a form of narrative fiction could say and do things that the discourses of science or politics simply could not say and do. What the scientific tract could only posit, and the political treatise or oration could only advocate, the novel could *narrativize*, setting characters into action before the eyes