

MARGARET FULLER AND THE RHETORIC OF TRANSCENDENTAL NATIONALISM

A Dissertation

by

DAVID N MUNSON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Nathan Crick
Committee Members,	Kristan Poirot
	Randall Sumpter
	James Burk
Head of Department,	Kevin J. Barge

August 2018

Major Subject: Communication

Copyright 2018 David Nicholas Munson

ABSTRACT

In this project, I track the development of Margaret Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism within the context of the Roman revolution in 1848. My central purpose is to situate the legacy of Margaret Fuller in the field of rhetorical theory and criticism, as well as to position her dispatches from Italy as the culmination of her work—not an eclipse of her previous writings, but a vital part of any understanding of the woman, the writer, the Transcendentalist, the feminist, the nationalist, the revolutionary that was Margaret Fuller. Furthermore, I argue that Fuller's dispatches offer a model for a distinctly transcendental form of nationalism through her combined skills, such as critiquing large networks of power, her classical knowledge and familiarity with the language of myth, her growing narrative form and structure, her love of German-Romantic philosophy and literature, her literary nationalist voice, and her deeply-rooted belief in the collective power of the Italian people.

Although arriving as a travel-writer abroad, Fuller was also a foreign correspondent for the *New-York Tribune* with the task of reporting back on any and all happenings. Europe, at the time, was in a tumultuous state, which would soon erupt in open insurrection and full-blown revolution. And Fuller was right in the middle of it. After travelling through England and France, she arrived in Italy and quickly became a convert to the Italian nationalist cause. Although her dispatches begin with descriptions of her encounters with art, nature and culture, once in Italy Fuller adopts a more aggressive rhetorical voice that quickly evolves into a sophisticated rhetoric of transcendental nationalism. This dissertation will explore how Fuller transformed her Transcendental belief in the power of individualism and the art of self-culture into a radical,

revolutionary, nationalist rhetorical style that called a nation together based on common origin, character, spirit, and destiny in an effort to pursue a new Democratic Order. This dissertation thus traces the works of Margaret Fuller beginning with her major publications in America, continuing through her dispatches from Europe (1846-1850), and ending with a distinct rhetorical form and style, which I call the rhetoric of transcendental nationalism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a few people I would especially like to thank that helped me through this long and arduous process. Firstly, I would like to thank my parents, Tim Munson, Marty Munson, and Nancy Kestler. Without each of you, I am nothing. Next, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Nathan Crick, whose conversation, guidance, and character has proven an invaluable resource over the past several years, as well as a genuine pleasure to be around—a true model of spirit and strength.

I would also like to specifically thank those people I have been fortunate enough to meet in life who have made me a better person. Jordan Kincaid, brotherhood shows thyself! A man who knows the value of being lost together—I hasten the return. Rachel Whitten, it is because of your friendship, care, generosity, perseverance, wit, and all around personality that I know what it means to “grow,” may the plant of our friendship be watered ever more. Amanda McAlpin, throughout many dark times and across many years your light has been like a beacon, shining forth. Christopher Trevino, on the tennis court we met as opponents, but as doubles partners we became brothers! Each of you I am both lucky and fortunate to have met.

Lastly, I would like to thank my undergraduate and masters advisors, Dr. Andrew Hansen and Dr. Kendall Phillips. Each of you helped steer me in a direction when I felt lost or uncertain. I do not know where I would be today if not for your guidance, and I look forward to many more conversations with you. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Kristan Poirot, Dr. Randall Sumpter, and Dr. James Burk, for their thought, guidance and banter both inside the room and out. Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a great experience.

CONTRIBUTORS & FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professor Nathan Crick [advisor] and Professors Kristan Poirot and Randall Sumpter of the Department of Communication and Professor James Burk of the Department of Sociology.

All work for this dissertation was completed independently by the student.

Funding Sources

There are no outside funding contributions to acknowledge related to the research and compilation of this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
CHAPTER II A NEW AMERICAN CULTURAL IDENTITY	27
CHAPTER III THE RISE OF LITERARY NATIONALISM	48
CHAPTER IV ENGLAND: THE OUTBREAK OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.....	64
CHAPTER V FRANCE: THE EXPLOSION OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	87
CHAPTER VI ITALY: THE RISE OF REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALISM	115
CHAPTER VII TALES FROM THE GREAT DRAMA	143
CHAPTER VIII THE PIETY OF ROME'S OLD ORDER	151
CHAPTER IX THE VISION OF A NEW ERA.....	176
CHAPTER X CONCLUSION.....	202
NOTES	215
REFERENCES	228

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In the summer of 1850, Margaret Fuller, a transcendentalist and foreign correspondent for the *New York Tribune* fled the city of Rome to survive a siege from French foreign invaders. As a correspondent, Fuller had been in Europe for the past couple of years reporting on its culture, politics, art, literature, and social conditions across three of its major nations—England, France, and Italy. In the year 1848, however, she found herself unexpectedly in the middle of a burgeoning revolutionary situation. One by one, city-states across the Italian peninsula were erupting in insurrection, revolt, and, in the case of Sicily, even full-blown revolution. While in Rome, Fuller sketched out descriptions of the rapid flow of events happening all around. But her writing would soon be interrupted by French troops storming the gates of Rome. Although many of Fuller’s American friends urged her return, she was determined to finish her book about the history of the Roman revolution. “If I cannot make any thing out of my present materials,” she wrote to her friends, “my future is dark indeed.”¹ And by the time she finally departed, Fuller indeed did make something of her writing. Her manuscript, “History of the Late Revolutionary Movements in Italy,” would be her greatest production yet. More importantly, it would serve as proof that she finally overcame her greatest perceived limitation—being only a mother to genius and not genius herself.

But then tragedy struck. In Fuller’s haste to flee she hadn’t the time or resources to scrape together enough money to afford a newer, more reliable steamship back to America. So she settled on a sailing ship, the *Elizabeth*, whose captain had inauspiciously died of smallpox just before the trip. So, with a captain-less ship run by an inexperienced first-mate, Fuller’s ill-fated

voyage began. In crossing the Atlantic, a hurricane appeared, which caused the first-mate to miscalculate the ship's position, driving it onto a bar just off the coast of Fire Island, New York. After hours of being battered by the high seas, the *Elizabeth* finally broke in two. Fuller watched as several passengers were swept out to sea, among them her recently married husband, Giovanni Angelo Ossoli, and their not quite two-year-old boy, Angelo Eugene Philip Ossoli. Somehow, Fuller had managed to grab hold of a nearby mast, but as her family was gone, and all her belongings along with the manuscript of the Italian revolution with them, she had little will to survive.² According to one of the cook's, Fuller, dressed in her white nightdress, looked out upon the sea and said, "I see nothing but death before me—I shall never reach the shore."³ At that moment, a great wave crashed over her and Margaret Fuller was gone. Three days later, Ralph Waldo Emerson sent fellow Transcendentalist Henry David Thoreau to the site of the wreck in the hopes of recovering some semblance of Fuller's manuscript. But by the time Thoreau made it to Long Island, five days had passed since the wreck, and most of the items that washed up from the *Elizabeth* had already been scavenged.⁴ The only thing of value Thoreau found was the coat of Giovanni Ossoli, from which he took a single button. The manuscript was lost forever.

One of the major tragedies of Margaret Fuller's death was that her legacy was no longer her own, but was instead left to those who claimed to have known her best. Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*, published an article "In Memory of the Martyr to Human Liberty" to express the profound loss of both a dear friend, as well as a symbol of freedom for the American people.⁵ Elsewhere, Fuller's closest friends, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Henry Channing and James Freeman Clarke published a collection of *Memoirs* as a synopsis of her life (Fuller's brother, Arthur, also contributed to this book). After selecting a series of

epigraphic quotes from some of Fuller's favorite Romantic writers—Goethe, Tennyson, Schiller, Shelley, and Browning—her brother Arthur opens the *Memoirs* with a quote from his sister:

Tieck, who has embodied so many Runic secrets, explained to me what I have often felt toward myself, when he tells of the poor changeling, who, turned from the door of her adopted home, sat down on a stone and so pitied herself that she wept. Yet me also, the wonderful bird, singing in the wild forest, has tempted on, and not in vain.⁶

In many ways, this quote captures Margaret Fuller's personality perfectly—her love of literature, tragic self-perception, love of individual freedom, and passion for pushing past her limits. But as many scholars have pointed out, these *Memoirs* are barely more than the husk of the woman who, as Nathan Crick describes, is “arguably the most recognizable, influential, and controversial American woman of her age.”⁷

What is most problematic about the *Memoirs* is the fact that it does not mention Fuller's dispatches or the time she spent in Europe. Moreover, it is filled with adulterations of her work; Emerson, for instance, modified words, revised sentences, shifted paragraphs, ignored dates and time sequence, and even gave incorrect names of letter recipients. Put simply, the *Memoirs* were undoubtedly a maddening piece for any scholar of the life and work of Margaret Fuller. In the words of Joseph Jay Deiss, it was “a cut-and-paste job, with the scissors acting as censor's shears.”⁸ This project attempts to recover the last works of Fuller by way of rhetorical analysis. It further argues that Fuller's dispatches from Europe offer a culminating view of her thought. This was a woman whose parting words to Americans before leaving for Europe were: “To see with my own eyes...Life in the old world, and to bring home some packages of seed for life in the new.”⁹ The tragedy of Fuller's life and death is thus twofold—first, she was never able to bring back to America the “seed” she had been cultivating, her manuscript; and second, the tragic fact

that all her work and experience were reduced to, on the one hand, a series of dispatches edited and omitted by a hand that was not her own, and, on the other hand, a compilation of *Memoirs* that's final chapter ends in Boston, which was the very place from which Fuller left with the hope of discovering new ways to regenerate what she saw as a decaying culture. In short, this dissertation seeks to continue to interpret Fuller's legacy, but instead of focusing on her time in America, I explore Fuller's dispatches to the *Tribune* as the culmination of all her works—not to eclipse the value of her other works, but to make a vital part of any understanding of Fuller's thought, whether ideological, political or personal.

Although Fuller's legacy remains open to interpretation, the one thing that cannot be challenged is her contribution to nineteenth century American society. Even after her death, the name Margaret Fuller remained well known in America. For instance, in *History of Woman Suffrage*, published 1881 and written by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, Fuller is described as a woman who “possessed more influence on the thought of American women than any woman previous to her time.”¹⁰ And according to Deiss, “for the fifteen years preceding the Civil War, her name was almost a household word in the East.”¹¹ She was a teacher and conversationalist, editor and translator, poet and literary critic, author and world traveller, woman of letters and foreign correspondent, feminist and transcendentalist. And Fuller's contributions to the feminist and transcendentalist traditions are most widely reflected in her two published books—*Woman in the Nineteenth Century* and *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*. But Fuller had already established her position within Boston's intellectual circles well before writing either of these two books.

By 1843, Fuller was considered the most remarkable woman in the Transcendental Club. And when the Transcendentalists started their first and only public journal, she was the obvious

choice to be its editor. During this time, Fuller published her most well-known essay, “The Great Lawsuit: Man versus Men. Woman versus Women.” which Philip Gura calls “the landmark piece of her feminist thought.”¹² It was so popular that it eventually became the basis of her most well-known book, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. This book, according to Joan von Mehren, “appeared at a time when women’s rising educational levels and growing expectations provided a ready audience for an appeal to women to direct their energies to exploring the self, developing autonomy, and expanding their intellectual and personal horizons.”¹³ In it, Fuller calls on women to raise themselves out of their conditions of dependence and embrace the doctrine of “self reliance”—popularized by Ralph Waldo Emerson. But what Emerson called “Man-Thinking,” Fuller reconfigured into “Woman-Thinking,” which she popularized in a series of “Conversations” for women in Boston. Her “Conversations” aimed to help women develop their potential, not as wives or mothers confined to domesticity, but as individuals who possessed creative powers, particular talents, and passionate desires. As Barbara Packer points out, “such pedagogy hardly strikes anyone as revolutionary now, but to women who had scarcely ever been asked to do anything except repeat by rote, it seemed electrifying.”¹⁴ Especially in the nineteenth century, when women were taught from an early age to prepare for marriage, and that motherhood was the only occupation a woman could ever have.

This is not to say that Emerson’s notion Man-Thinking was meant to constrain the growth of women. If anything, the term “Man” was used in its most general sense—mankind. But in *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, Fuller articulates a new understanding of gender relations based on humanity’s “twin powers” of Man and Woman. Each was a form of energy, Fuller thought, with unique qualities and characteristics: manly qualities like critical intellect, power, and self-awareness Fuller called Minerva-like powers; feminine powers like beauty, intuition,

and emotional-awareness she called Muse-like powers. Fuller knew the word “woman” carried a heavy burden of oppression in America’s male-dominated society. Therefore, she used Greek mythology to discuss her thoughts on gender relations knowing full well that the realm of the sacred was something her readers could understand and relate to. Thus, Fuller declares that all women need to cultivate themselves, “because the Power who gave a power, by its mere existence, signifies that it must be brought out towards perfection.”¹⁵ By harnessing, developing, and bringing into harmony the powers of Minerva and the Muse, Fuller argued that “Woman” might overcome the societal constraints of “Women.” In effect, the publications of “The Great Lawsuit” and *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, along with several series of “Conversations,” helped solidified Fuller’s position in the feminist tradition. Together, they offer the first extended intellectual examination of the “woman question” done by a woman in the United States. And when Fuller died tragically in 1850, so too did an American voice that not only challenged women to rise up and become something more than what society demanded, but also challenged America as a whole to envision a future where every person could realize and fulfill their potential through the process of cultivating their powers.

Another aspect of Fuller’s legacy that scholars frequently discuss is her literary nationalist voice. From an early age she refined her critical voice in book reviews, letters with friends, and private journals. Her subject material ranged from popular classical composers to contemporary art and opera, from practical criticism on America’s prison system to literary criticism of contemporary poets and aspiring authors. From Boston to Providence, Fuller explored the culture of each city’s art and music scene, each time coming out mostly disappointed. Fuller became convinced that America was in cultural decay, and thus needed a new source of regeneration. And the first place she turned for inspiration and advice was to her

fellow Transcendentalists. For one, there was friend James Freeman Clarke, a close friend of Fuller's who had recently travelled to the Ohio Valley to do mission work. Then there was George Ripley, who had started a new agricultural community just outside of Boston called Brook Farm. But what intrigued Fuller the most was her friends that had travelled to Europe, such as Ralph Waldo Emerson and Sam Ward. Since she had grown up reading the works of Europe's great Romantic authors, Fuller thought one way to improve American culture was to expose it to a higher literary culture.

While living in Boston, Fuller spent most of her efforts interpreting European literature and German literary philosophy. Through her teaching and *Conversations*, then, she developed her intellectual powers by encouraging American literature and art to discover its own unique form, a realization she would later refer to as "an American fact." According to Mattson Bean and Myerson, "Fuller's early development into a literary critic consisted of extensive reading and responding in private journals and publishing translations and critical reviews for several periodicals in addition to publishing her two books."¹⁶ While at the *Dial*, she refined her critical pen as both a writer and editor. Her two biggest accomplishments were publishing "The Great Lawsuit" and a translation of *Conversations with Goethe in the Last Years of His Life* with an original preface. Each of these works represented a kind of culmination in Fuller's thought—one formally expressed Fuller's thoughts on the woman question; the other showcased a full-bodied understanding of her familiarity with German Romanticism's foremost writers. She had tied the knot on two separate strands of her own Romantic-Transcendental epistemology. And having achieved this, Fuller felt it was time for a change. She retired as editor of the *Dial* and then took a four-month excursion across the Great Lakes region.

The result of Fuller's trip was the twofold discovery of her emerging nationalist voice and a new rhetorical pursuit in intellectual travel writing. At the beginning, Fuller's goal was to simply explore America's biggest and most diverse frontier, but what she found instead was an expansive Romantic continent with the potential for an entirely new literary subject matter. From her experiences, she hoped to reshape America's national identity by awakening a new national cultural consciousness that connected the civilized eastern region with the wild and expansive west. After returning from her trip, Fuller wrote and published her first book, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*. In it, she asserts a new proto-American mythology rooted in the tragic culture of the Native American. Fuller's book was wildly successful amongst the Transcendental Club. It even caught the eye of Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*. Greeley was already familiar with Fuller's reputation because of his wife who had attended Fuller's "Conversations." But when he read *Summer on the Lakes*, Greeley found an emerging nationalist voice that he wanted to steer the *Tribune* in a new direction.

As the new editor of the *Tribune's* literary department, Fuller used her position as a platform to publicly express doubts about America's literary cultural identity. Much like *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, Fuller's *Tribune* essays offer more than mere cultural criticism; they represent her own evolving political and cultural views. According to Mattson Bean and Myerson, "They show that she gained an increased understanding of the opportunities for political action open to women and to intellectuals as she directly considered national political programs and her own role in shaping them through one of the most popular newspapers of the day."¹⁷ In line with the continuity of her work, Fuller's *Tribune* essays are unique in that they arise from within a new location, aimed at a national American audience instead of an intellectual elite, and were published and distributed using new media technology. In short,

Greeley's experience as a flagship newspaper editor combined with Fuller's literary power as a critic and author helped the *Tribune* become a powerful democratic institution that aimed to educate the American people through genres such as literary dialogues and art-music, as well as through practical criticism, such as on progressive political events in the United States.

By the time Fuller left America for Europe, she had secured her position as a prominent writer, critic and thinker in the feminist and transcendental traditions. Especially considering the fact that her European dispatches only increased her popularity in America. As Reynolds and Belasco Smith point out, "Fuller supplied her American readers not only with the news they so eagerly sought, but also with informed analyses supporting the republican cause."¹⁸ Therefore, it seems strange that names such as Julia Ward Howe, Louisa May Alcott, and Susan B. Anthony are all commonly remembered from the nineteenth century, but Margaret Fuller is not. Just like in the *Memoirs*, Fuller's memory is today confined to that sphere from which she tried with all her being to escape, namely, the intellectual elite, which according to Deiss, is "an elite so restricted that it includes few but students of American literature and occasional scholars in the general humanities." Furthermore, Deiss also points to Vernon L. Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought* as a precise evaluation of the Margaret Fuller matter: "Misunderstood in her own time, caricatured by unfriendly critics, and with significant facts of her life suppressed by her friends by a chivalrous sense of loyalty, the real woman has been lost in a Margaret Fuller myth and later generations have come to under-estimate her powers and undervalue her work."¹⁹ Yet, given the latter half of the twentieth-century, with the rise of fascist and totalitarian forms of nationalism, no other woman of the nineteenth-century can be more worth studying.

The study of Margaret Fuller in women's history increased when biographers began to reexamine and reorder her works starting in the 1960s. Robert N. Hudspeth's five edited volumes

of Fuller's private letters and Joel Myerson's bibliographical scholarship have proven invaluable to the proliferation of Fuller scholarship. According to Mehren, "New editions of her essays and books, fresh examinations of her poetry, the publication of her *Tribune* dispatches from Europe in one volume, and the appearance of some of her private journals, resurrected from dusty boxes, and new scholarship on many of the figures who peopled her (many of them women) have provided authors with a wealth of fresh material."²⁰ Then, in 1992, Charles Capper published the first of a two volume comprehensive biography on *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*. His work demonstrated a new level of detail and breadth to Fuller's historical and social context, along with rich descriptions and analyses of her psychological and emotional state within these contexts. Capper opened a door for other biographers, like Joan von Mehren, Jeffrey Steele and Mary Kelley, to take more subjective and specific perspectives, while others situate her more generally within the Transcendentalist tradition, like Barbara Packer, Philip Gura and Perry Miller.²¹ Together, these authors offer a largely unified center of the narrative of the life of Margaret Fuller.

The final strand of Fuller scholarship, although significantly smaller in scope, departs from previous work by centering Fuller's rhetorical legacy in Europe. First, there is Joseph Jay Deiss with his book *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller*. Although Fuller's European experiences came at the tail end of her life, Deiss argues that in Europe Fuller was most at home with herself, and thus her writing reflects a level of intellectual and emotional contentment that cannot be found in any of her previous works. No longer was she advocating for a *need* to seek out new forms of cultural regeneration, for in Europe she was actually doing it. "In America," Deiss writes, "she had never lived as she wished to live, never loved as she wished to love. In Rome she heard the subtle echoes of antiquity, and answered them. It was a dialog of deep

emotion.” It is important to note that while other scholars do in fact talk of Fuller’s time in Rome, it is always done toward the end of her life, as a kind of epilogue or conclusion. One of the reasons for this, according to Deiss, is because the public history of the Roman Republic and the private history of Fuller’s experiences are impossible to separate. “In her letters and dispatches,” Deiss writes, “the personal and historical, the historical and personal, are inseparably intermingled.”²² A lot of this had to do with Fuller’s reason for being in Europe. Whether as foreign correspondent, transcendentalist, intellectual travel writer, lover of history, critic of literature, Romantic adventurer, Woman-Thinking, or even just an American abroad, Fuller’s multiple identifications were intricately interwoven into her writing. Thus, scholars who study Fuller must have familiarity with both Roman history and the Italian language in order to even attempt writing about this part of Fuller’s life. For this reason Deiss claims that today’s “image of Margaret Fuller” overstresses her “American years” and offers little to no attention to the “dramatic Roman climax of her life.”²³

Around the same time as Capper’s biographies, Larry J. Reynolds and Susan Belasco Smith published an edited volume of Fuller’s entire series of European dispatches (1856-1850), entitled *These Sad But Glorious Days*. This work, above any other, has proved invaluable to this dissertation process because it offers the most accurate and complete version of the dispatches organized with titles in a single book. Unlike more subjective descriptions of Fuller’s time in Europe, this work contributes to Fuller’s legacy by preserving her final writings in their raw, untouched form. Instead of framing Fuller’s subjective approach to the dispatches as a constraint on interpreting history, Reynolds and Belasco Smith frame her work as a literary achievement, combining the unique circumstances of her contextual situation with the stirring style of her narrative form, as well as her commitment to documenting the struggle for liberty in Europe. In

the introduction, they acknowledges that dispatches “wander far outside the boundaries of conventional travel writing and take on the qualities of the history, the sermon, the political manifesto, the historical romance, and especially the diary.”²⁴ Drawing on Transcendental thought, Fuller saw the Italian project as a revolution fueled by Romantic notions of heroism, struggling to discover the essence of the Italian “idea” by breaking apart its many semblances and forms. Thus, what Reynolds and Belasco Smith contribute with their work is, in large part, interpret Fuller’s ethos as a historian: “[Fuller] believed, like other romantic writers, that a poetic faculty of mind, called imagination or Reason, was necessary for the historian to perceive and express that which determined the course of historical events.”²⁵ Thus, it is above all else the ethos of Fuller as a Transcendental poet-historian that gives her dispatches credibility as a literary production.

Fuller referred to her dispatches explicitly as a “great drama,” thus what Reynolds and Belasco Smith do is untangle the relationship between Fuller’s dispatches and her view of History in their introduction so that Fuller’s voice can speak for itself. “The relationship she envisioned between the dispatches and her “History” was that between sketches and an oil painting; the first done quickly and impressionistically with the scenes before her eyes; the second created in the studio and showing the effects not only of contemplation and reflection, but also of selection and arrangement.” Moreover, Fuller writes of “History” in the same vein as those influenced by German Romantic thought and the Hegelian tradition, namely, of the objectification of World History, or Spirit, into objects which reflect the unifying aspects of Nature as it develops teleologically across time. Like Hegel, Fuller also viewed History in tragic terms. According to Reynolds and Belasco Smith, “The European revolutionary movement, which Fuller embraced and then saw crushed, emerged out of very real and widespread social

misery.”²⁶ While in Europe, she encountered pervasive unemployment in urban cities, widespread famine in rural country sides, and the same social disease of corrupt and despotic governments across multiple nations. What she envisioned, then, was a more perfect form of democracy. And as a rhetorical artifact, her dispatches do more than merely record the sequence of historical events. They represent the culmination of her thoughts on the relationship between History, Art and Nature.

For Fuller, history writing is itself a creative endeavor—it combines attention to detail and the use of archival materials to bring a narrative to life through the art of rhetoric. In *These Sad But Glorious Days*, readers gain access to Fuller’s rich descriptions and vivid metaphor of the heroic figures and dramatic scenes that unfolded in the Europe’s year of revolutions. And while Reynolds and Belasco Smith’s edited volume in no way represent the definitive study of Margaret Fuller’s radicalization in Europe, they do provide the most accurate version to date of her dispatches. This dissertation thus builds upon the works of those who have accumulated, consolidated, and organized Fuller’s writing by offering a rhetorical analysis of the dispatches. More specifically, it addresses them as a stand alone literary production, which, I argue, represents both a culmination of Fuller’s work as well as a distinctly transcendental form of nationalist rhetoric. I am not arguing that the dispatches should eclipse any of Fuller’s previous feminist works. What I am saying is that the dispatches give readers a clear view of multiple threads of Fuller’s work, which, from a historical point of view, makes her stand apart from other transcendentalists. Moreover, her writing anticipates the rise of international global politics in the nineteenth century through the use of new media technology that addressed a national audience. In this regard, Fuller is one of the few Transcendentalists whose rhetorical practices go beyond the parochial and address a larger, international stage to a national audience using what I am

calling the rhetoric of transcendental nationalism. In the remaining pages of this introduction, I will address Fuller's position in the field of rhetoric, how it relates to the study of both transcendentalism and nationalism, as well as what makes her unique brand of transcendental nationalism appealing to rhetorical scholars today.

The most recent and significant contribution on Margaret Fuller to the field of rhetoric is *The Keys of Power: The Rhetoric and Politics of Transcendentalism* by Nathan Crick. Drawing on the biographical works of who embed Fuller within the Transcendentalist tradition, such as Lawrence Buell and Barbara Packer, Crick offers a single, highly potent chapter on the rhetoric of her revolutionary nationalism. Furthermore, Crick focuses squarely upon Fuller's time spent in Europe in order to give her a new, more revolutionary rhetorical identity. "In her dispatches from Italy," Crick writes, "Fuller placed transcendental eloquence on the global stage, lashing out against the cause of tyranny and wrong that as everywhere the same, criticizing the United States for the same barbarity she saw in Europe, and championing the rights of all people—not only individuals but entire nations—to pursue self determination and tap into the sources of their own unique genius that would give them both beauty and power."²⁷ Working through several biographical sources on Fuller's life, such as Charles Capper, Joan von Mehren, and Jeffrey Steele, Crick tracks Fuller's development as a writer through the language of history, myth and nationalism, as well as her growing use of synecdoche. In the case of Italy in 1848, Crick argues that "Fuller's rhetoric of revolutionary nationalism did not contradict but was built upon her previous rhetorical strategies."²⁸ Crick's chapter thus works through Fuller's most significant writings in order to first identify and classify those rhetorical strategies, and then to piece them together into a distinct rhetoric of revolutionary nationalism.

In the early stages of Fuller's life, Crick uses the theoretical work of Michel Foucault in order to show how Fuller transforms the limitations of her sex into a powerful public discourse. "In the face of complete domination by her environment," Crick writes, "Fuller exploited the contradictions within power to pursue a practice of freedom—or what Foucault calls 'an exercise of the self on the self by which one attempts to develop and transform oneself, and the attain a certain mode of being.'"²⁹ Since power, according to Foucault, is always relational and is regulated by knowledge and discourse, a critique of power can be understood as a subject taking hold of their right to question the effects of power, to expose gaps and inconsistencies in its relational network, and to challenge its practices. For Fuller, this mode of critique took the form of literary criticism, most noticeably while she was working the *Dial*, and culminating with the publication of "The Great Lawsuit: Man versus Men. Woman versus Women." Fuller's criticism aligns with those who study "critical rhetoric," such as Raymie McKerrow, Kent Ono and John Sloop, as well as those who theorize on the rhetoric of dissension, the politics of freedom, and practices of resistance, such as Kendall Phillips, Barbara Biesecker, Robert Ivie, and Arthur Walzer. I believe it is important to acknowledge that Fuller was a critic first and foremost because it was through criticism that she gained her understanding of the politics of transcendence.

More than anything, transcendentalism for Fuller was about developing and deploying individual power. As a woman living in the nineteenth century, Fuller used her literary knowledge, her teaching skills, and her powers of criticism to hold "Conversations" with women in which they could explore topics such as Greek mythology, history, and art without being bound to the confines of society's dual-gender spheres ideology. These conversations influenced Fuller's writing in a rhetorically significant way because it fused together the politics and

ideology of women's liberation in the nineteenth with the language of history and myth, which she had absorbed throughout all her readings in classical, German, and Romantic literature. In "The Great Lawsuit" she references Cassandra—the genius of the prophetess of Delphi—in order to show how the female powers are inclined toward the Muse-like tendencies and thus need to focus on developing their Minerva instincts. To reinforce this claim, Fuller inverts the Greek parable of Orpheus and Eurydice, which tells of a man's "descent" into the underworld to "seek after" his buried female love, in order to call for a "new age of Eurydice" in which women must Romantically quest after the means of self-development. Then, in *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller fuses the language of history and myth into America's own tragic past through vivid accounts of the difficult lives of women on the frontier and tragic dramatizations of the lives of the Native Americans. According to Crick, Fuller took on the new rhetorical challenge of finding a way to convey these tragic realizations while simultaneously communicating a new vision of America using "the language of the symbol."³⁰ *Summer on the Lakes* thus transformed the American "West" into a symbolic landscape, containing within its vastness the potential for discovering America's cosmopolitan greatness.

In *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller wanted readers to not only see the beauty of the American West, but also to recognize the tragic experience of its Native American inhabitants. In searching for a new national vision, then, Fuller exposed its greatest flaw. And she wanted readers to associate this vast beauty as distinctly "American." But being American required people to first acknowledge the history of America's shameful past. Thus, Fuller portrays the Native American as a tragic symbol in order to reconstruct America's national identity. In this way, *Summer on the Lakes* stands as a crucial development in Fuller's rhetorical process because it signals the emergence of her unique nationalist voice. Nationalism can best be understood

through Benedict Anderson's idea of "imagined communities." According to Anderson, a nation is "an imagined political community, both inherently limited and sovereign."³¹ Fuller's rhetoric of nationalism, then, was transcendental because it sought to push beyond the boundaries of "civilized" America by questing into its new, Romantic landscape and discovering a new national cultural idea based on the language of myth and history, using both the light and dark aspects of America's revolutionary past.

Rhetorical scholars today who study the language of nationalism tend to focus on the relationship between rhetoric and ideology. In Philip Wander's essay on "The Third Persona," he discusses the relationship in terms of rhetorical criticism. For Wander, rhetorical criticism is the product of "a real person" whose historical perspective can best be understood as an ideological examination, study, or commentary on the great issues of the day. Michael Calvin McGree discusses the relationship between rhetoric and ideology in terms of what he calls "The Ideograph." For McGee, ideology creates a vocabulary of ideographs that when put into practice in the realm of human affairs shapes every day discourse. This discourse is political in nature because it builds, classifies and deploys ideographs through what McGee calls "a rhetoric of control," or "a system of persuasion" that is based entirely upon words and the potential for their use within a context of power.³² Ideographs, then, are the building blocks of nationalist ideology. Furthermore, when those blocks are under the control of those in power and are used to achieve their ends, these ideographs take on new meaning, which eventually gets absorbed into public memory. Walter Fisher uses the term "narrative paradigm" to describe this matter. For Fisher, a paradigm is a representation of an experience designed to formalize its structural components in a way that directs all understanding or inquiry into the nature and function of that experience. In other words, paradigms use stories to tell us how the world works; and since humans are rational

beings, we understand the world's many unknowns as a set of logical puzzles, of which paradigms help us make sense by way of reason, analysis and knowledge. Narratives, then, put these arguments into a sequence and thus give them deeper meaning. Fisher states that as rational beings, we are essentially storytellers, and our stories comprise the primary means by which we understand each other's actions in the world. Narration can thus be understood as a theory of symbolic action, which synthesizes the powers of vision and insight in order to better sequence our descriptions of events in a way that elicits deeper meaning. Stories, Fisher writes, "are the enactment of the whole mind in concert with itself," and a narrative paradigm arises when those stories take of our understanding of the world in which we live.³³ This mixture of ideology and storytelling in many ways is how the rhetoric of nationalism forms.

For readers who study theory, the rhetoric of nationalism follows three general trajectories: the historical, the ideological, and the artistic. The first focuses on the relationship between rhetoric and the historical development of the public sphere. Working through the theory of Jürgen Habermas, the public sphere is a realm of social life that uses public opinion as a method of achieving consensus in the hopes of guaranteeing access to all citizens.³⁴ This relates to the rhetoric of nationalism because a public sphere will always take shape within an historical context, and is thus always embedded within a network of power and an accompanying rhetoric of control. This is clearly seen in Habermas's analysis of the French bourgeoisie. More recently, Nancy Frazier has argued that today's public sphere is not altogether different from the bourgeois public sphere—a body of private persons assembled to discuss matters of public concern and common interest.³⁵ And since the bourgeoisie faced a proliferation of competing publics in its own formation, so too must rhetorical scholars study the voices and stories of "counter-publics," as well as dissension that occurs within and between a multiplicity of publics.

Scholars who have written on the topic of publics, counter-publics and dissension between competing voices within large networks of power include Robert Asen, Gerard Hauser, and Kendall Phillips. But to study the question of the public sphere in the United States is, above all, to study the question of democracy, as well as the ideology and style that it produces.

The second trajectory of the rhetoric of nationalism follows those who study of the relationship between ideology and democracy. For instance, Robert Jensen writes about what it means to live in a democracy, namely, that every citizen has access to free speech, or the legal right to speak absent government repression. But Jensen goes on to say that democracy represents more than the existence of its institutions, or its noticeable democratic features; it is also a method of action that guides a society to pursue a more perfect version of itself, as well as to speak out against corruption and tyranny and to pursue the good life through learning, teaching, and building upon a foundation of truth and knowledge.³⁶ But the “idea” of democracy, Jensen notes, often gets in the way of actual democratic processes. In the case of the United States, Jensen identifies its ideological paradox using the following phrase: “More Freedom, Less Democracy.” Elsewhere, James Miller argues that the paradox of American democracy is tied specifically to its popular culture. He argues that politics produces boredom more than anything, mostly because the electoral process “has grown utterly predictable and unremittingly centrist.” Put another way, the idea of American democracy is ideologically tied to its revolutionary past. The ideology of American individualism, Miller writes, “despite being mass-marketed, has routinely been wildly nonconformist and even transcendently ‘idealist,’ provoking instability and social conflict.” As a result, he concludes, “popular culture has become the unacknowledged legislators of Americans, shaping sentiments.”³⁷ Finally, there are those such as Bradford Vivian who discuss the ideology of democracy in terms of its potential to

envision and pursue a more perfect form. Calling on the theory of Friedrich Nietzsche, Vivian writes about how public opinion, or “herd mentality,” necessitates the search for “new values concerning truth, morality, and ‘man’” because it compels people to configure their habits in accordance with socially accepted truth. Thus, when we name certain forms of social behavior as “democratic,” we are essentially cultivating an ever-evolving ideological culture vernacular.³⁸ Democracy, then, is not a goal for humanity, but a critical stage in its development as people learn to name and create new values, and to discover new ways of speaking.

The third trajectory of the rhetoric of nationalism follows those who view rhetoric as an art form, and thus study political style within a broader context of power. Beginning with the work of Thomas Farrell, rhetoric is an art that “derives its material from the real condition of civic life, the appearances of our cultural world.” In practice, rhetoric “makes room for disputation about the meaning, implications, direction and value of cultural appearances,” Farrell writes, and thus to study rhetoric is to study civic life in action.³⁹ And for Robert Hariman, the manner in which civic life takes shape depends upon the language and study of style. In his article, “Decorum, Power and the Courtly Style,” Hariman argues that matters of style are crucial to the practice of politics because political style, too, is an art. And for this reason, to study political style in the field of rhetoric, Hariman claims, “still remains a catalogue of discursive forms rather than the dynamics of our social experience or the relationship between rhetorical practice and political decisions.”⁴⁰ Citing the works of Thomas Farrell, Michael Leff, and Terry Eagleton, Hariman connects political style to artistic style based on universal elements of the human condition, such as an appreciation of poetry, which can be organized into communicative patterns with their own standards of appropriateness. James Arnt Aune extends the discussion on the relationship between artistic style and political power in his article “Democratic Style and

Ideological Containment” by pursuing a deeper analysis of the sociological basis of political style through the lens of music and other fine arts. For Aune, style is always intertwined with a critique of ideology because it deals with matters of form, which he claims are artistic in nature because they seek to arouse emotional or physical desire. Aune uses the examples of Beethoven and Schoenberg in classical music to show how musical style affects bodily experience by producing oscillating feelings of tension and release. Like music, political style embodies appeals to the universal human experience of tension and release in the forms it produces.⁴¹ Thus, to study the forms of political style is to study them as a pathology of ideological criticism—other scholars who do this kind of work are Darrel Enck-Wanzer, Mary Stuckey and Sean Patrick O’Rourke, Jeremy Engels, Ellen Gorsevski, and Michael Butterworth.

The study of Margaret Fuller in this dissertation is most like the third trajectory because it looks at the dispatches as a piece of ideological criticism focusing on the Italian democratic style within the broader context of revolution. Fuller believed the Italian revolutionary had the power to inspire Americans to take a closer look at the changing nature of their own political style. In order to do this, she draws heavily from literature and myth to provide form and content for understanding the context of Italian culture and politics, which must have been an altogether unknown political and cultural situation for American readers in the nineteenth century. Those who study constitutive rhetoric through the works of Maurice Charland, Kenneth Zagacki, Michael Leff, and Ebony Utley will understand this in terms of its ideological effect. According to Charland, “narratives work through a representational effect,” and constitutive rhetoric looks at how narratives contribute to the creation of the collective identification crucial to “founding moments” (e.g. for Fuller, this was the Roman Republic of 1848).⁴² In terms of the rhetoric of nationalism, Fuller’s dispatches constituted a collective identity for the Italian people rooted in a

narrative of revolution aimed at helping an American audience better understand these events. Moreover, the power of her rhetorical style sought to inspire readers to act freely and to transform themselves by truly feeling the Italian cause for liberty. In this dissertation, the theoretical work of Kenneth Burke will prove helpful because of the overlap between Burke and Fuller on the topic of myth and literature in the context of historical drama and developing human powers.

In a Burkean sense, rhetoric deals primarily with matters of identification; it considers the ways in which individuals are at odds with one another, or become identified with groups more or less at odds with one another, as well as how those individuals or groups act based on their common identifications, sensations, concepts, images, and attitudes.⁴³ Thus the rhetoric of nationalism is tied to Burke because it is based on establishing a collective common identity that gives meaning and purpose to individuals' lives through shared habits, communicative patterns and modes of thought. Moreover, although Fuller precedes Burke by nearly a century, both draw heavily from the literary tradition when it comes to understanding and critiquing forms of political power. Furthermore, the modern language of Burke's theory—terms such as identification, transcendence, rhetoric, nationalism, guilt, redemption, sacrifice, victimage, scapegoating, mortification, etc.—function as a helpful filter that adapts and brings out the rhetorical qualities of Fuller's writing. Therefore, this dissertation brings together the biographical study of Margaret Fuller, the rhetorical study of identification, and the ideological study of nationalism within the context of the Roman Revolution of 1848. It also builds upon the work of Nathan Crick in his recent study of Fuller, but in a way that is more contextually situated and historically grounded in her discourse of nationalism as described in the dispatches. In sum, Fuller's rhetorical style is unique within the Transcendental tradition because it takes place on an

international, global stage in a way that no other Transcendentalists work does. Her dispatches, then, require a deeper and richer rhetorical study than has yet to be produced. This dissertation attempts to take a step further in this direction.

I believe Margaret Fuller's Italian dispatches demand a deeper look because of her rhetoric of transcendental nationalism, which focuses on the building up of power through intellectual, emotional, and cultural self-development. Much of Fuller's allure as a Transcendentalist, I think, has to do with the cultivation of personal powers in a way that is individual-based, not leadership driven. On the topic of the woman question, for instance, Fuller used teaching, conversation, and writing to advance women's position through the overcoming of obstacles and discovering of powers alongside others who are also developing themselves, whether in terms of gender, race, or class. On the topic of nationalism, Fuller's book *Summer on the Lakes* reimagines the "idea" of America through the language of myth and history. Her *Tribune* essays then reinforce her new idea of America as a nation of people, in voluntary association with one another, who feel the capacity to act in toward the collective development of national powers. She envisioned America taking a ground up approach to the task of cultural regeneration based on a deeper understanding and appreciation for literature. Thus, what makes Fuller's rhetoric of nationalism distinctly transcendental is not so much that it lifts people up or resolves some inherent contradiction, but rather that individuals can emancipate themselves through the process of reading and writing by discovering new powers and deploying them in the public sphere. In a word, Fuller's rhetorical style is limitless.

Unlike other Transcendentalists who believed that the soul is complete in and of itself, Fuller believed the soul was incomplete on its own, and thus required the assistance others—whether through love, friendship, camaraderie, or simply mutual identification—in order to help

raise the self up into a higher collective consciousness and discover new powers and abilities. To clarify, it is not so much that the soul has a limitless expanse of possibility within itself, but rather that it must work with others to become something greater than it already is. And for Fuller, the primary means of developing the self is through the study of other forms of culture, history and mythology. This kind of literary transcendentalism offers an alluring form of self-development because it gives every person the potential to be revolutionary in a democratic, egalitarian, literary, and cultured kind of way. In the case of Italy, her dispatches offer insight into the richness of Italian culture. And while they may sound like jingoistic nationalism to the uncultivated eye, they actually perform a teleological celebration of Italy's history and spirit. In other words, without an understanding and appreciation for the history of Italy's culture, politics, religion and thought, one cannot expect to shout "*viva!*" and be called a patriot for the Italian cause. In this way, Fuller's rhetoric of nationalism is transcendental not because it resolves a contradiction by rising above it; it is transcendental because it helps individuals get outside themselves by understanding history, which is also the method for developing new individual powers. Put simply, Fuller's rhetoric is inspiring because it transcends patriotism. It continuously raises the reader up, through national history and into the stream of World History. The reader thus transcends the mortal realm and enters into the hall of History's hero by virtue of having access to that stream. And although Fuller's writing goes way beyond the normal capacity of such an expression, her work does set a certain standard, or model, for understanding how such a form of transcendental nationalism can grow across time.

In light of recent forms of emerging nationalism, I argue that Fuller's dispatches offer a form of nationalism that brings out some of the best qualities of the American tradition. For one, it has higher expectations of those who consider themselves patriots because it requires them to

have knowledge in literature, culture and history. In this way, it is an elitist form of nationalism, birthed from Fuller's own preference for Jeffersonian Republicanism, her love of German Romantic Idealism and classical Greek mythology, and her passion for literature and history as a means of cultural regeneration. Unlike other forms of nationalism, which strive to offer realistic goals for attaining ends such as political freedom, social improvement, or economic stability, Fuller's literary nationalism transcends the realm of "realism" for a higher *telos*, namely, the ongoing pursuit of the ideal. The individual becomes more than a citizen, she is now a soul. And the soul's primary means of improvement does not require one to improve their position within society, but rather pushes them beyond their perceived limitations by demanding a higher set of standards. In other words, it is precisely because Fuller's transcendental nationalism is an ideal and not a real attainment that gives it virtuous qualities. In pursuing personal power, one cannot simply immerse the self in a hole of personal experience, but must rather come out of their hole to study higher experiences by looking at the wider history and culture of a nation through its art and politics. One does not simply become a nationalist, then, without first studying history to better understand the richness of its culture across time and space.

In conclusion, Margaret Fuller is unique for being representative of a woman in the nineteenth century who believed that proper cultivation of the self was key for developing power as a literary writer. As a Transcendentalist, she sought to rid not just herself, but all women of the labels and connotations that inhibited their growth through the mode of teaching, writing, and conversation. In doing so, she turned the idea of "gender" into a power in need of development. She viewed the process of education as an art form whereby you inspire others to cultivate their own powers. In this way, Fuller's transcendental form of nationalism is a pedagogical process, which pursues the potentials of one's own country, both its positives and its negatives, in order to

develop a sense of collective power with nationalistic aspirations. In her own life, Fuller's trip into the West gave her a new sense of "America" based on the tragic history of its native people. In New York, she used new media technology in the field of journalism to both unite her nation and criticize its faults based on her discoveries in *Summer on the Lakes*. And this all happened before Fuller went to Europe. The point is that while Margaret Fuller's legacy may have been cut short by personal tragedy, the fact that it remains incomplete gives it limitless potential. Her dispatches thus represent the culmination of a life-long quest to pursue self-development. And they remain, like her life, open to new and unexpected interpretations. If there was a maxim that could sum up what it means to study Margaret Fuller and the rhetoric of transcendental nationalism it would be this: What can or cannot be achieved speaks not to what can be pursued.

CHAPTER II

A NEW AMERICAN CULTURAL IDENTITY

“The hordes of vulgar barbarians who crowd the landings, how unworthy they seem of these shores, of these sunsets, these moonlights. Can it be that from these a race shall spring who shall make amends to nature for the present violation of her majestic charms[?]”—Margaret Fuller

After completing the “Great Lawsuit,” Fuller took a break from writing to explore get out of her mind and into nature. “I am tired now of books and pens and thoughts no less,” she told her editor, “and shall be glad when I take wing for an idle outdoors life, mere sight and emotion.”⁴⁴ After toying with the idea of travelling to the West for the past year, she informed Emerson of her plans to go on a four-month excursion with several of her friends to the Great Lakes region. Her destination was the virgin lands of the rapidly settling upper Mississippi valley, which Charles Capper describes as, “America’s biggest and most diverse frontier.” Her motive for travelling was entirely Romantic—to encounter a new vision of America’s democratic potential. Her first stop was Niagara Falls, an iconic American Romantic landscape. But upon inspecting the great American destination, Fuller found Niagara to be a far cry from the dream spot she had imagined it to be. Instead, she discovered nothing more (or less) than a booming tourist destination. Fuller was, to say the least, incapacitated by its iconic presence, but struggled to separate the real Niagara from its mere picturesque qualities. She sketched out what she could, and then quickly left this densely populated national attraction the following week, by way of a steamboat ride down Lake Erie, into the forests of the Manitou Islands.⁴⁵

Fuller’s lake voyage, while different from the booming economy of Niagara, also left her feeling disappointed. So she turned her sketches away from the natural environment and toward

the ethos of Westerner. “I selected from the tobacco chewing, sharp, yet sensual looking crowd,” she wrote to Emerson, “one man that looked more clean and intellectual than the rest, and was told he was a famous Land-Shark.”⁴⁶ Fuller lacked the eye for America’s western culture, and thus left her feeling very out of place. In one of her more gloomy entries, Fuller reflects on her journey down Lake Erie:

[It] left on my mind an impression of grandeur, of disconsolateness, of inevitable fate,
The emigrants who accompanied us, the hordes of vulgar barbarians who crowd the
landings, how unworthy they seem of these shores, of these sunsets, these moonlights.
Can it be that from these a race shall spring who shall make amends to nature for the
present violation of her majestic charms[?]⁴⁷

At the heart of Fuller’s excursion was nothing less than the Romantic desire to discover a genuine way into America. And her quest to discover this new race was the first sign of a blooming nationalist rhetorical style. But the more vulgarity she saw in Western culture, the less hopeful she was that her Romantic quest would in fact yield any positive cultural discoveries.

As her travels continued through Illinois, Fuller finally found the beauty she had been looking for in America’s vast West. From across the bank of her double log cabin, the sight of trees, flowers, and the high, sharp-ridged bluffs of the Rock River amazed her to the point of epiphany. Sitting atop Eagle’s Nest—the area’s tallest and most forested bluff—she wrote her brother Richard on the morning of July 4: “I thought, if we two could live and you have a farm...and have our books and our pens, and a little boat on the river, how happy we might be for four or five years.”⁴⁸ Capper describes this moment as a “patriotic epiphany,” but not as some abstract allegiance to “America,” rather as a genuine sense of belonging—a hopeful feeling for the possibility of a new America. Even after seeing Lake Michigan, nothing could compare with

the “Rock River Eden” she had discovered at Eagle’s Nest.⁴⁹ Having located her ideal vision of the West, Fuller turned once again to the culture of its settlers. First and foremost, she studied the women of the West, searching for signs of cultural superiority to the civilized easterner. “All the Eastern women say, oh it is well for the men,” she told Emerson while visiting Chicago, “who enjoy their hunting and fishing, but for us, we have everything to bear and no time or health to enjoy or learn.” But these western women, Fuller wrote excitedly, with their “rough-and-ready ways...do not ape fashion, talk jargon or burn out life as a tallow candle for a tawdry show,” she wrote to Emerson. But the more she explored their culture, the more disappointed she became as she slowly realized these western women “belong to the men.”⁵⁰ Indeed, the deeply engrained social ideologies of male prejudice in Eastern culture were still prevalent in America’s undeveloped West, albeit in a less cultivated form.

Next, Fuller turned her attention to the significant number of Indian tribes, whom had been forcibly dispossessed of their lands by the United States government just five years prior. The physical memory of these recently displaced tribes—such as tomahawks, tree marks, pottery, arrowheads, and burial mounds—haunted Fuller. “I am silenced by these people,” she told Emerson, “they are so all life and no thought, any thing that might fall from my lips would seem an impertinence. I move about silently and look at them unnoticed.” Seeing a people so full of “life,” yet who lacked the cultural grounding of a physical home, only amplified Fuller’s own sense of displacement. “Truly there is no place for me to live,” she continues. “I mean as regards being with men. I like not the petty intellectualities, cant, and bloodless theory there at home, but this merely instinctive existence, to those who live it so ‘first rate’ ‘off hand’ and ‘go ahead,’ please me no better.”⁵¹ And Fuller’s indignation toward Eastern culture only increased as she

traveled to Mackinac Island in Michigan, where she witnessed several thousand Indians gathering to receive their annual payments from U.S. government officials.⁵²

At Mackinac Island, Fuller immersed herself in the daily activities of the Indian people. She walked among them, tried to communicate using improvised sign language, went canoeing with a tribal chief's son, pounded corn for breakfast as children played in the lake, and even spent her final day caring for an Indian child with smallpox. In a letter to Mary Rotch, Fuller confessed that she had lost interest in traveling to Europe after having “looked upon these dawnings of a vast future.”⁵³ She even expressed a new ambivalence toward her “home”: “In these splendid October days,” she wrote to Henry James, “[New England] seems as good a place as any in the world,” but “while traversing the ample fields of the West, it seemed a poor shady little nook.”⁵⁴ Clearly, the “poor shady little nook” of her home back East indicated to Fuller that her own imaginings of “America” had expanded to include the beautiful, sublime, and undiscovered culture of her country's wild and expansive West. In short, Fuller's journey into the American West gave her hope that it was possible to discover a new Romantic national self.

Once her journey was done, Fuller went to work converting her sketches of the American West into a full-fledged book. Yet, as travel writing was a new literary genre for her, Fuller refined her style by first publishing three essays—one in William Channing's journal, *Present*, and two in the *Dial*—on the subject of drama using the format of literary dialogue. Her first essay, “The Two Herberts,” was a literary dialogue between seventeenth-century poet George Herbert and his lesser-known brother Edward, in which they discuss the relative differences between the *vita attiva* and the *vita contemplative*.⁵⁵ Her other two essays, published in the *Dial*'s January and April issues, dealt more directly with the structural mechanics of drama writing. Her less interesting essay, simply titled “Dialogue,” offers a rumination on the

relationship between melancholy and drama. But her other essay, “The Modern Drama,” offers a bold hierarchical approach to the standards of contemporary drama. In it, she effectively broadens the field by articulating three ascending categories of what she considered to be good drama. First is the “actors’ plays,” which typically follows a narrative arc—usually tragic—of a play’s central character. Second is the “intellectual drama,” which investigates a philosophical problem through the various characters’ interactions. Third is the historical play, which Fuller considers the closest representation of a “true drama.”⁵⁶ Together, these three essays, express Fuller’s hopes for producing what would eventually become her first published book, and Transcendentalism’s only intellectual travel drama on the great American West.

“I had no guidebook, kept no diary, do not know how many miles we travelled each day, nor how many in all... What I got from the journey was the poetic impression of the country at large; it is all I have aimed to communicate.”—Margaret Fuller

Not only was travel writing one of the most popular literary genres at the time, but with the last of the Indian tribes being forcefully uprooted by the American government, the American West was also one of the most accessible and exotic literary subjects. But Fuller wanted her book to be more than a rehashing of those old and tired English travelogues she had grown to detest; she wanted her book to be an intellectual narrative, combining her own self-reflections with, what she refers to as, “poetic impressions”: “I had no guidebook, kept no diary, do not know how many miles we travelled each day, nor how many in all... What I got from the journey was the poetic impression of the country at large; it is all I have aimed to communicate.”⁵⁷ By this Fuller was referring to both the reader’s impression of her book, as well as the many voices and personas she creates in her writing. This aspect of her forthcoming book, however, left many critics baffled, confused and, in many cases, frustrated. According to Mehren, “*Summer on the Lakes, in 1843* is a meandering, fragmentary, subjective book, almost a diary.” As the book’s narrator, Fuller employs the voice of a travelling companion over a guide, and “invites the reader to join in her spontaneous thoughts, her self-exploration, her moods and misgivings.”⁵⁸ Even today, “scholars who like its comments about women and Indians express impatience,” Capper suggests, “with its interlaced musings, dialogues, tales, poems, book critiques, and other seeming digressions.”⁵⁹ In short, what Fuller produced was not so much a conventional travel book, nor even a straightforward narrative, but rather an eclectic recording of her own subjective impressions, which she used to uncover the meaning that lies dormant within Nature’s mighty scenes.

In the opening pages of *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, Fuller begins with the problem of Nature's accessibility. "Nature always refuses to be seen by being started at," she writes of her initial impression of the Great Lakes. "But he who has gone to sleep in childish ease on her lap, or leaned an aching brow upon her breast, seeking there comfort with full trust as from a mother, will see all a mother's beauty in the look she bends upon him."⁶⁰ Indeed, the challenge of extracting spiritual meaning from an otherwise monotonous natural scene was a constant theme throughout her book. It was not so much the physical inaccessibility that Fuller found problematic, such as in the Great Lakes Niagara Falls, but rather the spiritual accessibility, which for a Romantic observer was the entire reason behind travelling in the first place. Niagara, for instance, she denounces as a mere "tourist spot," which conceals Nature's spiritual effect behind false and picturesque appearances. Consequently, she often attempts to circumvent this problem by turning from the scene to the various characters acting within: "Once, just as I had seated myself there," she writes about Niagara, "a man came to take his first look. He walked close up to the fall, and, after looking at it a moment, with an air as if thinking how he could best appropriate it to his own use, he spat in it." But Fuller quickly discards the character of these "philistines" to reflect upon a wider circumference. Despite Niagara being awash with tourists and obtrusive buildings, "the spectacle is capable to swallow up such objects, they are not seen in the great whole, more than an earthworm in a wide field."⁶¹ Fuller's dual Romantic-Transcendental style of travel writing thus oscillates between condensing all of Nature into quotidian moments and scenes, and then expanding outward once again into the great whole.

In Fuller's next chapter, "The Lakes," she sails away from sublime watery images in the northern Illinois and Great Lakes region, where she presents the metaphor of a garden for America's vast West. More specifically, she uses this metaphor to explicate the tension between

the West as a vast “wilderness” and the East as a progressive “civilization”: “The river flows sometimes through these parks and lawns,” Fuller writes, describing a view of Rock River,

then betwixt high bluffs, whose grassy ridges are covered with fine trees, or broken with crumbling stone, that easily assume the forms of buttress, arch and clustered columns.

Along the face of such crumbling rocks, swallows’ nests are clustered, thick as cities, and eagles and deer do not disdain their summits. One morning, out in the boat along the base of these rocks, it was amusing, and affecting too, to see these swallows put their heads out to look at us. There was something very hospitable about it, as if man had never shown himself a tyrant among them.⁶²

In describing swallows’ nests as thick cities, Fuller imagines the potential of a “hospitable” society. Unlike the busy tourist spots, Fuller locates “Nature” herself in the small crevices of Rock River “betwixt high bluffs,” tucked away behind a city of birds, eagles and deer. Indeed, like Eagle’s Nest, the idea that “Nature” expresses herself through the “ordinary” was another sign that the secret to America’s new national vision was not hidden, but merely only out of sight.

Moving away from quaint descriptions of nature’s expressiveness, Fuller adopts a more critical tone about the “mushroom growth” of commercial development in the region’s culture and settlements. She argues that the development of artificial and commercial worlds *within* Nature’s most wonderful spots would only further polarize the tension between America’s two worlds of nature and civilization. She then darts her critical eye sharply onto her fellow New England travelers, denouncing how they talk of “not what they should do, but of what they should get in the new scene.”⁶³ Such pompous displays of personal freedoms—the freedom to travel, the freedom to passively receive nature’s beauty, and the freedom to do so without any

sense of responsibility for its preservation—was the primary reason Fuller believed Easterners needed the culture of America’s vast and undeveloped West. As a running theme throughout *Summer on the Lakes*, the vast West was only a land for future commercial development, but also represented the limitless potential of the western settler’s free-minded thinking. By contrast, Easterners seemed bound to their illusions of luxury and artificial modern growth, constrained by a culture prone to an even larger obsession with the West’s expansiveness. But the actual expansiveness of the West created a corresponding psychology, which Fuller felt her eastern “home” deeply needed.

Fuller then transforms the expansive West into a symbol of America’s potential cosmopolitan greatness through the use of representative anecdotes and figures. For instance, she describes the ethos of an American logger as a typical representation of a western vocation: "I had thought of such a position from its mixture of profound solitude with service to the great world, as possessing an ideal beauty." Fuller goes on to describe the logger as a noble, almost transcendental figure, whose ethos is sadly misunderstood and unappreciated because of the nature of the vocation. Fuller then directly addresses the deforestation of the Manitou Islands: "I will not agree that all noble trees are gone already from this island," she says, "it will have Medea’s virtue, and reproduce them in the form of new intellectual growths, since centuries cannot again adorn the land with such."⁶⁴ By using organic metaphors, Fuller connects America’s civilization and expansive wilderness as two parts a greater whole: "Buffalo and Chicago," she writes, are "two corresponding valves that open and shut all the time, as the life-blood rushes from east to west, and back again from west to east."⁶⁵ And she communicates the movement of that “life-blood” through the depictions of its many characters.

Aside from sketches of lonely logger, Fuller both narrates and turns herself into an actual character in her book. “Certainly I had never felt so happy that I was born in America,” she writes, describing a morning spent meditating atop Eagle’s Nest. “Wo to all country folks that never saw this spot, never swept and enraptured gaze over the prospect that stretched beneath. I do believe Rome and Florence are suburbs compared to this capital of nature’s art.”⁶⁶ Fuller believed herself travelling with a higher purpose, namely, to connect America’s divided worlds. Thus, the central concept of *Summer on the Lakes* is the realization of a new type of American, combining both Fuller’s imaginings for a new Western man and a new Western woman. And as her own representative figure, she embodies the Romantic ideal of a solitary adventurer on a quest to discover America’s potential cosmopolitan greatness. Her aim, to encapsulate both the harsh reality of America’s western expanse and the idealism of its Romantic potential into a single mythic narrative. In doing so, she articulated a new national-cultural approach to individual growth—not simply as “Man” and “Woman,” but as “American.”

Her transcendental approach, however, had its limitations. For one, Fuller’s attempt to extract spiritual meaning out of nature was a constant struggle because “spirit” does not readily present itself. She had to first penetrate beneath the surface of appearances. Ironically, this often caused Fuller’s writing to depart, according to Capper, from the West as the book’s central subject, plunging instead into fictional tales, such as the story of the ill-wedded Mariana, and extensive book critiques, like her forty-three-page critique of Kerner’s *Die Seherin von Prevorst*.⁶⁷ Moreover, Fuller was frustrated that she could not speak the native languages, which she felt severely constrained her narrative power: “Could I have but flown at night through such mental experiences, instead of being shut up in my little bedroom at the Milwaukee boarding house, this chapter would’ve been worth reading,” she writes in her chapter, “Wisconsin,”

I was obliged to walk the streets and pick up what I could in casual intercourse. When I left the street, indeed, and walked on the bluffs, or sat beside the lake in their shadow, my mind was rich in dreams congenial to the scene, some time to be realized, but not by me.⁶⁸

Such digressions, although off-topic, give insight into Fuller's recurring outsider psychology. Her search for an authentic American experience ironically became a confessional of her own disappointment at being unable to experience a Romantic sublime. Thus, the rest of her chapter becomes a critique on America's great garden and the blight of its tarnished history.

Fuller then weaves together her search for a new, more capacious national vision of American with what she saw as its greatest flaw, namely, the tragic experience of the American-Indian. "After awhile it so drew me into itself as to inspire an undefined dread," Fuller writes in her chapter on Niagara,

The perpetual trampling of the waters seized my senses. I felt that no other sound, however near, could be heard, and would start and look behind me for a foe. I realized the identity of that mood of nature in which these waters were poured down with such absorbing force, with that in which the Indian was shaped on the same soil. For continually upon my mind came, unsought and unwelcome, images, such as never haunted it before, of naked savages stealing behind me with uplifted tomahawks; again and again this illusion recurred, and even after I had thought it over, and tried to shake it off, I could not help starting and looking behind me.⁶⁹

This scene, according to Capper, suggests the entire narrative arc of *Summer on the Lakes*—unable to have an authentic spiritual experience at the falls, Fuller offers a "textbook Romantic sublime," which brings the reader up to "the precipice of transcendent beauty," and then

immediately withdraws to reflect on the tragic past of the American West.⁷⁰ This can also be seen in her chapters on “Chicago” and “Wisconsin.” Having been unable to access the folklore of the region’s settlers through conversations, Fuller instead reminds readers of the fact that America will always carry the memory of its former Indian inhabitants, which was evidently strong enough to produce daymares within Fuller’s mind. And being among the most educated in America, Fuller’s own shortcomings suggest that the West’s inaccessibility is a direct outgrowth of this tragic rejection of American history.

In her final chapters on Mackinaw Island and Sault Sainte Marie, Fuller reconstructs the identity of the American Indian as, above all, a tragic symbol. “Man,” she writes, “is constantly breaking bounds, in proportion as the mental gets the better of the mere instinctive existence.” She refers to “the civilized mind” as larger, but more imperfect in nature than “the savage mind.”⁷¹ The relationship between the “savage” and “Nature” is key to understanding Fuller’s Romantic reconstruction of the American Indian:

I have spoken of the hatred felt by the white man for the Indian...“Get you gone, you Indian dog,” was the felt, if not the breathed expression towards the hapless owners of the soil. All their claims, all their sorrows quite forgot, in abhorrence of their dirt, their tawny skins, and the vices the whites have taught them.⁷²

Fuller made sure not to conflate the terms “Indian,” “Nature,” and “America” together, for she did not want to side step the controversy of the Indian as an object of moral and imaginative explication. Instead, she directly ties her reconstruction of the savage Indian to their premodern existence and the materiality of their physical memory. Neither the bloodthirsty savage many believed them to be, nor the outsider in need of religious shepherding, Fuller’s Romantic version of a nonmodern Indian functions entirely as a tragic critique on the modern age of commercial

growth. Moreover, by separating the “nonmodern” “savage” who lives in “nature” from the “modern” “man” who lives in the “civilized” world, Fuller classifies the Indian world as an entirely autonomous and organic cultural system. And if left unimpeded, they might even grow and develop into a thriving community. But ultimately, their culture was doomed to extinction precisely because they lived in the modern age: “Nature seems, like all else, to declare, that this race is fated to perish,” she writes after having just quoted a Chippewa orator at Mackinaw about how “the white man looks to the future and paves the way for posterity.”⁷³ She places blame for this cultural extinction on those whites who refuse to acknowledge the value of a nonmodern world. She then tells a story of an Indian who, upon receiving a medal of bravery from President Washington, replied that he had not known what he did was good enough to deserve a medal. “Were we, too, so good, as to need a medal to show us that we are!”⁷⁴ Indeed, the “civilized” pursuit of the “good” is precisely what led to the tragedy eradication of America’s true children, the old and the forgotten. The only consolation for Indian culture, Fuller thought, was in the preservation of its national institutes, picture galleries, and libraries.

Although *Summer on the Lakes* began as a first-person account of a lonely female “seeker” on a “poetic adventure” into America’s great West, by the end of the book Fuller has painted a dark picture of an doomed culture that’s inevitable decline is tragically predetermined. Fuller evinces what many recent scholars have called an enlightened form of savagism that either dooms Indians to extinction or erases their old identities, largely through religious conversion, and turns them into Noble Savages:

My savage friends, cries the old fat priest, you must, above all things, aim at *purity*. Oh, my heart swelled, when I saw them in a Christian church. Better their own dog-feasts and bloody rites than such mockery of that other faith.

By describing Indian culture as “dog-feasts” and “bloody rites,” Fuller illustrates the limited view of those who care nothing for the tragic past and culture of the Indians. Yet, Fuller found a deeper spiritual irony in Easterner’s use of the “dog” as a racist term against the Indians:

“The dog,” said an Indian, “was once a spirit; he has fallen for his sin, and was given by the Great spirit, in this shape, to man, as his most intelligent companion. Therefore we sacrifice it in honor to our friends in this world,—to our protecting geniuses in another.

There was religion in that thought, Fuller surmises, “The white man sacrifices his own brother, and to Mammon, yet he turns in loathing from the dog-feast.”⁷⁵ Much like the Indian who received his medal from Washington, the Easterners’ denigration of the dog juxtaposed with the Indians’ recognition of the dog’s spiritual element only further reinforces the disconnect between America’s two exclusive cultures.

More than anything, Fuller wanted to write a book that’s expression and force would provoke readers to see more than beauty in the West’s expansive nature. She wanted readers to associate this beauty as distinctly “American,” which carries with it a distinctly shameful historical past. Citing the same biblical text as Lincoln in his Second Inaugural Address, Fuller draws out the moral lesson of the American-Indians’ “immediate degradation, and speedy death”: “The whole sermon may be preached from the text, ‘Need be that offences must come, yet wo them by whom they come.’”⁷⁶ Consequently, the offenses of the past manifest in the present as haunting images and physical memory spaces of the recently deceased and forcibly uprooted. *Summer on the Lakes* thus offers an eloquent and provocative attempt at filling the “symbolic middle landscape” between “civilized” and “wild” America—the first, which hopes for a Romantic journey into an expansive new land; the second, which betrays a harsh reality, reflected in the struggles of the pioneer period.

In terms of Fuller's own professional future, *Summer on the Lakes* opened up new possibilities for her as a first-person literary journalist writing for a national audience. She had finally experienced the Romantic quest she had always hoped for, expanding her wealth of experience, as well as literary subject matter. But more importantly, she discovered within her own nation—in which she had always felt herself an outsider—an expansive Romantic continent, continuously reshaping America's national identity by pushing every beyond itself. Whether at Niagara Falls, riding a steamboat down a river in Illinois, or on an island amidst Indian village, Fuller's Romantic Transcendentalism weaves together her initial impressions of nature and culture with her later critical reflections on those same events. In doing so, she condenses a new national cultural consciousness—with the American Indian as symbolic centerpiece—into a new Western proto-mythology—"I say, that what is limitless is alone divine."⁷⁷

“Then I felt a delightful glow as if I put a good deal of my true life in it, as if, suppose I went away now, the measure of my foot-print would be left on the earth.”—Margaret Fuller

In *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller broaches the topic of women in the west, if only to point out their lack of appreciation for the arts. This was in her mind the single greatest drawback that prevented these women’s individual growth. Fuller argues that the artistic culture needs to be revitalized in order to combat upper-middle-class women’s obsession with decadence:

[If] the little girls grow up strong, resolute, able to exert their faculties, their mothers mourn over their want of fashionable delicacy...[These] ladies laments that "they cannot go to school, where they might learn to be quiet." They lament the want of "education" for their daughters, as if the thousand needs which call out their young energies, and the language of nature around, yielded no education.

Fuller found such high-minded conventional views of education quite insufficient for the daughters of Illinois farmers, “as satin shoes to climb Indian mounds.”⁷⁸ Therefore, after finishing her book, Fuller immediately went to work on a new project that directly addressed the issue of women’s education, but not just for western or Eastern women. Instead, she wanted to address women all across the country using her new nationalist voice. And so, in December of 1843, Fuller spent seven weeks at Fishkill Landing, NY, converting her “Great Lawsuit” into a book on the woman question. However, instead of writing for a small audience of like-minded intellectuals and highly literate readers, she now faced the difficult task of making her work accessible to a wider and more popular audience. Thus, Fuller expanded her original essay by complimenting its highly philosophical tone with a more polemic discussion on the “woman question” through several contested gender topics.

In the final two weeks of her stay at Fishkill, Fuller wrote furiously to finish her final draft of *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. And on February 16th, 1845, she signed a contract with Greeley and McElrath to officially publish her book for sale to the general public.⁷⁹ For all its recognition, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* is mostly an expansion and thickening of her original essay, “The Great Lawsuit.” And yet, the pride she felt upon finishing it was equal to, if not greater than, after completing her first book. “Then I felt a delightful glow,” she wrote in her journal after finishing a final draft, “as if I put a good deal of my true life in it, as if, suppose I went away now, the measure of my foot-print would be left on the earth.”⁸⁰ True to this statement, Fuller is indeed remembered today predominately in feminist literature for her contribution to the woman question. But aside from a few additions, the first half of the book is an almost exact copy of “The Great Lawsuit.” The most substantive changes come toward the end of the first half, where Fuller explicitly blames male prejudice for the suppression of woman’s intuitive power, and the stifling of women’s contribution to *mankind*.

Of the many gender topics Fuller thought about adding to her book, the two discussions that interested her most were the threatened annexation of Texas and the conditions of lower-working class women. The first topic carried with it an expedited sense of urgency—on November 5th, pro-annexation candidate James K. Polk was elected President of the United States. “Might not we women do something in regard to this to this Texas annexation project?” Fuller wrote in her journal. “I have never felt that I had any call to take part in public affairs before; but this is a great moral question, and we had an obvious right to express our convictions.”⁸¹ Despite having never before written about this topic, Fuller used the energy of those women in her *Conversations* who were politically active and opinionated to sign insert several pages on it *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. On the subject of lower-working class

women, Fuller used a heavy-handed approach after visiting the Female Prison Mount at Pleasant in Sing Sing. Established five years earlier, this prison was, according to Capper, “arguably the nation’s most liberal penitentiary, as well as its only reformatory woman's prison.”⁸² “They were among the so-called worst,” Fuller wrote in a letter to Elizabeth Hoar, “but nothing could be more decorous than their conduct, and frank too.”⁸³ After reading several of the inmates’ journals, Fuller was shocked to find similar themes as in the writing of Boston’s female middle-class. In this prison, Fuller unexpectedly located a latent middle-class of women, whose degradation, she thought, powerfully expressed the wants of the sex at large in the present age.

The second half of *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* departs from Fuller’s androgynous approach to gender psychology in favor of a more polemic approach to the woman question. In a manner similar to her first series of Conversations on Greek mythology, Fuller typifies twelve unique “powers,” encompassing four distinct “spheres,”—each coming in a neatly arranged triad—which are occupied by figures in classical mythology: first is the *demiurgic* or *fabricative* powers embodied by Jupiter, Neptune, and Vulcan; second is the *defensive* powers of Vesta, Minerva, and Mars; third is the *vivific* found in Ceres, Juno, and Diana; and fourth is the *elevating and harmonic* trio of Mercury, Venus and Apollo.⁸⁴ By grouping male and female gods together, Fuller returns to the Romantic meta-psychology of her original essay, but now charged with the energy of the Greek gods. “The growth of Man is two-fold, masculine and feminine,” and each method of growth carries within it distinctly human powers—the masculine containing Energy, Power and Intellect; the feminine containing Harmony, Beauty and Love. “These two sides,” she writes, “are supposed to be expressed in Man and Woman, that is, as the more and the less, for the faculties have not been given pure to either, but only in preponderance.”⁸⁵ Thus, she returns to her Romantic androgynous style by rounding out both Man and Woman as, “two

halves of one [divine] thought. I lay no especial stress on the welfare of either. I believe that the development of the one cannot be affected without that of the other.”⁸⁶ Except unlike her more philosophical essay, Fuller assert this new unity with a greater goal in mind—where before “man” plus “woman” equaled “Man,” now “Man” plus “Woman” equals “American.”

What gives *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* nearly triple its original page count was not so much her expansion of the Greek meta-psychology, but rather an analysis of various gender practices, which of course, Fuller ranks based on their potential for promoting or constraining the organic growth of women. Through literary illustrations and theoretical discussions, Fuller addresses what she saw as America’s most prominent signs of the times. Her first topic boldly advocates for reform in the unequal distribution of sexual power, both inside and outside of marriage. And most controversial of all was her discussion of prostitution, which Capper refers to as an “ideological minefield” that made Fuller’s book seem “highly distasteful” to those eyes of “polite” society.⁸⁷ In highlighting the allotment of sexual power between the sexes, Fuller then offers a cultural remedy: first, men need to rid themselves of the ideological double standard presuming their own greater sexual needs, which, Fuller argues, allows them to justify promiscuous behavior. To do this, she expands her original essay’s discussion of Goethe by adding a hierarchical ranking of “three male minds”—Goethe, Swedenborg, and Fourier—each of which express the best qualities of the male mind in the “coming age.”⁸⁸ Second, women need to take control of the knowledge and rights about their own sexuality so they might better negotiate sexual boundaries with their husbands. Thus, despite blaming men for the oppression of women, Fuller still places the majority of responsibility for women’s betterment squarely upon the shoulders of women.

Fuller's final topic addresses the anti-slavery movement with a special emphasis on the recurring subject of the annexation of Texas. Appealing to America's own revolutionary past, Fuller invokes the memory of female British freedom fighters, Puritan radicals—"the mothers of our own revolution,"—to emphasize the fact that women have an ideological stake in the outcome. "Have you nothing to do with this?" she asks rhetorically,

Ah! If this should take place, who will dare again to feel the throb of heavenly hope, as to the destiny of this country? The noble thought that gave unity to all our knowledge, harmony to all our designs;—the thought that the progress of history had brought on the era, the tissue of prophecies pointed out the spot, where humanity was, at last, to have a fair chance to know itself, and all men to be born free and equal for the eagle's flight flutters as if about to leave the breast, which, deprived of it, will have no more a nation, no more a home on earth.⁸⁹

Above all, Fuller's vague reference to a "nation" as "a home on earth" illustrates how *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* is a nationalist expansion of her essay's original "masculine" and "feminine" "methods" of "growth." She had officially welded together her literary and philosophical first half with the new gendered polemics of her second half.⁹⁰ Fuller then ends her book with a Romantic-Transcendental prescription for all of womankind: "Woman," encumbered by tradition, needed "self-subsistence in its two forms of self-reliance and self-impulse." If men would but "remove arbitrary barriers," then equal-rights gender politics could organically enter the public sphere.⁹¹ In one of her most famous lines, Fuller gives women their rallying cry: "Let them be sea-captains, if you will."⁹²

By writing *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* Fuller not only reconfigured and expanded the intellectual work she originally produced, but in doing so remade two key Transcendental

tropes—the intuitive imagination and Man-Thinking—to be potentially exploitable by women in the public sphere. “Woman,” Fuller argued, could grow as both an individual through studied introspection and boundless experience, as well as constitute the “self” within society using the vehicle of social reform movements. Finally, as a form of transcendence, the idea of a new type of Woman manifested in her book as a contingent promise based on a new Romantic metahistory, acknowledging the presence of the Divine in both the natural and historical world. “Always the soul says to us all,” Fuller writes in the final lines. “Cherish your best hopes as a faith, and abide by them in action. Such shall be the effectual fervent means to their fulfillment.”⁹³

CHAPTER III
THE RISE OF LITERARY NATIONALISM

*“The gold lyre was not given to my hand, and I am but the prophecy of the poet. Let me use,
then, the slow pen.”—Margaret Fuller*

In August of 1843, Fuller accepted an offer from Horace Greeley to become the literary editor for his *New York Tribune*.⁹⁴ After reading *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843* and helping turn “The Great Lawsuit” into her second book, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, Greeley asked Fuller to start a new life in the press beginning on December 1st. This decision drastically changed her literary identity from a writer to a well-known literary critic of an American premiere newspaper institution. “In earlier years I aspired to wield the scepter or the lyre,” Fuller writes in her journal, who with “wise design and irresistible command [could] mold many to one purpose.” But alas, she admits,

The gold lyre was not given to my hand, I am but the prophecy of the poet. Let me use, then, the slow pen. ...I assume no garland; I dare not even dedicate myself as a novice...but I will court excellence, so far as an humble heart and open eye can merit it, and, if I may gradually grow to some degree of worthiness in this mode of expression, I shall be grateful.⁹⁵

Fuller always knew the limitations of her abilities as a writer, so she instead embraced her Romantic-Transcendental Credo of *looking into multiple forms* and applied it to her professional career as a literary critic on a national level. And she did so in a city that boasted the world’s highest literacy rates, unprecedented population growth, and new technologies—railroads, transatlantic steamers, and steam-powered cylinder presses. With an unrivaled population and

strategic shipping position, New York City, according to Capper, had “a near virtual monopoly on the distribution of national and international news.” The sheer number of daily circulating newspapers also made it a prime breeding ground for reporters who were willing to publish on almost anything to sell copies. Moreover, the several “circulation dailies” created a competitive atmosphere, which resulted in significantly reduced paper prices, an eruption of several news departments, and “armies of newsboys” aggressively pushing their “penny papers” throughout the entire city.⁹⁶ Indeed, New York City was in the middle of its own newspaper revolution and Fuller was right in the middle of it, occupying the coveted position of America’s first full-time female editor of a popular mass circulation daily press.

Horace Greeley’s *New York Tribune* was largely a reflection of his own political ideology. Writing for an emergent middle class of readers and publishing on a wide range of topics from political and economic reports to human-interest stories, the *Tribune* targeted those who were tired of the same old format of newspaper writing and were instead looking for a way to engage in the social sphere. This decision is what ultimately contributed to the *Tribune*’s success, as well as propelled Fuller into the spotlight of the city’s premiere metropolitan newspaper. Despite her own dismay at writing, it was ironically her skills as a writer that initially persuaded Greeley to recruit her for the position. Having read both *Summer on the Lakes* and *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, Greeley was familiar with Fuller’s adept writing style, particularly as it related to social issues. He knew she would make a powerful addition to his vision for the *Tribune*, especially given the recent election of James K. Polk—a lifetime slaveholder—who Greeley knew would push readers toward a newspaper that’s aim was provide social and cultural uplift. Thus, Greeley gave Fuller complete autonomy in the *Tribune*’s “literary department,” which meant he was both her boss and her mentor. He also gave Fuller

honest and frank criticism of her work: “They were always fresh and vigorous, but not always clear,” he wrote of Fuller’s “higher” efforts. What he found most frustrating was, as Capper describes, the “painful slowness and occasional awkwardness” of her writing,” as well as her obnoxious habit of only writing when she was “in the vein.”⁹⁷ And yet, despite Greeley’s proclivity for “legendary falsetto and profanity-spewing,” his tough love style of teaching helped Fuller sharpen her writing to fit the parameters of the *Tribune’s* column format.

Column writing was an entirely new genre for Fuller because it not only forced her to write with purpose, but also within a confined space. “My associates think my pen does not make too fine a mark to be felt,” she wrote a friend toward the end of December, “and may be a vigorous and purifying element.” But on the whole, it had a positive impact on her writing style: “Now that I can choose my own times,” she writes, “and have a public of sufficient range or disposition and powers to interest me...I hope my average writing will be better than it has been.”⁹⁸ True to her thoughts, Fuller attained maximum visibility at the *Tribune*, as Greeley placed nearly all of her columns on the first page and then reprinted them in his *Weekly Tribune*. Not long after, Fuller’s reputation skyrocketed. She began signing all her columns with an asterisk instead of her name, quickly earning her the title: The “Star” of the *New York Tribune*. “It must be obvious,” she answered one inquirer, “that, as we always write under one signature, and any one who wishes may know to whom it belongs, we do not say anything by which we are not prepared to abide.”⁹⁹ Although this may have been an attempt to confuse readers—for more conservative readers, knowing the “Star” was actually a woman created consternation—on the whole, writing under “a gritty version of her old symbol for lonely femininity,” was both satisfying and journalistically meaningful. Not only was her “Star” column the first serious book review section in the country, but being in a literary department helped it transform Greeley’s

Tribune's from a politically partisan newspaper into America's first mass-circulation periodical of ideas.¹⁰⁰

Within the first month of working for Greeley, Fuller wrote on a wide array of topics from opera and art music, to her favorite topic on the social conditions of female prisoners.¹⁰¹ In February, she returned to the female prison at Sing Sing, but this time with an added stop at the Bloomingdale Insane Asylum—New York's only private mental health institution. Just as she did when writing *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, Fuller once again used her interactions with the women to criticize New York's reformatory institutions: "Here are twelve hundred, who receive the punishment due to the vices of so large a portion of the rest," Fuller wrote in a series of columns that winter. "And under what circumstances! Never was punishment treated more simply as a social convenience, without regard to pure right, or a hope of reformation." She then points to the real culprit of these deplorable conditions, the city government. "There is wealth enough, intelligence, and good desire enough, and *surely, need enough*," she writes, warning readers about the importance of holding city officials, state representatives, and prison administration accountable for their actions. "If she be not the best cared for city in the world, she threatens to surpass in corruption London and Paris."¹⁰²

Over the next year, Fuller constantly traveled with Greeley between Boston and New York before moving into a small boardinghouse in lower Manhattan in December, 1845.¹⁰³ Like many times prior, the contingency of her living arrangements had an adverse psychological effect: "I seem a wandering Intelligence," she wrote in her journal, "driven from spot to spot, that I may learn all secrets, and fulfill a circle of knowledge. This thought envelopes me as a cold atmosphere."¹⁰⁴ But Fuller's gloomy disposition soon dissipated once she was introduced to the "Literati of New York City," which included famous editors, like Evert Duyckinck, George

Palmer Putnam, John L. O'Sullivan, Lewis Gaylord Clark, Charles Fenno Hoffman, Charles F. Briggs, and Rufus W. Griswold; rising stars, like Bayard Taylor, Joel T. Headley, and Edgar Allen Poe; as well as leading women authors, such as Frances Osgood, Sara Jane Lippincott, Mary Gove, Elizabeth Oakes Smith, Caroline Kirkland and Catharine Maria Sedgwick.¹⁰⁵ And so, amidst these cosmopolitan heroes, Fuller found a new intellectually cosmopolitan and distinctly American group of people, which she felt was lacking amongst both her New York literary friends, as well as her New England ones.

New York City was full of lively literary characters and exciting debates, which Edgar Allen Poe would later refer to as the Wars of the Literati. According to Capper, "These 'battles' would get so heated that, sometimes, they would turn into lawsuits and street brawls," and it would intensify in the months to come. Fuller's allies in these wars were the literary circles of "Young America," which included the editors Evert Duycknick and O'Sullivan, the critic William A. Jones, the playwright Cornelius Mathews, the journalist Godwin, and the popular historian Joel Headley, to name a few.¹⁰⁶ Aptly named, "Young America" was comprised of several individuals much younger in age than Fuller: "I do not find much among my old friends," she wrote to her friend Clarke, "They think I ought to produce something excellent, while I am content for the present to aid in the great work of mutual education in this way."¹⁰⁷ As Fuller did not believe herself capable of genius, it made sense why she would align herself with young scholars whose love of Continental literature, American regional inclusiveness, and admiration for professional critics as literary gatekeepers resonated with her own aspirations for a new, more cosmopolitan America. And after spending an entire career in search of literary genius to little avail, it was time for Fuller to embrace her role as the mother of genius.

“America is as yet an European babe:—some new ways and motions she has, consequent on a new position, but that soul that may shape her mature life scarce begins to know itself yet.”

—Margaret Fuller

Fuller’s resolve as an emerging literary nationalist strengthened between the years 1845 and 1846. As the leading editor of the *Tribune*’s literary department, Fuller used her position to publicly express doubts about America having any sort of literary identity. In her article, “American Literature; Its Position in the Present Time and Prospects for the Future,” Fuller declares, “It does not follow, because many books are written by persons born in America that there exists an American literature.”¹⁰⁸ Practically speaking, she required only two qualities in *Tribune* submissions—that the writer’s poetic vision be a “genuine” one originating in actual observation, and that the resulting expression be rooted in that same vision. Achieving these two qualities, however, would prove to be more difficult than she imagined. “The way that newspapers and other periodicals is managed is American,” she firmly declares,

A go-ahead, fearless adroitness is American; so is *not*, exclusively, the want of strict honor. But we look about in vain for traits as characteristic of what may be individually the character of the Nation, as we can find at a glance of Spain, England, France, or Turkey. America is as yet an European babe:—some new ways and motions she has, consequent on a new position, but that soul that may shape her mature life scarce begins to know itself yet.¹⁰⁹

And the more she reviewed, the more she doubted there was even such a thing as an American body of literature. Fuller believed that if such a thing were to emerge, the Nation would need a more complete fusion of its races, as well as a further exploration of its western resources to

grow into a higher literature. Most importantly, American writers needed to embrace moral and intellectual freedom on the same level as their political freedom.

If a genuine body of American literature was to bring new life and thought to the nation, Fuller believed it first had to grow out of a distinctly original idea. “American facts!” she exclaimed in a review of George Palmer Putnam’s defense of American culture: “Why! What has been done that marks individuality? Among men there is Franklin! He is a fact, and an American fact. Niagara is another, in a different style.”¹¹⁰ By lumping together America’s representative figure with its symbolic landscapes, Fuller introduces the broader idea of what it means to be an “American fact,” while simultaneously locating it within the realm of literature. But as she thought America was but “an European babe,” Fuller had yet to find the mark of a truly American literature, despite admitting that “our era” has established “freer inquiry,” “bolder experiment,” and “nobler discovery” on a “firmer, broader basis.”¹¹¹ By contrast, she found that virtually all of its literary attributes were derivative of European literature, or as Capper refers to it as America’s literary “Other.”¹¹²

In her summary review of “American Literature,” Fuller assesses the value of each major European country’s influence on America’s nascent cultural awakening. Unsurprisingly, Germany receives her highest remarks for their “indefatigable” cosmopolitan scholarship and their “searching, honest, and, in the highest sense, visionary...genius.”¹¹³ England, on the other hand, Fuller considered a looking glass for America: “We use her language, and receive, in torrents, the influence of her thought.”¹¹⁴ Both seductive and dangerous, Fuller found England a helpful literary influence for American poets to discover themselves, even if only for the sake of negatively defining themselves as distinctly *not* English. She saves her boldest judgments, however, for contemporary French novelists. Citing the works of Honoré de Balzac and George

Sand, Fuller gives her clearest definition of “genius” to date: “Balzac, with all his force and [fullness] of talent, never rises one moment into the region of genius. For genius is, in its nature, positive and creative, and cannot exist where there is no heart to believe in realities.”¹¹⁵

Combining her love of heroic ideals and dark realities, Fuller articulates a version of “genius” that balances these two opposing forces. For example, in the work of George Sand—a writer with a scandalous public image and whose work created much consternation—Fuller declares, “The shuttle is at work, and the threads are gradually added that shall bring out the pattern and prove what seems at present confusion is really the way and means to order and beauty.” While Fuller may not use the term “genius” explicitly, she does give Sand the title of the “best living writer,” proving that “the way and means to order and beauty” often demands an author who is “fearless, not shameless.”¹¹⁶

In her summary review of American Literature, Fuller focusing primarily on Europe’s authors and poets, but also acknowledges other forms of artistic achievement in its lesser prestigious regions. “The great efforts of art belong to artistic regions,” Fuller writes of Greece and Italy, “where the boys in the street draw sketches on the wall and torment melodies on rude flutes; shoals of sonneteers follow in the wake of the great poet.”¹¹⁷ Indeed, if there was ever a model for an American fact, Fuller thought it might be found in the simple, but genuine efforts of artists who rely primarily upon their highest constructive faculty, “the Imagination.”¹¹⁸ These works of art must not be excluded from Europe’s greater whole, Fuller concludes, but must instead be taken together in order to provoke an authentic American national literature. As Capper points out, “Only cosmopolitan provocation and self-reflexive assimilation could ensure that ‘foreign’ influences helped rather than hindered the emergence of a national literary culture.”¹¹⁹ And as America was in its artistic infancy, Fuller pleads for its children to not only

appreciate the historical and cultural foreignness of classic European works, but more importantly, to see them as provocations to aspire toward, instead of as objects to imitate. In a word, if American readers were to ever appreciate the great literary texts of Europe, they first had to awaken and develop their original, organic self-culture.

Turning her gaze to popular criticism, Fuller addresses the well-known Boston writers James Russell Lowell and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, who were both significantly accomplished in the eyes of New York's Literati. She casts an unusually critical glance at their work in an effort to strike a decisive blow against America's self-perceived "high" literary authors. On Lowell, she claims that his "great facility at versification has enabled him to fill the ear with a copious stream of pleasant sound. But his verse is stereotyped, his thought sounds no depth, and posterity will not remember him."¹²⁰ As for Longfellow, Fuller downplays his success to merely exaggerated praise from uncritical reviewers—a worry she previously expressed in her treatise on Goethe. The biggest problem Fuller saw in Longfellow's work was the same derivative problem she saw in the entirety of American literature, namely, a "perpetual borrowing" of metaphor, anecdote, and imagery: "We have been surmised that any one should have been anxious to fasten special charges of this kind upon him," she writes, "when we had supposed it so obvious that the greater part of his mental stores were derived from the works of others." She makes explicit Longfellow's lack of originality by using one of his own metaphors against him. Just as he wrote of "musings' amidst long walks through the woods, Fuller writes, "Musing upon many things—ay! and upon many books too or we should have nothing of Pentecost or bishop's caps with their golden rights. For ourselves, we have not the least idea what bishop's caps are;—are they flowers?—or what? Truly, the schoolmaster was abroad in the woodlands that day! Real poetry, in other words, is not derived from someone else's experiences,

nor is it, “a superhuman or supernatural gift,” strung together with “jingling rhymes, and dragging, stumbling rhythms.”¹²¹ No, real poetry is simply the ability to clearly and distinctly communicate the events of the poet’s observations and experiences.

Although the works of Longfellow and Lowell did indeed charm the American public, Fuller declared them no more than the products of literary mediocrity, not worth the praise they received. In Fuller’s eyes, such unadorned celebration only reinforced the idea that American readers were incapable of recognizing great works of art, much less being able to judge lesser works by their standard. And while Fuller did receive some criticism for her overly harsh tone, many New Yorkers were impressed and pleased with her summary review. Among the supporters were many of her Young American allies: “Did you see Margaret Fuller’s notice of Longfellow in the Tribune?” the literary Whig Charles Fenno Hoffman eagerly asked his colleague Rufus Griswold, “an admirably done thing so far as pointing out his deficiencies.”¹²² Even Edgar Allen Poe, a self-admitted fan of Longfellow, would express his enthusiasm a few months later in his own sketch of New York’s Literati: “In my opinion it is one of the very few reviews of Longfellow’s poems, ever published in America, of which the critics have not had abundant reason to be ashamed.”¹²³ Above all, Fuller’s honest and frank criticism of those whom America’s literary republics considered the best and brightest were aimed not at denouncing their attempts to form a uniquely American body of literature, but rather to preserve readers’ appreciation for real genius when it arises, as well as to slow the ascendancy of an official literature. A mother of genius indeed!

“Newspaper writing...has this advantage: we address, not our neighbor, who forces us to remember his limitations and prejudices, but the ideal presence of human nature as we feel it ought to be and trust it will be.”—Margaret Fuller

In 1845 and 1846, improvements in the technology of New York’s print culture changed the nature of Fuller’s growing literary nationalism. For instance, the electric telegraph enabled her to write more within the confines of a new format, column-writing. It also changed the editing process, allowing editors to adapt and augment the arrangement and interpretation of the news. The newspaper was now a rapidly evolving medium for publishing and reviewing a diverse array of works, ranging from condensed essays and short stories, to book reviews and lyric poetry. And for Fuller, the newspaper empowered her to start a new national conversation:

Newspaper writing is next door to conversation and should be conducted on the same principles. It has this advantage: we address, not our neighbor, who forces us to remember his limitations and prejudices, but the ideal presence of human nature as we feel it ought to be and trust it will be. We address America rather than Americans.¹²⁴

In essence, the *New York Tribune* expanded the conceptual apparatus of her *Conversations*, effectively transferring Fuller’s conversational style into a nation-wide discussion orchestrated by the process of selecting, editing, and publishing the works of Americans. And the best part was that Fuller had the authority to decide who gets to speak in this national conversation. Among her more well-known works were Frederick Douglass’s *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, Edgar Allen Poe’s *The Raven and Other Poems*, and a potpourri of poems and essays by Ralph Waldo Emerson. In the summer of 1846, however, Fuller’s search for American facts led her into a lesser known and noticeably darker quality of American authorship in the works of two young intellectual poets named Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning.

After reading Barrett's *Drama of Exile and Other Poem*, Fuller praised the intellectual quality of her poems, especially in an age where female authors often produced nothing more than "morbid sentimentalism" about the "little things of life." But ultimately, Fuller was mostly left with disappointment: "The lore is not always assimilated to the new form," she writes, "we are too much and too often reminded of other minds and other lives."¹²⁵ By contrast, she applauded Robert Browning's work for its "enchancing variety and unobtrusive unity," which invoked humor and satire, and sometimes even ventured into tragedy. "If one tithe of what informs this little pamphlet were brought out into clear relief by the plastic power of a Shakespeare," Fuller wrote, "the world would stand transfixed before the sad revelation."¹²⁶ Ironically, the dark tones of sadness and tragedy she found in the works of Barrett and Browning shed light on an emerging potential for a distinctly American literary identity. And the first American writer to truly captured America's dark literary identity was Nathaniel Hawthorne, whose "dark disclosures" proved to Fuller that he was indeed the "best writer of the day." After reviewing *Moses from an Old Manse*, she highlights the dark themes that tie together his most consistently praised works, such as "The Birth Mark," "Rappaccini's Daughter," "The Artist of the Beautiful," "Young Goodman Brown," and "Roger Malvin's Burial." Though underdeveloped, Fuller found Hawthorne invigorating; he opened the door for a new American avant-garde literature to emerge, as well as the democratic possibilities that come with popular reception of darker Romantic authors.

In the final months of her time in New York, Fuller was growing increasingly tired of the American social system. To combat this, she channeled her penchant for dark disclosures into a thunderous article, "First of August, 1845," which commemorated the anniversary of Britain's abolition of slavery in the West Indies. "The most shameful deed has been done that ever

disgraced a nation,” Fuller wrote. “Other nations have done wickedly, but we have surpassed them all in trampling under foot the principles that had been assumed as the basis of our national existence and our willingness to forfeit our honor in the face of the world.”¹²⁷ And just three days after President Polk signed the congressional act on December 29th making Texas a state, Fuller followed up with an editorial piece entitled, “1st January, 1846,” in which she provides an even grimmer sketch of America:

Texas annexed, and more annexations in store; Slavery perpetuated, as the most striking new feature of these movements. Such are the fruits of American love of liberty!

Mormons murdered and driven out, as an expression of American freedom of conscience.

Cassius Clay’s paper expelled from Kentucky; that is American freedom of the press.

And all these deeds defended on the true Russian grounds: “We (the stronger) know what you (the weaker) ought to do and be, and it *shall* be so.”¹²⁸

Interestingly, Fuller bifurcates America’s “love of liberty” with a noticeably cosmopolitan (i.e. Russian) maxim, implying that her country’s need for radical cultural reform must also come from a cosmopolitan source. In other words, Fuller’s literary aspirations as well as national ambitions were coalescing into a single rhetorical style.

Fuller’s evolving ideology, which began under her father’s liberal Jeffersonian Republican education, then progressed through German Romanticism and Transcendentalism, ended up forming into a unique mold of literary nationalism. And her bifurcated view of American culture—a product of both light and dark authors, men and women, Easterners and Westerners, the stronger and the weaker—gained momentum in the winter and spring of 1846 with two articles, appropriately titled “The Rich Man—an Ideal Sketch” and “The Poor Man—an Ideal Sketch.” When taken together, these two essays offer a dichotomous sketch of American

capitalism. First, Fuller critiques America's rich class by launching an attack against the "rhetorical gentleman and silken dames," who loved to talk "as if Woman need to be fitted for no other chance than that of growing like a cherished flower in the garden of domestic love," while caring nothing for the misfortunes of others.¹²⁹ In her second article, Fuller broadly defines the "poor" as ranging from the "hodman and washerwoman" to the "hard-working, poorly paid lawyer, clerk, schoolmaster or scribe." The aim was not to offer some utopian solution to America's, albeit oversimplified, cultural problem, but instead for readers to simply see that they "must accept [their] lot," while living within it.¹³⁰ Put another way, Fuller simply wanted to shed light on the sad reality that "high society" refuses to acknowledge the existence of America's suffering class, or even worse, erases it like they had done with the American Indians.

Fuller's commitment to racial justice and anti-war rhetoric was at this point in her life stronger than ever; especially after the opposition efforts of both abolitionists and liberal Whigs failed to prevent President Polk from declaring war against Mexico. "Our hopes as to National honor and goodness are almost wearied out," she confesses in a review of *Recollections of Mexico* by Waddy Thompson, "and we feel obliged to turn to the Individual and to the Future for consolation."¹³¹ But, if her column proved anything, it was that "the Individual" to whom America must "feel obliged to turn" was not an American. Quite the opposite, in fact. Fuller believed all hope for a model of democratic nationalism now seemed to point toward Europe. "At every step I have missed the culture I sought in going," she wrote to the now married Sam and Anna Ward,

for with me it [was] no scheme of pleasure but the means of needed development. It was what I wanted after my painful youth, and what I was ready to be used and nourished by.

It would have given my genius wings and I should have been, not in idea indeed, but in achievement far superior to what I can be now.

But ever since the death of her father, Fuller had given up on her dream of seeing that great land. “My mind and character are too much formed,” she went on in her letter. “I shall not modify them but only add to my stores of knowledge.”¹³² But this was clearly the lamentations of a tired mind, for soon she would embark on a grand adventure that would take her all across Europe. And with the benefit of retrospect, Fuller’s comments seem to suggest a potential litmus test for analyzing Fuller’s perspective across each of the countries she traveled while in Europe as she formulated a distinct national character for each country, which she stored in a series of dispatches published in the *New York Tribune*.

Not only was there an abundance of cultural capital in northern and western European countries, Fuller was also becoming increasingly interested in the revolutionary nationalist movements in Europe’s eastern and southern regions. In an article reviewing a recent meeting celebrating the anniversary of the defeated Polish Revolution of 1830-1831, Fuller declares, “May the same fervor of heart be turned to forward the good of the adopted land, for where there is genius, greatness and religion, blooms anew the true Italy, the garden of the world!” Recycling one of her operative metaphors from *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller sketches out her own ideal of a European model with the potential to ignite America’s democratic national spirit:

We do not want that each nation needs to hear from those of her compatriots, able to guide and enlighten them. We do not want that each nation should preserve what is valuable in its parent stock. We want all the elements of the new people of the new world. We want the prudence, the honor, the practical skill of the English; the fun, the affectionateness, the generosity of the Irish; the vivacity, the grace, the quick intelligence

of the French; the thorough honest, the capacity for philosophical view, and deep enthusiasm of the German Biedermann; the shrewdness and romance of the Scotch; but we want none of their prejudices. We want the healthy seed to develop itself into a different plant, in the new climate.

Her sketch of Europe, even before arriving on its shores, is organic and implies notions of the beautiful, which clearly grows out of Fuller's own ethos as the mother of genius. And given Europe's revolutionary situation at the time, she had every reason to hope that the revolutions in Europe would succeed and bring forth "a new and generous race, where the Italian meets the Dutch, the Swede the Jew. Let nothing be obliterated, but all regenerated."¹³³

August 1st, 1846 was the last time Margaret Fuller would stand on American soil. With her eyes gazing hopefully toward Europe, she left her country with disdain for its present state. The moral superiority she once felt for America, and had always preached in the post-revolutionary era, now seemed even less viable than its potential for literary greatness, which, ironically, Fuller never believed would improve. It was now time for her to stop preaching and to expand her own cultural boundaries. After publishing a slim two volumes, titled, *Papers on Literature and Art*, Fuller scraped together enough money to afford a one-way ticket to Europe, where she could, in the words of her "Farewell" address, "observe with my own eyes... Life in the old world, and to bring home some packages of seed for life in the new."¹³⁴ But in the following years, Europe would explode into its infamous "Year of Revolution," and with Fuller at its epicenter, her literary nationalist aspirations quickly transformed into an even more radical revolutionary rhetoric, as she began advocating for Americans to take action and support the Italian struggle for independence.

CHAPTER IV

ENGLAND: THE OUTBREAK OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

“At first sight of the Liverpool Docks...we felt ourselves in a slower, solider, and not on that account less truly active state of things than at home.”—Margaret Fuller

When Margaret Fuller landed on the docks of Liverpool in 1846, she spent nine days taking in her surroundings and drafting her the first of thirty-seven dispatches as foreign correspondent for the *New York Tribune*. First published as “Letters from England” on September 24th, 1846, Fuller sent her initial impressions of England.¹³⁵

At first sight of the Liverpool Docks, extending miles on each side of our landing, we felt ourselves in a slower, solider, and not on that account less truly active state of things than at home. That impression is confirmed. There is not as we travel that rushing, tearing and swearing, that snatching of baggage, that prodigality of shoe-leather and lungs that attend the course of the traveler in the United States.¹³⁶

From the moment Fuller steps foot in Europe, she adopts the Romantic persona of an “American traveler” and with the fast-paced New York lifestyle behind her, she describes for her American readers in vivid detail the majesty of the English countryside. “Passing from Liverpool to Lancaster,” she writes in her second dispatch, “we there took the canal-boat to Kendal, and passed pleasantly through a country of that soft, that refined and cultivated loveliness, which, however and forever we have heard of it, finds the American eye—accustomed to so much wildness, so much rudeness, such a corrosive action of man upon nature—wholly unprepared.”¹³⁷ And with her “American eye,” she distinguishes the “rudeness” of America’s wilderness—as she had previously described in *Summer on the Lakes*—from the “cultivated

loveliness” of England’s nature scenes. In her first few dispatches, Fuller paints a beautiful picture for readers of the land she has long dreamed of seeing with her own eyes, but not simply for the sake of description. England was the country out of which so much great literature had emerged, which Fuller had herself taught in the Conversations and at the Greene Street School.

Fuller’s goal as a professional journalist abroad was to invoke beautiful images of England for readers, and then associate those images with the many great literary figures America has “borrowed” from England in its quest to create a unique canon of literature. “The first day of which I wished to speak was passed in visiting Langdale,” Fuller writes in the third dispatch, “the scene of Wordsworth’s ‘Excursion.’ Our party of eight went in two of the vehicles called cars or droskas—open carriages, each drawn by one horse. They are rather fatiguing to ride in, but good to see from.”¹³⁸ Her curious reference to the experience of riding in “open carriages” is an important remark because it shows Fuller’s belief that an observer should be a part of the scene itself, in the “outer air.” Fuller then goes to describe the atmosphere of that place where Wordsworth wrote his famous poem, with which many of her readers were undoubtedly familiar,

The scenes through which we passed are, indeed, of the most wild and noble character.

The wildness is not savage but very calm. Without recurring to details, I recognized the tone and atmosphere of that noble poem, which was to me, at a feverish period in my life, as pure waters, free breezes and cold blue sky, bringing a sense of eternity that gave an aspect of composure to the rudest volcano wrecks of time.¹³⁹

Through old picturesque towns and great English castle, Fuller attempts to create that same noble “atmosphere” for readers by taking them on a Fuller-guided literary open carriage ride, across the lakes of Chester and the shores of Ambleside, and through the “wonderful” rural regions of

England's countryside. And yet, she cannot fully bring the majesty of her surroundings to life, so instead, in a manner similar to her *Summer on the Lakes*, she takes readers right up to the precipice of beauty, and then retreats, goading them to go out and see it with their own eyes: "The mind does not now furnish congenial colors with which to represent the vision of that day: it must still wait in the mind and bide its time, again to emerge to outer air."¹⁴⁰

Through quaint descriptions of nature's beauty, Fuller uses her Romantic-Transcendental style to connect the great English poets of the past to the land out of which they originated. In her fifth dispatch, for instance, she invokes the voices of English "Artists," who "rejoice that all England is thrown open to them for sketching ground." Whereas before they were "obliged to confine themselves to a few 'green and bowery' spots in the neighborhood of the metropolis," Fuller writes, these artists could now "avail themselves of a day's leisure at a great distance and with choice of position."¹⁴¹ Fuller then takes readers on an "excursion" of her own into the Highlands of Ben Lomond, where she spent a fortnight: "[We] set forth," she writes, "often stopping to enjoy the points of view, which are many, for Ben Lomond consists of a congeries of hills, above which towers the true Ben or highest peak, as the head of a many-limbed body,"

On reaching the peak, the night was one of beauty and grandeur such as imagination never painted. You see around you no plain ground, but on every side constellations or groups of hills exquisitely dressed in the soft purple of the heather, amid which gleam the lakes like eyes that tell the secrets of the earth and drink in those of the heavens.¹⁴²

"Peak beyond peak," Fuller describes her various perspective on "the shifting light" which emerged from the tops of rolling hills, as well as the subsequent "colors of the prism" they produced. But here too, she again retreats from encountering England's beauty, so as to conceal it behind the veil of literary mystery: "Words are idle on such subjects; what can I say but that it

was a noble vision that satisfied the eye and stirred the imagination in all her secret pulses? Had that been, as afterward seemed likely, the last act of my life, there could not have been a finer decoration painted on the curtain which was to drop upon it.”¹⁴³

Much like the beauty of England’s night sky, Fuller reflects upon the many English authors and poets in her dispatches, who have written of their country’s exquisite beauty through literature and poetry. From Wordsworth and Coleridge, to Walter Scott and Robert Burns, Fuller situates them within a “constellation” of literary form that together comprise a genius, which America has continuously looked to for inspiration.¹⁴⁴ And within her constellation of English genius Fuller draws lines of reasoning to help readers understand how England’s genius has grown throughout the years. “On the coach with us,” Fuller writes in the third dispatch, “was a gentleman coming from London to make his yearly visit to the neighborhood of Robert Burns, in which he was born,”

"I can now," said he, "go about once a year; when a boy I never let a week pass, without visiting the house of Burns." He afterward observed, as every step woke us to fresh recollections of Walter Scott, that Scott, with all his vast range of talent, knowledge and activity, was a poet of the past, and in his inmost heart wedded to the habits of the feudal aristocracy, while Burns is the poet of the present and the future, the man of the People, and throughout a genuine.¹⁴⁵

Though Fuller did not disagree, she still could not entirely endorse such a comparison. “Both were wanted,” she claims, “each acting the important part assigned by destiny with a wonderful thoroughness and completeness. Scott breathed the breath just fleeting from the forms of ancient Scottish heroism and poesy into new—he made for us the bridge by which we have gone into the old Ossianic hall and caught the meaning just as it was about to pass from us forever.” As for

Burns, she calls him “full of noble, genuine democracy which seeks not to destroy royalty, but to make all men kings, as he himself was, in nature and in action.” For Fuller, Sir Walter Scott brought the past to life, as well preserved the vestiges of the “Old” in a new age where the “People” are in search of the genuine expressions of a new, yet-to-be-formed, era. “They belong to the same world,” Fuller concludes of Scott and Burns, “they are pillars of the same church, though they uphold its start from opposite sides.”¹⁴⁶

One of the reasons Fuller hesitates to elevate the “New” above the “Old” in the case of English literature is because, as she saw it, not all products of progress were for the betterment of England’s culture and society. The train car, for one, was a product of England’s Industrial Revolution and, in Fuller’s opinion, “the purgatory of dullness.”¹⁴⁷ Although she acknowledges the advantages of travelling by train, such as allowing artists and poets the luxury of traveling far distances, she also laments the way it disconnects the observer from the scene. “Traveling by railroad is in my opinion the most stupid process on earth,” she exclaims; “it is sleep without the refreshment of sleep, for the noise of the train makes it impossible either to read, talk or sleep to advantage.”¹⁴⁸ In this way, Fuller longs to preserve the vestiges of the past, such as travelling by open carriage. In her fourth dispatch, she describes a statue of Walter Scott, fittingly positioned “in the open square between us and the Old Town,” which, Fuller claims “is to be the terminus of the Railroad,”

yet Scott could hardly have looked without regret upon an object that marks so distinctly the conquest of the New over the Old, and, appropriately enough, his statute has its back turned that way... This is now the fourth that has been erected within two years to commemorate the triumphs of genius. Monuments that have risen from the same idea in such quick succession, to Schiller, to Goethe, to Beethoven into Scott, signaled the

character of the new era still more happily than does the Railroad coming up almost to the foot of Edinburgh Castle.¹⁴⁹

It is almost as if Fuller is attempting to resurrect the great literary figures of the past—which she undoubtedly believed her readers were mostly familiar with—in order to show what happens when a new order of things takes over and, like Scott's statue, hides the old within monuments to the new, to progress and industrialization.

“I am glad I did not first see all that pomp and parade of wealth and luxury in contrast with the misery, squalid, agonizing, ruffianly, which stares one in the face in every street of London.”

—Margaret Fuller

For the past half century, prior to Fuller’s arrival the entire Continent had been affected by what many historians have called the world’s greatest economic transformation, the Industrial Revolution.¹⁵⁰ And of all the innovations during the 1830s and 1840s, it was the advent of the railroad that changed Europe’s modern industrial society more than anything else. No innovation revealed the power and speed of Europe’s new age as dramatically as the railroad. Capable of rapidly distributing raw materials and finished products across Europe, it was the very symbol of humanity’s modern triumph over nature via technology. “Pushing its huge smoke plume snakes at the speed of wind across countries and continents,” as historian Eric Hobsbawm describes, “no innovation of the Industrial Revolution has fired the imagination as much as the railway, as witness the fact that it is the only product of the 19th-century industrialization which has been fully absorbed into the imagery of popular and literate poetry.”¹⁵¹ But when Fuller took her first train ride from Liverpool to Lancaster in August 1846, she was underwhelmed by that “convenient, but most unprofitable and stupid way of traveling.”¹⁵² Indeed, travelling by train car as the world passes by at dizzying speeds was quite stupid in Fuller’s mind, for how could she appreciate the lands of her favorite poets through a window? No, she much preferred boat rides and open carriages to the railway, for at least they allowed time to appreciate England’s beautiful scenery.

Fuller’s complete disregard for Britain’s most powerful technological achievement can be largely attributed to her overall disdain for high-society. The train separates its passengers from the real world, and thus prevents them from seeing the sad truth, namely, that the comfort of

“industrial” living comes at a heavy price, one that is paid predominately by the working class. When Fuller arrives in London and sees the misery for herself, she shifts the language of her dispatches from poetic descriptions of beautiful lands to harsh realities of England’s industrial society. “We arrived at the time which the well bred Englishman considers as no time at all,” Fuller writes in her eighth dispatch, “quite out of ‘the season,’ when Parliament is in session, and London thronged with the equipages of her aristocracy, her titled, wealthy nobles,”

And though I wish to return to London in "the season" when that city is an adequate representative of the state of things in England, I am glad I did not first see all that pomp and parade of wealth and luxury in contrast with the misery, squalid, agonizing, ruffianly, which stares one in the face in every street of London and hoots at the gates of her palaces more ominous a note than ever was that of owl or raven in the portentous times when empires and races have crumbled and fallen from inward decay.¹⁵³

Fuller’s description of London is consistent with many cities across the United Kingdom that had transformed their quaint little towns into a full-scale urban industrial economy. The atmosphere was fog-bound and smoke-laden, its proletariat class more pronounced and worse off, and for the first time, there emerged a distinct class-consciousness, which separated the middle class from the working classes, and further polarized the disparities of England’s socio-economic conditions. This was, indeed, too high a price to pay, as Fuller saw it, for England’s transformation into, as history remembers her, “the workshop of the world.”¹⁵⁴

One of the main contributing factors to the deteriorating conditions of England’s working class was unprecedented population growth in many of its industrial cities. The population of Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, for instance, all experienced a substantial increase in its population, with some cities expanding as much as forty percent in a single decade.¹⁵⁵

According to Breunig and Levinger, “In one country after another an increasing proportion of the working people spent their lives not cultivating the fields and living in small, isolated villages, but toiling in factories or mines and living in large, crowded cities.”¹⁵⁶ As for how this affected Fuller, she writes in her sixth dispatch: “I saw here in Glasgow persons, especially women, dressed in dirty, wretched tatters, worse than none, and with an expression of listless, unexpected woe upon their faces, far more tragic than the inscription over the gate of Dante’s *Inferno*.”¹⁵⁷ Indeed “the stamp of squalid, stolid misery and degradation,” Fuller writes, was the direct consequence of Europe’s cause for progress.¹⁵⁸ And while the effects of these sudden changes brought increased wealth to the English aristocracy, the living conditions of the working class were being completely devastated by, as Breunig and Levinger describe, “the displacement of rural populations by enclosures, the availability of raw materials and investment capital as a result of burgeoning trade, and the existence of colonial markets for textiles and other finished goods.”¹⁵⁹ In order to better understand why England, of all places, was the epicenter of Europe’s industrial takeoff, one must first take into account the specific changes in its method and technology.

Initially, the Industrial Revolution began by replacing tools operated by hand or foot with steam or water powered machines.¹⁶⁰ This simple, yet revolutionary change in production technology not only completely revolutionized how production and labor was organized, but also sparked the simultaneous and rapid increase of technological innovation across Europe. More than anything else, technological innovations in the cotton, coal and iron industries contributed to the take off of Britain’s industrial economy. In the cotton industry, British manufacturers were able to take control of the market in the production of cloth with improved spinning devices and more efficient looms.¹⁶¹ This enable British “factories” and “mills” to revolutionize their textile

manufacturing industry because of an increased capacity to produce goods in such vast quantities and at such rapidly diminishing costs, virtually eliminating the existing demand for workers through the advent of mechanization.¹⁶² Moreover, new inventions and improvements to existing technology also helped revolutionize England's agriculture and cotton industry—the spinning Jenny, the water-frame, the mule in spinning, and a little later the power-loom in weaving were all made sufficiently simple and cheap, as well as provided both a large rising surplus of potential recruits for the towns and industries and a mechanism for the accumulation of capital to be used in the more modern sectors of the economy.¹⁶³ Mostly, though, the cotton industry was driven by “profit,” evinced by their dependency on colonial trade with India.¹⁶⁴ Thus, the cotton industry was launched by a dual-propulsion of colonial trade and technological growth; it promised not only rapid and unpredictable expansion, but also that businessmen and workers alike would need to adopt its revolutionary techniques if they were to survive in the new era of industrialization.

Most historians agree that Europe's “industrial takeoff” was the result of no single cause or event, but rather stemmed from a variety of factors: population growth, advances in agriculture, the expansion of overseas trade and banking, improvements in transportation networks, political liberalization, and the overall rapid development of technological innovation to name a few.¹⁶⁵ But what tied all of these industries together was their dependency on the production and distribution of coal and iron. As early as 1800, England had already acquired these elements needed to trigger the Industrial Revolution—fuel, in the form of coal, high-quality iron for building new machines and other uses, and the dependable power of the steam engine.¹⁶⁶ And as history has proven time and again, “no industrial economy can develop beyond a certain point unless it possesses adequate capital-goods capacity,” which, according to

Hobsbawm, “is why even today the most reliable single index of any country's industrial potential is the quantity of its iron and steel production.”¹⁶⁷ On the one hand, iron was the single most important resource for maintaining the growing mechanization of European industries, and on the other hand, coal had the advantage of being both a major source of industrial power in the nineteenth century and a reliable form of domestic fuel, which had been rapidly expanding since the sixteenth century.¹⁶⁸ In short, coal was a source of fuel for the new steam engines, and iron was the raw material needed for building the machines themselves.¹⁶⁹ In this regard, iron was the means for building the “Iron Road,” and coal was the fuel that ultimately transformed England’s capital-goods industry.¹⁷⁰

When Fuller arrived in England half a century after the start of the Industrial Revolution, she saw first hand the social consequences of industrial transformation. “But to dwell first on London,” she writes in her eighth dispatch, “London, in itself a world,”

I found that, with my way of viewing things, it would be to me an inexhaustible studio, and that if life were only long enough, I would live there for years obscure in some corner, from which I could issue forth day by day to watch unobserved the vast stream of life, or to decipher the hieroglyphics which ages have been inscribing on the walls of this vast palace... which human effort has reared for means, not yet used efficaciously, of human culture.¹⁷¹

With the persona of an “outsider looking in,” Fuller makes her initial sketches of London in a manner similar to her *Tribune* articles, which described the visible social disparities between America’s rich and poor classes. But this time, her subject matter was England’s “monstrous wealth and cruel poverty,” which she uses to polarize the character of the English aristocracy from that of the laboring poor.¹⁷² “It is impossible, however, to take a near view of the treasures

created by English genius, accumulated by industry,” Fuller exclaims, “without a prayer, daily more fervent, that the needful changes in the condition of this people may be effected by peaceful revolution which shall destroy nothing except the shocking inhumanity of exclusiveness, which now prevents their being used for the benefit of all.”¹⁷³ Fuller’s dispatches at this moment function as a looking glass for American readers, and the many scenes of beauty and sorrow Fuller describes in the world of London, she hoped would provoke sympathy in readers who also felt the oppression of wealth, while simultaneously casting shame on America’s own class of wealthy nobles and aristocrats.

Through depictions of sorrowful scenes, Fuller uses her dispatches to cast a light on the dark scenes of England’s poverty and misery. “The Castle of Stirling is as rich as any place in romantic associations,” Fuller writes in her sixth dispatch. “We were shown its dungeons and its Court of Lions, where, says tradition, wild animals, kept in the grated cells adjacent, were brought out on festival occasions to furnish entertainment for the Court.”¹⁷⁴ Many of Fuller’s dispatches begin in this way, by offering a vivid sketch of a beautiful scene, only to turn some aspect of that scene into a biting social critique: “So, while lords and ladies gay danced and sang above, prisoners pined and wild beasts starved below.”¹⁷⁵ Readers familiar with Fuller’s *Tribune* articles would probably expect at this point for Fuller to give a quintessentially harsh judgment on the character of these “lords and ladies,” but surprisingly, she steadies her critical pen and instead concedes that such sorrow is merely a reflection of the Old World status quo:

This at first blush looks like a very barbarous state of things, but, on reflection, one does not find that we have outgrown it in our present so-called state of refined civilization, only the present way of expressing the same facts is a little different. Still lords and ladies

dance and sing above, unknowing or uncaring that the laborers who minister to their luxuries starve or are turned into wild beasts—below.”¹⁷⁶

In the past, Fuller has associated terms such as “barbarous” with a typical American’s opinion of the “savage” Indian, placing them both on a horizontal axis, polarizing America’s civilized East from its vast West. But here, she imposes a vertical structure on England’s caste system in order to comment on the nature of tradition as a whole, for, as Fuller saw it, it was just as true in America as in England that “lords and ladies” sit “above” the “wild beasts” and “laborers” who suffer “below.” By situating England’s aristocracy atop a hierarchy of social privilege, however, Fuller is able to assign them the responsibility of addressing such miserable living conditions precisely because they are empowered with the privileged of hierarchical status and wealth. In short, if England’s scenes of sorrow were a direct result of the actions of its rhetorical agents in power, thus, the solution for England’s social problem must come directly from those agents, namely, the English intelligentsia and aristocracy.

“Need indeed is glaring throughout Scotland and England...and, without such application, must ere very long seek help by other means than words.”—Margaret Fuller

The social problems of English high society were altogether not that different from the class-based critiques Fuller had launched previously in Boston and New York. England was just another reminder that it was not one country, but the world at large that was suffering from the problems of poverty and wealth. “Man need not boast his condition,” Fuller writes her sixth dispatch, “till he can weave his costly tapestry without the side that is kept under looking like that, methinks.”¹⁷⁷ Realizing that the social conditions of the working class were a part of Europe’s industrial scene at large, Fuller turned her hopes toward the centers of intellectual life in England’s manufacturing and commercial towns. “Where evil comes to an extreme, Heaven seems busy in providing means for the remedy,”

Need indeed is glaring throughout Scotland and England for the devoutest application of intellect and love to the cure of ills that cry aloud, and, without such application, *must* ere very long seek help by other means than words. Yet there is every reason to hope that those who ought to help are seriously, though slowly, becoming alive to the imperative nature of this duty, so we must not cease to hope, even in the streets of Glasgow and the gin palaces of Manchester, and the dreariest recesses of London.¹⁷⁸

“Hope,” then, is what drove Fuller deeper into English society in search of “other means than words,” to help cure England’s cruel poverty. Unlike in America, where she shames the upper classes for their inability to diagnose the current social and political problems surrounding them, in England Fuller uses her powers of observation to assign responsibility for England’s problems to those capable of addressing it. “A few already are earnest in a good spirit,” she writes in her eighth dispatch, but not nearly enough took up Fuller’s cause for progress.

And the middle class, too, Fuller held responsible for the terrors of poverty she witnessed in the streets of London. “For myself,” she writes, “much as I pitied the poor, abandoned, hopeless wretches that swarm in the roads and streets of England, I pity far more the English noble with this difficult problem before him, and such need of a speedy solution,”

Sad is his life if a conscientious man; sadder still if not. Poverty in England has terrors of which I never dreamed at home. I felt that it would be terrible to be poor there, but far more so to be the possessor of that for which so many thousands are perishing.¹⁷⁹

Though not exactly lords and ladies, the middle class still enjoyed increasing wealth and luxury as a result of industrialization. And with population growth at all time high, it would have been impossible to not encounter the scenes of misery Fuller describes: “Too close, too dark throng the evils they cannot obviate,” she writes in the eighth dispatch, “the sorrows they cannot relieve.” Fuller concludes that to “a man of good heart, each day must bring purgatory, which he knows not how to bear—yet to which he fears to become insensible.”¹⁸⁰ As a writer, fear and anger was something Fuller could clearly evoke to an American audience by bringing before their eyes such contrasting scenes of decadence and misery. But as a journalist, she knew that “a man of good heart” would only be able to reach the eyes of a mass public if they too were writing about it. “From these clouds of the Present,” she declares, “it is pleasant to turn the thoughts to some objects which have cast a light upon the Past, and which, by the virtue of their very nature, prescribe hope for the Future.”¹⁸¹ And so, Fuller turned her own hopes for the betterment of the working class to the writers, journalists, and reform-minded heroes of England’s newspaper industry.

As part of the Industrial Revolution, media technology and print culture were constantly being redefined and renegotiated to match the rapid growth of transportation and communication

in the nineteenth century. The old methods of governments and businesses nationwide that used messengers on foot or horseback, postal pigeons, and semaphores, were replaced with the electric telegraph. England's newspaper industry, in particular, had been exponentially growing ever since the virtual revolution of its publication industry in the nineteenth century, which saw the emergence of newspapers as important vehicles for the dissemination and formation of opinion, along with reports of current events. According to Benedict Anderson, "Between 1691 and 1820, no less than 2,120 'newspapers' were published, of which 461 lasted more than ten years."¹⁸² Moreover, the drastic increase in newspapers signaled a corresponding increase in literacy and public interaction. As literacy increased, popular spirit became easier to arouse because of the power of the printed word to activate people's imagination. And this relationship between literacy and imagination is what ultimately enabled the bourgeoisie to become, as Anderson puts it, "the first classes to achieve solidarity on a purely imagined basis."¹⁸³ However, such rapid growth in the public sphere had an unexpected polarizing effect between the public and private realms, which was most in the readership differences between Europe's two most popular literary mediums: newspapers and novels.

As the market for published books, newspapers and magazines expanded, so too did the world of publishing. When the cost of printing dropped in the first half of the 19th century, the novel and magazine, as mediums, became disseminators of literary genre for all types of readers. In particular, women readers provided an important market for magazines and novels because of their predominate investment in issues in the private and domestic realm, such as advice on household matters or child rearing. Novels, on the one hand, were viewed as an appropriate outlet for women who were intellectually curious, but lived in an era when access to education was extremely limited. This is supported by the fact that some of the most admired English

writers of the 19th century were women—Jane Austen, Elizabeth Gaskell, Charlotte Bronte, and Mary Ann Evans (aka George Eliot), to name a few, whose success largely depended on publishing novels in the popular press. Literary magazines, on the other hand, were also popular among women because they often addressed subjects such as science and politics, allowing mental access into new areas of knowledge altogether foreign and irrelevant to women’s daily lives. For example, the magazine *Nature* (1869) helped popularize scientific ideas to a laymen audience while simultaneously incorporating contributions from prominent individuals like Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley. Together, these two literary mediums, novels and magazines, constituted the primary means by which individuals in the “private” sphere (i.e. women) acquired “public” knowledge.

In contradistinction, newspapers were associated with public life, and thus were considered the “masculine” counterpart to the more “feminine” magazine and novel. Fuller, who published her dispatches in the *New York Tribune*, opposed England’s more conservative, gender-dichotomous, and politically reactionary newspapers—chief among them, the *London Times*, a publishing giant amongst the European cafes and reading rooms as well as one of the few newspapers that successfully operated its own news service. Moreover, as newspaper subscriptions increased among the wealthy, so too did the demand for public spaces to purchase newspapers all across Europe. This meant that for an average person to read a newspaper, not only did they have to frequent *cabinets de lectures*—reading rooms that charged a fee for access to leading periodicals—but access to such places of public dissemination and deliberation was extremely limited and highly competitive. This further supports the idea that newspaper reading was a “masculine” activity because the primary breeding-grounds for radial nationalism across all of Europe were public newspaper cafés. And with conservative newspapers dominating

England's public sphere, Fuller had to find a way to powerfully assert her public voice as an American woman in an emerging radical nationalist country.

One way that Fuller asserted herself as a unique female journalist was by comparing and critiquing both England's and America's premiere newspaper institutions. In her fourth dispatch, for instance, Fuller describes having a conversation with a well-known English physiologist and editor of the *Phrenological Journal*, Dr. Andrew Combe: "I was impressed with great and affectionate respect by the benign and even temper of his mind," Fuller writes, bolstering his character for American readers. "Of our country he spoke very wisely and hopefully," Fuller recalls, but then she warns her readers that they would surely be "put to the blush here," if they knew of how one of America's "leading houses" had "stereotyped" an earlier edition of Combe's work: "When this work had passed through our editions," Fuller writes, "when he had for years been busy in reforming and amending it, her applied to this house to republish from the later and better condition. They refused,"

In vain he urged that it was not only for his own reputation as an author that he was anxious, but for the good of the great country through which writings on such important subjects were to be circulated, that they should have the benefit of his labors, and best knowledge.—Such arguments on the stupid and mercenary tempers of those addressed fell harmless as on a buffalo's hide might a gold-tipped arrow. The book, they thought, answered THEIR purpose sufficiently, for IT SELLS. Other purpose for a book they knew none. And as to the natural rights of an author over the fruits of his mind, the distilled essence of life consumed in the severities of mental labor, they had never heard of such a thing. His work was in the market, and he had no more to do with it, that they could see, than the silk-worm with the lining of one of their coats.¹⁸⁴

Fuller then appeals directly to her own editor, Horace Greeley, telling him that the more publishers of this sort she encountered—both at home and abroad—the more she was convinced, in opposition to Greeley’s views, “that the publisher cannot, if a mere tradesman, be a man of honor. It is impossible in the nature of things,” for “[he] *must* have some idea of the nature and value of literary labor, or he is wholly unfit to deal with its products.”¹⁸⁵ And of all the publishing giants Fuller encountered, the one she detested the most was the widely read London *Times*.

From an ideological standpoint, the policy of the *Times* was guided by, on the one hand, the best interests of Great Britain, and on the other by the fears of revolution and intervention. John Thadius Delane, editor of *The Times* in the 1840’s, said, “Our own dear public likes to see discord and revolution abroad however little it may care for liberation itself.”¹⁸⁶ This was precisely the kind of passive reactionary element Fuller detested, one in which all revolutions and revolutionary thinkers were explicitly condemned, but no help was ever given. “As for the *Times*,” Fuller writes in concluding her eighth dispatch, “on which you use your scissors so industriously, that is the *Times*’ times, managed with vast ability, no doubt, but the blood would tingle many a time to the fingers’ end of the body politic before that solemn organ which claims to represent the heart, would dare to beat in unison.”¹⁸⁷ Indeed, Fuller’s disdain for the London *Times* would grow in the following years, as she completely dismisses the possibility that “peaceful revolution” could ever come from such a reactionary institution.¹⁸⁸ Although this was only one of England’s premiere newspapers, the fact that it prevailed amongst public opinion significantly impact on Fuller’s rhetorical style. “Still it would require all the wise management of the *Times* or wisdom enough to do without it, and a wide range and diversity of talent, indeed, almost sweeping the circle, to make a People’s Journal for England. The present is only a bud of

the future flower.”¹⁸⁹ And the “future flower” was the increasingly radical and revolutionary sentiment for Fuller rapidly spreading throughout Europe.

Beginning with the eighth dispatch, Fuller’s rhetorical persona begins shifting from a Romantic traveler abroad to a radical social critic. Writing from Paris, she reflects on “the world of London”: “Here in the region of wax lights, mirrors, bright wood fires, shrugs, vivacious ejaculations, wreathed smiles and adroit courtesies, it is hard to remember John Bull”—the popular press’s national personification of the United Kingdom—“with his coal-smoke, hands in pockets, except when extended for ungracious demand of the perpetual half-crown or to pay for the all but perpetual mug of beer.”¹⁹⁰ She then calls him “the most churlish of clowns, and the most clownish of churls,” thus reducing all of England for American readers to this unflattering caricature.¹⁹¹ Moreover, since England has always been a repository of “culture” for America, which Fuller has explicitly argued many times in the past, her dispatches must have struck a heavy blow to many of her middle-class readers. But she does not only ridicule, for just like America, Fuller believed there were “treasures” of “English genius” yet to be uncovered.¹⁹² “But then there are so many other sides!” she writes of John Bull,

When a gentleman, he is so truly the gentleman, when a man so truly the man of honor! His graces, when he has any, grow up from his inmost heart. Not that he is free from humbug, on the contrary, he is prone to the most solemn humbug, generally of the philanthropic or otherway moral kind. But he is always awkward beneath the mask, and can never impose upon anybody—but himself. Nature meant him to be noble, generous, sincere, and has furnished him with no faculties to make himself agreeable in other way or mode of being.¹⁹³

Indeed, Fuller fully intended to remove the mask of England's churlishness—found most noticeably amongst its publishers—for American readers by penetrating into its “inmost heart,” particularly, its many reform clubs and efforts.

Fuller's final days in London were spent perusing London's art galleries, museums, public gardens, and reform clubs in search of English genius, which she could package up for her readers. For one, there was the London Reform Club, founded in 1832 for Radicals, which Fuller calls a “splendid institution.” And yet, despite the equipages of luxury and comfort, she could not fully agree with a Club that had no female members: “To me this palace of so many ‘single gentlemen rolled into one,’ seemed stupidly comfortable in the absence of that elegant arrangement and vivacious atmosphere which only Women can inspire.”¹⁹⁴ One after another, Fuller failed to find what she was looking for, all the while becoming more exacerbated in her search for the genius which she continuously promised her readers was present, but merely out of sight. “England houses the exile,” Fuller writes frustratingly in her ninth dispatch,

but not without house-tax, window-tax, and head-tax. Where is the Arcadia that dares invite all genius to her arms, and change her golden wheat for their green laurels and immortal flowers? Arcadia!—would the name were America!¹⁹⁵

Despite not finding an utopia of English genius, in this ninth dispatch we can see Fuller's transformation from an American journalist into a European nationalist, as she increasingly detaches her own identity from her home so that she can advocate for readers to invest themselves in Europe, her new home, and its budding radical reform efforts.

Fuller's final stop in England provides the clearest example of Fuller's rhetorical transformation into the persona of a revolutionary agent. “And here returns naturally to my mind one of the most interesting things I have seen here or elsewhere,” she writes toward the end of

the ninth dispatch—“the school for poor Italian boys, sustained and taught by a few of their exiled compatriots.”¹⁹⁶ She then applies one of her favorite nature metaphors by referring to the school’s inauguration as “a planting of the Kingdom of Heaven, and though now no larger than a grain of mustard-seed, and though, perhaps, none of those who watch the spot may live to see the birds singing in its branches.”¹⁹⁷ And chief among those who fertilized its growth was Guiseppe Mazzini, an Italian patriot and revolutionary whom Fuller later revered for his efforts during the Roman Revolution of 1848. Having only just met Mazzini, she describes his character for readers in a manner completely opposite of her recent sketch of John Bull:

The name of Joseph Mazzini is well known to those among us who take an interest in the cause of human freedom, who, not content with the peace and ease brought for themselves by the devotion and sacrifices of their fathers, look with anxious interest on the suffering nations who are preparing for a similar struggle. Those who are not, like the brutes that perish, content with the enjoyment of mere national advantages, indifferent to the idea they represent, cannot forget that the human family is one, “And beats with one great heart.”¹⁹⁸

In Fuller’s dispatches, then, Mazzini stands as the perfect agent for developing the “future flower” of Europe’s new revolutionary age. As a powerful personality, national visionary, and Romantic speaker, Mazzini aimed at Continental unification above all else, but even more so, his efforts focused upon Fuller’s most beloved national subject. “Italy,” Fuller cries, “the mother of our language and our laws, our greatest benefactress in the gifts of genius, the garden of the world, in which our best thoughts have delighted to expatiate, but over whose bowers now hangs a perpetual veil of sadness, and whose noblest plants are doomed to removal—for, if they cannot bear their ripe and perfect fruit in another climate, they are not permitted to lift their heads to

heaven in their own.”¹⁹⁹ In creating the perfect national subject, then, Fuller crafts a corresponding perfect literary hero, Guiseppe Mazzini: “the Siegfried of England, great and powerful, if not quite invulnerable, and of a might rather to destroy evil than legislate for good. At all events, he seems to be what Destiny intended.”²⁰⁰ Thus, having finally found a key protagonist for the revolutionary age to come, Fuller leaves London and continues her quest for uncovering genius. Her next stop, France—a land where, unlike the noble Englishmen, Frenchmen “can cheat you pleasantly, and move with grace in the devious and slippery path.”²⁰¹

CHAPTER V

FRANCE: THE EXPLOSION OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

“It was pleasant to my eye which has always been so wearied in our country by the sombre masses of men that overcloud our public assemblies, to see them now in so great variety of costume, color and decoration... the general effect was of a flower-garden”—Margaret Fuller

As Margaret Fuller left London for Paris in March of 1847, she reflected on the cultural differences between the two nations. In her tenth dispatch, Fuller describes a typical “washing day” in London: “Hanging out the clothes is a great exposure for women, even when they have a good place for it, but when, as is so common in cities, they must dry them in the house, how much they suffer!” She claims to have heard from “an eminent physician” of two children who died because “their mother, having but one room to live in, was obliged to wash and dry clothes close to their bed when they were ill.”²⁰² And “beneath that perpetual fall of soot,” was London, the worst of them all! From Paris, however, Fuller got the opposite impression. Unlike London’s soot-covered poor, France’s general public was much better off in terms of cleanliness. “It was pleasant to my eye,” Fuller writes in the tenth dispatch, “which has always been so wearied in our country by the sombre masses of men that overcloud our public assemblies, to see them now in so great variety of costume, color and decoration.”²⁰³ “Certainly there are many ugly ones,” Fuller writes of the French ladies whom surpass all others “in the art of dress,” “but they are so well dressed and have such an air of graceful vivacity, that the general effect was of a flower-garden.”²⁰⁴ This was also true of the opera houses, museums, and theatres. Thus, Fuller devotes a majority of her dispatches to the task of surveying France’s culture through the lens of its art and music scene, as she had done back in both Boston and New York.

In her ongoing search for European genius, Fuller compares England's opera scene, which she found so "full of execrable music and more execrable acting," to that of France, which she calls truly "living,"

But how different all this acting to what I find in France! Here the theatre is living; you see something really good, and good throughout. Not one touch of that stage strut and vulgar bombast of tone which the English actor fancies indispensable to scenic illusion is tolerated here. For the first time in my life I saw something represented in a style uniformly good, and should have found sufficient proof, if I had needed any, that all men will prefer what is good to what is bad, if only a fair opportunity for choice be allowed.²⁰⁵

Fuller then singles out the French actress Mademoiselle Rachel as the best representation of the "uniformly good" in France's opera scene. "I was sure that in her I should find a true genius," she declares after arriving in Paris. "And so it proved.—I found her a true artist, worthy of Greece, and worthy at many moments to have her conceptions immortalized in marble."²⁰⁶ But to the French audience, Rachel was far from perfect. "On the dark side, Fuller writes, "she is very great in hatred and revenge"—reminiscent of George Sand's popularity back in America. But unlike in America, the French crowd did not have the benefit of Fuller's literature reviews celebrating the darker sentiments of literature and art. "She can only express the darker passions and grief in its most desolate aspects," Fuller concedes. "Nature has not gifted her with those softer and more flowery attributes that lend to pathos its utmost tenderness."²⁰⁷ The French crowd expected those "flowery attributes" in its greatest actors, which, as Fuller puts it, "melt to tears or calm and elevate the heart by the presence of that tragic beauty that needs all the assaults of Fate to make it show its immortal sweetness."²⁰⁸ Fuller thus concludes that the French Opera, with Rachel as its representative figure, aligns all too well with the "common tragedy" found in

“a woman of genius,” who must throw away her “precious heart” lest she be deemed unworthy in the eyes of her audience. What makes an artist great in the eyes of the French crowd, then, was their ability to deeply affect to the point of “almost [suffocating] the beholder.”²⁰⁹ The irony, however, was that the French Modern School of Art was, on the whole, virtually incapable of producing such an effect. Indeed, aside from a few “little pieces,” which produced “excellent acting and a sparkle of wit unknown to the world out of France,” it seemed that the French crowd had more vivacity and spirit than its artists and actresses.

The more Fuller explored Paris’s art and music scene, the more frustrated she became at the nature and character of its general audience. She writes of being unable to attend many of Paris’s more desirable speeches and performances because of how quickly the “French audience” swarmed to those event. “I was very desirous to hear him speak,” Fuller writes, frustrated about being unable to see Alexandre Dumas defend himself in court.²¹⁰ “But a French audience, who knew the ground better, had slipped in before me, and I returned, as has been too often the case with me in Paris, having seen nothing but endless staircases, dreary vestibules, and *gens d’armes*.” The “treasures of the past,” she goes on to say, such as the various galleries, libraries, cabinets of coins, and museums, were “open in the most liberal manner to the stranger,” but “when anything is happened in the present, the French run quicker, glide in more adroitly, and get possession of the ground.”²¹¹ Consequently, Fuller was limited to the “art, pictures, sculptures, engravings, and the other riches which France lays open so freely to the stranger in her Musées.”²¹² But again, Fuller found herself disappointed by the divided spirit of the French school of Art. “No such great crisis...is to be apprehended from acquaintance with the productions of the modern French school,” Fuller surmises,

They are indeed full of talent and of vigor, but also melo-dramatic and exaggerated to a degree that seems to give the nightmare passage through the fresh and cheerful day. They sound no depth of soul, and are marked with the signet of a degenerate age.²¹³

In likening France to “a degenerate age,” Fuller draws attention to the fact that French culture was still in disarray in the wake of the French Revolution. And although she arrived over half a century later, she could still see the “signet” of its degenerative state, which describes in the eighteenth dispatch: “See this poor France, so full of talent, so adroit, yet so shallow and glossy still, which could not escape from a false position with all its baptism of blood.”²¹⁴ And so, she attempts to diagnosis the primary cause of France’s “false position,” which in her mind stems from the fact that the Soul of France was divided.

Fuller argues that the France’s inability to express a symbolic representation of the idea of their country as a whole was at the root of their cultural division. “These French painters seem to have no idea of this,” Fuller writes in the eleventh dispatch, “they have not studied the method of Nature.”²¹⁵ In a manner similar to *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller briefly digresses to the nature of Art, which she believed is most clearly expressed not in the dramatic and sublime, but is rather concealed within the mundane and ordinary:

With the true Artist, as with Nature herself, the more full the representation the more profound and enchanting is the sense of mystery. We look and look as on a flower of which we cannot scrutinize the secret life, yet by looking seem constantly drawn nearer to the soul that causes and governs that life.²¹⁶

The French artist has no sense for this mystery, Fuller exclaims. Their art merely “charmed the eye and the thought,” and turns the mind “inside out, in the coarsest acceptance of the phrase.”²¹⁷ And despite producing pleasing work for its own people, Fuller was unable to locate

a truly great work of art. They all lacked what she called “a great thought or a thought of beauty adequately expressed.”²¹⁸ The mark of truly great art resides in the artist’s ability to impress a symbol upon its audience. Furthermore, that symbol must reflect “some fact in the interior life,” Fuller says. “But then it *is* a symbol that Art seeks to present and not the fact itself.”²¹⁹ For neither in Art nor in Literature could “ordinary thought” become great simply by being “well-dressed.” And in France, Fuller declares the flashy tendencies of its people the sole reason why their artists lacked the deeper thoughts necessary for the production of genius—their ideas were “imperfectly expressed,” she writes, “because they cannot yet be held and treated masterly.”²²⁰

For the first time in France, Fuller found herself longing for England’s art scene, which saw “a movement in the opposite direction” as portrayed specifically in the work of the celebrated painter Joseph Mallord William Turner.²²¹ Reflecting on a series of Turner’s paintings, Fuller illustrates how truly great art has the power to bring out the ideological differences in its viewers:

It is well known that Turner, so long an idol of the English public, paints now in a manner which has caused the liveliest dissensions in the world of connoisseurs. There are two parties, one of which maintains that the pictures of late are not good and, moreover, that they are not pictures at all. Impossible to make out design or find what Turner is aiming at by strange blotches of color. The other declares that these pictures are not only good but divine, that whoever looks upon them in the true manner will not fail to find there somewhat ineffably and transcendently admirable—the soul of Art.²²²

Turner’s “strange blotches of color” contained the coveted effect of concealment. Such mystery in meaning forces viewers to call upon their own past experiences, behaviors, beliefs, and values in order to formulate a genuine opinion about the work. In doing so, they expose their ideological

character. Thus, true Art serves the uniquely political function of calling out the strange blotches of color in viewers' own ideological schema. "Turner has gone beyond the English gentleman's conventional view of Nature," Fuller declares, "which implies a little sentiment and a very cultivated taste." Unlike the French, "he has become awake to what is elemental, normal, in Nature—such, for instance, as one sees in the working of water on the sea-shore."²²³ In short, great art, for Fuller, is neither void of meaning nor merely expresses itself in excessive or explicit terms. Great art expresses itself in simple, yet symbolic terms. It conceals its "meaning" behind its mysterious form. Unlike French art, which Fuller calls "glossy," Turner's paintings offer a form of gentle persuasion that arouses uncertainty, goading viewers to search within for the meaning behind the work. And not only does great art have the capacity to divide an audience, but even more powerful is its capacity to provoke viewers into exposing themselves for who they are and what they believe.

While it is unclear if she meant to imply a correlative to France's political climate, Fuller's illustration of Turner's "strange blotches of color," and the corresponding "two parties" interpretation that came out of it, is a fitting analogy for the divide in France's competing ideologies between the moderate and radical liberals. A growing public opinion of radical revolutionary politics in France had created, much like Turner's "blotches of color," a strange feeling amongst the body politic, with one side, the moderates, unable "to make out design" or find anything valuable, and the other side, the radicals, declaring it is "not only good but divine," containing within its purpose the soul of France.²²⁴ But in France, public scrutiny was less forgiving than in England, such as with the actress Mademoiselle Rachel. In a letter to Caroline Sturgis, Fuller compares the public opinion of Rachel in France to that of America's own controversial female Artist, George Sand:

A liberal Frenchman says to me “*Me Sand* has committed what are called errors, but we doubt not the nobleness of her soul, but it is said that the private life of *Mlle Rachel* has nothing in common with the apparition of the Artist.” Do not speak of this in America.²²⁵

As with French Art, the French people had the nasty tendency of turning the character of their most famous figures inside out, thus exposing the scandals of their private lives for all to see. For this reason, Fuller ominously concludes, “To the noblest genius is joined the severest culture.”²²⁶ What exactly she meant by “severest culture,” however, begs for historical context, specifically, of the previous half century, starting with the explosion of the French Revolution and the various political ideologies coursing through the veins of the French population.

“A fisherman, introduced to such acquaintance with the marvels of love and beauty which we trample under foot or burn in the chimney each careless day, exclaimed, ‘Tis the good God who protects us on the sea that made all that,’ and a similar recognition, a correspondent feeling, will not be easily evaded by the most callous observer.”—Margaret Fuller

While in France, Fuller had the good fortune of meeting an artist from Florence who was working on a series of botanical wax models. These models were a part of the magnificent collection of the *Jardin des Plantes*, and the artist supplied many of them to Edinburgh and Bologna. Individually, they were comprised of “ten different *genera*, or fifty to sixty species of Fungi, mosses and lichens.” When Fuller asked the artist about his models he told her that his inspiration came from a fisherman, who upon being “introduced to such acquaintance with the marvels of love and beauty which we trample under foot or burn in the chimney each careless day, exclaimed, ‘Tis the good God who protects us on the sea that made all that,’ and a similar recognition, a correspondent feeling, will not be easily evaded by the most callous observer.” In recounting this conversation, Fuller shows both her Transcendental spirit and Romantic purpose for being in Europe. From a Transcendentalist perspective, Fuller uses the minutia of moss and lichen to access the greatness of God through Nature’s infinite variety. Just as she articulated in her Credo, Fuller highlights traces of the “All” by looking at and through the various “forms” of Nature. But from a Romantic perspective, she also frames her discovery to readers as if it were some hidden gem in Europe’s Art History. And she, the lonely female seeker in search of European treasures, had found this treasure and wished to send back to America so they too might learn to see the whole through the part. And so she concludes her thought on the matter by writing, “I wish the Universities of Cambridge, New-York, and other leading institutions of our country might avail themselves of the opportunity.”²²⁷

What is most striking about Fuller's reflections on art while in France is her emerging nationalist voice. Throughout all the dispatches, she does not simply celebrate art for art's sake, for "always art is art."²²⁸ No, she celebrates great works of art because they are the traces of great minds that possess the capacity to shape and influence public opinion. In England, for instance, she praises art's capacity to expose viewers' beliefs—both politically and ideologically—through the uncertainty and mystery of symbolic expression. But in "the French pictures," Fuller writes, "suffering is represented by streams of blood—wickedness by the most ghastly contortions."²²⁹ So too with its people, who, as she later announces in the eighteenth dispatch, "could not escape from a false position with all its baptism of blood."²³⁰ But then there was the Italian artist, whose work she praised as form and expression of "God." If every nation in Europe could see their own great History like the fisherman saw the mosses and lichens; that their nations, too, are but parts of a greater whole, and that they might learn to love each other just as the fisherman loves the fungi—to see both "God" and "Nature," "Europe" and "nation" in, as the fisherman says, "the marvels of love and beauty which we trample under foot." But unfortunately in France, Fuller discovered, the realization of Art's greatest potential is left hidden beneath the surface of its people's shallow and glossy nature. To discover why, however, we must journey back to its own revolutionary situation, namely, the explosion of the French Revolution.

If the Industrial Revolution primarily influenced changes in Europe's economy, then the French Revolution primarily shaped its politics and ideology. Where Britain provided Europe with its railways and factories, France modernized its vocabulary, as well as its liberal and radical democratic politics. Moreover, France provided not just Europe, but the entire world with its first great modern example of "nationalism"—both as a political term used by the people and as an emerging concept that would come to heavily influence the revolutions of 1848. In short,

the ideology of the French Revolution was the first to truly penetrate the old world and push it into a new era.²³¹ And out of all the revolutions that preceded and followed the French Revolution, it stands out as the first mass *social* revolution, immeasurably more radical in nature than any by comparison. In fact, when Tom Paine—an extremist in Britain and America—visited Paris, he found himself among the most moderate of the Girondins, who despite being moderates in France, were considered some of the most radically minded group of people throughout all of Europe. As Eric Hobsbawm reiterates, “It is no accident that the American revolutionaries, and the British ‘Jacobins’ who migrated to France because of their political sympathies, found themselves moderates in France.”²³² When you combine this radical ideology with the fact that approximately one out of every five Europeans was French in the year 1789, you get an emerging population of people powerful enough to overthrow the French regime, at the time ruled by Louis XVI.²³³ But before attempting to make sense of the ideological divide between France’s competing political groups—chief among them the moderate Girondins and the radical Jacobins—let us first explore some of the primary motives behind the French Revolution.

Generally speaking, the French Revolution can be reduced to the simple reasoning pattern of cause and effect—the cause being poor financial decisions on the part of France’s ruling class and the effect being devastating mass poverty. Up until the eighteenth century, France’s monarchs had handled their financial difficulties through the simple act of declaring bankruptcy, but the changing social and political conditions of the prerevolutionary era made this impossible in the years prior to revolutionary outbreak in the mid-nineteenth century. In the past, the French government had always relied on French financiers for loans, but state finances were no longer a matter of private discussion among politics leaders in the years leading up to the French Revolution. They were instead openly subjected to public scrutiny.²³⁴ And when France

became involved in the American War of Independence, victory over England came with the cost of final bankruptcy.²³⁵ Although it is easy to blame the extravagance of the French monarchy for the outbreak of violence, the reality of the situation is that France's final bankruptcy was the result of a nexus of irresponsible decisions. According to Hobsbawm, "court expenditure only amounted to 6 per cent of the total in 1788," whereas "war, navy and diplomacy made up one-quarter, the service of the existing debt one-half." And in the end, it was the American war and its debt that ultimately "broke the back of the monarchy."²³⁶ Thus, the French Revolution ironically began as an aristocratic attempt to recapture the state.

The year 1789 was also significant in France for another important reason, namely, it was the year of the Declaration of the Rights of Man—more specifically, the demands of the *bourgeoisie*. As a class, the "bourgeoisie" were composed of individuals who identified with all the virtues of classical liberalism, extolled in the Declaration of Rights of Man—a manifesto against the hierarchical society of noble privilege, but not in favor democratic or egalitarian society.²³⁷ "The source of all sovereignty," reads the Declaration, "resides essentially in the nation," and with the rise of bourgeoisie came a distinct class consciousness whereby "the people" were identifying with the "nation" as a revolutionary concept.²³⁸ According to Hobsbawm, "On the whole the classical liberal bourgeois of 1789 (and the liberal of 1789-1848) was not a democrat but a believer in constitutionalism, a secular state with civil liberties and guarantees for private enterprise, and government by tax-payers and property-owners."²³⁹ And as the people slowly became aware of themselves as citizens empowered with certain political guarantees, the king's authority was no longer seen as granted "by the grace of God," but instead by "the grace of God and the constitutional law of the state."²⁴⁰ Naturally, this was not a good turn for the French King and his aristocratic nobles, who had all but lost the ability to effectively

control events in their own country. Consequently, when Louis XVI hand-selected an “Assembly of Notables”—consisting of high nobles along with prominent bourgeois financiers—to guide the affairs of France’s fiscal reform as a counter-measure to Europe’s changing political climate in the prerevolutionary period, he had effectively equipped the bourgeoisie with the power to obsolesce both France’s monarchy and aristocracy.²⁴¹

By the year 1789, France’s fate was firmly secured in the hands of its bourgeoisie. And while the king and his nobles were bickering with his many national assemblies and committees, living conditions for the working class worsened. The aristocracy’s oversight of its people, then, stemmed from two fundamental miscalculations: first, they underestimated the “Third Estate”—the fictional entity deemed to represent all who were neither noble nor clergy, but that were mostly dominated by the middle class—and thus failed to consider the growing possibility that the “Third Estate” had intentions and aspirations of their own, independent of the monarchy. Second, they overlooked the economic and social crisis affecting France’s most powerful force, its laboring poor.²⁴² To make matters worse, as the French government dealt with its own political upheaval, two successive bad harvests drove food prices to extreme levels, causing a full-blown economic crisis across France.²⁴³ As suffering continued to spread, it became clear to the French “people” that their government was not going to help them. When the people accepted this fact, the French government officially lost all status in their eyes. Thus, all that remained was the symbolism of its rule, the Bastille, which would soon be toppled by France’s revolutionary peasantry.

The revolutionary peasantry was ultimately responsible for the fall of the French monarchy. But what exactly provoked France’s poor to revolt against its symbolic order can be largely attributed to financial bankruptcy after the American War for Independence. As

mentioned previously, when the years 1787 and 1788 brought bad harvests, the resulting famine had a devastating impact on the livelihood of France's peasantry. For one, most of those who lived in France's provincial countryside were already dirt poor. So when large producers started selling their grain at famine prices, they were forced to accept, or else resort to eating their own seed-corn.²⁴⁴ The result was catastrophic impoverishment taking the form of industrial depression. The survival of France's poor was thus reduced to the market value of its production. They became "desperate and restless," Hobsbawn writes, as the cost of living soared, and the people's mentality transformed into that of a simple maxim: "by any means necessary," which often took the form of riot and banditry.²⁴⁵ Under normal circumstances such tactics would never have led to a complete revolution—for one, France's newspapers and comics caricatured such "revolutionary" methods using the image of a peasant carrying a cleric and an aristocrat as his crops are devoured by pigeons and rabbits in the background, which only nobles were permitted to kill.²⁴⁶ But in 1788 and 1789, a combination of major convulsions in the kingdom and an election campaign of propaganda equipped France's desperate poor with a new political perspective, namely, "they introduced the tremendous and earth-shaking idea of *liberation* from gentry and oppression."²⁴⁷

To restate, it was the growing influence of France's bourgeoisie that ultimately had the largest ideological impact on the revolutionary peasantry. Generally speaking, peasant revolutions are vast, shapeless, and anonymous, yet irresistible movements waiting to be given purpose by some organizing power. What ultimately transformed an epidemic of peasant unrest into an irresistible convulsion was, according to Hobsbawn, "a combination of provincial town risings and a wave of mass panic, spreading obscurely but rapidly across vast stretches of the country."²⁴⁸ French people were beginning to identify with each other as a collective who

understood and shared each other's suffering. All they needed was the language of nationalism to ignite their passions and provoke a wholesale shift from being a suffering "people" to a "nation" in need of liberation. According to Benedict Anderson, a nation is "an imagined political community, both inherently limited and sovereign." Indeed, even small nations like England and France are imagined because they "will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion."²⁴⁹ A nation can be imagined as *limited*, for every nation has "finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations." It can be imagined as *sovereign*, for even the concept of a nation was "born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm." And finally, a nation can be imagined as a *community*, since all nations are composed of individuals who share a "deep, horizontal comradeship" with one another and are willing to die for such "limited imaginings."²⁵⁰ In the case of France, the peasants had already formed their own limited imaginings. All they needed was a push in the right direction. That push was the formation of the Third Estate, thus setting in motion the inevitable fall of France's most symbolic structure, the Bastille.

Once the spirit of France's revolutionary peasantry took shape, it was only a matter of time before the urban poor joined the fray, for their livelihood was equally deplorable. In fact, the peasantry's counter-revolution mobilized the Paris masses precisely because of the city's symbolic significance, which the "nation" now desperately wanted to see fall. The historic result was the capture of the Bastille—a state prison symbolizing royal authority—which further equipped the revolutionary movement with weapons to topple the regime.²⁵¹ According to Hobsbawm, "The capture of the Bastille, which has rightly made July 14th into the French national day, ratified the fall of despotism and was hailed all over the world as the beginning of

liberation.”²⁵² After the fall of the Bastille, the revolution spread like wild fire throughout France’s provincial towns and countryside. All that remained of state power was scattered fragments of “doubtfully reliable regiments.”²⁵³ Immediately thereafter the new French nation established its formal manifesto, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. But if all that was needed for Europe’s reform was a simple declaration of bourgeois liberal values, then nationalism as a political ideology would not have spread so rapidly throughout Europe in the nineteenth century. When the Declaration was announced, the King obviously resisted, but could do nothing as he no longer had any real power. The speed with which the revolutionary era took hold frightened many of its middle class revolutionaries. The social consequences that emerged out of France’s radical mass social upheaval caused many of the previously revolutionary-minded middle class liberals to revert back to a more conservative ideology, which solidified the ideological divide between moderate and radical liberals in France.

Between the years 1789 and 1791, the sections of moderate bourgeoisie liberals—now officially known as the Constitutional Assembly—devoted themselves to the rationalization and reform of France.²⁵⁴ Despite the fact that most of the lasting institutional achievements of the French Revolution came under the politics of the liberal bourgeoisie, the Constitutional Assembly made virtually zero progress at improving the lives of France’s common people. Certainly, the Declaration of the Rights of Man was never intended as a democratic treatise, but was merely in favor of ratifying a constitution. For example, the Constitution of 1791 fended off excessive democracy by a system of constitutional monarchy based on a distinction between “active” and “passive” citizens.²⁵⁵ But this was not an appropriate solution for those radically-minded Frenchmen who believed that the Revolution was but the first step toward an inevitable universal triumph of liberty.²⁵⁶ Unlike many subsequent bourgeois revolutions, where moderate

liberals either resisted revolution out of fear of the aristocracy or quickly transferred into a conservative camp, the French Revolution's liberal middle class produced an extremely radical sect known as the Jacobins, who were prepared to pursue revolution up to and beyond the brink of anti-bourgeois revolution. The Jacobins—whose name became a virtual stand-in for radical revolution everywhere—were the ones who ultimately transformed “the history of France” into “the history of Europe” through the Jacobin Revolution of Year II.²⁵⁷

The French Revolution did more than institute a new vocabulary of nationalism, it gave the world a clear and distinct model for bourgeoisie revolutionary politics. A “dramatic dialectical dance,” as Hobsbawm calls it, in which moderate middle-class reformers mobilize the masses in the form of a counter-revolution. But more often than not, the masses end up “pushing beyond the moderates’ aims to their own social revolutions,” thus splitting moderates into a conservative group that, ironically, aligns more with reactionary ideology than with the radical will of the masses.²⁵⁸ After the French Revolution, its monarchy was formally abolished on September 21, 1792, and a supplementary decree was passed to institute a new revolutionary calendar, with September 22 as the first day of “Year I of the French Revolution.”²⁵⁹ But this did little to bridge the ideological gap between France’s two most prominent political groups. On the one hand, there were the Girondins, who occupied the moderate position in France and were convinced the revolution needed no further social leveling. According to Breunig and Levinger, the Girondins, who generally came from a higher social strata, “tended to emphasize ‘liberty’ in their speeches, advocating—among other kinds of freedom—the exemption of trade and industry from regulation by the state.”²⁶⁰ And yet, despite sharing many ideas with the radical side, the Girondins tended to distrust interference in national politics, condemning those responsible for violence against the State, but in turn doing nothing to prevent it.

The other major political faction in France during the first eight months of the new revolutionary calendar was “the Mountain,” a name that later became synonymous with the Jacobins. According to Breunig and Levinger, “both the Girondins and the Mountain numbered Jacobins among their members, but the leaders of the Mountain gradually forced the Girondins from the club, and eventually dominated it to such an extent that ‘Mountain’ and ‘Jacobins’ became almost synonymous.”²⁶¹ In other words, the struggle between the Girondins and the Mountain was less over social differences—as members of both sides favored the continuation of war against French adversaries—as over temperament.²⁶² Unlike the Girondins, the Jacobins emphasized equality over liberty and favored the elimination of all social and political distinction amongst the French body politic. Although they considered private property paramount, Jacobin leaders “tended to be sympathetic toward the underprivileged, and to admit the right of the government in certain circumstances to intervene in the economy for the welfare of the society as a whole.”²⁶³ In fact, any and all plans for liberation in Europe between 1789 and 1848 “hinged on a joint rising of peoples under the leadership of the French.”²⁶⁴ And after 1830, according to Hobsbawm, “other movements of national and liberal revolt, such as the Italian or Polish, also tended to see their own nations in some sense as Messiahs destined by their own freedom to initiate everyone else’s.”²⁶⁵ Thus, Jacobinism was ideologically appealing to a majority of Frenchmen because of its approach to war as a means of liberation, as well as its democratic approach to freedom as a people’s right to identify as a nation.

In the year 1792, France’s new Legislative Assembly completely reframed their approach to war and the conquest of revolution. The radical ideal of the Jacobin Republic—“the terrible and glorious reign of justice and virtue when all good citizens were equal in the sight of the nation and the people smote the traitors”—pervasively spread throughout France, completely

reshaping the minds of its people.²⁶⁶ First, there was a growing consensus among members of the Legislative Assembly that war could be made to produce profit. More specifically, businessmen argued that France's present economic uncertainty could best be remedied through a declaration of war. Then there was the issue of what to do with king Louis XVI. Unlike many of the Girondins who advocated for clemency, the position of the Mountain was unanimous: the king was a traitor. This was a critical turning point in the legacy of the French Revolution. By essentially committing themselves to regicide, the Jacobins secured their position in two ways: first, they eliminated France's royalist regime; and second, they dealt the Girondins a permanent defeat precisely because of their hesitation on what to do with the king.

After the king's execution, the Mountain seized control of France, effectively ending the Girondins and ushering in "the Reign of Terror."²⁶⁷ In fact, the years 1792-1794 were so important to France's history that what many refer to today as the "Terror" of the French Revolution is actually a reference to the Jacobin Republic of Year II, in which an unprecedented alliance between the middle class and the laboring poor effectively overthrew the French monarchy.²⁶⁸ Unfortunately, what made the Jacobin Republic a sensational regime—the middle and laboring classes working together—also led to its downfall. The same economic concerns plaguing the French countryside in 1789 resurfaced. And while the middle class focused on the economic needs of war, the suffering poor were ignored. Failing to learn from France's revolutionary past, the laboring poor took matters into their own hands and ended the bloody reign of the Jacobins. Thus ushering in an age of rapid regime change that would not dissipate until the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte.²⁶⁹

“The more I see of the terrible ills which infests the body politic of Europe, the more indignation I feel at the selfishness or stupidity of those in my own country who oppose an examination of these subjects.”—Margaret Fuller

The devastating effects of political upheaval, social poverty, and increasingly harsh winters in France resulting from the French Revolution persisted throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. By the year 1847, when Margaret Fuller entered Europe, even an American traveler could not avoid noticing the residual effects of the post-revolutionary industrial age. “I have collected many facts with regard to this suffering class of women, both in England and in France,” Fuller writes in the twelfth dispatch. “I have seen them under the thin veil of gayety, and in the horrible tatters of utter degradation. I have seen the hearts of men with regard to their condition and a general heartlessness in women of more favored and protected lives, which I can only ascribe to utter ignorance of the facts.”²⁷⁰ And yet, despite such sorrow, “the French crowd is always gay,” “full of quick drolleries” and “most amusing when most petulant.” After seeing for herself the signs of suffering and hunger, Fuller declared that France’s shallow and glossy culture is quite fitting, as “it represents what is so agreeable in the character of the nation.”²⁷¹ Fuller gives an example of “an immense crowd” that “thronged the streets” of Paris to see a popular play, only to conclude, almost consequentially, how “little invention” was produced by such an “emblem of plenty.”²⁷² “Indeed,” she writes, “few among the people could have had the heart for such a sham, knowing how the poorer classes have suffered from hunger this Winter.”²⁷³

Fuller was altogether disgusted with Parisian high society, especially after discovering how they actively ignored the suffering of the majority of their people. Even worse was the fact that whenever a public attempt was made to draw awareness to what should have been obvious

signs of suffering, it was immediately suppressed. She gives an example of a political pamphlet, “The Voice of Famine,” which “stated facts” about the suffering conditions of provincial France, but “was suppressed almost as soon as published.”²⁷⁴ But, “one cannot suppress the fact that the people in the Provinces have suffered most terribly amid the vaunted prosperity of France,” Fuller reminds her American readers:

The more I see of the terrible ills which infests the body politic of Europe, the more indignation I feel at the selfishness or stupidity of those in my own country who oppose an examination of these subjects—such as is animated by the hope of prevention.²⁷⁵

Having spent ample amounts of time in the French Chamber of Deputies listening to bourgeois politicians argue about reform, Fuller concluded that the current age of France’s bourgeoisie monarchy was in desperate need of not just reform, but radical reform. “While Louis Philippe lives,” Fuller writes scathingly, “the gases, compressed by his strong grasp, may not burst up to light; but the need of some radical measures of reform is not less strongly felt in France than elsewhere, and the time will come before long when such will be imperatively demanded.”²⁷⁶

Fuller’s remarks against the French monarchy employ a noticeably harsher tone than her remarks on England’s aristocracy. One reason for this is because unlike England, where Fuller passively reflected on the vertical structure of England’s high and low classes, in France she shifts the narrative from a vertical structure of lords and ladies to a horizontal view of France’s many talented artists, orators and poets. In the twelfth dispatch, Fuller writes as if she is standing in the middle of an art museum and even offers a brief history lesson:

In the library one sees the picture of Napoleon crossing the Alps, opposite to that of the present King of the French. Just as they are they should serve as frontispieces to two chapters of history.—In the first, the seed was sown in a field of blood indeed, but the

seed of all that is vital in the present period. By Napoleon the career was really laid open to talent, and all that is really great in France now consists in the possibility that talent finds of struggling to the light.²⁷⁷

Readers can imagine Fuller standing between these two paintings, with arms a-stretched, summarizing the tumultuous shifts in political power and ideology in France's history of war, ultimately giving birth to the July Monarchy, in 1830.²⁷⁸ At the time, France was under the rule of Louis-Philippe (1773-1850), the "citizen king,"—who came to power after Napoleon—who was vastly unpopular among the middle class anxiously waiting for societal and political reform.²⁷⁹ Reaching back to the age of Napoleon, then, Fuller shifts her persona from a casual observer looking for treasures in the Old World to bring back to America, to an active explorer in search of signs of revolutionary spirit amidst a state in transition. Unfortunately, such a spirit was nowhere to be seen. Like an empty shell, all that was left was the "shallow and glossy" culture of the French crowd—a people desperate to, as Fuller puts it, "escape from a false position with all its baptism of blood."²⁸⁰

After the fall of the Jacobin Republic just prior to the turn of the nineteenth century, France's revolutionary army quickly became an economy that transformed soldiers-with-a-duty into professionals-with-a-career. And like many other professions, the opportunity to pursue war as a career was only possible in the aftermath of the French Revolution. Those who were successful had a vested interest in the army's internal stability. The army, too, depended upon talented men, who had come of age during the French Revolution, and who wanted to pursue a career in the military. The most successful of these career-minded Frenchmen was none other than Napoleon Bonaparte. Born in 1796, Napoleon made his way through the military ranks by starting in the artillery, one of the few branches of the royal army in which, according to

Hobsbawn, “technical competence was indispensable, ambitious, discontented and revolutionary.”²⁸¹ During the Italian campaign of 1796 Napoleon’s recognition increased, but it wasn’t until the foreign invasion of 1799 that his reputation and charisma thrust him into one of the most rapid ascensions to power human history has ever witnessed: General by the start of Year II; from general he became First Consul; then the Consul for life; then Emperor.²⁸² Under Napoleon’s rule, France developed its first Civil Code, a concordat with the Church, and even a National Bank.²⁸³ To put it plainly, Napoleon proved himself the single most effective ruler France had ever seen. And as France and England’s twin revolutions opened up the possibility of personal ambition, the mere mention of his name became a metonymy for ambition.²⁸⁴

Napoleon was without a doubt France’s most successful ruler, but even more powerful than his success was the ideology of his legacy.²⁸⁵ Unlike in England, where industrial progress left most Englishmen (i.e. the working class) worse off than at the turn of the century, under Napoleonic rule the lives of most Frenchmen significantly improved. With this improvement came the birth of the Napoleonic myth. Bonapartism grew by feeding on the remnants of the French Revolution’s radical Jacobins.²⁸⁶ After the fall of the Jacobin Republic, Bonapartism replaced bourgeois liberalism as France’s dominant national identity, replacing the bourgeois dream of equality, liberty and fraternity with the Napoleonic values of individual talent, liberty, and the freedom to pursue individual ambition. According to Hobsbawn, “Every young intellectual who devoured books, as the young Bonaparte had done, wrote bad poems and novels, and adored Rousseau could henceforth see the sky as his limit.”²⁸⁷ He embodied both the civilized and rationalist man of the eighteenth century, as well as the romantic man of the nineteenth century. But the persona that best characterizes the Napoleonic myth was that of the “man of the Revolution,” who brought stability to France in a time of political and economic

uncertainty.²⁸⁸ “Such is the method of genius,” Fuller deduces, “to ripen fruit for the crowd by those rays of whose heat they complain.”²⁸⁹

Although the July Monarchy had been in power for over a decade while Fuller was in France, the French were a people deeply engrained with the Napoleonic fire of pursuing *talent* as a *career*. Just as Fuller had stood between the portraits of Napoleon and Louis-Philippe, France too was in a state of transition. The radical ideology of Jacobinism and the ambition of Bonapartism made for a wily national character, but the nature of France’s bourgeoisie monarchy bred discontent and a desire for radical reform. Above all else, France was a literary culture, and thus its people were above all else animated by the fires of its greatest writers and speakers. The writings of Rousseau, for instance, were an important precursor to the Romantic Movement because of his focus on sentiment and the celebration of man in his natural state.²⁹⁰ While visiting the Library of Deputies, for instance, Fuller describes having seen first-hand the manuscripts of Rousseau: “At their touch,” she writes, “I seemed to feel the fire of youth, immortally glowing, more and more expansive, with which his soul has pervaded this century.”²⁹¹ Even though his “blood was mixed with madness, and the course of his actual life made some detours through villainous places,” it was his spirit that she found “intimate with the fundamental truths of human nature, and fraught with prophecy: There is none who has give birth to more life for this age; his gifts are yet untold; they are too present with us.”²⁹² And when the flames of Rousseau’s legacy are stoked by the ambition of Bonapartism animating the souls of Frenchmen across the country, the product was a nation that, according to Fuller, is full of a “truly Greek vivacity,” who want a charismatic leader to captivate them with passion and sentiment, but who have little to no tolerance for uncultivated talent.

Rousseau's legacy of passion and sentiment was most apparent in France's various public speaking events and venues. Of The Chamber of Deputies Fuller writes, "When any one is speaking that commands interest the effect of this vivacity is very pleasing; the murmur of feeling that rushes over the assembly is so quick and electric—light, too, as the ripple on the lake."²⁹³ But whenever a dull speaker took the floor, Fuller describes how quickly the atmosphere shifted:

In the French Chamber, if a man who has nothing to say ascends the tribune, the audience swarm with the noise of a myriad bee-hive; the President rises on his feet, and passes the whole time of the speech in taking the most violent exercise, stretching himself to look imposing, ringing his bell every two minutes, shouting to the Representatives of the Nation to be decorous and attentive in vain.²⁹⁴

Clearly, the French hate to be bored. And when a speaker did not meet the expectations of a French audience, they must fight against them simply to be seen and heard. "Certainly a man of any other nation would have died of embarrassment," Fuller describes, but instead the French speaker can be seen "screaming out his sentences, stretching out both arms with an air of injured dignity, panting, growing red in the face." Fuller goes on to describe how one speaker in such a situation sneakily pretended to calm his audience, but once calmed, quickly "seized the occasion, and shouted out a sentence; but it was the only one he was able to make heard. They were not to be trapped so a second time."²⁹⁵ Though such conduct was "not very dignified," Fuller expresses her wish that American politicians might learn from these passionate Frenchmen: "I should like a corps of the same kind of sharp-shooters in our legislative assemblies," she states, "when honorable gentlemen are addressing their constituents, and not the assembly, repeating in lengthy, windy, clumsy paragraphs what has been the truism of the newspaper press for months

previous.”²⁹⁶ In France, Fuller exclaims, “their tribune is that of literature, and one needs not to beg tickets to mingle with the audience.”²⁹⁷

Surprisingly, what Fuller praised most in the French speakers had little to do with their actual capabilities as a speaker, and everything to do with the beauty of the French language itself. At the *Athénée* in Paris Fuller heard several excellent speakers “with admirable readiness, skill and rhetorical polish,” displaying their management of the French language. “French is the best of languages for such a purpose,” she surmises—“clear, flexible, full of sparkling points and quick, picturesque turns, with a subtle blandness that makes the dart tickle while it wounds.”²⁹⁸ But unfortunately, that’s all it was, a momentary tickle of the spirit. Under the command of a talented speaker, however, Fuller found the French language pleasing to the ear, as if being carried smoothly along across swift waters. But these French waters were still quite shallow; they lacked the depth of a genuine cause. Thus, the same malady she saw in France’s artists was also present in its speakers, namely, an inability to understand the deeper machinery of the soul, which was animated not by elaborate expressiveness or pleasing turns of phrase, but by a symbol concealed within a genuine soulful expression.

Fuller listened to many talented speakers while in France, and in doing so had visions of what might be done in America if its citizens had the same benefits of literary culture. She writes of how adults in Paris had made “surprising progress” in reading, writing, and drawing: “I saw with the highest pleasure, excellent copies of good models made by hard-handed porters and errand-boys with their brass badges on their breasts. The benefits of such an accomplishment are, in my eyes, of the highest value, giving them, by insensible degrees, their part in the glories of art and science, in the tranquil refinements of home.”²⁹⁹ But sadly, Fuller goes on to say that “the literary dynasty of France is growing old, and here, as in England and Germany, there seems

likely to occur a serious gap before the inauguration of another, if indeed another is coming.”³⁰⁰ Indeed, Fuller reminds her audience that time is of the essence, and her Romantic quest of gathering treasures from the Old World to usher in a new age seemed to her just over the horizon.

Before leaving France, Fuller offers two non-French examples of what she thought was a genuine expression of spirit. The first was a speaker, the second a teacher. At the Athenée, Fuller writes, “Then came from the crowd a gentleman, not one of the appointed orators of the evening, but who had really something in his heart to say”—

a grave, dark man, with Spanish eyes, and the simple dignity of honor and earnestness in all his gesture and manner. He said in few and unadorned words his say, and the sense of a real presence filled the room and those charms of rhetoric faded, as vanish the beauties of soap-bubbles from the eyes of astonished childhood.³⁰¹

In contrast to the flashy style of the typical French speaker, this man spoke with a gravity that needed no introduction. Having encountered someone “who had really something in his heart to say,” Fuller distinguished this type of genuine speech from the shallow rhetoric she had heard from so many slippery French tongues. Whereas the speaker possesses the power of impressing upon an audience their genuine will, the teacher she described showed an altogether different capacity, namely, a genuine love or care to bring out the best in those whom society had deemed useless.

The second example of genuine spirit Fuller encountered at the end of her stay in France was in a visit to a “School for Idiots,” near Paris. “Idiots,” Fuller writes, “so called long time by the impatience of the crowd,” were actually not idiots at all, but children who were “so below the average standard, so partially organized that it is difficult for them to learn or to sustain

themselves.”³⁰² The term “idiot” is actually a contextual reference to the late eighteenth-and early nineteenth-century fascination with the “idiot child” who, according to Alan Bewell, was “a privileged object of observation and commentary in the heated arguments of philosophers and theologians concerning the origins and conditions of language and memory and their role in defining man.”³⁰³ But what Fuller found most fascinating was the teacher: “A good angel these of Paris have in their master,” she writes happily,

He is a man of seven or eight-and-twenty, who formerly came there only to give lessons in writing, but became so interested in his charge that he came at last to live among them and to serve them. They sing the hymns he writes for them, and as I saw his fine countenance looking in love on those distorted and opaque vases of humanity, where he had succeeded in waking up a faint flame, I thought his heart could never fail to be well-warmed and buoyant.³⁰⁴

Here again, Fuller references the power of a simple, but genuine expression. But unlike the Spanish-eyed speaker, whose power was in his purpose, this teacher was able to not only stir the soul by calling out its dormant potential, which society had deemed inept. The most interesting case, Fuller writes, was in reading the metaphysician’s report of a thirteen year old boy who was deemed “in a state of brutality,” who lacked a “ray of decency or reason,” and who was “entirely beneath the animals in the exercise of the senses.” But after spending two and a half years with the teacher, had found a particular skill in mathematics. “He delights in the figures,” Fuller writes, “can draw and name them all, detects them by the touch when blindfolded.” While she admits that “each mental gesture of the kind he still follows up with an imbecile chuckle,” Fuller declares his spirit raised from a “sensual state” to a level that could “discriminate and name colors and perfumes which before were all alike to him.”³⁰⁵ Fuller goes on to give other

examples of success in this School for Idiots, but only to reinforce the idea that genuine speech must not only have a genuine purpose to arouse an audience, but must also have a genuine love for the audience, so as to call out their dormant power. “Sad as are many features of the time,” Fuller writes in leaving France for Italy, but “much light has been let in at the windows of the world, and many dark nooks have been touched by a consoling ray.” She had, at the very least, found some satisfaction in knowing “that if something true can be revealed—if something wise and kind shall be perseveringly tried, it stands a chance of nearer success than ever before.”³⁰⁶

CHAPTER VI

ITALY: THE RISE OF REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALISM

“Italy is beautiful, worthy to be loved and embraced, not talked about...The great features of the past pursue and fill the eye.”—Margaret Fuller

On 25 February 1847, Margaret Fuller left France for Italy, continuing her quest to discover the means of America’s cultural revival. “Italy is beautiful,” she exclaims, “worthy to be loved and embraced, not talked about.”³⁰⁷ Unlike in France and England, Italy’s culture and politics differed based on region. As Fuller travelled along the coast by steamboat, she spent the early months of her visit recounting for American readers her observations as a traveller in a new Romantic land. “At Genoa and Leghorn,” she writes in the thirteenth dispatch, “I saw for the first time Italians in their homes. Very attractive I found them, charming women, refined men, eloquent and courteous. If the cold wind hid Italy, it could not the Italians.”³⁰⁸ And as Fuller encountered different regions she began piecing together the unique groups of Italian faces all across the countryside, each of which had its own character, dignity, and, in her own words, “what is so rare in an American face, the capacity for pure, exalting passion.”

Adopting the persona of an American travelling abroad, Fuller laments how the average traveler fails to see Italy’s true character. “The excessive beauty of Genoa is well known,” she writes, “and the impression upon the eye alone was correspondent with what I expected, but alas!” she cries, “the marble palaces, the gardens, the magnificent water-view of Genoa failed to charm, ‘I *saw, not felt*, how beautiful they were.’”³⁰⁹ At this moment, I imagine Fuller experiencing a similar feeling to when she encountered Niagara Falls for the first time—a sense

that Nature was still further, behind the world of appearances, concealed *within* the picturesque. Thus, Fuller declares,

The traveler passing along the beaten track, vetturinoed from inn to inn, ciceroned from gallery to gallery, thrown, through indolence, want of tact, or ignorance of the language, too much into the society of his compatriots, sees the least possible of the country; fortunately, it is impossible to avoid seeing a great deal. The great features of the past pursue and fill the eye.³¹⁰

For Fuller, getting to know Italy was not so much rooted in the beauty of its landscape and architecture as it was in the spirit of its people and its Past. “Who can ever be alone for a moment in Italy?” she asks rhetorically. “Every stone has a voice, every grain of dust seems instinct with spirit from the Past, every step recalls some line, some legend of long neglected lore.”³¹¹ In northern Italy, Fuller visited Venice, which she declared to be “a fit asylum for the dynasties of the Past.” “Certainly,” she tells readers, “I have learned more than ever in any previous ten days of my existence, and have formed an idea what is needed for the study of Art and its history in these regions.”³¹²

Although Fuller appreciated seeing the great features of the Past, she did not *feel* the same spirit from these vestiges as existed in the Italian people themselves. “Of the fragments of the great time,” she writes in the fourteenth dispatch, “I have now seen nearly all that are treasured up here; I have, however, as yet nothing of consequence to say of them.”³¹³ But the great features of the past were only vestiges of the Italian spirit. And for that matter, Fuller informs readers that there are many others whom have described in great detail how the great works of the Past *look*; but as to what they *are*, she writes, “it can only be known by approximating to the state of the soul out of which they grew. They should not be described, but

reproduced.”³¹⁴ Italy’s true spirit, then, was something that, for Fuller, must be *seen* and located in the passions and sentiments of the Italian people. In particular, Fuller praises those Italian cities that celebrated the accomplishments of women. For instance, Fuller deduces that “a woman should love Bologna, for there has the spark of intellect in Woman been cherished with reverent care.”³¹⁵ She writes happily of how the University “proudly” displays monuments to their Greek professors; she describes the busts of accomplished women and the prominently displayed works of female artists, and delights in the fact that their work was given such a conspicuous place. “In other cities,” Fuller says, “the men alone have their *Casino dei Nobilii*, where they give *balls converzazioni* and similar entertainment. Here women have one, and are the soul of society.”³¹⁶

All throughout Italy Fuller searched for remnants of its diverse national character. With each new place she describes, Fuller slowly reveals to her American readers the soul of the Italian people. Out of all the places Fuller visited in Italy in the first several months, Naples was the city that in her opinion best captured the Italy spirit. “Here at Naples I *have* found at last *my* Italy,” she writes in the thirteenth dispatch.³¹⁷ She describes passing through grottos and the “sweet exhilaration” of ascending “enchanted” mountains, whose morning rays “the boots of English dandies cannot trample out, nor the raptures of sentimental tourists daub or fade.”³¹⁸ But in truth, Naples in the 19th century was anything but picturesque. Historian Harry Header describes Naples as “a grotesque parasite,” whose royal inhabitants and priests “lived on the back of a desperately overworked, desperately poor, peasantry, who were given no civic rights.”³¹⁹ And yet, this priest ridden and misgoverned city, “full of dirty, degraded men and women” was to Fuller “most lovely.” Not because its lower classes were better off than in England or France, but because in Italy, the people seemed to possess the “divine aspect of

nature,” which, she tells readers, “*can* make you forget the situation of Man this region, which was sure intended for him as a princely child, angelic in virtue, genius and beauty, and not as a begging, vermin-haunted, image-kissing Lazzarone.”³²⁰ In these dispatches from Italy, then, Fuller invokes her German Romantic Credo of locating traces of the “All” in Italy’s various “forms” of democratic national spirit. But instead of questing *into* an untapped land to discover a hidden national character, Fuller turns *outward* and looks at Italy with a wider vision aimed at bringing together the various characters of Italians and forming one genuine Italian spirit.

Fuller’s uses her unique outsider consciousness in order to appeal to the travelling mind of her American readers. She tells them that it is “quite out of the question to know Italy”; to have any idea of her spirit, one must travel to, as she describes, those “districts untouched by the scorch and dust of foreign invasion.”³²¹ Although Italy had been under the control of both France and Austria in the years leading up to 1848, Fuller narrows her focus to a particular kind of invasion—“the invasion of the diletanti,” more specifically, those travelling French and Englishmen who, “as a tribe,” Fuller writes, “seem the most unseeing of all possible animals.”³²² In Florence, for instance, Fuller expresses her disdain. “Florence I do not like as I do cities more purely Italian,” she writes, “The natural character is ironed out here, and done up in a French pattern; yet there is no French vivacity, nor Italian either.”³²³ Moreover, the Grand Duke was becoming, according to Fuller, “more and more agitated by the position in which he finds himself between the influence of the Pope and that of Austria.” And though he “keeps imploring and commanding his people to keep still,” all throughout Tuscany, Fuller writes, “there is, in a large circle, mental preparation for a very different state of things from the present, with an ardent desire to diffuse the same amid the people at large.”³²⁴ Thus, while Austria externally

pressured Italy's rulers, the masses of men and women within Italy turned their gaze collectively upward, toward the symbolic figure-head of the Papacy.

When Fuller visited Rome for the first time she wrote extensively about the ceremonies of the Church, particularly, those in which "the present Pontiff," Pope Pius IX, was involved. On the character of the Pope, she says: "He is a man of noble and good aspect, who, it is easy to see, has set his heart upon doing something solid for the benefit of Man."³²⁵ But given the fact that Italy was under Hapsburg rule at the time, Fuller concludes that he is too timid to lead Rome through the tumultuous years ahead. "The Italians do not feel it," she goes on, "but deliver themselves, with all the vivacity of their temperament, to perpetual hurra, vivas, rockets, and torch-light processions."³²⁶ All across the peninsula, Italians were placing their hopes in Pius IX, thinking that he might liberate them from the clutches of Austrian rule and foreign invasion. Even in the tranquil hills of Perugia, Fuller found churches where "on every wall was read *Viva Pio IX*, and we found the guides and workmen in the shop full of a vague hope from him."³²⁷ And yet, while most of Italy looked with promising eyes toward the Pope, Fuller did not have nearly the level of faith in Pius IX as did the Italians. "But pensively too, must one feel how hampered and inadequate are the means at his command to accomplish these ends," Fuller writes in the fourteenth dispatch. "I often think how grave and sad must the Pope feel, as he sits alone and hears all this noise of expectation."³²⁸

Fuller describes a scene of people advocating for a representative council at the Quirinal in Rome in order to explain to American readers the tension between the people's love for their Pope and the Papacy's ability to institute measures of reform. "A week or two ago the Cardinal Secretary published a circular inviting the departments to measures which would give the people a sort of representative council," Fuller writes in the fourteenth dispatch amidst describing the

ceremonies of the Church. “Nothing could seem more limited than this improvement but it was a great measure for Rome,”

At night the Corso, in which we live, was illuminated, and many thousands passed through it in a torch-bearing procession. I saw them first assembled in the Piazza del Popolo, forming around its fountain a great circle of fire.—Then, as a river of fire, they streamed slowly through the Corso, in their way to the Quirinal to thank the Pope, upbearing a banner on which the edict was printed. The stream of fire advanced slowly with a perpetual surge-like sound of voices; the torches flashed on the animated Italian faces. I have never seen anything finer.³²⁹

Seen from afar, Fuller praises the Italians for the spirit with which they ascend the Quirinal for a cause that, by her own standards, seemed quite limited. “Ascending the Quirinal they made it a mount of light,” she continues, “Bengal fires were thrown up, which cast their red and white light on the noble Greek figures of men and horses that reign over it.” Then, as the Pope appeared on his balcony, “the crowd shouted three vivas; he extended his arms: the crowd fell on their knees and received his benediction; he retired, and the torches were extinguished, and the multitude dispersed in an instant.”³³⁰ Italy’s ascending spirit was for Fuller an Orphic realization of the new age of Eurydice, as she originally described in *Women in the Nineteenth Century*, but now on a national level—not simply Italians seeking a savior, but all of Italy’s diverse personalities coming together to form one ascending spirit. She applies her Romantic Credo, but this time in reverse order—not to distinguish the various forms of Italian character, but to unite them through their love of the Pope.

It was not the Pope, however, whom Fuller believed would save Italy. For her, it was the burgeoning spirit of the people themselves that gave Italy hope. Indeed, the Pope appeared to be

the hope of Italy in the eyes of all Romans. But their “ascending” spirit was not a sign that Pius IX would have any profound political impact; especially considering the fact that it was the Austrian Empire that had administrative control over Italy in the mid 1840s, not the Papacy. The dispatches make it clear that the national character of the Italian people was valuable because it had the potential to be a genuine model of democratic national spirit, which Fuller could then import to American readers. In her dispatches, she praises Italian patriotism as a force of genius within a context of foreign invasion. “Our age has still its demonstrations to make, its heroes and poets to crown,” she writes.³³¹ If only the Italian people had the means to liberate themselves from the oppression of foreign rule, then as a whole, Italy might realize a new democratic order. “Where a whole country is so kept down,” Fuller writes in the sixteenth dispatch,

her best minds cannot take the lead in the progress of the age; they have too much to suffer, too much to explain. But among the few who, through depth of spiritual experience and the beauty of form in which it is expressed, belong not only to Italy, but to the world.³³²

And yet, foreign rule was more of a condition for Italy than a problem, as its people had been under perpetual occupation since the turn of the century. In this next section, I will provide some historical context for Italy’s geographical and political development in the nineteenth century starting with the French Revolution, extending through the Napoleonic era, and arriving in the 1840s, when Fuller first stepped entered Italy by way of “the blue and arrowy Rhone.”³³³

“It is vain to hope fruits from a tree out of season, and equally in vain to introduce the best measures into a country not prepared to receive them.”

—Fuller, quoting from the *Contemporaneo*

In the years immediately preceding the turn of the nineteenth century, Italy was divided into ten states, each with its own culture and politics.³³⁴ In order for the different dynasties and social elites to coexist, competition between cities and neighboring countries rose, as each tried to secure influence within the peninsula.³³⁵ Moreover, the influence of each individual state varied in importance and expanse; each different dynasty possessed their own legal codes, economic structures, administrative institutions, currencies, and spoken dialects. For instance, over the second half of the eighteenth century the political and economic gap widened between states like Lombardy and Tuscany because of the growing ideological divide between the reactionary ethos of Italian governments juxtaposed with the radical pathos of the Italian people. According to Jonathan Davis, it was precisely because “enlightened absolutists” launched “broad reform policies” that all such reform programmes in states like the Kingdom of Naples failed.³³⁶ Consequently, interest in, and support for, Italian states drastically increased when the French Revolution broke out.

Although many Italians expected political change in the wake of the French Revolution, their governments fiercely opposed all emerging radical ideology. For one, enlightened Italian intellectuals viewed the French Revolution as further evidence of their own country’s need for radical reform. Not only had the papacy broken relations with France in 1791, but both Piedmont and the Kingdom of Naples had also joined the anti-French coalition.³³⁷ On a larger scale, radical revolutionary ideology found support in the Italian countryside, especially in areas where agricultural commercialization had increased poverty. And in many Italian cities, political

dissenters (i.e. members of the middle classes) established secret societies that endorsed radical French ideas and conspired to overthrow their own governments. In Turin, for example, a group of revolutionaries planned to proclaim a republic, while in Palermo, another group planned an uprising, and in Bologna, people plotted to free their city from the papacy.³³⁸ And the strained relationship between Italian governments and their people was further bifurcated by the feelings of many liberal progressive newspapers and organizations. “I cannot well wind up my gossip on this subject better than by translating the programme of the [*Contemporaneo*],” Fuller writes in the fourteenth dispatch, “which represents the hope of Rome at this moment, and which is offered you in exchange for *The Tribune*”:³³⁹

The *Contemporaneo* (Contemporary) is a journal of progress, but tempered, as the good and wise think best, in conformity with the will of our best of Princes, and the wants and expectations of the public...These are men by nature formed for good, who ought not to be opposed and repressed, but rather enrolled in the ranks of social progress, taught to temper that heat by prudence, and work by reason rather than impulse. To those who constitute the greater part of our youth the *Contemporaneo* especially addresses its affection and its thoughts; as, being the journal of progress, it must hope to be the Journal of the young.³⁴⁰

Fuller must have felt a similar identification with the *Contemporaneo* as she had with Young America back in New York, and the growing heat amongst Italy’s body politic was merely a politically-charged version of New York’s Wars of the Literati. As Fuller had always sided with the “young” in America, she once again aligned herself with the youth in Italy—the more progressive and radically minded individuals.

Although Horace Greeley chose to omit most of Fuller's translation of the *Contemporaneo's* programme in the *New York Tribune*, Fuller thought that this piece of Italian propaganda was relevant to her American audience. In Larry J. Reynolds and Susan Belasco Smith's edited version of the Dispatches, one can see the full translation, in which is articulated a genuine disapproval for Italy's political leaders: "These are men rooted in old habits, absolutely hostile to every innovation. These see disorder and anarchy in the most innocent attempts at progress...what wonder if they are likewise hostile to steam-engines, railways, banks, Scientific Congresses, and other means taken by modern civilization in aid of commerce, industry and knowledge?"³⁴¹ So powerful was the effect of the French Revolution on Italy that even half a century later the same political divide existed between the reactionary politics of Italian governments and the progressive will of the Italian people. Fuller's translation thus ends with an ominous description of the present state in Italy:

So ancient superstitions have succeeded in the present day the fear of the Demon of Revolution, which, at the annunciation of anything new, trembles lest new Robespierres come to mow off human heads.³⁴²

And it was toward journals such as these that Fuller saw hope for Italy. "Through discussion," the *Contemporaneo* sought to "prepare minds to receive reforms." For "it is vain to hope fruits from a tree out of season, and equally in vain to introduce the best measures into a country not prepared to receive them."³⁴³ But this cry for an emerging radical ideology was not new, but can rather be directly traced to when Napoleon Bonaparte's crossed the Alps in April 1796—an event that would forever change Italy's geographical, political, and ideological direction.

Before the turn of the nineteenth century, France' governing body, the French Directory, was in full support of Napoleon Bonaparte's campaign in Italy, for it was seen as a valuable asset

of future financial profit. Napoleon, then, in exchange for a role in France's armies in Italy, proposed to the Directory his plan to impose heavy taxes on the Italian people while simultaneously permitting French soldiers to live off the land. In doing so, Napoleon planned to transform Italy into the main front in France's war against Austria.³⁴⁴ Napoleon's Revolutionary Triennium (1796-99) was the first stage of French domination in Italy, and brought with it great change and lively debate. According to Davis, "Republican governments replaced the old regimes and experimented with democratic systems, while Italian 'Jacobins', calling themselves 'patriots', advocated national independence and social reforms."³⁴⁵ These self-proclaimed "patriots" believed an independent and united Italy was the true first step toward creating a modern democratic state. But when it came to how much reform was needed, they were divided. On the one hand, moderates emphasized legal equality, the right of private property, and supported opening public positions to merit, free commerce, and freedom of religion. On the other hand, radicals believed that free public education designed to teach new revolutionary principles in popular classes would generate enthusiasm for Italy's new republic, thus strengthening its movement toward a democratic society.³⁴⁶ Whether moderate or radical, however, both sides disagreed on the objectives of Napoleon and the Directory. Whereas Napoleon aimed to consolidate his dominion over the peninsula by exploiting resources and use it as leverage against Austria, the Directory simply wanted to maintain its hold over the region for financial support.³⁴⁷ Consequently, any attempt at implementing national or social programs in Italy at the time was instantly suppressed by the concerted effort of Napoleon and the Directory.

In Italy, resistance to troops started almost immediately after France invaded Italy in 1796. Starting with the Charles Emmanuel IV's forced abdication in December 1798, which

ended French occupation in the Kingdom of Sardinia, it was only a matter of time other French republics fell apart as well.³⁴⁸ Austria, who had been waiting for France's grip on Italy to weaken, seized the opportunity and established a new government in Milan, which in turn provoked a series of popular uprisings across northern and central Italy. But nowhere was the scale of violence greater than in the South. Across Tuscany people chanted "Viva Maria" as they destroyed symbols of the French republic; in Piedmont many of the peasants actually joined the Austrian army to help with their occupation!³⁴⁹ But as conditions worsened in southern Italy over the next six months, Napoleon again secured his hold by initiating his second, much longer, rule over Italy.³⁵⁰

Between the years 1800-1814, Napoleon reshaped the Italian peninsula—changing its borders, deposing rulers, annexing territories, and establishing new states. His two greatest accomplishments during this period were, according to historian Jonathan Davis, "the unification in a single central state of regions that were previously part of five different states, and the formation of uniform and increasingly effective legal and administrative structures."³⁵¹ Napoleon consolidated Italy into three parts: the northern Italian republic, later transformed into the Kingdom of Italy; the Kingdom of Naples; and areas annexed to imperial France, of which Tuscany, Piedmont, Rome, and many others were a part.³⁵² In consolidating Italy, Napoleon strengthened the state's machinery by laying the foundation for a powerful centralized government, introducing a national army, a central bureaucracy, unified legal and fiscal systems, a national market, and state control over the Church.³⁵³ After becoming emperor in March 1805, Napoleon transformed the entire Kingdom of Italy into a Napoleonic satellite state, which served to maintain French troops in its territory, provide soldiers to aid the French army, and enforce the Continental blockade against Austria.³⁵⁴ By 1810, Napoleon had all but dominated the entire

peninsula, with only Sicily and Sardinia remaining under the old monarchs.³⁵⁵ And for the next several decades, the Napoleonic central state known as “Code Napoleon” became the new political model for all rulers of unified Italy, as well as the basis of its legal system.³⁵⁶

For the first time in centuries, Italy was under the rule of a single administrative organization. Code Napoleon was a system of conscription and uniform tax that not only accelerated the modernization of society in Italy, but also set the political, institutional, and ideological foundations for a new era of unification and independence. Despite its uniformity of law, however, Italy still remained territorially and politically divided, with major differences in its northern and southern regions. According to Dennis Mack Smith, “Not only did the French bring something positive to Italy, but the high taxes which they imposed, and which Napoleon’s wars made necessary, in time generated a strong opposition which took its place in the development of national consciousness.”³⁵⁷ And when high numbers of Italian casualties and mounting financial pressures put a strain on the relations between Napoleon and the Pope (Pius VII), an all out power struggle began. The first strike came in May 1809, when Napoleon annexed all of the Papal States to the French Empire.³⁵⁸ Pius VII, in turn, responded by excommunicating Napoleon, who then exiled the Pope to Savona the following month.³⁵⁹ By February 1810, Rome had been officially incorporated into the French Empire, leaving many Italians angry and ready to mobilize against Napoleon due to their newly heightened sense of national identity.³⁶⁰ This led to the formation of many secret societies in Italy, such as the *carbonari* (charcoal burners) who were made up of, in part, army officers, soldiers, and the small provincial bourgeoisie who advocated for independence and a new liberal constitution.³⁶¹

Fuller characterizes the Italian people, although passionate for independence, as ignorant of the larger political workings of foreign nations, in particular Austria. When anti-French

sentiment culminated on April 20th, 1814 with the lynching of Count Guiseppe Prina—the minister of finance appointed by Napoleon—in Milan, the resulting riots directly lead to the fall of Napoleonic Italy.³⁶² Shortly thereafter, Austrian forces entered Milan, recaptured Lombardy, returned Pius VII to Rome, and restored the old dynasties in central Italy. After the defeat of Napoleon in 1914, Austria gained complete control over Italy. Not only were the old dynasties powerless against Austria, many felt as though they might lose their thrones without the support of the Habsburg Empire.³⁶³ With the tables now turned, Italy became Austria’s bastion against the French, and, unlike Napoleon, Austria would not impose an overtly expansionist policy. Instead, according to Davis, they simply secured “a strong precedent for Habsburg rule” in Italy; particularly, in Venetia and Lombardy, which were incorporated into the Austrian empire as a single kingdom.³⁶⁴ The rest of the peninsula—along with the islands of Sardinia and Sicily, both of which had escaped French conquest—maintained their own political power structures, with no direct link to Austria.³⁶⁵ Thus began Italy’s age of Restoration under the rule of the Habsburg Empire, which stretched from 1815 up until 1848.

After reinstating the Papal States into the Kingdom of Italy, the Hapsburg Empire had virtually complete control over Italy. Some benefits of Austria’s rule were, for one the relative wealth of Vienna-Lombardy, which was far less burdensome than under the French government; censorship was also less oppressive than in most Italian states; the judicial system was remarkably even-handed, according to Davis; and even Austria’s bureaucratic structures, although notoriously slow, were neither corrupt nor unsympathetic to the conditions of the local Italian populations.³⁶⁶ Austria’s modesty in expansionism, however, did not take away from its military assertiveness, for immediately following Napoleon’s defeat, Austria signed a defensive treaty with the Two Sicilies in Italy, placing all of the Neapolitan army under de facto Austrian

control.³⁶⁷ And after 1815, all of Italy's rulers were faced with the question of what to do with Napoleon's system of administrative monarchy. While Austria provided the freedom to choose their own method of governance, the Napoleonic system was still regarded as an impressively efficient system with the potential to construct a stable absolutist system by many Italian rulers.³⁶⁸ Consequently, all the Restoration regimes opted to keep the Napoleonic system largely intact. But that was all they kept, for despite economic stability under Napoleonic fiscal structures, Bonapartism and Italian nationalism had bred distinct characters among the states, which thus meant different outlooks on foreign policy.

The reactionary politics of Italy's Restoration regimes were largely susceptible to discontent and uprisings amongst the Italian citizenry. According to Dennis Mack Smith, "No one region could aspire to a pre-eminent political position without the others reacting vehemently and almost automatically against it."³⁶⁹ At the most reactionary end of the spectrum stood Francesco IV (1815-46) and Victor Emmanuel I (1802-21) of Modena and Sardinia-Piedmont, respectively. According to Davis, "Francesco IV was fiercely opposed to reform or innovation of any kind, and worked to return Modena to the pre-revolutionary era," and Victor Emmanuel shared his "obsessive desire to turn back the clock to the *ancien regime*."³⁷⁰ Although these uprisings were short-lived, composed mostly of discontent army officers and secret societies with both democratic and moderate ambitions, they did show the risks involved with adopting a foreign policy that's natural effect was to produce uncompromising reaction in large parts of the population.³⁷¹ On the other end of the political spectrum were the Papal States, which were significantly more successful at pacifying discontent in the early years of the Restoration precisely because Pius VII had the support and sympathy of many Italians after his exile. Moreover, his role as "spiritual overlord of Christianity" made the Papal States—stretching

across the peninsula from the Adriatic to the Tyrrhenian Sea—more than “merely Italian,” as Mack Smith puts it.³⁷² This would all change, however, when Pius VII’s successor, Leo XII (1823-29), came to power.

As Pope, Leo XII used the power of the Papacy to reform Italian policies so as to eliminate any and all friction from Austrian rule. He began by dismantling bureaucratic policies, reintroducing feudal rights, and imposing “vexatious regulations,” which, according to Davis, were justified as being “designed to safeguard the moral welfare of his subjects.”³⁷³ Leo XII’s staunch conservatism complimented Austrian rule, and thus he had ample reason to suppress any and all uprisings of Italian patriotism, particularly, from Naples, Florence, Milan, or Venice. From within, however, the Carbonari (Italy’s preeminent secret society) were penetrating the Papal States. Although not active in Rome, they were swelling in pockets such as the Marches, which were a part of the Papal States and were closest in spirit and character to the Kingdom of Naples.³⁷⁴ The growth and proliferation of secret societies in opposition to the Restoration was, according to Mack Smith, an “insuperable obstacle to any political union of north and south Italy.”³⁷⁵ Their strategy was to equate the Pope’s temporal power to religious dogma. In effect, the Carbonari not only cast a doubtful shadow on both Leo XII as an individual and the papacy as a whole, but they also disrupted administration in both north and south Italy, as well as aroused popular disdain among the Italian masses. The final blow came when famine hit Italy in the late 1820s, which caused mass panic, triggered an economic crisis and reduced a great number of people to either begging, or becoming entirely dependent upon the charity of the Church. The resulting riots are remembered as the unfortunate risings of 1820-1821, which, according to Mack Smith, had “deplorable consequences for Italy” in the years leading up to the revolutionary era.³⁷⁶

After Austria suppressed the uprisings in Sardinia-Piedmont and the Two Sicilies, the Italian people and its leaders knew with certainty that the new precedent for Austrian policy when it came to all internal affairs of the Italian states that sought after a confederation united against its rule was armed intervention. Consequently, many Italian rulers failed to see the urgency for improving the quality of their governance; neither did they feel the need to strengthen their forces in the case of future uprisings. But having seen first hand what happens to rulers who fail to address the suffering of the people, many Italian rulers attempted to allay people's concerns by attempting to appease both the supporters of the present administration system and the reactionaries eager to gain independence.³⁷⁷ This obviously failed, and ironically, it was precisely because they oscillated on matters of political and economic importance that their actions directly contributed to the growth of Italian nationalism. This is crucial for understanding why the *Risorgimento* occurred in 1848. Prior to 1830, the concept of "national political identity" had little to do with being free from foreign countries for a vast majority of Italians. It could have just as easily meant casting off the unwanted control of another Italian city or region, as it did to the Austrians.³⁷⁸ It was not so much that foreign countries were contributing to the rapid growth of Italy's nationalist movement, nor was it the people coming together in national solidarity against Austria—it would take another decade and a half for the majority of Italians to even conceptualize the idea of "Italy."³⁷⁹ No, the single greatest contributing factor to the rise of nationalist sentiment in Italy was, ironically, the reactionary attitude of its own preexisting rulers.³⁸⁰

In the 1830s, national resurgence and the desire for independence had spread like wildfire across Europe as a whole. France was in the middle of its July 1830 revolution. The Greeks had successfully gained their independence from the Ottoman Empire. Polish resistance was in full

force against the tsar of Russia. And Belgian independence from the Netherlands had the effect across of Europe of weakening the Vienna Settlement of 1815.³⁸¹ When it came to Italy, many of its regions were in full endemic revolt—particularly, the Papal States. Secret societies and sects of revolutionary-minded Italians were using the events of other countries to gain momentum for their own revolt against Habsburg armies. Despite being quickly suppressed by Austria, the insurrections of 1830-31 proved that the mighty Habsburg Empire was becoming increasingly vulnerable to acts of Italian resistance. And out of this discontent rose the voice of revolutionaries like Guiseppe Mazzini, whose anger at the suffering of the Italian people completely erased any and all positive progressive policies that Austria had championed in the wake of Napoleon’s rule.³⁸² Moreover, a rapid succession of new rulers in the 1830s worked to increasingly weaken Austria’s grip on Italy. Current Pope Gregory XVI (1831-46), following in the Leo XII’s tradition, enacted new conservative policies that for many Italians “embodied all the worst about the government of Restoration Italy” according to Davis, even amongst supporters.³⁸³ Any control Austria had abruptly ceased with the death of the Austrian Emperor in 1835, Francis I, whose successor and son, Ferdinand I (1835-48), was seen throughout Italy as completely incompetent on matters of international politics.³⁸⁴ Thus going into the 1840s, Italy’s political and ideological landscape was comprised primarily of radical discontent, reactionary policy, and foreign rule.

“Thus we may see that the liberty of Rome does not yet advance with seven-leagued boots, and the new Romulus will need to be prepared for deeds at least as bold as his predecessor, if he is to open a new order of things”—Margaret Fuller

When Margaret Fuller arrived in Italy in 1846, there were already a host of revolutionaries and conspirators coming up with ideological alternatives to counteract Austrian hegemony.³⁸⁵ In Rome, Fuller witnessed a swell of national spirit, which she had been searching for since first arriving in Europe. As a city, Rome was overflowing with revolutionary passion at a unique historical moment when Austria’s grip on Italy was at its weakest. “The Austrian race have no faculties that can ever enable them to understand the Italian character,” Fuller writes in the sixteenth dispatch; “their policy, so well contrived to palsy and repress for a time, cannot kill, and there is always a force at work underneath which shall yet, and I think before long, shake off the incubus.”³⁸⁶ Fuller believed in the middle class. She believed they would rise up, shake off the present system, and “produce a wine that shall set the Lombard veins on fire when the time for action shall arrive.”³⁸⁷ But while Fuller looked hopefully toward northern Italy, she was growing increasingly frustrated with the dull state of its southern regions due to an overall censure of the press, as well as a lack of public assemblies, which stifled the people’s access to “more instructed and aspiring minds.”³⁸⁸ Indeed, such censorship, according to Dennis Mack Smith, left many Italians in the southern parts of the peninsula “blind enough to be duped, weak enough to accept [Austria’s] favors, and so embittered with each other as to throw themselves into its arms.”³⁸⁹ “These States,” Fuller declares at the end of her sixteenth dispatch, “are obliged to hold their breath while their poor, ignorant sovereigns skulk in corners, hoping to hide from the coming storm.”³⁹⁰

There was one great moral influence, however, that united northern and southern Italy, namely, the hope that the coronation of Pope Pius IX would bring with it some progressive political reform.³⁹¹ In her dispatches, Fuller uses patriotic anecdotes in order to illustrate the incompatibility between the average Roman citizen's perception of national independence and the reality of being under Austrian rule. "A great dinner was given at the Baths of Titus," Fuller writes in the fourteenth dispatch, describing a dinner celebration for "the natal day of Rome," "and the Romans greeted it in an intoxication of hope and pleasure."³⁹² During the celebration, "a man of literary note in Italy," Marquis d'Azergio, stood up and publicly denounced the Austrian Emperor. In his speech, he cites the past relationship between Pope Gregory VII (1015-1085) and the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry IV, which Fuller then transcribes in part:

The crown passed to the head of a German monarch; but he wore it not to the benefit but the injury of Christianity—of the world. The Emperor Henry was a tyrant who wearied out the patience of God. God said to Rome, 'I give you the Emperor Henry;' and from these hills that surround us, Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII. Raised his austere and potent voice to say to the Emperor, '*God did not give you Italy that you might destroy her,*' and Italy, Germany, Europe, saw her butcher prostrated at the feet of Gregory in penitence. Italy, Germany, Europe, had then kindled in the heart the first spark of Liberty.³⁹³

But when the narrative of the dinner passed to the Ambassador of Austria, it was immediately suppressed. "And so the paper was seized," Fuller laments, "and the account of the dinner only told from mouth to mouth, from those who had already read it."³⁹⁴ It was further decided that the Pope no longer needed such extravagant dinners in his honor, she tells readers: "Thus we may see that the liberty of Rome does not yet advance with seven-leagued boots, and the new Romulus will need to be prepared for deeds at least as bold as his predecessor, if he is to open a

new order of things.”³⁹⁵ Clearly, the solution for national independence does not come from top down policy, but instead must spring up from the people themselves. And for Fuller, the “people” must be roused by the passion and reason of Italy’s poets, heroes, philosophers, and, most importantly, its revolutionary orators.

The first and arguably most important voice that influenced the people was the Pope, whose series of reforms in the spring of 1847, brought some significant changes to the Papal States. In her seventeenth dispatch, Fuller describes the “childlike joy and trust” that the Italian people had in their Pope: “It was beautiful to see the immediate good influence of human feeling, generous designs, on the part of a ruler,” Fuller writes of Pius IX,

Heart had spoken to heart between the Prince and the People...he had wished to be a father, and the Italians, with that readiness of genius that characterizes them, entered at once into the relation; they, the Roman people, stigmatized by prejudice as so crafty and ferocious, showed themselves children, eager to learn, quick to obey, happy to confide.³⁹⁶

The pastoral power at work between the Pope as “father” and the people as “children” further catalyzed Pius IX’s reforms. After his election in 1846, Davis describes these “liberal” reforms as, “including an amnesty for political prisoners, the relaxation of censorship, public works schemes, and proposals to introduce a new legal code and permit the construction of railways.”³⁹⁷ On the plus side, this meant that Papal subjects were more active in the policy process, even permitting them to attend scientific congresses for the first time. Fuller, however, expressed clear and explicit skepticism toward these seemingly progressive reforms in her dispatches: “Certainly I, for one, do not think that the present road will suffice to lead Italy to her goal,” she writes, sharing the opinion of many radically-minded reformers who also did not see Pius IX as the “patriot pope” many claimed him to be, nor did they think his reforms were meant

to directly destabilize the peninsula. “But it is an onward, upward road,” Fuller concludes, “and the people learn as it advances.”³⁹⁸

Pius IX’s reforms garnered support across all of Italy, but the likelihood was low that they would usher in genuine radical reform in Fuller’s eyes. She instead considered the Pope’s task to be wrought with “insuperable difficulties.”³⁹⁹ Yet despite his moderate attempts at reform, they did play a significant role in, according to Davis, “the politicizing of all levels of Italy’s population in the months before the outbreak of revolution in 1848.”⁴⁰⁰ Fuller describes the excitement of the Italian people in her dispatches, and even writes directly to her long time friend Emerson about the Pope’s role in it:

I don’t know whether you take interest in the present state of things in Italy, but you would if you were here...As to the Pope, it is difficult here as elsewhere to put new wine into old bottles, and there is something false as well as ludicrous in the spectacle of the people first driving their princes to do a little justice, and then *viva-ing* them at such a rate.⁴⁰¹

It was not just the Pope, however, whom Fuller detested, but also the many new “Princes” in Italy, who had come to acquire dominion over Italy’s regions in the recent years. According to Davis, “the succession to the throne of Ferdinand II (1830-59) in the Two Sicilies, and of Charles Albert (1831-49) in Sardinia-Piedmont, dramatically altered the peninsula’s position vis-à-vis Austria.”⁴⁰² For one, Ferdinand II was determined to govern unconstrained by the Habsburgs, and Charles Albert, according to Davis, was “the focus for the patriotic aspirations of many Italian moderates” because of his desire to “free himself from any outside restrictions,” his “independent—even confrontational—foreign policy,” and even his domestic policy, which introduced new law codes in 1837, reduced clerical privileges, and reorganized both the Army

and the pursuit of trade agreements with other Italian and European states.⁴⁰³ But to Fuller, Charles Albert was “a worthless man, in whom nobody puts any trust so far as regards his heart or honor.” Yet, “the stress of things,” she thought, would likely “keep him on the right side,” so long as there was internal pressure from radicals.⁴⁰⁴ And this was precisely the challenge: organizing and maintaining the radicals through the voices of those powerful enough to lead, yet who were neither the Pope nor Italy’s many princes.

Fuller’s opinion on the Pope and Italy’s leaders was largely informed by the bifurcated politics of Italian public opinion. On the subject of the Pope, it was not that Fuller despised his character; on the contrary, she praises his “great heart” and his “love of the people,” for “it was his heart that gave way to such impulse,” she writes, “and this people has shown, to the shame of English and other prejudice, how unspoiled they were at the core, how open, nay, how wondrous swift to answer a generous appeal!”⁴⁰⁵ Ironically, it was precisely his loving character Fuller found inadequate for the difficult task of ushering in a new world order. As she told Emerson, it is difficult to put new wine into old bottles. But at least he had his heart! For on the subject of Italy’s “leaders”—whether dominated by the Hapsburg, or desperately trying to escape from under its thumb—Fuller had expressed but disappointment and distrust. “The little sovereigns blustered at first,” she writes, “then ran away affrighted when they found there was really a spirit risen at last within the charmed circle, a spirit likely to defy, to transcend, the spells of haggard premiers and imbecile monarchs.”⁴⁰⁶ But Italian public opinion was far from united. In the 1840s, three conflicting perspectives dominated Italian politics on the issue of national unification. As a transcendentalist, Fuller most closely aligned with the revolutionary cause of Italy’s radically-minded reformers. Chief among them, Guiseppe Mazzini, whose maxim she popularizes in both her private letters and public dispatches. “It is never easy to put new wine

into old bottles,” she writes at the beginning of the seventeenth dispatch, “and our age is one where all things tend to great crisis, not merely to revolution but to radical reform.”⁴⁰⁷ Fuller elevates “radical reform” above “revolution” in order to distinguish between competing ideologies within Italy, who see revolution as instrumental, and “radical reform” as a distinct end, which not all of Italy’s reform-minded thinkers wanted.

By aligning herself with the radicals in the seventeenth dispatch, Fuller thus transforms her public persona from a Transcendentalist abroad, to an Italian propagandist advocating for Italian unification. “From the people themselves the help must come,” she declares, “and not from princes.” She goes on to state her position, and by extension the position she thought America should take as well, both clearly and explicitly:

In the new state of things there will be none but natural princes, great men. From the aspirations of the general heart, from the teachings of conscience in individuals, and not from an old ivory-covered church, long since undermined, corroded by Time and gnawed by vermin, the help must come. Rome, to resume her glory, must cease to be an ecclesiastical Capital; must renounce all this gorgeous mummery, whose poetry, whose picture charms no one more than myself, but whose meaning is all of the Past and finds no echo in the Future.⁴⁰⁸

In direct opposition to this belief was Italy’s Moderate Party who wanted to establish a constitutional monarchy, yet who valued economic unification over political (i.e. national) unity.⁴⁰⁹ On this group of liberal nobles and members of the bourgeoisie, Fuller has this to say: “The Moderate Party, like all who, in a transition state, manage affairs with a constant eye to prudence, lacks dignity always in its expositions; it is disagreeable and depressing to read them.”⁴¹⁰ The other two factions working toward the unification of Italy were, as previously

mentioned, Giuseppe Mazzini and his followers—who believed in the principle of popular sovereignty and a strong nation,—and the Neo-Guelph movement, led by Vincenzo Gioberti (1801-52), who advocated for a federation of Italian states with the Pope as its leader, and with executive authority placed in the hands of a college of princes.⁴¹¹

Vincenzo Gioberti and Giuseppe Mazzini were on opposing ends of a political spectrum comprised entirely of radical and reform-minded Italians. On the one hand there was Gioberti, a distinguished philosopher and Piedmontese cleric whose views were among the more moderate of radical reformers. According to Reynolds and Belasco, he published *Del primato morale e civile degli Italiani* in 1843, which was an enormously popular book that called for the establishment of an Italian confederation, with the pope as its president, as the first step toward greater unity.⁴¹² According to Davis, Gioberti strongly believed “that a powerful papacy was the key to all human progress.”⁴¹³ And although Fuller sympathized with the love and warmth of the Italian people for the Pope, she ultimately detested such “adulation of leading writers, who were so willing to take all from the hand of the prince, of the Church, as a gift and a bounty instead of implying steadily that it was the right of the people.”⁴¹⁴ Mazzini, on the other hand, Fuller found highly attractive for his life as an agitator and pamphleteer, which gave him a charisma that was enormously popular amongst the people, despite obvious faults in his many facts and theories.⁴¹⁵ But above all else, what attracted Fuller to Mazzini was not his belief in a mass popular revolution to establish a united, democratic Italian republic, but was instead his skillful and rhetorical use of propaganda, which, according to Davis, “won over increasing numbers to the idea of a united Italy, including a growing body of foreign sympathizers.”⁴¹⁶

As the chief propagandist of the national revolution, Mazzini was among the best-known theorists of nationalism in Europe at the time. Although political opponents called his vision

overly simplistic and naively optimistic, the sheer certainty of his single-mindedness gave Mazzini a strong ethos, both as a revolutionary thinker and as a public orator. When Fuller first met Mazzini back in London in February, 1847, while visiting the school for poor Italian boys, she was taken by his charm and charisma. In a letter to Caroline Sturgis, she calls him “by far the most beautiful person I have seen” and “one in whom holiness has purified, but nowhere dwarfed the man.”⁴¹⁷ She also began importing Mazzini’s political vision into her dispatches that same month:

The name Joseph Mazzini is well known to those among us who take an interest in the cause of human freedom, who, not content with the peace and ease bought for themselves by the devotions and sacrifices of their fathers, look with anxious interest on the suffering nations who are preparing for a similar struggle. Those who are not, like the brutes that perish, content with the enjoyment of mere national advantages, indifferent to the idea they represent, cannot forget that the human family is one,
“And beats with one great heart.”⁴¹⁸

And aside from his rhetorical polish and charismatic charm, Mazzini’s involvement with the “Young Italy” movement reminded Fuller of her own involvement with “Young America” back in New York.⁴¹⁹ Later, in the twenty-first dispatch, Fuller transcribes a letter from Mazzini that articulates the views of Young Italy, which she prefaces with: “Should it in any other way have reached the United States yet, it will not be amiss to have it translated for *The Tribune*, as many of your readers may not otherwise have a chance of seeing this noble document, one of the milestones in the march of Thought.”⁴²⁰ According to Mack Smith, Mazzini believed “that if only the various nations of the world could be given the frontiers which God intended for them, this would almost automatically ensure international peace and goodwill.”⁴²¹ In line with both

Fuller's "Credo" in particular and Transcendental philosophy as a whole, Mazzini represented the precise kind of voice that Fuller had been searching for: one who was neither the Pope nor a prince, but who captured the minds of the people through both radical and revolutionary rhetoric.

While Rome was overflowing with Italian patriotism, so too were almost all Italian states in 1846 and 1847.⁴²² By this time, it was now firmly felt across the peninsula that "foreign intrusion" was "*the* curse of Italy," and "that if she could be free from foreign aggression she would find the elements of salvation within herself."⁴²³ Fuller had reason to hope in men like Mazzini because he advocated for a ground-up revolution, one that would serve the interest of the people:

I see more reason for hope, as I know more of the people. Their rash and baffled struggles have taught them prudence; they are wanted in the civilized world as a peculiar influence; their leaders are thinking men, their cause is righteous. I believe that Italy will revive to new life, and probably a greater, a more truly rich and glorious, than at either epoch of her former greatness.⁴²⁴

Italy's righteous cause reminded Fuller of her own country's struggles with slavery, the Mexican War, the debate over the annexation of Texas, the lust for gold, and the abolitionist movement. But unlike America, Fuller found in Italy a people who valued their national inheritance and together sought to overthrow the rule of Austria and establish a state that, as she puts it, "shall be governed as becomes a man by his own conscience and intelligence, where he may speak the truth as it rises in his mind, and indulge his natural emotions in purity"; in short, a democratic Republic of Italy.⁴²⁵

Those dispatches beginning on New Year's Eve 1848 were the final published pieces from Margaret Fuller before her untimely death in 1850. They tell the tale of a transformed

woman, writing with new purpose, more radical and revolutionary than ever. Although scattered, Fuller's thoughts and reflections in them represent her on-the-ground experience in Rome during one of the most extraordinary moments in all of human history. And she took her role as the narrator of this "sequel to Modern Europe" quite seriously. "At this moment there is great excitement in Italy," she writes, prior to announcing her allegiance to the Italian cause:

A supposed spy of Austria has been assassinated at Ferrara, and Austrian troops are marched there... The National Guard is forming. All things seem to announce that some important change is inevitable here, but what? Neither Radicals nor Moderates dare predict with confidence, and I am yet too much a stranger to speak with assurance of impressions I have received.—But it is impossible not to hope.⁴²⁶

Indeed, hope is precisely what characterizes Fuller's voice going into the eighteenth dispatch—the symbolic and chronological "middle" of her dispatches—and it is also the primary feeling she hopes to instill in American readers,

I have found many among the youth of England, of France—of Italy also—full of high desire," she writes at the end of the eighteenth dispatch, "but will they have courage and purity to fight the battle through in the sacred, the immortal band? To these, the heart of my country, a Happy New Year! I do not know what I have written. I have merely yielded to my feelings in thinking of America; but something of true love must be in these lines—receive them kindly, my friends; it is, by itself, some merit for printed word to be sincere.⁴²⁷

Although Fuller may not have known what she was writing, the narrative arc of her remaining dispatches represent, in my opinion, the height of her rhetorical skill, complete with epic, tragedy and comedy, as well as, I argue, the *magnus opus* of her literary career.

CHAPTER VII
TALES FROM THE GREAT DRAMA

Throughout the years 1848-1850 Margaret Fuller reported on the tumultuous events of Italy's *Risorgimento* in her Italian dispatches. As a foreign correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, and America's first female foreign correspondent and Transcendentalist abroad, Fuller compared the Old World culture of Europe to her own country's New World idealism as she traverses Europe's many nations. At first, her goal was to simply be a Transcendental observer and travel writer, as she had done in *Summer on the Lakes*. She describes her modest goal in a "Farewell" article just before she left New York for England: "To observe with my own eyes, life in the old world, and to bring home some packages of seed for life in the new."⁴²⁸ But as revolution broke out across Europe in the coming years, Fuller radically shifted her rhetorical voice into one of national liberation ideology and persuasive advocacy on behalf of Italy's fight for independence. The eighteenth dispatch indicates the explicit shift in her rhetoric: "A great theme never lost sight of," she cries, "a mighty idea, an adorable history to which the hearts of men invariably cling."⁴²⁹ The great theme she speaks of is the history of revolution, which broke out in France; the mighty idea is of course national independence; and the adorable history is Europe's rich literary and cultural past. Together, these pronouncements set the stage for Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism, which she would later refer to as Europe's "great drama."

Not only did Fuller portray Europe as both an adorable history and a mighty idea—after all, she had read its literary greats her entire life—she further believed that Modern Europe was the "sequel" to that history. "Yet are genuine results as rare as grains of gold in the river's sandy bed!" Fuller continues. As Europe's own history had proven, revolutionary sentiment often

suppressed itself through the discordant machinations of its various actors. And in the drama of Modern Europe, its many nations were these tragic and comedic actors:

see this hollow England, with its monstrous wealth and cruel poverty, its conventional life and low, practical aims; see this poor France, so full of talent, so adroit, yet so shallow and glossy still, which could not escape from a false position with all its baptism of blood; see that lost Poland and this Italy bound down by treacherous hands in all the force of genius; see Russia with its brutal Czar and innumerable slaves; see Austria and its royalty that represents nothing, and its people who, as people, are and have nothing! If we consider the amount of truth that has really been spoken out in the world, and the love that has beat in private hearts—how Genius has decked each spring-time with such splendid flowers, conveying each one enough of instruction in its life of harmonious energy, and how continually, unquenchably the spark of faith has striven to burst into flame and light up the Universe—the public failure seems amazing, seems monstrous.⁴³⁰

And to Fuller, the public failure was manifold. She chastises the reactionary response of England to revolutions of 1848. She shows disgust for the French's betrayal of Italy and occupation of Rome during their time of need. She dismisses the Austrians' inability to understand Italy's noble cause, which only reaffirmed in her mind that the Old World was crumbling. And while she does celebrate Italy's noble sentiment, Fuller largely laments their divided hopes, as Italian princes vied amongst each other for independence, but failed to realize that "Mankind is one and beats with one great heart."

But the monstrous public failure does not stop on the shores of Ambleside, it rather extends all the way back the shores of Fuller's own country. Indeed, the greatest public failure, she thought, was America's: "There is this horrible cancer of Slavery, and this wicked War, that

has grown out of it,” she writes in reference to the Mexican War of 1846-1848.⁴³¹ But “how dare I speak of these things here?” she writes scathingly, after having just theorized “a nobler harmony to the coming age,”

I listen to the same arguments against the emancipation of Italy, that are used against the emancipation of our blacks; the same arguments in favor of the spoliation of Poland as for the conquest of Mexico. I find the cause of tyranny and wrong everywhere the same—and lo! my Country the darkest offender, because with the least excuse, foresworn to the high calling with which she was called,—no champion of the rights of men, but a robber and a jailer; the scourge hid behind her banner; her eyes fixed, not on the stars, but on the possessions of other men.⁴³²

America was, at present, absorbed by their “lust of gain,” Fuller wrote in the sixteenth dispatch. “They see only the equipages, the fine clothes, the food—they have no heart for the idea, for the destiny of our own great nation.”⁴³³ How could they *feel* Italy’s struggling spirit? And how could Italy, being Fuller’s central subject, wake up Americans to the need for their own cultural revival? These questions Fuller sought to answer in the remainder of her dispatches. Borrowing Aristotle’s notion of metaphor, Fuller’s emotive language and rich description brought the *energeia* of Italy’s spirit to life. As Aristotle describes in *On Rhetoric*, metaphors are like riddles—they are charged with an alluring mixture of strangeness, beauty and mystery. But a good metaphor is not easy to create. It must make “the lifeless living” by imbuing it with *energeia*, or motion. Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism is thus based upon the idea that by dramatizing the actions of Europe’s heroic figures, villainous traitors, and tragic prophets, she might bring to life Italy’s revolutionary situation before the eyes of her American readers.

And in doing so, expose the similarities between America's revolutionary history and the *Risorgimento*, while contrasting Italy's noble cause with the injustices present in America.

From a rhetorical perspective, the central challenge of Fuller's dispatches is their high-literary use of nineteenth century vocabulary. For one, her anti-Catholicism toward the Pope and propagandist voice in favor of Italian nationalism makes it difficult to gain any historical accuracy about the events taking place in Rome. Moreover, the dispatches' lack of narrative form combined with the elapsed time between each publication distorts to cohesion of her narrative persona. Finally, most of the final dispatches are written from within barricaded Rome, and so Fuller's perspective on the events of the Roman Revolution display a highly focused point of view, which blinds her to larger motives of other European actors, such as those Italian city-states outside of Rome, and the twin forces of the French army, and the Hapsburg Empire. Therefore, to get the full rhetorical impact of her writing, this section puts the work of Kenneth Burke in conversation throughout the remaining dispatches. Its essence is pragmatic: to import a language of modern rhetorical theory as a means of tracking and translating Fuller's dispatches to a modern audience. In particular, this section targets the field of rhetoric and seeks to advance a theoretical argument that will shed new light on the relationship between Burke's dramatic categories within the context of a revolutionary situation.

Out of Kenneth Burke's body of major works, *Permanence and Change* stands as the one with the most clear narrative arc. It presents not just a study of literary form, nor simply a lexicon of rhetorical vocabulary, but an entire theory of social change, which implements the language of rhetorical studies—the rhetorical study of historical events. Essentially, Burke asserts a new language of poetry and action that seeks to destabilize the old order of religion and dogma and replace it with a dramatistic approach to human nature. His goal is to explain how humans

respond to complex rhetorical situations, and in doing so, asserts a distinctly rhetorical method for linking together rhetorical processes in a way that transcends the simple order of historical society. In its simplest form, *Permanence and Change* takes the reader through the human process of stabilization, destabilization, and restabilization. It is equipment for living, and for the rhetorical scholar it offers a range of vocabulary to not simply engage works of the past as objects of study, but as processes of *how* we come to certain realizations within any given situation. Margaret Fuller is, above all, a process thinker. And the complexities present in her dispatches affirm this fact. Furthermore, as a Thinking-Woman, Fuller's rhetorical process had been developing long before she arrived in Europe.

This dissertation has thus far attempted to track Fuller's rhetorical process through its two major ideological paths: Transcendentalism and Nationalism. Each of these paths produced a rhetorical process, as well as a central object to study. In Fuller's early childhood education she developed a love for literary form and content beginning with her father's liberal Jeffersonian teachings. Her education then took a distinctly German-Romantic turn, which yielded her first true *process* of thinking: "I am merely Germanico," she told James Freeman Clarke, "and nothing more."⁴³⁴ German Romanticism has become Fuller's thought process and the Transcendentalists were her object of study. But all that changed as she began to form relationships within their group. Slowly, the Transcendentalists as "object of study" became a new Transcendental process of thinking. Fuller went on to adopt several modes of communication during this time as she began to slowly transform Emerson's notion of *Man-Thinking* into her own construction of *Woman-Thinking*. And thus the rhetorical legacy of Margaret Fuller, the Transcendentalist, was born.

Having adopted a new rhetorical process, Fuller then shifted her gaze to “America” as a new object of study. In her first major published book, *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller embarked on romantic quest to discover the hidden character of America into its “wild” West. Slowly, Fuller synthesized her Romantic metapsychology on the twin powers of “Man” and “Woman” with the tragic symbol of the American Indian in order to theorize a new vision of America, which she saw as divided between two separate worlds. From atop a lighthouse, Fuller observed a harbor, and saw a microcosm of American culture. And from her lofty view, she saw infinite variety in America’s Eastern, civilized world. And yet this “civilization,” of which its many characters were a part, was internally divided. “Buffalo and Chicago,” she wrote in *Summer on the Lakes*, are “two corresponding valves that open and shut all the time, as the life-blood rushes from east to west, and back again from west to east.”⁴³⁵ The “free-minded” Western-settler psychology on one side, and the “civilized” Easterner, bound by their illusions of luxury and artificial modern growth, needed to be connected. And the thread Fuller shuttled through her writing to accomplish this task was the tragic history of the American Indian. In doing so, she conceptualized a new type of “American,” thus forming a distinctly Transcendental approach to a nationalist project, as well as a new national-cultural approach to individual growth—not simply “Man-Thinking” and “Woman-Thinking,” but “American-Thinking.”

Having once again discovered a new rhetorical object, Fuller engaged Americans with her writing through the rhetorical process of literary nationalism. Her next career choice reflected this fact. No longer editor of the *Dial*, after publishing *Summer On the Lakes* Fuller was hired by Horace Greeley to as chief literary editor of the *New York Tribune*. Once in New York, Fuller discovered why America’s top literary authors lacked talent, namely, because it lacked its own literary canon from which to think through its own glaring societal problems. As a result, Fuller

came to the conclusion that America's cultural revival would not come from the writings of an American, but must rather be discovered abroad, in European culture. It is at this point in Fuller's life that she embarked on her first trip to Europe, and where she reconfigured her national object, "the American," into yet another rhetorical process. But first, she had to distance herself from the American scene. Throughout the first seventeen dispatches, then, Fuller tracks her progress travelling through England, France, and Italy. Along the way, Fuller digresses on the various means of transportation—boat, train, or stagecoach—as well as on differing aspects of each nation's social, political, and nature scenes. In a manner similar to her excursion into America's vast West, Fuller applies the rhetorical style of Transcendental travel writing to construct a national character for each place she visited. In doing so, she gives birth to an entirely new rhetorical process, which she defines in the eighteenth dispatch as "the thinking American."

Entitled "New and Old World Democracy," Fuller's eighteenth dispatch represents the theoretical foundation of what I argue constitutes her rhetoric of Transcendental nationalism. After moving through two lesser forms of Americans—the servile American and the conceited American—Fuller conceptualizes a new rhetorical process, which she calls the "thinking America,"—one who recognizes "the immense advantage of being born to a new world and on a virgin soil, yet does not wish one seed from the Past to be lost,"

He is anxious to gather and carry back with him all that will bear a new climate and new culture. Some will dwindle; others will attain a bloom and stature unknown before. He wishes to gather them clean, free from noxious insects. He wishes to give them a fair trial in his new world. And that he may know the conditions under which he may best place them in that new world, he does not neglect to study their history in this.⁴³⁶

And after theorizing this new rhetorical process, she becomes its first model. Unfortunately, the language of Fuller's final nineteen dispatches are largely marred by high-literary language, political and ideological bias, concurrent and scattered events, as well as long diatribes of Italian patriotism and nationalist propaganda. But despite all its variation, what threads the dispatches together is Fuller's constant backward glance at America. Indeed, "The American in Europe," she writes, "if a thinking mind can only become more American." Given this, the key to understanding Fuller's new rhetorical process lies in a theory of motives, which, according to Burke, are shorthand for situations, in this case, the revolutions of 1848.⁴³⁷ The purpose of this section, then, is to explicate Fuller's rhetoric of Transcendental nationalism through the relationship between her objects of analysis—modern Europe, revolutionary Italy, and America—and her rhetorical process of the thinking American.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PIETY OF ROME'S OLD ORDER

No; Rome is not a nine-day's wonder, and those who try to make it such lose the ideal Rome (if they ever had it) without gaining any notion of the real—Margaret Fuller

Margaret Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism took shape at the turn of the year in 1848. An apt time for its publication, too, for her newly formed rhetorical process hinged upon the idea that Italy's ancient and modern history had coalesced into the events of present-day Rome. But having just denounced the "conceited American" in her previous dispatch—one who "does not see...the history of Humanity," but is "instinctively bristling and proud," despite being "profoundly ignorant" of its "origin and meaning"—Fuller had to first distinguish between "the healthful method" of active observation and the "painful process of sight-seeing":

You rise in the morning knowing there are around you a great number of objects worth knowing, which you may never have a chance to see again. You go everyday, in all moods, under all circumstances; you feel, probably, in seeing them, the inadequacy in your preparation for understanding or duly receiving them; this consciousness would be most valuable if you had time to think and study, being the natural way in which the mind is lured to cure its defects—but you have no time, you are always wearied, body and mind, confused, dissipated, sad. The objects are of commanding beauty or full of suggestion, but you have no quiet to let that beauty breathe its life into your soul—no time to follow up these suggestions and plant for your proper harvest.⁴³⁸

A central tenant of Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism is that Man/Woman-Thinking must, above all, study Nature. Fuller operationalizes this concept in Rome to help readers

understand that “the thinking American” must not fall into the hurried habits of “those who travel,” but must instead dismiss such travelers in the same manner as she had done with the “philistine tourist” at Niagara in *Summer on the Lakes*. “Many persons run about Rome for nine days and then go away,” Fuller writes; “they might as well expect to see it so, as to appreciate the Venus by throwing a stone at it.” The ridiculous image of a traveller desecrating the statue of Venus by throwing a stone at it, although laughable, is not the point here. Rather it is the transcendental notion that Rome’s great remains hidden beneath the surface of its sacred artifacts. “No, Rome is not a nine-day’s wonder,” Fuller exclaims, “and those who try to make it such lose the ideal Rome (if they ever had it) without gaining any notion of the real.”⁴³⁹

After suffering through several weeks of sight-seeing, Fuller describes her frustrating experiences in the nineteenth dispatch. “I stayed in Rome nine weeks,” she reports, “and came away unhappy as he who, having been taken in the visions of night through some wondrous realm, wakes unable to recall anything but the hues and outlines of the pageant.” As she had done at Niagara, Fuller yearned for Rome’s “real knowledge.” Making use of her high-literary style, she then compares her desire to know Rome to that of the Greek figure Tantalus, “hungrier even when he most needed to be fed.” But with each passing day she became increasingly familiar and receptive to the hidden undercurrents of Rome’s great history. “I now really live in Rome,” she writes, “and I begin to see and feel the real Rome. She reveals herself now; she tells me some of her life. Now I never go out to see a sight, but I walk everyday.” No longer solely an American travelling abroad, Fuller now explicitly identifies as being Roman. And this is where her noticeably Transcendental tendencies become more distinctly nationalistic: “As one becomes familiar, ancient and modern Rome—at first so painfully and discordantly jumbled together, are drawn apart to the mental vision. You see where objects and limits anciently were; the

superstructures vanish, and you recognize the local habitation of so many thoughts. When this begins to happen it is that one feels first truly at ease in Rome.” In essence, Fuller brings to life Rome’s great history before the eyes of her readers by expanding Rome’s historical eras across both space and time. Beginning with ancient Rome, she describes “the old Kings, the Consuls, and Tribunes, the Emperors, drunk with blood and gold,” living amidst scenes such as “the seven hills tower, the innumerable temples glitter, and the Via Sacra,” which, she happily tells readers, “swarms with triumphal life once more.” Indeed, *this* Rome brings joy to the “life of the mind,” she declares, and proves that its great history is alive and well, even if hidden behind the appearances of modern sight-seeing, or as she elsewhere describes, “the pitiful, peddling, Anglicised Rome...all full of taverns, lodging houses, cheating chambermaids, vilest vile *valets de place* and fleas!!”⁴⁴⁰

Next, Fuller tells of Rome’s Papal era, historically significant because it brought together Italy’s Northern and Southern regions under the symbolic figurehead of the Papacy. For a child of Protestant, Republican America, Fuller knew this era was largely inaccessible to her American readers because “it requires much acquaintance, much thought, much reference to books,” in order “to see where belong the legends illustrated by rite and picture, the sense of all the rich tapestry where it has a united and poetic meaning, where it is broken by some accident of history.” Indeed, Papal Rome is one of the most historically complex aspects of Italy’s rich culture “to the uninformed eye,” and its many obscure religious ceremonies further substantiate this claim.⁴⁴¹ But for a thinking American—who recognizes “the immense advantage of being born to a new world and on a virgin soil, yet does not wish for one seed from the Past to be lost,”—this seemingly “senseless mass of juggleries” reveals itself instead as “growths of the human spirit struggling to develop its life, and full of instruction for those who learn to

understand them.”⁴⁴² Nowhere was this more apparent than in Modern Rome—“still ecclesiastical, still darkened and damp in the shadow of the Vatican, but where bright hopes gleam now amid the ashes.” These ashes, Fuller states, signaled that Italy’s Old Order—“bloody tyranny, and incubus of priestcraft, the invasions, first of Goths, then of trampling emperors and kings, then of sight-seeing foreigners”—was indeed coming to an end. And although Italians could not see the obvious signs of the coming New Order, Fuller still believes that “the natural expression of these fine forms will animate them yet.”⁴⁴³

Put plainly, the Italian spirit was unlike any of Fuller’s previous nationalist constructions, mostly because it was animated by, what she calls, the “noble sentiment” of its people toward their Pope. “It makes me very happy to be for once in a place ruled by a father’s love,” Fuller writes, “and where the pervasive glow of one good, generous heart is felt in every pulse of every day.” Indeed, the Pope linked all of Italy together under a single symbolic order amidst competing forms of secular utopianism and political ideologies. “I have seen the Pope several times since my return,” she tells her readers, “and it is a real pleasure to see him in the thoroughfares.” But as revolution erupted and the Old Order began to dissipate, the Pope transformed into more than a symbolic representation of Rome’s cultural piety, he became the linchpin of Italy’s future. But would he be the reformist Prince that so many radical Italians wanted him to be, or the fatherly Priest whom the people saw as “*the living soul*”?⁴⁴⁴ The answer depended entirely upon Rome’s culture of piety and linkages. Not only was the Pope the symbol of Italy, he also represented its entire schema of orientation—its rituals, its piety, its obedience to the orientation of an Old Order, and the resulting trained incapacities of its people, which ultimately led to the tragic loss of that symbolic figurehead—the flight of Pius IX.

In the human sphere, the subject of expectancy and the judgment as to what is proper in conduct is largely bound up with the subject of motives, for if we know why people do as they do, we feel that we know what to expect of them and of ourselves—Kenneth Burke

When we turn to Fuller's dispatches in Italy, we find what Kenneth Burke would call a rhetoric of motives. That is to say, Fuller's engagement with the historical movements in Italy in 1848 transformed her from cultural critic to revolutionary advocate, and in doing so pushed her into a new rhetorical style that sought not only to understand the changing motives of the Italians but to rhetorically construct a situation that would create new motives in her American audience. Her style of revolutionary nationalism thus sought, on the one hand, to understand what type of situation produced revolutionary motives in the Italians she saw around her while, on the other hand, constituting forms of identification between her American audience and Italy's revolutionaries. To accomplish this task, Fuller would have to draw on all of her creative faculties she had honed over the past decades as an American Romantic-Transcendentalist and put them to use in a new, vigorously and explicitly political style.

To help navigate through these developments in Fuller's style we can therefore turn to Burke's theories of rhetoric and motive, particularly as they are found in his canonical work, *Permanence and Change*. There, he puts forth a theory of social change that describes the uniquely human process of stabilization, destabilization and restabilization as it is constituted through symbolic action. In the first section, "On Interpretation," Burke explains the process by which humans link together their interpretations of things in a way that transcends the narrow confines of our biological experience, thus making historical change fundamentally a process of the transformation of meanings. His starting point, that human beings are distinct from all other organisms by interpreting their situations using words: "Where as all organisms are critical,"

Burke writes, “man seeks by verbalization to perfect a methodology of criticism.”⁴⁴⁵ Whereas animals react instinctively to stimuli they are hardwired to recognize, human beings use verbalizations to interpret their environment. And this environment includes not only *things* that move around but also *agents* who act with conscious intent. Consequently, “a distinguishing feature of consciousness” is “a feeling that we must consider the motives for our choices.”⁴⁴⁶ To study motives is thus to study the symbolic means by which we understand our shared situation and constitute ourselves as social beings in a political world.

Burke’s central insight into the nature of motives is that motives are not primarily internal feelings, emotions, or aims that originate in the privacy of one’s own mind or soul; motives are better understood as symbolic ways of interpreting observable and shared situations that make certain actions seem more necessary or appropriate than others. Burke refers to motives as “rough, shorthand descriptions for certain typical patterns of discrepant and conflicting stimuli.” Indeed, he calls any motive a shorthand for a type of situation that naturally calls forth a certain established mode of behavior. For instance, if a man informs us that he has “glanced back in suspicion,” then suspicion was his motivation. And according to Burke, “suspicion is a word for designating a complex set of signs, meanings, or stimuli not wholly in consonance with one another.” He further describes one possible “concoction” for how this motivation might arise: “danger-signs (“there is something ominous about that fellow”); reassurance-signs (“but nobody would try to rob me here”); social-signs (“I don’t want to make a fool of myself if there is nothing wrong, but I could just glance back along the pavement as though I had dropped something) etc.”⁴⁴⁷ Thus, by a roundabout line of reasoning, the word “suspicion” becomes shorthand for the situation itself. For a person to explain her actions by referring to the word

“suspicion,” she immediately calls to mind in her audience a type of situation they would immediately recognize as having a suspicious character.

The rhetorical implications of motives are quite clear once we think of the consequences of the situation they occupy. To say, for instance, that one glanced back in suspicion immediately implies that certain actions might appropriately follow due to the nature of the situation. For instance, a person accompanying this suspiciously-motivated individual on a walk would naturally try to determine whether or not the situation was in fact dangerous, and, if so, what drastic actions, if any, would have to be taken to ensure his or her safety. Burke identifies these forms of appropriate action as being part of an “orientation.” An orientation, Burke tells us, is a “bundle of judgments as to how things were, how they are, and how they may be.”⁴⁴⁸ Orientation is thus a “schema of serviceability” in which our interpretations of the world stimulate habitual forms of action which are themselves bound up together with our expectations of what is pleasant and unpleasant, good and evil, useful and harmful.⁴⁴⁹ A soldier on the battlefield, for instance, a spy in a foreign capital, a hunter in the forest, a parent in the home, a lover on a walk, or an American literary critic abroad all have different orientations to the world precisely because they would react to a “suspicious” situation in different ways to achieve different ends. Thus, “since we characterize a situation with reference to our general scheme of meanings, it is clear how motives, as shorthand words for situations, are assigned with reference to our orientation in general.”⁴⁵⁰ Put simply, a suspicious situation is not the same for everyone; it all depends on the way we interpret such situations and the way our orientations respond to them. Consequently, the rhetorical challenge for someone like Fuller is to try to use symbolic action to create a common frame of interpretation and orientation so that collective action is possible.

The way such rhetorical work is performed can be understood through Burke's concept of "linkages." Linkages are the associations we make between events, objects, qualities and people that make possible our ability to constitute complex situations as a "whole," which are made up of numerous interlocking parts. That is to say, a "situation" is never simply a "thing," but a nexus of "things" threaded together through symbols until it has a unitary quality. For instance, "If we say that we perform an act under the motivation of duty," Burke writes, "we generally use the term to indicate a complex stimulus-situation wherein certain stimuli calling for one kind of response are linked with certain stimuli calling for another kind of response." And how one chooses to link an act to a motive behind that act involves "acquiescent response to stimuli," which can have either a "pleasure-character" or a "displeasure-character." Again, as situations are a nexus of things, linkages are often brought into conflict, and this conflict is ultimately what spurs action into being, as well as what makes motives so difficult to discern. Returning to the motive of duty, once an act is completed any retroactive search for motive will undoubtedly result in duty being the motive behind that act. Thus, duty merely becomes a verbal signifier in the recurrent "recognition of a particular pattern of conflict."⁴⁵¹ In other words, once a linkage is made, the word itself becomes one's primary orientation to any given situation.

In times of stability, rhetoric must rely on these pre-existing words to determine established linkages in a given situation. This is the world of Italy that Margaret Fuller encountered when she first arrived. This universe of established, taken-for-granted linkages represents rhetorically the language of "piety." Piety can best be understood as a traditional and authoritative schema of orientation. Piety is a "system-builder," Burke declares, "a desire to round things out, to fit experiences together into a unified whole." And although the word itself carries a stigma of tradition in the religious sphere, Burke quickly corrects this by expanding the

notion to a *sense of what properly goes with what*. “It would as well as be present,” he argues, “when the potter moulds the clay to exactly that form which completely gratifies his sense of how it ought to be.”⁴⁵² And if there is such a thing as an altar of piety, then the pious man is one who performs a ritual act as a kind of “symbolic cleanliness.” Moreover, the ritual act of cleansing one’s hands before an altar indicates a kind of “technique,” which uses “pious linkages” to bring about, as Burke puts it, “all the significant details of the day into coordination, relating them integrally with one another by a complex interpretative network.”⁴⁵³ In the realm of human affairs, then, piety is largely tied up with the notion of obedience and symbolic ritual, which, according to Burke, we do because we wish to know everything’s proper place so that we might name a thing by what it ultimately wishes to become. We thus repeat our symbolic incantations as a kind of prayer for our orientations to be true.

Within this system of piety, actions which are performed in perfect obedience to the sources of their own being amount to the perfection of what Burke calls a “style.” In its simplest manifestation, he writes, style is “ingratiating,” or the “attempt to gain favor by the hypnotic or suggestive process of ‘saying the right thing.’” What the right thing is, however, depends upon one’s mental linkages as they relate to motive. Burke uses the example of someone trying to appeal to the pieties of a drunken man. One would not, for instance, attempt to persuade an intoxicated person to stop drinking by way of “sober” analysis and a weighing out of costs and benefits. It would be far more effective to dance the attitude of drunkenness if one is to persuade a drunkard to adjust his actions. Burke writes: “I have seen men, themselves schooled in the experiences of alcohol, who knew exactly how to approach a drunken man, bent upon smashing something, and quickly to act upon him by such phrases and intimations as were ‘just right’ for diverting his fluid suggestibility into the channel of maudlin good fellowship.”⁴⁵⁴ In this way,

style becomes a rhetorical technique by which one uses symbolic gestures and forms to appeal to an audience's orientation and structure of piety in order to encourage specific forms of behavior.

In sum, rhetorical communication is a system of links and bridges that condenses complex scenes, events, or populations into smaller and more manageable forms that elicit certain preferred responses. These forms help reduce complex situations into easily digestible patterns of action and interaction. Furthermore, if the words for those motives function as links that help us *select* an orientation within a complex situation, then they also function as screens that *deflect*, block out, and separate those aspects of our world we can't see, or choose not to see. In this way, words, above all, are a matter of means-selecting, and "the devices by which we arrive at a correct orientation may be quite the same as those involved in an incorrect one."⁴⁵⁵ To illustrate this, Burke describes the flight habits of a flock of birds:

Suppose there is a flock of birds and that one of them, rightly or wrongly, is frightened into flight; the rest of the flock rises also. In other words, the flight of the flock goes with the flight of the one. By our definition, this gregarious obedience would be piety.⁴⁵⁶

Burke's point is that our orientations and pieties cannot be judged as right or wrong from an external perspective. They are pious because they obey a traditional orientation. To say that they should have done otherwise is to import a foreign orientation, and hence to be impious. For the birds, piety means to rise with the rest of the flock. Clearly, this selects certain stimuli as important—the flapping of wings—while deflecting other stimuli that might be of significance—for instance, the hand of a child holding out seeds. Since birds are not symbolic creatures, it is no use arguing with them. Their orientation is, for the most part, hardwired. But human beings, being symbolic creatures, can be persuaded to alter their orientations if their systems of piety are no longer useful to attaining their ends.

In the realm of human affairs, piety often manifests as a complex network of strategies that help order large groups of people by way of ritualizing their habits of obedience. To better explain this, Burke imports John Dewey's concept of "occupational psychosis," which refers to the phenomenon by which one's specific way of making a living produces a way of looking at the world as if every situation were a subset of their occupation. For instance, "a tribe which lives by the hunt," Burke writes, "may be expected to reveal a corresponding hunt pattern in its marriage rites, where the relation between man and woman may show a marked similarity to the relationship between huntsman and quarry."⁴⁵⁷ This phenomenon shows how much our familiar vocabularies affect our interpretation of our universal situations. When we remain within a stable realm of piety, occupational psychosis can lead to the shared pleasure of interpreting all local events as if they are of the same kind, directed toward the same end. For instance, if local Italian villages which have remained unchanged for centuries look at the world as if it was an extension of Classical and Christian Rome, then they remain at the center of this continuous world history. Yet in a situation marked by rapid change, occupational psychosis can lead to a failure to see and recognize these changes through inherited blind spots.

These blind spots, when entered into the realm of practice, Burke calls a "trained incapacity." Since, as Burke points out, "a way of seeing is also a way of not seeing," occupational psychosis often leads to the development of a "trained incapacity" in instances of cultural destabilization and shifts in economic patterns.⁴⁵⁸ In its simplest form, the concept of a trained incapacity is when a person's past training causes them to misjudge a new situation because of an application of an orientation that helped them master an old situation. That is to say, the capacities in which they have been trained, based on an old system of piety, become active limitations—the proverbial old dog unable to learn new tricks. Importing the language of

Thornstein Veblen, Burke discusses trained incapacity using the example of “business men who, through long training in competitive finance, have so built their scheme of orientation about this kind of effort and ambition that they cannot see serious possibilities in any other system of production and distribution.”⁴⁵⁹ In this way, one’s present state of affairs function as a sort of blindness in a future state of affairs; as Burke puts it, “People may be unfitted by being fit in an unfit fitness.”⁴⁶⁰ Thus, Dewey’s concept of occupational psychosis, Burke suggests, achieves implicitly what Veblen’s concept of trained incapacity contains explicitly in instances of political, cultural, or economic shifts.

Burke’s discussion of motives in *Permanence and Change* offers a critical vocabulary to interpret Fuller’s rhetorical work in her Italian dispatches of 1848. Although I will return to Burke’s conceptual apparatus in subsequent chapters, his writing on motive, piety, orientation, occupational psychosis, and trained incapacity prove useful in analyzing Fuller’s early dispatches. For, when Fuller first encountered Italy before the revolution, she interpreted motives primarily in terms of the inherited culture of ancient piety, a culture she found beautiful in its style but also frozen in time, in a kind of paralysis. After the revolution had begun, however, she quickly developed a rhetorical style aimed at understanding and appreciating Rome’s occupational psychosis—as she calls it, the “Spirit” of Italy. In order to do this, she had to first orient herself to its schema, the people’s pattern of their cultural experience, and the Symbol which binds them all together—the Pope. Her rhetoric of transcendental nationalism, then, expands the circumference of Italy’s rhetorical situation and the piety of its people within a broader context of cultural destabilization, namely, the revolution of 1848. Her rhetoric thus sought to understand the new motives of the Italians while simultaneously developing a language that would make American readers revolutionaries as well.

Rome seeks to reconcile Reform and Priestcraft. But their eyes are shut that they see not. Oh awake, indeed, Romans! And you will see that the Christ who is to save men is no wooden dingy

effigy of by-gone superstitions.—Margaret Fuller

New Years Eve, 1848, Margaret Fuller writes to America of Italy's "Spirit" as news of revolution flooded the streets of Rome. "This month" she writes in the twenty-second dispatch, "no day, scarcely no hour, has passed unmarked by some showy spectacle or some exciting piece of news."⁴⁶¹ By this point, Fuller had been completely swept up in the culture of Rome's Old World ceremonies. She listened to speeches from its poets and priests, she attended festivities of its public figures and politicians, and she observed how all these occasions were bound together by a single system of piety, the Pope. To an outsider and a "thinking American," such an orientation might have seemed absurd. But within the world of Rome itself, the atmosphere was like a pleasant ether, despite the wider circumference of Europe's revolutionary events. This atmosphere came largely from the presence of Rome's symbolic figurehead. But the actions of Pope Pius IX, however, were not necessarily pious to his people, as they were to him. Instead, they were tied up with an altogether different motive, namely, the desire to appease Europe's Old World leaders. Herein lies the question of motive, which Fuller articulates in the following way: "Rome seeks to reconcile Reform and Priestcraft,"

But their eyes are shut that they see not. Oh awake, indeed, Romans! And you will see that the Christ who is to save men is no wooden dingy effigy of by-gone superstitions, but such as art has seen Him in your better mood—a Child, living, full of love, prophetic of a boundless Future—a Man acquainted with all sorrows that rend the heart of all, but only loving Man, with sympathy and faith death cannot quench—*that* Christ lives or is sought; burn you doll of wood.⁴⁶²

Indeed, the Pope is linked to more than just the piety of Rome's formal traditions, he is the symbol of Italy itself, and is thus pervasively linked to all the rituals, orientations, and subsequent obedience of its people. But the question of motive—whether Pius IX will be the Reforming Prince, or the Fatherly Priest—was still uncertain in Fuller's eyes. And so, she uses her dispatches to not only describe Italy's greater rhetorical situation, but to even more directly narrate the various scenes of its crumbling Old Order. In doing so, she hoped her American readers might recognize the Pope and his people's different schemas of orientation and, as Kenneth Burke would say, "glance back in suspicion."

In the nineteenth dispatch, Fuller describes Rome's occupational psychosis through the spirit of its prayer and ritual. "The first week of November, there was much praying for the dead in the chapels of the cemeteries," she begins. "We entered the Cemetery; it was a sweet, tranquil place, lined with cypresses, and soft sunshine lying on the stone coverings where repose the houses of clay in which once dwelt joyous Roman hearts." She describes the Courtyard, "painted with the Passion of Jesus on the walls; a Franciscan monk, a pregnant woman, and some boys." Clearly, the more Fuller immersed herself within the Italian spirit, so too was she captivated by it: "It was a beautiful moment," she writes,

from the position of mind indicated by these forms, their spirit touched me and I prayed too—prayed for the distant, every way distant—for those who seem to have forgotten me, and with me all we had in common—prayed for the dead in spirit if not in body—prayed for myself, that I might never walk to earth. "The tomb of my dead self."⁴⁶³

The spirit of prayer and ceremony, then, was intrinsically tied to Rome's Old Order, and nowhere was this more prevalent than in its church proceedings. "The music was beautiful and the effect of the church with its richly-painted dome and altar-piece in a blaze of light, while the

assembly were in a sort of brown darkness, was very fine.” But to the outsider, this Spirit was altogether inaccessible. “A number of Americans there, new arrivals, kept requesting in the midst of the music to know when ‘*it* would begin,’ she writes. “Why this is *it*,” a Roman at last had the patience to answer: “You are hearing Vespers now.” “What,” the American replied, “is there no oration, no speech!” Thus, Fuller concludes, “So deeply rooted in the American mind is the idea that a sermon is the only real worship!”⁴⁶⁴ No, when in Rome you must do as the Romans, which means being pious to its schema of orientation. And in the dispatches, Fuller articulates this schema by way of linking every ceremony and ritual back to the character of Pius IX.

In constructing his character, then, Fuller offers a series of vignettes between the Pope and his people. “When the Pope entered, borne in his chair of state amid the pomp of his tiara and his white and gold robes, he looked to me thin, or as the Italians murmur anxiously at times *consumato*, or wasted.” But as the ceremonies of St. Carlo began, “he seemed absorbed in his devotions, and at the end I think he had become exhilarated, and his face wore a bright glow of faith.” Put simply, the Pope’s genuine expression functions as a synecdoche of the Italian spirit, giving him “power of this people,” Fuller writes, and representing the strength of the linkage between him and the Old Order. “He is a face to shame the selfish,” she says, “redeem the skeptic, alarm the wicked and cheer to new effort the weary and heavy-laden.” Surely, Pius IX had *the* expression of a loving father—a shepherd’s love for his flock. And the Italians had a word “peculiarly characteristic of their highly endowed nature,”

They say of such and such, “*Ha una phisonomia simpatico*,”—“He has a sympathetic expression;” and this is praise enough. This may be preeminently said of that of Pius IX. *He* looks, indeed, as if nothing human could be foreign to him. Such alone are the genuine kings of men.

Certainly, the Pope's sympathetic expression, his "magnetic sweetness," confirmed all of Fuller's theories about the relationship between the Pope and his people—a genuine love that needed no ceremony to prove its authenticity. "I am quite content to see him standing amid the crowd, while the band plays the music he has inspired—'Sons of Rome, awake!'"⁴⁶⁵ Indeed, the Pope standing atop his Quirinal was a representative event in Fuller's eyes for Rome's occupational psychosis, and the central link to its entire cultural psychology.

After describing Pius IX's sympathetic expression, Fuller casts a critical eye on the nature of his ceremonies in order to introduce some disorder to this schema of orientation. "Every sweet must have its sour," she writes in the twentieth dispatch, "and the exchange from the brilliance of the Italian heaven to weeks and months of rain and such black cloud, is unspeakably dejecting." Using dreary scenery of Rome's rainy days' observations, Fuller describes the feast of St. John, which celebrated of the name-day of the Pope. "It was raining again and the Pope could give but a hasty salute under an umbrella," she writes, before turning her attention to a nun taking the veil. Unlike "pompous" ceremonies, there was "no moment of throwing on the black veil" for this nun; "no peal of music, nor salute of cannon,"

Poor thing! She looked as if the domestic olives and poppies were all she wanted; and, lacking these, tares and wormwood must be her portion. She was then taken behind a grating, her hair cut, and her clothes exchanged for the nun's vestments; the black-robed sisters who worked upon her, looking like crows or ravens at their ominous feasts. All the while the music played, first sweet and thoughtful, then triumphant strains. The effect on my mind was revolting and painful to the last degree.

Here, too, every sweet must have its sour. And for Rome, that which is sour is that which lacks the intoxicating ether of music and ceremony. Here Fuller shifts her rhetorical style to a grander

historical scale. “Festivities in Italy have been of great importance, since for a century or two back,” she writes, “the thought, the feeling, the genius of the people have had more chance to expand, to express themselves, there than anywhere else.” And as Rome’s “march of Reform goes forward,” she predicts, the ceremonies of its Old Order will soon be in danger of eradication. What Rome needed was the voice of the Reformer, and if the Pope would not rise to the occasion, then others would. But she hoped that while hovering “betwixt the old and the new,” Fuller still hoped that “what is poetical in the old will not be lost.”⁴⁶⁶

Fuller’s rhetorical style up to this point has focused squarely upon the atmosphere and rituals of Rome’s Old Order, but while the people were praying and the Pope was feasting, Italy was in full blown insurrection. Thus, in her dispatches she would often interrupt the narrative of her interior discussions by inserting news of the external revolutionary situation. “Parma,” she writes in the twentieth dispatch, “passing from bad to worse, falls into the hands of the Duke of Modena, and the people and the magistracy have made an address to their ruler which I translate as a specimen of the temperate and free manner which is to be admired in such acts here.”⁴⁶⁷

Fuller now adopts a noticeably political tone, in which she would translate the letters and speeches of Italy’s rulers, pontiff, charismatic speakers (like Poland’s Adam Mickiewicz) and radical revolutionaries (like Guiseppe Mazzini). Although Fuller’s point in inserting these documents was to expand her reader’s awareness of Italy’s greater rhetorical situation, from the perspective of a rhetoric of motives, her goal was to challenge Romans’ uncritical obedience to the spirit of its “churchliness,” which was a particularly radical notion within Italy’s divided political spectrum. Thus, Fuller again introduces disorder into her rhetorical style in an effort to frame the stupidity and ignorance of Italy’s rulers while juxtaposing the “fomenting” spirit in the

hearts of the Italian people. “The dragon’s teeth are sown,” she cries, “and the lazzaroni may be men yet.”⁴⁶⁸

Fuller’s rhetorical style up to this point oscillates between the occupational psychosis of the Roman people and the machinations at work between Italy’s rulers and revolutionaries. And with the Pope as its central figure, whose existence symbolically links both ritual and ceremony to an Old Order, Fuller challenges those who remain obediently pious to this great altar by way of Rome’s spirit and history. And so we see Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism in its most potent form: a rapid staccato of scene expansions and contractions that when taken together form a tapestry of Italy’s rhetorical situation as seen through the eyes of its most prominent figures. The challenge, then, was how to make these various scenes and characters come into conflict, break apart, and disrupt the Old Order for her American readers, while she herself remained fully ingratiated within its schema of orientation. Therefore, it is less significant whether or not Fuller’s dispatches were historically accurate, and more significant, from a rhetorical perspective, in how she redirects external stimuli—the news of revolution—to reframe the question of motive as it related to the Pope. In other words, her rhetorical style is not about who Pius IX was as a Pope, but rather about how he activates the dispositions of his people while simultaneously speaking to both Italy and Europe’s larger audience of kings and leaders.

From the nineteenth to the twenty fourth dispatch, Fuller offers a series of signs to help her readers understand how certain acts of piety and ritual can be linked to a greater understanding of the Pope’s central motive. “For my part, I shall always rejoice to have been here in this time,” she writes. And the issues of Pius IX’s life—would he be “the Man, the Reforming Prince, or the Pope”—helped make sense of his two competing schemas of orientation: first, the pious order to which the Roman people remained obedient; and second, the

Pope's larger motive of preserving Italy's political autonomy via the power of the Papal States by ameliorating the leaders of the Old Order.⁴⁶⁹ It was not that Pius IX lacked revolutionary qualities, then, but rather that his orientation, above all, was theological and not nationalistic. "A wave has been set in motion," she warns readers in the twenty-first dispatch,

which cannot stop till it casts up its freight upon the shore, and if Pius IX does not suffer himself to be surrounded by dignitaries, to hear the signs of the times through the medium of others, if he does not suffer the knowledge he had of general society as a simple Prelate, to become incrustated by the ignorance habitual to Princes, he cannot fail long to be a most important agent in fashioning a new and better era for this beautiful, injured land.

With her own a glance of suspicion, Fuller hoped that her American readers would also see Pius IX's sympathetic expression as lacking the Reformer quality necessary to protect his people from impending revolutionary violence. And in the coming months, Fuller would use the "signs of the times"—war and bloodshed, slaughter and atrocious daily acts of hatred and dissension—to create a new set of terms of disorder in order to reconstruct the Pope's motive as she saw him, namely, "a Protestant Pope," with a good heart but a feeble soul.⁴⁷⁰

From this point on, Fuller narrates scenes of the Pope that all but preclude his inevitable demise. "This afternoon I went to the Quirinal Palace to see the Pope receive the new municipal officers," she writes in the twenty-first dispatch:

They took the oaths of office and then actually kissed his foot. I had supposed this was never really done, but only a very low obeisance made: the act seemed to me disgustingly abject. A Heavenly Father does not want his children at his feet, but in his arms, on a level with his heart.⁴⁷¹

By disconnecting the Pope from his people, Fuller casts doubt upon his own piety to the people, in a way foreshadowing his imminent betrayal. A few days later, she describes with “unspeakable disgust” how people had “thronged” around “a very imposing” altar-piece at a local church. She then dismally describes the preacher at this church who, while “panting, sweating, leaning half out of the pulpit was exhorting his hearers to ‘imitate Christ.’” And like this preacher, Rome too was awash with imitators and “false shepherd” who failed in their “duty to a poor stray lamb.”⁴⁷² Even those critics who opposed the pope were contributing to this treacherous atmosphere: “A false miracle is devised,” she declares, “the Madonna del Popolo...has cured a paralytic youth, (who, in fact, was never diseased,) and appearing to him in a vision, takes occasion to criticise severely the measures of the Pope.” But no matter how many “rumors of tumult” circulated between Roman quarters, or “inflammatory handbills” put up in the middle of the night, “the Roman thus far,” she laments, “resists all intrigues of the foe to excite him to bad conduct.” Clearly, the piety of Rome’s Old Order was in recalcitrance to the idea that the Pope could ever truly be their “foe.” Fuller then sums up the suspicious nature of these false signs with a simple maxim: “One swallow does not make a Summer.”⁴⁷³

The Romans were indeed pious to their Old Order—to Pius IX—but while the Summer of revolution was still on the horizon, more news of revolution flooded into Rome, casting an even larger shadow fell on the Pope’s popularity. “To return to the Pope,” Fuller writes, “although the shadow that has fallen on his popularity is in a great measure the work of his enemies, yet there is real cause for it too.” After listening to “his speech to the Consistory,” Fuller declares it “so deplorably weak in thought and obsolete in manner,” so “terribly afraid to be or seem to be less the Pope of Rome,” that if pressed by a domestic foe, would surely break. “Whenever there shall be a collision between the Priest and the Reformer,” Fuller deduces, “the

Priest shall triumph.”⁴⁷⁴ From a historical perspective, the Pope was not a weak leader; on the contrary, he had Italy’s larger preservation in mind. But from a rhetorical perspective, Fuller was trying to say that one cannot simply chant, “viva la revolución!” to achieve a successful revolution. One must first recognize the larger rhetorical situation at work if they are to determine the appropriate response. Fuller therefore lines up the linkages in such a way that the Pope must be cast out. In her mind, a true revolutionary moment recognizes that small events are what disrupt dominant hegemonic styles. When taken as a whole, these various scenes and signs represent the piety, linkages, and motives of Rome’s Old Order. And after receiving “authentic news” from Naples that Sicily was in “full insurrection,” Fuller sets up a rejection frame for American readers to frame Pius IX’s words and deeds. In the twenty-sixth dispatch, Fuller writes, “Pius IX no one can doubt, who has looked on him, has a good and pure heart, but it needed also not only a strong but a great mind.”

While no one doubted that Pius IX was trustworthy *as* a Pope, when it comes to the politics of revolution, his kind-hearted, generous soul would surely falter. And on his many clerics and magistrates, she writes, “We must hope these men of straw will serve as thatch to keep out the rain, and not be exposed to the assaults of a devouring flame.”⁴⁷⁵ Shortly thereafter, the Pope’s demise followed on the heels of news that revolution had officially broke out in Naples. Neither Sicilians, nor Neapolitans, Fuller reports, “will trust the King,” but instead “demand his abdication.”⁴⁷⁶ Even the Pope himself acknowledged the workings of a greater power in his proclamation to the Roman people: “The events which these two months past have seen rush after one another in so rapid succession, are no human work,”

Woe to him who in this wind, which shakes and tears up alike the lofty cedars and humble shrubs, hears not the voice of God! Woe to human pride, if to the fault or merit of

any man whatsoever it refer these wonderful changes, instead of adoring the mysterious designs of Providence.⁴⁷⁷

It is easy to understand how the Pope's theologically progressive, but politically conservative, style could have been interpreted as more radically revolutionary. He had built himself up in the eyes of his people with implicitly false promises. And as the saying goes: the bigger they are the harder they fall. According to Hudspeth, "On April 29 Pius IX issued an allocution that put an end to the hopes for a republic that he would head: he disavowed the war against Austria. In doing so, the pope ended his brief career as a political leader and caused unrest in Rome which Fuller witnessed firsthand."⁴⁷⁸ Again, from a wider circumference, the Pope was clearly acting in consideration of his flock, but from the schema of the Roman people, Fuller states, if any "agitations arise, the Pope can no longer calm them by one of his fatherly looks."⁴⁷⁹ Despite his "true benevolence and piety," his actions displayed "tokens of indubitable weakness," which he made clear in his preference for "the wisdom of the Past to that of the Future." Again, Fuller deduces that "In conflicts between Priest and Man he would always choose Priest."⁴⁸⁰

Shortly after the Pope's declaration that he would not support the people's desire for a constitution, revolution in Lombardy broke out. "He acted wiselier than he intended," Fuller writes all but mockingly; "a sop to Cerberus indeed, a poor vamped-up thing that will by-and-by have to give place to something more legitimate, but which served its purpose at the time as a declaration of rights for the people."⁴⁸¹ Then, the moment of crisis came when, according to Fuller, "a well-known artist was hung by the Austrians and the people went to the Pope and demanded he take a decisive stand and declare war against the Austrians." Again, the Pope gave a speech declaring "that he had never any thought of the great results that had followed his actions,"

that he had only intended local reforms, such as had previously been suggested by the potentates of Europe; that he regretted the *misuse* that had been made of his name; and wound up by lamenting over the war—dear to every Italian heart as the best and holiest cause in which for ages they had been called to embark their hopes—as if it something offensive to the spirit of religion, and which he would fain see hushed up, and its motives smoothed out and ironed over.”⁴⁸²

The thing about motives, however, is that unlike clothes, once the people understood Pius IX’s true devotion, they could never smooth out, nor iron over, the creases of doubt he had created. The words “traitor” and “imbecile” were now the terms of Fuller’s new disorder orientation. “Poor Pope!” she cries. “I believe he really thinks now the Progress movement tends to anarchy, blood, all that looked worst in the first French Revolution.” Having shifted the order of the Roman people’s piety to the disorder of their denial and rejection for the Pope, Fuller declares, “When the question was of waging war for the independence of Italy, they regarded him solely the head of the Church; but when the demand was to satisfy the wants of his people, and ecclesiastical goods were threatened with taxes, then he was the Prince of the State, bound to maintain all the selfish prerogative of by-gone days for the benefit of his successors.” Fuller thus deduces that “the only dignified course for the Pope to pursue was to resign his temporal power.”⁴⁸³

And so solidified a new counter-order for the Roman people. The Pope, having lost the ethos of noble sentiment had no choice but to shamefully flee his duty as shepherd and father to his people. “A sad scene began,” Fuller writes in the twenty-fifth dispatch,

The Pope—shut up more and more in his palace, the crowd of selfish and insidious advisers darkening round, enslaved by a confessor—he who might have been the

liberator of suffering Europe, permitted the most infamous treacheries to be practiced in his name. Private letters were written to the foreign powers denying the acts he outwardly sanctioned; the hopes of the people were evaded or dallied with; the Chamber of Deputies permitted to talk and pass measures which they never could get funds to put into execution; legions to form and maneuver, but never to have the arms and clothing they needed. Again and again the people went to the Pope for satisfaction. They got only—benediction.

Fuller has now explicitly denounced the Pope and his entire ensemble of a cast: “Thus plotted and thus worked the scarlet men of sin, playing the hopes of Italy off and on,” she writes, having *their* hopes dashed upon the rocks by “a still worse traitor at Milan on the 6th of August,”—the evacuation of their king, Charles Albert. Fuller now aimed her rhetorical style entirely at Italy’s national transcendence. She mocks the “poor Pope’s” actions, “indeed, what could be expected from the ‘SWORD OF PIUS IX.’”⁴⁸⁴ “Begone with him!” she says, in a wholesale rejection. “The responsibility of events now lies wholly with the People and that wave of Thought which has begun to pervade them.” And then dismisses his acts as those of “either a fool or a foe.” Here again shines Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism—to vindicate the hopes of the Italian people by dismissing the mistakes of a single Man via a rhetorical expansion of Italy’s rhetorical situation from Rome to Italy to Europe and inevitably, to the whole of History. “No more of him!” she writes, “His day is over.”⁴⁸⁵ But Fuller’s narrative of the Roman Revolution was far from over. On the contrary, she merely shuffled the cast. For after dismissing the Pope, she writes, “I remain at present here.—Should my hopes be dashed to the ground, it will not change my faith, but the struggle for its manifestation is to me of vital interest.” Indeed, “all lies in the Future,” for Italy had not yet reached its final form. “Here things are before my eyes worth

recording,” she tells her American audience, “and, if I cannot help this work, I would gladly be its historian.”⁴⁸⁶ In doing so, she shifts the narrative of her dispatches from vestiges of Rome’s Old Order to its revolutionary state of transition: “Of all this great drama I have much to write,” she ends her twenty-fifth dispatch with, “but elsewhere, in a more full form, and where I can sketch the portraits of actors little known in America.”⁴⁸⁷

In sum, this chapter began by introducing Margaret Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism starting with the eighteenth dispatch and her construction of the thinking American as a lens through which to observe Europe’s Old Order. She then widened Italy’s circumference in order to bring out its great history as an unfolding of Destiny. Through its many eras—ancient, Papal, and modern—“Rome” was the word that indicated an entire schema of piety and order amongst the people. In describing its many ceremonies, Fuller pointed to all the rituals and events that contributed to Rome’s occupational psychosis, clustered around a single symbolic figurehead—the Pope. Using the language of motives Fuller mapped out two primary schemas of orientation—the Pope and his people—in Rome during the year of 1848. Her goal was to determine the Pope’s true motive—Reform or Priestcraft—through describing the various linkages between the Pope as a Fatherly Priest who dances the attitude of a Reforming Prince for the trusting Italian people. But with the looming threat of more revolution, the Pope had no choice but to betray his people, thus leading to their trained incapacity of religious habits when what was needed was political action in the form of constituting a genuine Democracy. Thus, Fuller’s rhetorical style aimed to orient American readers to a burgeoning revolutionary spirit developing in Italy through the language of piety, motives, ritual, and order in the hopes that they, too, would become revolutionary-minded, just as she had.

CHAPTER IX
THE VISION OF A NEW ERA

“Still there is now an obvious tide throughout Europe toward a better order of things, and a wave of it may bear Italy onward to the shore.”—Margaret Fuller

After one year of uprisings, insurrection, and revolution in Italy, Margaret Fuller tells her American readers about the growing state of “Republican Rome” amidst the revolutions of 1848. In February, 1849, she writes, “The revolution, like all genuine ones, has been instinctive, its results unexpected and surprising to the greater part of those who achieved them.” For the Romans, what was unexpected about *this* revolution was the loss of their symbolic leader who had represented the traditional system of piety. “The unreality of relation between the people and the hierarchy,” Fuller continues, “was obvious instantly upon the flight of Pio. He made an immense mistake then, and he made it because neither he nor his Cardinals were aware of the unreality. They did not know that, great as is the force of habit, truth *only* is imperishable.” This force of habit being the ways of old Rome’s pious order, and the imperishable truth being a current that, like water, “flowed so secretly beneath the crust of habit.”⁴⁸⁸ Indeed, even after the Pope fled, “the people were not quite alienated from Pio.” Rather:

They felt sure that his heart as, in substance, good and kindly, though the habits of the priest and the arts of his counselors had led him so egregiously to falsify its dictates and forget the vocation with which he had been called.

But this soon changed after the Pope wrote a letter, addressed “*To our most Beloved Subjects*,” threatening excommunication against all those who supported the changes happening in Rome. Fuller described in her diary how “the people received it with jeers, tore it at once from the walls

and...ran along giggling and mumbling in imitation of priestly chants.”⁴⁸⁹ This was the final of “St. Peterdom” as she put it. The Pope and the old order was out, and Republican Rome as the new order was in.

Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism brings to life those currents of Italian nationalism springing up forth in the streets of Rome at the formation of the new Republic. “The Hand of the Omnipotent works for us,” she cries, describing “an old man” whom she saw selling cigars in the street the evening before the opening of the Constitutional Assembly,

He was struck by the radiant beauty of the night. The old people observe that there never as been such a Winter since that of the establishment by the French of the Republic. May the omens speed well! A host of enemies without are ready to levy war against this long-suffering people, to rivet anew their chains. Still there is now an obvious tide throughout Europe toward a better order of things, and a wave of it may bear Italy onward to the shore.⁴⁹⁰

At the helm of Rome’s new Republic was a new leader of the new order, Guiseppe Mazzini, “the great radical thinker of Italy,” who believed that “Unity not union” was what Italy needed. He wanted an Italian Constitutional Assembly, selected directly by the people, to decide what form the Italian peninsula would take in the uncertain future. But Italy was still politically divided between the Radicals and Moderates. Those who followed the thought of Gioberti—“who embodied the lingering hope of the Catholic Church”—predicted that the Radical project would fail. “But ravens now-a-days are not the true prophetic birds,” Fuller declares. “The Roman Eagle recommences her flight, and it is from its direction only that the High Priest may draw his augery.”⁴⁹¹ In shifting from the Pope to Mazzini and the raven to the Eagle, Fuller has explicitly introduced a new set of what Kenneth Burke would call “terms of order.”

From the twenty-eighth dispatch onward, Fuller adopts a new radical vocabulary that aims to construct a counter-covenant against Rome's Old Order and forms of a new world vision of Republican Rome. "The only powers Mazzini acknowledged were *God and the People*," Fuller writes. She describes how the theme of Mazzini's thought was dispersed throughout Rome; "his motto, *Dio e Popolo*, is put upon the coin with the Roman Eagle."⁴⁹² She even inserts multiple texts from his various public letters and speeches in order to make explicit the needed shift in terms of order: "Let us not hear of right, of left, of center," Fuller quotes Mazzini in a speech to the Constitutional Assembly as its newly appointed President, "these terms express the three powers in a constitutional monarchy; for us they have no meaning; the only divisions for us are of Republicans or non-Republicans—or of sincere men and temporizing men."⁴⁹³ Mazzini's goal was threefold: first, to acknowledge the shift in temporal power in the Roman State; second, to declare the new form of a pure Democracy for the Roman Republic; and third, to unite all Italians under a common nationality. "Unity above union" was Mazzini's rhetoric of identification. And in a similar manner, Fuller's rhetorical voice aims to reflect this passionate optimism in her dispatches by bringing to life the noble deeds of Italy's heroes before the eyes of American readers. Her hope was that readers would see their own past revolutionary situation reflected in the Italian cause of national unification. "How I wish my country would show some noble sympathy when an experience so like her own is going on...and make some small sacrifice of its own great resources in aid of a sister cause, now."⁴⁹⁴ Thus, Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism appeals to Americans through a form of political advocacy that identifies with the national idea behind Republican Rome.

In the early months of 1849, Fuller wrote of how the Italian destiny had not yet been fulfilled. This was mostly because internally, Italy still struggled with her idea between its

divided people and city-states. The Grand Duke of Tuscany had fled, “the illustrious Gioberti” had fallen, and Charles Albert was “betwixt two fires.”⁴⁹⁵ And then there was Mazzini, who recognized that by walling themselves in, the radicals in Rome would never achieve the successful revolution for which they so desperately craved. Amidst all this turmoil, what Mazzini sought after was the rhetorical success of a new set of radical--meaning Republican—terms of order. But what made this revolutionary situation truly rhetorical was even more so the urgency of the external situation, namely, the surrounding nations that still clung to the old way of things. “Could Italy be left alone!” Fuller cries, “but treacherous, selfish men at home strive to betray, and foes threaten her from without on every side. Even France, her natural ally, promises to prove foolishly and basely faithless.”⁴⁹⁶ What was needed was a corresponding rhetoric that could both unite the Italians from within while simultaneously directing their energy outward against any and all foes. In this chapter, I will reconstruct Fuller’s new vision for Italy using Kenneth Burke’s rhetoric of identification and symbolic rebirth, using as a model a modified form of his system outline in “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle,” adapted to a different revolutionary context. From there, I explore how Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism follows a similar pattern, but with several key differences being the creation of a nation, the establishment of democracy, the scapegoating of a foreign power, and the strive for unity of all nation, which Fuller consistently reinforces throughout the remainder of the dispatches in the form of one of Mazzini’s favorite maxims: “Mankind is one, and beats with one great heart.”

“The desire for national unity, in the present state of the world, is genuine and admirable. But this unity, if attained on a deceptive basis, by emotional trickeries that shift our criticism from the accurate locus of our trouble, is no unity at all.”—Kenneth Burke

In looking at Fuller’s final dispatches in Italy, we find a distinct rhetoric of nationalism. More to the point, Fuller’s rhetorical style adopted a form of political advocacy that aimed not only to rally Italians to a new Republican order but also to transform her American readers from passive recipients to active advocates on behalf of Italy’s revolutionary cause in the year 1848. In doing so, she shifts the schema of Italy’s orientation from an Old Order to a New Era by way of rhetorically creating a sense of national identification. Her style of transcendental nationalism thus sought, on the one hand, to create a counter-covenant on behalf of the Italian State toward a new Democratic political order (i.e. the Roman Republic) under the guidance of Guiseppe Mazzini while, on the other hand, providing a model of criticism that aimed to reconcile Italy’s revolutionary situation with the actions of its leading figures by way of transferring power from the representatives of the Old Order (i.e. the Pope) to those of the New Era (i.e. Mazzini and the Constitutional Assembly). In order to accomplish this task, Fuller had to push her dispatches to the limits of all her past rhetorical training in order to both imagine and bring to life the vision of a new world order. This section, then, explores Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism through the idea of Kenneth Burke’s terms of order.

When one speaks of “transcendence” in a Burkean context, the reference is to a symbolic process by which we rise above a perceived contradiction to achieve a higher synthesis, a broader vision, a universal law by which opposites are reconciled and power emancipated. Thus, transcendence is an emotional consummation that comes from moving up in a hierarchy and taking on a perspective in which an apparent contradiction appears to be resolved, as when one

justifies an act of violence for “the greater glory of God.”⁴⁹⁷ Transcendence results in an attitude of what Burke calls “heads I win, tails you lose,” whereby “if things turn out one way, your system accounts for them—and if they turn out the opposite way, your system also accounts for them.”⁴⁹⁸ This ability to resolve contradictions facilitates collective action particularly when it smooths a path ahead by identifying one’s system with the historical movement of an “ultimate dialectic,” which is a way of viewing history as a developmental process by which dialectical opposites continually evolve toward “a ‘guiding idea’ or ‘unitary principle’ behind the diversity of voices.”⁴⁹⁹ This unitary principle thus functions as a “god-term” toward which all of history is inexorably moving, such that “later history can be made to look like the goal of earlier history.”⁵⁰⁰ The rhetorical power of such transcendence, particularly when tied with a newly forced national identity, is that people can now see themselves as vehicles for the actualization of some higher purpose and logic, even if their actions result in arguably undesirable consequences that appear to outsiders as expressions of vice, ignorance, or cruelty. Hence, a rhetoric of transcendental nationalism represents a particular sort of highly charged, polarized language that offers a highly selective interpretation of the world that justifies a group’s actions in teleological, historical terms grounded in abstract principle and which sets forth an attractive aesthetic vision of ultimate transcendence for a political group.

In order to work through Burke’s varying terminology as to a proper rhetoric of transcendental nationalism, we can use as a guide his rhetorical analysis of Hitler’s “Battle,” particularly as it relates to the rhetoric of identification and its corresponding terms of order. This is not to equate the substance of the two types of movements in any way; rather it is to find in those movements certain similar methods and processes, despite their very different subject matter and content. For instance, in his rhetorical analysis, Burke asserts that Hitler concocted a

type of rhetorical “medicine” that aimed to establish a “grand united front of prejudices” against the Jews, in the name of a seemingly democratic order. “Hitler found a panacea,” Burke writes, “a ‘cure for what ails you,’ a ‘snake-oil,’ that made such sinister unifying possible within his own nation.” But instead of creating a internally superior nation by destroying internationalism, Fuller’s style aimed to create a nation by rhetorically constructing an international order under a single international identification. However, despite the fact that the arc of Fuller’s rhetoric aimed at a different end, it follows the same trajectory as that of Hitler’s “Battle.” For instance, Burke writes in a general sense that:

Every movement that would recruit its followers from among many discordant and divergent bands must have some spot toward which all roads lead. Each man may get there in his own way, but it must be the one unifying center of reference for all.

This center of reference, Burke goes on to say, “must be not merely a centralizing hub of *ideas*, but a mecca geographically located, toward which all eyes could turn at the appointed hours of prayer.” And if a movement must have its mecca, its Rome, then, according to Burke, it “must also have its devil.”⁵⁰¹ These rules apply equally to both circumstances despite their situational differences. Studying Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism is to study the associated terms of order by which we understand how a people wholesale shift from an associated schema of order and obedience, through a series of disobedient acts, and ultimately toward the formation of a counter-order, which Burke refers to as forming a counter-covenant.

Burke’s discussion on the nature of order bypasses a series of “terms,” which can be typified into three separate categories, or modes, which help determine the position of a particular word within a certain schema of orientation. The first set of terms are called “positive terms,” which are words that help connect us with the concrete world and help to identify to

identify the primary source of our pleasures and pains. “They name par excellence the things of experience,” Burke declares. They are, simply put, terms that name things which have both a visible and tangible existence. Take for instance the sentence, “This is a house.” It is a sensible sentence that it deals directly with the realm of perception—size, shape, texture, color—but also deals with what Burke calls “intuitions,” which when taken together, “clamps a unifying term, a ‘concept,’ upon the lot.” This leads to the second set of terms known as “dialectical terms.”

Unlike positive terms, which deal with the realm of motion and perception, dialectical terms deal with the symbolic realm of action and ideas. Whereas positive terms refer to “real entities,” dialectical terms refer to “fictitious entities” that exist only in the realm of human meanings, and are used to evaluate or organize our experience under “titular” headings. “For though you may locate the positive referent for the expression ‘house,’” Burke points out, “you will have a hard time trying to locate a similarly positive referent for the expression, ‘principles of positivism.’” Instead of defining these terms by what they look or feel like, we must define them, according to Burke, “by asking how they *behave*,” which are thus revealed by revealing “the secret modifiers implicit in the expression itself.”⁵⁰² Honor above faith, mercy above sacrifice, truth above compassion, these range of ideas help make sense of why dialectical terms are rhetorically useful, namely, because they allow us to “transcend” to positive world into a realm of meanings and values that present ethical alternatives.

The final set of terms Burke calls “ultimate terms,” and are used to order complex environments into a meaningful and moral unity that provides direction and justification. In the case of Margaret Fuller, we can understand the order of “Rome” to function as an ultimate term, which is to say a unitary principle that organizes dialectical terms and places them in a hierarchical sequence, or series that ultimately leads toward their fulfillment. Now, the difference

between the “dialectical” and the “ultimate” order is that the merely dialectical would leave, as Burke describes, “the competing voices in a jangling relation with one another,” but the ultimate term refers to the “guiding idea” behind the multiplicity of voices that both constitutes a collective vision and creates a common goal. Take for instance the way Plato organizes the four kinds of imperfect governments in Book VIII and IX in *The Republic*, “They are presented not merely as one might draw up a list,” Burke surmises, “but *developmentally*. The steps from his ideal government to ‘timocracy,’ and thence successively to ‘oligarchy,’ ‘democracy,’ and ‘tyranny’ are interpreted as the unfolding of a single process.”⁵⁰³ Thus, it is the interrelation between the terms that make for an ultimate order. And just like with Fuller, if Rome must have its devil, then so too must “Rome” be considered an ordering principle, a “god term,” which we use to interlock the associated dialectical and positive terms to construct an altar of piety.

Returning to Hitler’s “Battle,” the second step toward creating a rhetoric of nationalism is what Burke calls “identification through inborn dignity,” which is to say that one must unite a multiplicity of people at different levels of status by stressing an “innate” superiority that is both pure in potential and has a corresponding end goal, or aspiration. “In both religious and humanistic patterns of thought,” Burke states, “a ‘natural born’ dignity of man is stressed. And this categorical dignity is considered to be an attribute of *all* men, if they will but avail themselves of it, by right thinking and right living.”⁵⁰⁴ To identify with a natural, inborn dignity is to directly confront the implications of identification as a rhetorical trope. For Burke, identification means, above all, to define the central property of a thing. Rhetorically, once we assign meaning to a thing, we then act on the basis of those identifications. Identifying with a thing, however, does not mean are comprised of the same substance. Quite the opposite in fact. “A is not identical with his colleague, B,” Burke states. “But insofar as their interests are joined,

A is *identified* with B. Or he may *identify himself* with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so.”⁵⁰⁵ Herein lies the ambiguity of substance, according to Burke—that we are all discrete individuals possessing our own unique substance—and since to confront the implications of *identification* is also to confront those of *division*—then here too is revealed the paradox of substance. In practice, we only know a thing’s substance by identifying its properties and what surrounds it or is associated with it; thus, we know a thing’s inside by its outside. Therefore, to understand the identification is to confront the explicit doctrine of *consubstantiality*.

To be consubstantial with a thing is to acknowledge a state of sharing, or shared substance, but only through the identification of shared properties. Substance, Burke points to in the old philosophies, “was an *act*; and a way of life is an *acting-together*; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them *consubstantial*.” Thus, the rhetoric of identification “deals with the possibilities of classification in its *partisan* aspects; it considers the ways in which individuals are at odds with one another, or become identified with groups more or less at odds with one another.” In short, consubstantiality both brings together and separates us from others. Returning to the case of Hitler’s “Battle,” “Modern war characteristically requires a myriad of constructive acts for each destructive one,” therefore in order to destroy internationalism Hitler had to first construct an united front of disparate individuals whom were consubstantial with each other based on the shared substance of inborn dignity.⁵⁰⁶ In order to share this substance, however, Hitler had to first convince the German people that their innate dignity was founded upon the idea that they were all headed toward the same goal. Complex identifications are in this way, “entelechial”—a term that Burke imports from Aristotle’s concept of the “entelechy, the notion that each being aims at the perfection

natural to its kind,” or etymologically, is marked by a “possession of the telos within.”⁵⁰⁷ Put simply, entelechy is a way of naming a thing according to the intuition, maturing, or ideal fulfillment of its own being. In the case of Hitler’s “Battle,” this maturation was aimed at the “Aryan race,” and in the case of Margaret Fuller and Italian Revolution, this ideal fulfillment was twofold: that the Italians were a noble race, and that Italy was moving toward a New Era, marked by its developing Democratic Order.

The third step of Hitler’s “Battle” sees one of the more dramatic differences between his rhetoric of nationalism and Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism. That is to say, once a people have become consubstantial with one another, acknowledging the shared entelechial substance of an inborn superiority combined with a great destiny, they must then rally behind a leader who embodies their common will. In Hitler’s case, he did not celebrate himself as some “philosophy of the superman,” as Burke describes, but instead integrates “leader” and “people” so intricately “that leader and people were completely identified with each other.” In doing so, Hitler becomes the de facto “inner voice” of the collective German Personality—“Hitler’s inner voice, equals leader-people identification, equals unity, equals Reich, equals the mecca of Munich, equals plow, equals sword, equals work, equals war, equals army as midrib, equals responsibility, equals sacrifice, equals the theory of ‘German democracy,’ equals love, equals idealism, equals obedience to nature, equals race, nation.”⁵⁰⁸ The case of Italian nationalism, however, differs from this model in one major way, namely, the common will resides in the people—the “Spirit” of Italy—instead of in a single leader from which all linkages follow. Yes, Fuller celebrates Guiseppe Mazzini, but the people celebrate “The Republic.” Thus instead of totalitarianism, Fuller envisions a New Democratic Order of Unity for all of Italy. In this way, Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism asserts the operative positive, dialectical, and

ultimate terms of this new Order. To do this, however, she first had to shift the terms of order from an old covenant (i.e. the Pope) and form, what Burke calls, a *counter-covenant*.

The idea of forming a “counter-covenant” links up with the fourth and fifth step in Hitler’s rhetoric of nationalism because it deals with the movements between opposing ranges of piety. In the fourth step, after rallying a people behind some representation of the common will, one must then create a sense of collective guilt, which can then be targeted onto a “perfect” enemy in the fifth step as a Projection Device. As Burke writes, “Order is to disorder as obedience is to disobedience.”⁵⁰⁹ By using language to create a “perfect” order, we thus create the inevitable outcome of failing to live up to our ideals, causing pain in others in the process—all the while seeking to punish the guilty and redeem ourselves. As Burke puts it, “if order, then guilt; if guilt, then redemption; if redemption, then victimage.”⁵¹⁰ In the case of Italy in 1848, Fuller locates the collective guilt in the tragic loss of the Pope—who symbolized the entelechial substance of Italian identification. In other words, the fact that Italy believed Pius IX would bring them a glorious future only made it more painful to realize how far the collective had fallen from the ideal when he failed to live up to his promise. “In sum,” Burke writes, “there is a notable qualitative difference between the idea of a mere ‘fall’ from a position in which one still believes but to which one is at times unequal, and the idea of a deliberate turn to an alternate allegiance. It would be a difference between being ‘weak in virtue’ and being ‘strong in sin.’”⁵¹¹ The Pope was strong in sin when he deliberately fled Rome, and thus the people’s sense of collective guilt stems from that same root. All that was needed was a *scapegoat*, a “perfect” enemy onto which to project their guilt.

In the fifth step of Hitler’s rhetoric of nationalism, a “perfect” enemy is needed that can properly bear the burden of collective guilt in a multiplicity of ways. This enemy must

simultaneously appear to be ever-present and invisible, as well as a great threat but also weak of virtue, and not focused on a specific individual. It is, above all, a “curative” process, Burke writes, “that comes with the ability to hand over one’s ills to a *scapegoat*, thereby getting purification by dissociation.” Burke defines a “scapegoat” as the “representative” or “vessel” of certain unwanted evils; it is “the sacrificial animal upon whose back the burden of these evils is ritualistically loaded.”⁵¹² In the case of Hitler, projecting their evils on an entire other race was “especially medicinal, since the sense of frustration leads to a self-questioning. Hence if one can hand over his infirmities to a vessel, or ‘cause,’ outside the self, one can battle an external enemy instead of battling an enemy within.”⁵¹³ Where the Italian case differs, however, is that the people could not identify their scapegoat, for they mistakenly identified the surrounding nations, France in particular, as sympathetic to their revolutionary cause, unaware they were playing a much larger game of power with Austria and the Old Order. Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism thus differs from the Hitler model in that she did not have the perfect villain, but instead had to convince the people (i.e. her readers) that their scapegoat was the very nations that were pretending to be on their side. This false linkage can easily be explained, however, through the sixth step in Hitler’s rhetoric of nationalism.

In the sixth step, one must demand a new self-discipline based on *Mortification* of old virtues turned into vices. If the scapegoat is guilt projected outward onto some sacrificial vessel, then the process of mortification is when guilt turns inward, but in a way that makes the collective feel “stronger” and committed to a new goal, namely, by purging oneself of the “selfishness” and “pity” that led to dissolution of unity. “The principle of mortification is particularly crucial to conditions of empire,” Burke writes, “which act simultaneously to awaken all sorts of odd and exactly obstacles to their fulfillment,”

The mortified must, with one aspect of himself, be saying no to another aspect of himself—hence the urgent incentive to be “purified” by “projecting” his conflict upon a scapegoat, by “passing the buck,” by seeking a sacrificial vessel upon which he can vent, as from without, a turmoil that is actually within.⁵¹⁴

The problem with Italy was that its people could not be fully purged of the Pope’s presence. The trained incapacity of their spiritual rituals made it so that their “holy father” was never entirely to blame. Thus they projected their anger onto lesser political and religious leaders, while holding onto the idea that the poor Pope was just a fool, never meant for politics or revolution. To reiterate, mortification is akin to a symbolic suicide—we slays a part of ourselves in the name of self-control, self governance, or self-discipline; where as scapegoating is akin to a symbolic homicide—we slay something or someone external to us which bears the guilt and removes it. And when applied as a formula onto the revolutionary situation in Italy in 1848, would look like this: Fuller’s rhetorical linkages—[Pope → creates guilt, thus Pope needs mortification] + [collective guilt → search for scapegoat] = [correctly identify France as “enemy”] function as medicine for the Italians’ mental linkages—[Pope → creates guilt, thus his underlings need to be scapegoated] + [collective guilt → search for scapegoat] = [incorrectly identify France as “friend”]. Fuller, however, knew the Italians could not entirely slay themselves of the Pope, for he was the only thing tying together Italy’s Northern and Southern regions. What was needed then was the final step, as articulated by Burke, of Hitler’s rhetoric of nationalism—achieving a symbolic *rebirth*.

After going through the cycle of guilt, scapegoating, and/or mortification, the seventh and final step focuses on the task of redemption, which is to say the “rebirth” brought about through a combination of actual and vicarious atonements. As the prophet of his own people, Hitler’s

rhetoric gave his people a “positive” view of the future—“they can again get the feel of *moving forward*, toward a *goal*.” Such symbolic rebirth required, according to Burke, “a symbolic change of lineage,”

Here, above all, we see Hitler giving a malign twist to a benign aspect of Christian thought. For whereas the Pope, in the familistic pattern of thought basic to the Church, stated that the Hebrew prophets were the *spiritual ancestors* of Christianity, Hitler uses this same mode of thinking in reverse. He renounces this “ancestry” in a “materialistic” way by voting himself and the members of his lodge a different “blood stream” from that of the Jews.⁵¹⁵

The conclusion of this line of reasoning is intuitive—collective violence against the scapegoat is needed in order to purge all guilt and cure all ills. Rhetorically, we place upon the scapegoat all “devil terms,” identified by their “positive” characteristics, so that the resulting collective violence is entirely contingent upon the scapegoat’s “purgation,”—even if the act of purging does not actually attain any practical end. “A total rebirth would require a change of *substance*,” Burke says, and Hitler provided that in the form of an actual new blood stream.⁵¹⁶ But in the case of Italy, with its people having missed their scapegoat, Fuller’s job was the reverse of Hitler’s. She must construct a new set of “god terms” that can be associated by the “positive” characteristics of the events happening in Rome. To do this, she appealed to the philosophy of Guiseppe Mazzini, who promised the Italian people a spiritual rebirth in the form of a new nation. Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism thus sought to widen the entelechial circumference of the Italian great destiny of Unity—“Mankind is one, and beats with one great heart.” Here, the rebirth is not in an actual blood stream, but rather of accepting various “bloods” as all parts of a greater, transcendent whole.

Although I am using Burke here as a model to explore Fuller's transcendental nationalism, it must be noted that her writing is in no way connected to Burke's actual theory. Indeed, Fuller developed, practice and mastered her rhetorical style without having any rhetorical template to guide her. The core argument of this dissertation, in fact, is all of the steps of her rhetorical development were necessary for her to produce this type of rhetoric. The rhetoric of transcendence came about through her early life experience, inspired at first simply by the demands of her father and then cultivated in her conversations with other intellectuals, the women of her salon, the wide range of her reading, and her personal reflections. The rhetoric of nationalism was born in her trip to the west and writing in Greeley's *Tribune*, a rhetoric that then quickly matured and took on a critical and emancipatory tone in her travels through Europe. In Italy these two strands came together and produced a model for the rhetoric of transcendental nationalism that would become not an expression of Burke's genre, but a historical revolutionary context for understanding his theory in action as well as our own practice today as we aspire to achieve the same ideals.

“The New Era is no longer an embryo; it is born; it begins to walk—this very year sees its first giant steps, and can no longer mistake its features.”—Margaret Fuller

In the Winter of 1850, the revolutions of 1848 had finally come to a close. Writing from Florence, Fuller reflects on the power of the Italian Spirit and the voices that animated it throughout the past years: “The voice of this age shall yet proclaim the names of some of these Patriots whose inspiring soul was JOSEPH MAZZINI.” Unfortunately, Mazzini had not achieved his grand vision for a truly United Italy. “Humbug shows itself now with a flare of departing light,” Fuller writes somberly, “and one grows breathless at the impudence with which tyrants call on God to prosper their bloody dealings.”⁵¹⁷ In fact, the state of Italy at present was a far cry from the glorious revolution Mazzini had envisioned. “At this moment,” Fuller writes, “all the worst men are in power, and the best betrayed and exiled,”

All the falsities, the abuses of the old political forms, the old social compact, seem confirmed. Yet it is not so: the struggle that is now to begin will be fearful, but even from the first hours not doubtful. Bodies rotten and trembling cannot long contend with swelling life. Tongue and hand cannot be permanently employed to keep down hearts. Indeed, the events of the Roman Revolution had only worked to waft the flames of indignation that the Italians felt in their hearts. Now more than ever, the revolutionary spirit was alive. And it resided predominately in Fuller’s rhetorical style. She tells her readers of how seeds for a vast harvest of hatreds and contempts are sown over every inch of Roman ground,” and they will not be cut off at the root, unless “the wishes of Heaven shall waft a fire that will burn down all, root and branch, and prepare the earth for an entirely new culture.” The next revolution, she declares, “here and elsewhere, will be radical.”⁵¹⁸

Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism did not die when Italy lost the war, but instead burst out as if from a cocoon to take flight in a new, more radical form. Even though Rome had been occupied, and the Old Order was once again in control, its old schema of pious orientation could never again take hold of the hearts of Italians. "The Pope cannot retain even his spiritual power," Fuller declares, "Not only Jesuitism must go, but the Roman Catholic religion must go... Not only the Austrian, and every potentate of foreign blood, must be deposed, but every man who assumes an arbitrary lordship over fellow man, must be driven out." Fuller cries how the next revolution will be "uncompromising,"

England cannot reason nor ratify nor criticize it—France cannot betray it—Germany cannot bungle it—Italy cannot bubble it away—Russia cannot stamp it down nor hide it in Siberia. The New Era is no longer an embryo; it is born; it begins to walk—this very year sees its first giant steps, and can no longer mistake its features.

Having burst forth into a new rhetorical style, Fuller tells readers how "little interest" she now has in the state of Italy, "It is all leavened with the same leaven, and ferments to the same end." It is toward America that her rhetorical hopes are now directed. She had always felt that America's destiny lies in the secrets of Europe's Old World culture, but the irony in this is that Europe's "New Era" had given *her* the rhetorical capabilities of a new form of transcendental rhetoric, which she planned to put to work once safely back in America. "A faith is offered—men are everywhere embracing it; the film is hourly falling from their eyes and they see, not only near but far, duties worthy to be done."⁵¹⁹ Sadly, this is one of the last sentences Fuller would ever publish. But instead of lamenting the loss of a potential radical new rhetoric, we must excavate what she did write, which the remainder of this section will do, as outlined in the previous section.

In the twenty-sixth dispatch, Fuller writes of the beginning of the revolution in Rome in which she expresses the solidarity felt between those who remained in Rome after word of its possible invasion. “City of the Soul!” she proclaims, “The great Past enfolds us, and the emotions of the moment cannot here importantly disturb that impression.” Rome functioned as a god term for the Italians that so strong even “the revolutions, tumults, panics, hopes of the present day” could not affect the general disposition of its people. “Repose!” Fuller cries, “still the temper of life here is Repose.” And with the city void of all “foreigners,” she describes how the “the secret heart” that “lies buried or has fled to animate other forms” came to life in the city, the fields, the rivers, and beneath the moon of Rome:

for of that part historians have rarely given a hint, more than they do now of the truest life of our day, that refuses to be embodied by the pen; it craves forms more mutable, more eloquent than the pen can give.

She felt consubstantial with those who remained; who could appreciate an Italian sun.

And so, while resting in the grass on one of the many burial grounds, Fuller describes feeling consubstantial with the people who remained. “The very dust magnetizes you,” she writes, “and thousand spells have been chaining you in every careless, every murmuring moment. Yes! Rome, however seen, thou must be still adored; and every hour of absence or presence must deepen love with one who has known what it is to repose in thy arms.”⁵²⁰ Thus repose was the motive of Italian, who fell back into the arms of destiny—for Italy was undoubtedly filled with glorious entelechial substance. It is on the grounds of this grand united front that Fuller rhetorically orients her readers to the revolution in Rome. That is to say, she isolates the beauty of Rome behind the veil of “foreigners,” as if sifting for gold on a river’s sandy bottom. Thus Beauty, Nature, and Italy coalesce to form a rhetorical promise, namely, that both Nature and

Destiny were on the side of Italy, and the revolution would not stop until Italy became independent and united as a republic.

After identifying the entelechial substance of Italy, Fuller's moves on to describe the inborn dignity of its people. The Italians she describes as "noble," "genuine," full of passion and "sentiment." In the twenty-eighth dispatch, she describes having a conversation with an American who "had no confidence in the Republic," Why? she asked him, because he had "no confidence in the People." Why? Fuller probed further, because they "were not like our people." "I must say," Fuller replies, "the Italian has a decided advantage over you in the power of quickly feeling generous sympathy."⁵²¹ Between the twenty-sixth and twenty-eighth dispatch, then, Fuller links the inborn dignity of the "noble Italian" together with the great destiny of "Rome." Of the women she writes, "Many handsome women, otherwise dressed in white, wore the red liberty cap, and the noble though somewhat coarse Roman outline beneath this brilliant red, by the changeful glow of million lights, made a fine effect."⁵²² Here we see both "positive terms" like the liberty cap and dialectical terms like "noble" associated with the image of the "Italian" that's aim is to create a sense of inborn dignity through a new democratic ethos.

As Fuller saw it, the only problem standing in the way of ushering in a New Era was where to locate the common will of the people. Having lost their symbolic figurehead, the Italians need some vessel, some scapegoat to purge themselves of collective guilt. Seeing as how the Pope had already removed himself from the situation in the most cowardly way—"stealing away by night in the coach of a foreign diplomatist"—the Italian people needed a vessel to sacrifice to purge their guilt.⁵²³ In Fuller's dispatches, this role fell consistently upon the prime minister. First, there was Pelligrino Rossi, assassinated by a just outside the Chamber of the Assembly:

The Chamber was awaiting the entrance of Rossi. Had he lived to enter, he would have found the Assembly, without a single exception, ranged upon the Opposition benches. His carriage approached, attended by a howling, hissing multitude. He smiled, affected unconcern, but must have felt relieved when his horses entered the courtyard gate of the *Cancelleria*. He did not know he was entering the place of his execution. The horses stopped; he alighted in the midst of a crowd, it jostled him as if for the purpose of insult; he turned abruptly and received as he did so the fatal blow. It was dealt by a resolute, perhaps experienced, hand; he fell and spoke no word more.

After Rossi fell, Fuller describes the crowd as “silent” and unaffected, “as if all previously acquainted with the plan, as no doubt most of them were.” She suggests that the people viewed the killing as “an act of summary justice on an offender whom the law could not reach, but they felt it indecent to shout or exult on the spot where he was breathing last.” And then again, once the “illustrious Gioberti” was appointed Minister, he too was purged and quickly fell “from his high scaffold of words,” having “been made the scape-goat” after being forced to accept the role of Minister by Charles Albert just four weeks prior. “His demerits,” Fuller states, “were too unmistakable for rhetoric to hide.”⁵²⁴ And all the while, as Italians purged themselves of those parts of the church and the Italian governments they had scapegoated, the real enemy was preparing to invade.

With the scapegoats purged, Fuller’s rhetoric turns toward a vessel with the potential to embody and actualize the common will of the Italian people. This vessel was twofold: the new democratic order of the Roman Republic, and its temporary symbolic power, the Third Roman Triumvirate with Guiseppe Mazzini as its most prominent figure. “Mazzini is the idol of the people,” Fuller cries. Even in exile, he “remained absolutely devoted to his native country,”

because he believed, according to Fuller, “that the interests of humanity in all nations are identical, he felt also that, born of a race so suffering, so much needing devotion and energy, his first duty was to that.” Indeed, “Rome” was the theme of Mazzini’s thoughts, and the only powers he acknowledged were “*God and the People*.” He embodied all that was best in the Italian character. And after transcribing several of his speeches, some even from memory, she declares him “a man of genius, an elevated thinker,” and “most powerful” in “the religion of his soul, of his *virtue*, both in the modern and antique sense of the word.”⁵²⁵ He was the prophet that this artist-people needed, who could introduce a new metaphor that could unite the people behind a common will. As Kenneth Burke later theorizes in *Permanence and Change*, “The decay of a priesthood” naturally leads to “a division between priests and prophets. The priests devote their efforts to maintaining the vestigial structure; the prophets seek new perspectives whereby this vestigial structure may be criticized and a new one established in its place.”⁵²⁶ And the prophet is precisely what Fuller felt Rome needed, for Mazzini had the gift of foresight and his philosophy of action aimed particularly at long-term Unity, even if their efforts were doomed in the short-term. And doomed they were! for starting in the thirtieth dispatch, Fuller wrote from within barricaded Rome. “The Mother of Nations,” she laments, “is now at bay against them all.”⁵²⁷

The arrival of the French brought with it a new enemy. But having been so focused inward, Italy did not at once receive France as a foe, but rather as a friend. Fuller, however, anticipated the French treachery over two months prior. In the twenty-eighth dispatch, Fuller reports on Austria invading Ferrara: “This step is no doubt intended to determine whether France will resent the insult, or whether she will betray Italy.”⁵²⁸ Sure enough, France sent their general Nicolas Oudinot and one by one the French army took over Italy’s outer city-states on their march to Rome. “Ah! the way of falsehood,” Fuller declares, “the way of treachery, how dark—

how full of pitfalls and traps!”⁵²⁹ She goes on to translate a series of correspondence between M. Ferdinand Lesseps—official Envoy of the French Government—and Rome’s Triumvirate on the topic of halting the French invasion. But with every letter came news of another city ransacked by the French. “Observe the miserable evasion of this missive of Oudinot,” Fuller critically observes. “He pretended to come as a friend, a protector,”

Cowardly man! He knows now that he comes upon a city which wishes to receive him only as a friend, and he cries, “With my cannon—with my bombs, I will compel you to let me betray you.”⁵³⁰

No one thought possible the bombardment of Rome. Matters had verged to a crisis. Fuller, too, was in shock: “In the evening ’tis pretty, though a terror, to see the bombs, fiery meteors, springing from the horizon line upon their bright path to do their wicked message.”⁵³¹ The prophet Mazzini was also losing his allure in the eyes of Italians as they increasingly feared for their safety. What the people needed now was not a prophet, but a hero—someone who could face the immediate threats of the present head on and force open the New Era.

On April 30th, the first encounter between French and Italian armies took place outside Civita Vecchia, and the French were driven back by the mighty legions of Giuseppe Garibaldi. Brandishing their signature red tunics, Garibaldi’s men “fought like lions,” Fuller writes, “and no inch of ground was gained by the assailant. The loss of the French is said to be very great: it could not be otherwise.” The French, too, Fuller says, “fought with great bravery,” as they skillfully “sheltered themselves in their advance by moveable barricades.” Here, Fuller’s voice seems to straddle the realms of art criticism and romanticized notions of battle. “Six or seven hundred Italians are dead or wounded,” she writes, “those of Garibaldi especially, who are much exposed by their daring bravery, and whose red tunic makes them the natural mark of the

enemy.” With a dark and almost humorous tone she declares, “It seems to me a great folly to wear such a dress amid the dark uniforms, but Garibaldi has always done it. He has now been wounded twice here and seventeen times in Ancona.” Fuller’s lambasting tone for Garibaldi is telling because it shows how little faith she had in the efforts of his Italian legions. Even though people celebrated Garibaldi as their savior, Fuller knew his efforts, although noble, would never be able to overcome the hordes of French billowing into Italy. “Frightful sacrifices are being made by Rome. All her glorious oaks, all her gardens of delight, her casinos, full of the monuments of genius and taste, are perishing in the defense.” And since Fuller believed much of the Spirit of Italy resides within the materiality of its great history, she was horrified to think that Spirit was being bombarded and destroyed. Here begins the language of mortification in Fuller’s dispatches—“Rome will never recover the cruel ravage of these days,” she concedes, “perhaps only just begun.”⁵³²

In the thirty-third dispatch, Fuller writes on the topic of Rome under siege as an act of mortification, or a symbolic slaying of the self. She directs her lamentations in the direction of Rome’s ravagers: “As to the men who die, I share the impassioned sorrow of the Triumvirs. ‘O Frenchmen!’ they wrote, ‘could you know what men you destroy.—*They* are no mercenaries, like those who fill your ranks, but the flower of the Italian youth, and the noblest souls of the age.’” This was especially true of the Garibaldi legions in whom “a spirit burns noble as ever,” and that represented those “previous facts we treasure from the heroic age.”⁵³³ The final act of severing limb from body came on the evening of July 2nd: “It was known that the French were preparing to cross the river and take possession of all the city,” Fuller writes,

I went into the Corso with some friends; it was filled with citizens and military, the carriage was stopped by the crowd near the Doria palace; the lancers of Garibaldi

galloped along in full career, I longed for Sir Walter Scott to be on earth again, and see them; all are light, athletic, resolute figures, many of the forms of the finest manly beauty of the South, all sparkling with its genius and ennobled by the resolute spirit, ready to dare, to do, to die.

Fuller portrays Garibaldi's exit as a "beautiful," "romantic," and "sad" scene, as everyone in the crowd knew full well that they were most likely galloping to their graves. "*Where* go, they know not," Fuller observes of these beautifully dressed dragoons—"the tunic of bright red cloth, the Greek cap or else round hat with Puritan plume, their long hair was blown back from resolute faces; all looked full of courage." Losing these men was the final piece of the transformation of the Italian people. "And Rome," she cries, "must she lose also these beautiful and brave that promised her regeneration and would have given it, but for the perfidy, the overpowering force of the foreign intervention." These were the men of the revolution who embodied the Italian Spirit. Men who "had counted the cost before they entered on this perilous struggle; they had weighed life and all its material advantages against liberty, and made their election; they turned not back, nor flinched at this bitter crisis." Yes! "Hard was the heart, stony and seared the eye that had no tear for that moment," Fuller says. "Go! Fated, gallant band, and if forth to perish," then at least Rome would have its consolation: a prize that Mazzini promised, and Garibaldi tried to deliver; a future for the Italian people in the New Era. "The fruits of all this will be the same as elsewhere: temporary repression will sow the seeds of perpetual resistance," Fuller concludes in the thirty-fourth dispatch; "and never was Rome in so fair a way to be educated for the Republican form of Government as now."⁵³⁴

In sum, this chapter began with Fuller rhetorically transferring the hope of Rome from a cowardly Pope to a promising new Republic. Her hope was that the people would form a new

counter-covenant with Guiseppe Mazzini and the Third Triumvirate of the Roman Constitutional Assembly. Her rhetoric was thus one of national identification, rooted in an entelechial consubstantiality, and aimed at the Transcendental destiny of a great nation united in a common will for genuine democracy. From there, Fuller's rhetoric of transcendence aimed to glorify Italy as a nation and a people fated to break the chains of their Old Order and usher in a New Era for all of Europe. Her goal was to dramatize this process for American readers by outlining the various ways Italians sought to redirect their Spirit so as to rally behind a new symbol and purge themselves of their collective guilt from the tragic loss of the Pope. To do this, Fuller puts forth a new set of terms of order that serve the medicinal function of achieving a symbolic rebirth through, what Kenneth Burke has later termed, the guilt-redemption cycle. To reiterate, the point of these past two chapters has been less about rhetorically reconstructing Fuller's drama of the Roman revolution using Burkean terms, and more about positioning Fuller as *a priori* to Burke's modern theoretical approach to the rhetoric of transcendence and nationalism. My central point is that Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism came to being *through* her particular life experiences in both American *and* Europe, which then culminated in the contextual moment of the Italian revolutionary situation.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

“Send, dear America, a talisman to thy ambassadors, precious beyond all that boasted gold of California. Let it loose his tongue to cry ‘Long live the Republic, and may God bless the cause of the People, the brotherhood of nations and of men—the equality of rights for all.’ Viva America! Hail to my country! May she live a free, a glorious, a loving life, and not perish, like the old dominion, from the leprosy of selfishness.”—Margaret Fuller

Fuller wrote this on May 27th, 1849, just before negotiations with the French heated up. This was the last sentence Fuller sent back to America until after the bombardment and defeat of Rome. “If I mistake not, I closed my last letter just as the news arrived here that the attempt of the Democratic party in France to resist the infamous proceedings of the Government had failed,” Fuller begins the thirty-fourth dispatch with, “and thus Rome, as far as human calculation went, had not a hope for her liberties left.”⁵³⁵ What then followed was an entire dispatch describing the destruction, invasion, and occupation of her beloved city. After Garibaldi’s departure, the final act of mortification had concluded. The Romans redeemed their guilt, but the outcome was unexpected. A far cry from what Mazzini prophesized, Rome was now in a grotesque state—ransacked and occupied by the soldiers of the very country whom Italy had used as inspiration for its own revolutionary spirit. The New Era was supposed to bring with it an unfettering of chains, but instead switched them out for a new pair. “The French have taken up their quarters in the court-yards of the Quirinal and Venetian Palaces, which are full of the wounded, many of whom have been driven well nigh mad, and their burning wounds exasperated by the sound of their drums and trumpets—the constant sense of their insulting

presence.”⁵³⁶ But while the state of Italy was certainly grotesque, Fuller was convinced now more than ever that Mazzini’s vision for a new order had indeed come to pass.

Despite under the occupation of France, the people were no longer bound to the ideology of its Old Order. Whereas Fuller had worried the people’s Spirit would extinguish after the tragic loss of the Pope, once the people saw their hero, Garibaldi, exit the city atop his noble steed to continue the fight, knowing full well defeat was inevitable. The guilt-redemption cycle had completed its first revolution, and no matter what form the New Era took—whether as a Republic, or under the thumb of foreign rule—its ideology was unchangeable. In the last of her dispatches, Fuller describes various forms of resistance against the French to show that the Spirit had not been squashed, but was rather buried under the crust of oppression. On July 8th, for instance, she describes the reaction of the American Consul, Mr. Brown, after his “domicile” was “violated” by the French:

that Mr. Brown, banner in one hand and sword in the other, repelled the assault, and fairly drove them down stairs; that then he made them an appropriate speech, though in a mixed language of English, French and Italian; that the crowd vehemently applauded Mr. Brown, who already was much liked for the warm sympathy he had shown the Romans in their aspirations and their distresses; that he then donned his uniform and went to Oudinot to make his protest. How this was received I know not, but understand Mr. B. departed with his family yesterday evening.

Turning her rhetorical voice onto Americans, Fuller concludes, “Will America look as coldly on the insult to herself as she has on the struggle of this injured people?” And this was not the only vignette that signifies these patriotic outbursts—these “emblems of anarchy,” as Fuller puts it (307-308). She also offers other punchy anecdotes about Italian resistance: how three families

were carried to prison after a boy “crowed like a cock” at French soldiers; how an Address “To the people of Rome” had been circulated advocating for “sublime silence” as a “weapon” to use against the French; and how when amidst a service in honor of the dead at the Church of St. Ignatius, an unknown Italian shouted, “Peace be with the souls of those who perished for their country!” and then the crowd responded, “Peace, Peace, Amen!”⁵³⁷ Although every effort was made by the French authorities to discover the speaker, it was in vain, for this “deep voice” was merely a single representation of a much larger, and more powerful common will of the Italian people. Although the Old Order had taken back their hold over Italy’s body, the Spirit of the Italians had been set free.

In her thirty-seventh and final dispatch, Fuller prophesized a coming revolution, but the next revolution, she declared, would not be for Italy; it would be for the world. “Joy to those born in this day,” she begins:

In America is open to them the easy chance of a noble, peaceful growth, in Europe of a combat grand in its motives, and in its extent beyond what the world ever before so much as dreamed. Joy to them; and joy to those their heralds, who, if their path was desert, their work unfinished, and their heads in the power of a prostituted civilization, to throw as toys at their feet of flushed, triumphant wickedness, yet holy-hearted in unasking love, great and entire in their devotion, fall or fade, happy in the thought that there come after them greater than themselves, who may at last string the harp of the world to full concord, in glory to God in the highest, for peace and love from man to man is become the bond of life.⁵³⁸

Although Europe’s revolution had ended, the revolution in Fuller’s rhetorical style had only just begun. Having written an entire manuscript on the History of the Roman Revolution, Fuller

undoubtedly thought her next book would be on America. For the last she saw its shores, she had departed on a romantic quest to recover seeds of life in the Old World and bring them back to plant in the New. But what Fuller found was not some treasure, some rhetorical object to repackage for Americans. What she found was a new rhetorical style with which to dramatize the great history of America's own current state. She had not discovered a new literature in Europe, but instead developed a new genre—revolutionary nationalism, as Nathan Crick calls it. “In her dispatches,” Crick writes, “Fuller placed transcendental eloquence on the global stage, lashing out against the cause of tyranny and wrong that was everywhere the same, criticizing the United States for the same barbarity that she saw in Europe, and championing the rights of all people—not only individuals but entire nations—to pursue self-determination and tap into the sources of their own unique genius that would give them both beauty and power.”⁵³⁹ Ironically, both *History and Nature*—two things Fuller loved—decided that she would not get the opportunity to germinate her revolutionary rhetoric. On July 19th, 1850, Margaret Fuller Ossoli drowned along with her husband and infant baby a few hundred yards off the shore of Fire Island, New York. Her manuscript was never found.

History remembers the life of Margaret Fuller as the tragedy of a woman who had always felt herself an outsider, and thus pushed beyond every constraint, geographically, political, personally, and rhetorically. “She never lost faith,” Crick writes, “that the achievements of individual genius, motivated by a deep religious love would inspire practical development and culminate in the happiness of the multitude.”⁵⁴⁰ But in the end, the one constraint she could not surpass was her own mortality, which could only be taken by a hand greater than her own—the hand of God, of Nature. After her death aboard the *Elizabeth*, Horace Greeley published an article in the *Tribune* entitled, “In Memory of the Martyr to Human Liberty” in order to express

the profound emotional loss of not just friend, but a symbol of strength and power for both America and Americans.⁵⁴¹ Her early education taught her how to be discerning in her thinking, and her time as a teacher helped rise to the top of a system that helped refine her power as a woman, while restricting simultaneously restricting her to a narrow sphere of action. Thus, she established her famous series of “Conversations,” which gave Fuller, according to Crick, “the first real, immediate experience with how the art of words, especially in the context of dialogical exchange, could be used to shatter constraints and emancipate the latent powers of others—in this case other women.”⁵⁴² This led to her essay, “The Great Lawsuit: Man versus Men; Woman versus Women,” which after her time at the *Dial* became her second book, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. Here, Fuller eloquently maps out the specific challenges faced by women, calls for men to cast aside all arbitrary boundaries they had placed upon women, and asserts a new Romantic metahistory of the human Origin in the form of the “twin powers,”—the Muse and the Minerva—of humanity’s masculine and feminine faculties. She had put forth her first explicit politics of transcendence. And having transcended the separate gender spheres psychology of America, Fuller embarked on an even greater quest to seek out America’s hidden potential by going into its vast Western landscape.

Unlike her previous work, *Summer on the Lakes* was not critical in nature, but lyrical. Her goal, above all, was to entertain readers with poetry and story, but to also challenge readers with vivid accounts of the difficulties of women who live on the frontier as well as dramatizations of the tragic past of the Native Americans. Here, she mastered the art of synecdoche—constructing symbolic representations of human experience through an explicit formula—refined her intellectual travel voice, and asserted a new Western proto-mythology using Greek tales and creating representative characters that situated the noble savage Indian as

the tragic symbol of America's forgotten past. Her solution was to open the valves that connect America's civilized East and its wild West in order to create a new American ethos. More than just offering a new ideology, Fuller adapted her writing to a wider audience, which ultimately caught the eye of Horace Greeley, who offered her a job at the *New York Tribune*.

It was in the newspaper, then that Fuller finally developed a more explicit rhetorical style and partisan voice that spoke to a public readership. It was also where she reformulated her prosaic musings into a distinct rhetoric of nationalism. This is ultimately what spring-boarded Fuller into the position of foreign correspondent, where she fused her nationalist voice with her synecdochal rhetorical style to form a full-bodied characterization of each major European nation. Thus, it is important to emphasize that Fuller rhetoric of revolutionary nationalism, according to Crick, "did not contradict but was built upon her previous rhetorical strategies." Her skill at criticism helped her critique Europe's complex power structures and in doing so expose gaps and contradictions in those structures that enabled the emergence of new practices and identities. Her familiarity with the classical, Romantic and modern language of myth uniquely positioned her to construct an Italian national character charged with the history of its great Past. And her association with the Transcendentalists helped rhetorically transform the vertical structure of "Man-Thinking," into the horizontal structure of revolutionary nationalism, which Crick writes, "called a nation into being based on an identification of common origin, character, and destiny that bound them together through systems of representations and practices."⁵⁴³ Therefore, it makes sense to judge Fuller's rhetorical legacy based upon the work she did write, and not, as many historians lament, by the potential of what she didn't, or more appropriately, didn't publish.

I argue that Margaret Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism had not fully formed until the latter half of her Italian dispatches. The language of nationalism—as articulated by Guiseppe Mazzini—captured Fuller's imagination, that is to say it helped her construct the Italian character based on a grand vision of a radical new order for Italy. What makes it revolutionary, Crick argues, is that articulates “a romantic vision of new generations of Europeans casting off the old order and creating a new form of democratic republicanism founded on the principles of association inspired by the French Revolution.”⁵⁴⁴ But what makes it transcendental, I argue, is that even after the revolutions in Italy ended, Fuller's rhetoric was seemingly on the incline. “That advent called EMMANUEL begins to be understood,” she writes in the penultimate paragraph of her final dispatch. “Men shall now be represented as souls, not hands and feet, and governed accordingly. A congress of great, pure, loving minds, and not a congress of selfish ambitions, shall preside.”⁵⁴⁵ Therefore, I think it is best to end this dissertation not with a summary of what has been done—for far better historians have judged Fuller's life based upon the collective body of her work which led to a brief rhetorical spark of revolutionary nationalism—but instead with a prediction of what might have been.

In this final section, I want to answer this hypothetical question: If Fuller had survived, what would she have done? I think the answer to this question lies in the clues she left behind in her dispatches. I believe that like Italy, she would have dramatized a great American guilt-redemption cycle through the history of its own revolutionary past, using the tragic loss of its native people as a central cause for its current deplorable state. Thus, I aim to widen the circumference of Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism beyond the context of the Roman Revolution and walk in the direction of what she called the New Era.

“Nature, it seems to me, reveals herself more freely in our land; she is true, virgin and confiding—she smiles upon the vision of a true Endymion. I hope to see not only copies upon canvas of our magnificent scenes, but a transfusion of the spirit which is their divinity.”

—Margaret Fuller

Throughout all of the dispatches, Fuller would frequently digress into side discussions about the relationship between Art and Nature, specifically, why the American Artist should study in Italy. In the twenty-first dispatch, for instance, she says that American Artists are often told “they would do better to come home and *study*,” that “their landscapes show a want of familiarity with Nature,” and so “they need to return to America and see her again.” Yet, Fuller warns her readers against such advice, for “the aim of art to reproduce all forms of Nature, and that you would not be sorry to have transcripts of what you have not always round you.” It is here that Fuller’s rhetoric of transcendental nationalism truly begins. “But, friends,” she cries, “Nature wears a different face in Italy from what she does in America. Do you not want to see her Italian face; it is very glorious!” Nature was thus the grand front that Fuller initially began her dramatization of the Italian struggle for independence. And Nature, again, must be the grand front, albeit with a different face, that has the power to unite Americans, allowing them to become consubstantial with the great destiny of their vast land. This, however, could only happen if both America’s East and West were first united, as she argued in *Summer on the Lakes*. It is for this reason that Fuller advocates the American Artist to come abroad, for “American art,” she says, “is not necessarily a reorganization of American nature alone.”⁵⁴⁶

It is on this same point that the American abroad often becomes *more* ignorant in Fuller’s eyes. In the twenty-eighth dispatch she writes, “It is not thus that any seed-corn can be gathered from foreign gardens.” It takes “observation” and “patient study” to harness the power of Nature

through Art, and without both, the American will go home with “a mind befooled rather than instructed.” True instruction, then, lies in the American Artist’s ability to “speak the languages of these countries and know personally some of their inhabitants in order to form any accurate impressions.”⁵⁴⁷ In Italy, the ruins and artifacts told the tale of Italy’s great Past. Both Nature and History congeal together in Italy’s lakes and landscapes. “Every stone,” Fuller writes, speaks “for the instruction of the artist.” Thus, to understand the union between a people and its history is, according to Fuller, “a main secret of art.” And though America and Italy were different, the Artist can attune her “instructed eye” to both, thus unlocking their “mysteries of beauty.”⁵⁴⁸ In Artists, then, Fuller locates a sense of inborn dignity for both Italians and Americans based upon each of their great pasts. In terms of Nature, America did not have the ruins or lakes of Italy, but it had the vast West, with its limitless expanses, serene bluffs, hidden nooks, and beautiful lookout points. In terms of history, America had a great revolutionary past, but also a shameful one. Therefore, I believe Fuller would have used the divided nature of America’s past in order to make Americans acknowledge a sense of collective guilt.

Slavery is a major wrong in American culture that Fuller explicitly identified as a scapegoat to begin the process of purging America’s collective guilt. In the eighteenth dispatch, “New and Old World Democracy,” she writes, “Then there is this horrible cancer of Slavery, and this wicked War, that has grown out of it,”

How dare I speak of these things here? I listen to the same arguments against the emancipation of Italy, that are used against the emancipation of our blacks; the same arguments in favor of the spoliation of Poland as for the conquest of Mexico. I find the cause of tyranny and wrong everywhere the same—and lo! my Country the darkest

offender...no champion of the rights of men, but a robber and a jailer; the scourge hid behind her banner; her eyes fixed, not on the stars, but on the possessions of other men.⁵⁴⁹

Along with slavery, Fuller offers several other explicit topics onto which America could project its guilt. During her time at the Tribune, she also consistently wrote about the annexation of Texas, the character of the President, and the conditions of prison women. Central for Fuller is the idea that all of these problems are outgrowths of America's revolutionary past. Yes, America is the land of the New World; but its people have done many shameful acts. And these acts are a part of American history and should never be forgotten. In fact, Fuller observed that by ignoring America's tragic past, it has made Americans culturally weaker, and thus has led to a shameful present. Therefore, after establishing America's grand front of Nature, and the subsequent consubstantiality of its people in both this grand front and their own inborn dignity—stemming for a great revolutionary past—Fuller must unite the people in their collective guilt by pointing to scapegoats in the present, that have emerged out of a tragic past.

With the scapegoat identified, Fuller would most likely end the process with Mortification as the final act of guilt-purging. Fuller narrates Italy's process of Mortification in the dispatches by starting with the tragic loss of a holy father, the Pope. To the Italians, Italy's erupting revolutions combined with the tragic loss of the Pope made it seem as if Europe's "Old Order" was crumbling. When the French came to Italy, the Italians welcomed them as agents of the revolution—since France, as a nation, personified the spirit of revolution. France, however, was playing a much larger game with Austria for control of Europe. To the Italians, the French appeared saviors at first, but quickly became agents of the Old Order. Italy needed a symbolic savior. For Fuller, that savior was Mazzini who took the form of a prophet with a vision of a new world. For the Italian people, that savior was Garibaldi, the hero, who valiantly fought against

the French. But the French vastly outnumbered the Italians. And eventually, Rome fell. So, the Italian people, in a final act of mortification, watched their hero retreat out of the city into the mountains to continue the fight for Italy. America, like Italy, was also amidst a war. But unlike Italy, America was not being threatened by some greater force, or invading nation. The war America was facing was symptom of its own shameful state. "I do not deeply distrust my country," Fuller writes in the twenty-fourth dispatch. "She is not dead, but in my time she sleepeth, and the spirit of our fathers flames no more, but lies hid beneath the ashes."⁵⁵⁰ Once again, Fuller points to America's revolutionary past as the birthplace of its spirit. It is also the birthplace of its greatest tragedy, namely, the eradication of the Native Americans.

In *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller specifically identifies the Native American as *the* tragic symbol of America's past. What makes them tragic is not simply the fact that they were slaughtered, according to Fuller. It is more the fact that their noble culture is incompatible with America at present. For this reason, not only were the Indians annihilated, their very culture was uprooted, declared "savage," and then ultimately assimilated into American westward expansion. "My country is at present spoiled by prosperity," Fuller writes, "stupid with the lust of gain, soiled by crime in its willing perpetuation of Slavery, shamed by an unjust war, noble sentiment much forgotten even by individuals, the aims of politicians selfish or petty, the literature frivolous and venal."⁵⁵¹ (230). These were the characteristics of the American people that must be purged by mortification. This might have looked like, first, an acknowledgment of responsibility for the consequences of America's actions against its own native children. Second, a collective effort at preserving the culture of these injured people and creating spaces for them to live. In doing so, America could be redeemed, and the glimpse of Beauty and Harmony Fuller

saw in the great American West would coalesce with the civilized world and forge an even greater American destiny. It would be a true symbolic rebirth.

In Italy, what happened in the second half of the nineteenth century was akin to the natural phenomenon of a “backward curl” in a river: When a riverbed is smooth with deep water, its waves will break and fall in the natural direction of the course of a river. This is like the normal flow of history. But when the water is shallow, like Italy’s divided efforts at independence, and the riverbed is rocky, like the year 1848, and the descent of the current considerable, like the people’s hopes after the loss of the Pope, the waves receiving a contrary impulse from the impending rocks turn over and fall backward in the opposite direction of the river’s natural flow. In other words, when the waves of “noble” Italians came up against the impending rocks of a French invasion, their feeble waters turned over and fell backward, against the natural flow of history. Italy fell back into its Old Order. As Fuller herself notes in the dispatches, “A similar phenomenon is produced in all large collections of water,” (i.e. all peoples and all nations) “and very remarkable in the sea, by a wind adverse to the course of the water.” Put plainly, in the sea of human affairs, modern revolutionary thinking is a remarkable phenomenon, if only for the backward curls that it produces:

See! Each wavelet
 Backward curls;
See! Reversed
 Each eddy swirls;

See! It casts
 Its lingering look
Toward the scenes
 It hath forsook.⁵⁵²

In today's society, the language of nationalism is stronger and more prevalent than ever. It takes over our phones, our televisions, our schools and churches, our politicians and activists. And what is particularly scary is the fact that it comes from within. In my final chapter I used the rhetoric of nationalism Burke identifies in Hitler's "Battle," as a roadmap for analyzing Fuller's rhetoric of transcendental nationalism as it applied to the Italians in 1848. But for today, Hitler's "Battle" is not what is needed. Fuller's dispatches offer instead a model of nationalism that does achieve symbolic rebirth—not under the common will of a single leader, but instead envisions a New Era and idealizes a democratic Republic. Studying the rhetoric of Margaret Fuller's transcendental nationalism is thus useful because it offers a medicine of sorts, which sought to treat an injured and betrayed people through the process of guilt and redemption in an effort to offer a glimmer of newness with power enough to create a long lasting desire for a new reality. In this way, revolutionary moments are rhetorical moments because he or she who offers a new metaphor will, under the right conditions, tap into the great drama of rhetoric and prophecy. The prophetic voice is ultimately what best captures Margaret Fuller. And her rhetoric of transcendental nationalism has that same quality at its core: a rhetorical promise of what is to come by the patient process of observing the Past, appreciating the Present, and envisioning the Future.

NOTES

- ¹ Gura, *American Transcendentalism*, 238.
- ² Gura, *American Transcendentalism*, 238.
- ³ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 184.
- ⁴ Packer, *The Transcendentalists*, 217.
- ⁵ Greeley, *Recollections*, 191.
- ⁶ *Memoirs* 11.
- ⁷ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 185.
- ⁸ Deiss, *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller*, viii.
- ⁹ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 275.
- ¹⁰ Von Mehren, *Minerva and the Muse*, 2.
- ¹¹ Deiss, *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller*, v.
- ¹² Gura, *American Transcendentalism*, 129.
- ¹³ Von Mehren, *Minerva and the Muse*, 2.
- ¹⁴ Packer, *The Transcendentalists*, 114.
- ¹⁵ Fuller, *The Portable Margaret Fuller*, xxvii.
- ¹⁶ Bean & Myerson, *Margaret Fuller, Critic*, xxix.
- ¹⁷ Bean & Myerson, *Margaret Fuller Critic*, xv.
- ¹⁸ Reynolds & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 2.
- ¹⁹ Deiss, *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller*, vi.
- ²⁰ Von Mehren, *Minerva and the Muse*, 4.
- ²¹ See the following books in order of authors listed: Von Mehren, *Minerva and the Muse*; Steele, *Transfiguring America: Myth, Ideology, and Mourning in Margaret Fuller's Writing*; Kelley, *The Portable Margaret Fuller*; Packer, *The Transcendentalists*; Gura, *American Transcendentalism: A History*; and Miller, *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology*
- ²² Deiss, *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller*, vii.
- ²³ Deiss, *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller*, ix.
- ²⁴ Reynolds & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 8.
- ²⁵ Reynolds & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 29.
- ²⁶ Reynolds & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 12.
- ²⁷ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 148-49.
- ²⁸ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 179.
- ²⁹ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 160.
- ³⁰ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 169.
- ³¹ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.
- ³² McGee, "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology."
- ³³ Fisher, "Narration as a Human Condition Paradigm—The Case of Public Moral Argument"
- ³⁴ Habermas, "The Public Sphere—An Encyclopedia Article (1964)."
- ³⁵ Frazier, "Rethinking the Public Sphere—Contribution to Critique of Actually Existing Democracy."
- ³⁶ Jensen, "The American Paradox—More Freedom, Less Democracy."
- ³⁷ Miller, "The Paradox of Popular Culture and Democracy in America."
- ³⁸ Vivian, "Freedom, Naming, and Nobility: Convergence of Rhetorical and Political Theory in Nietzsche's Philosophy."
- ³⁹ Farrell, "Practicing the Art of Rhetoric."
- ⁴⁰ Hariman, "Decorum, Power, and the Courtly Style."
- ⁴¹ Arnt Aune, "Democratic Style and Ideological Containment."
- ⁴² Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric—The Case of the People Quebecols."
- ⁴³ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 181.

-
- ⁴⁴ Fuller, May 9, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 123
- ⁴⁵ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 123-25.
- ⁴⁶ Fuller, June 16, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 130.
- ⁴⁷ Quoted in: Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 125.
- ⁴⁸ Fuller, July 29, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 133.
- ⁴⁹ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 128.
- ⁵⁰ Fuller, Aug. 4, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 138.
- ⁵¹ Fuller, Aug. 17, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 144.
- ⁵² She was able to do this thanks to a \$50 gift from her friend, James Clarke. Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 130.
- ⁵³ Fuller, Sept. 20, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 147.
- ⁵⁴ Fuller, Oct. 13, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 151.
- ⁵⁵ Fuller, "The Two Herberts," 1.
- ⁵⁶ Fuller, "The Modern Drama," 4.
- ⁵⁷ Quoted in: Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 142.
- ⁵⁸ Von Mehren, *Minerva and the Muse*, 178.
- ⁵⁹ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 142.
- ⁶⁰ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 67.
- ⁶¹ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 7, 9.
- ⁶² Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 43, 44.
- ⁶³ Fuller, June 16, 1843, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 130.
- ⁶⁴ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 27, 28.
- ⁶⁵ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 53.
- ⁶⁶ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 59, 60.
- ⁶⁷ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 147.
- ⁶⁸ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 166.
- ⁶⁹ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 5.
- ⁷⁰ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 147.
- ⁷¹ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 221.
- ⁷² Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 115, 116.
- ⁷³ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 199.
- ⁷⁴ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 232.
- ⁷⁵ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 232.
- ⁷⁶ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 235, 236.
- ⁷⁷ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 65.
- ⁷⁸ Fuller, *Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*, 61, 62.
- ⁷⁹ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 177.
- ⁸⁰ Fuller, Nov. 17, 1844, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 241.
- ⁸¹ *Memoirs*, 141.
- ⁸² Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 147.
- ⁸³ Fuller, Oct. 28, 1844, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 237.
- ⁸⁴ Fuller, *The Portable Margaret Fuller*, 294
- ⁸⁵ Fuller, *The Portable Margaret Fuller*, 326.
- ⁸⁶ Fuller, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, v, vi.
- ⁸⁷ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 180.
- ⁸⁸ Fuller, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, 109, 110.
- ⁸⁹ Fuller, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, 151, 152.
- ⁹⁰ The "masculine" faculties she identifies as Energy, Power, and Intellect; the "feminine" as Harmony, Beauty, and Love. Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 183.

-
- ⁹¹ Fuller, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, 158-161.
- ⁹² Kelley, Mary, *The Portable Margaret Fuller*, x.
- ⁹³ Fuller, *The Portable Margaret Fuller*, 331.
- ⁹⁴ Greeley's wife, Mary, had introduced him to Fuller after participating in Fuller's Conversations. Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 165.
- ⁹⁵ Fuller, Oct. 1844, *Memoirs*, 138.
- ⁹⁶ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 195.
- ⁹⁷ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 195, 196, 198, 199.
- ⁹⁸ Fuller, Dec. 29, 1844, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 256.
- ⁹⁹ Fuller, Jan. 15, 1845, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 46.
- ¹⁰⁰ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 198.
- ¹⁰¹ Fuller's reviews also encompassed British and American belles lettres; Continental fiction, poetry, and drama; history, biography, autobiography, and travel; collections of criticisms and treatises on foreign languages; music and art history and children's stories; religious and science books; and American quarterlies and European newspapers. Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 237.
- ¹⁰² Fuller, "Our City Charities," 1.
- ¹⁰³ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 231.
- ¹⁰⁴ Fuller, Feb. 1846, *Memoirs*, 167-68.
- ¹⁰⁵ Through her connections, she also met the Norwegian violinist Ole Bull, the Danish author and revolutionist Paul Harro Harring, and the antislavery editor Cassius Clay, all of whom recognized Fuller as a prominent newspaper editor. Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 214-15, 233.
- ¹⁰⁶ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 234-36.
- ¹⁰⁷ Fuller, Aug. 14, 1845, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 359.
- ¹⁰⁸ Fuller, *Papers on Literature and Art*, 122, 123.
- ¹⁰⁹ Fuller, "American Facts," 1.
- ¹¹⁰ Fuller, "American Facts," 1.
- ¹¹¹ Fuller, *The Life of Beethoven*, 1.
- ¹¹² Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 239.
- ¹¹³ Fuller, "Study of the German Language," 1.
- ¹¹⁴ Fuller, *Papers on Literature and Art*, 123-24.
- ¹¹⁵ Fuller, "French Novelists of the Day," 1.
- ¹¹⁶ Fuller, Review of George Sand's *Consuelo*, 1.
- ¹¹⁷ Fuller, "Prince's Poems," 1.
- ¹¹⁸ Fuller, "Thom's Poems," 1.
- ¹¹⁹ Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 240.
- ¹²⁰ Fuller, *Papers on Literature and Art*, 132.
- ¹²¹ Fuller, Review of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's *Poems*, 1.
- ¹²² Griswold, *Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold*, 203.
- ¹²³ Fuller, "The Literati in New York City," in *The Complete Works of Edgar Allen Poe*, 73-74.
- ¹²⁴ Fuller, *Papers on Literature and Art*, 139, 140.
- ¹²⁵ Fuller, "Miss Barrett's Poems," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1.
- ¹²⁶ Fuller, "Browning's Poems," 1; Fuller, "Browning's Poems," 1.
- ¹²⁷ Fuller, "First of August, 1845," 1.
- ¹²⁸ Fuller, "1st January, 1846," 1.
- ¹²⁹ Fuller, "The Rich Man—An Ideal Sketch," 1.
- ¹³⁰ Fuller, "The Poor Man—An Ideal Sketch," 1.
- ¹³¹ Fuller, Review of Waddy Thompson's *Recollections of Mexico*, 1.
- ¹³² Fuller, Mar. 3, 1846, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 192, 193.
- ¹³³ Fuller, "Deutsche Schnellpost," 1.

-
- ¹³⁴ Fuller, "Farewell," 2.
- ¹³⁵ After the first dispatch, Greeley retitled the rest of her dispatches as "Things and Thoughts in Europe." Reynolds & Belasco Smith, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*."
- ¹³⁶ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 41.
- ¹³⁷ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 50.
- ¹³⁸ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 59.
- ¹³⁹ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 59.
- ¹⁴⁰ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 60.
- ¹⁴¹ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 69.
- ¹⁴² Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 74.
- ¹⁴³ Fuller's ominous mention of the "last act" of her life is in reference to the remainder of her trip, whereupon she gets lost in the hills of Ben Lomond and has to stay in the wilderness overnight. Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 75.
- ¹⁴⁴ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 68.
- ¹⁴⁵ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 61.
- ¹⁴⁶ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 61.
- ¹⁴⁷ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 69.
- ¹⁴⁸ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 69.
- ¹⁴⁹ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 63.
- ¹⁵⁰ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 127.
- ¹⁵¹ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 61.
- ¹⁵² Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 50.
- ¹⁵³ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 87-88.
- ¹⁵⁴ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 68.
- ¹⁵⁵ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 141.
- ¹⁵⁶ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 140.
- ¹⁵⁷ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 79.
- ¹⁵⁸ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 79.
- ¹⁵⁹ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 132.
- ¹⁶⁰ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 125.
- ¹⁶¹ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 133.
- ¹⁶² Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 56.
- ¹⁶³ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 47, 51.
- ¹⁶⁴ The plantations of the West Indies, where the slaves were taken, provided the bulk of the raw cotton for the British industry. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 49.
- ¹⁶⁵ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 127-28.
- ¹⁶⁶ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 135-36.
- ¹⁶⁷ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 58-59.
- ¹⁶⁸ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 59-60.
- ¹⁶⁹ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 134.
- ¹⁷⁰ Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*, 143-44.
- ¹⁷¹ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 87-88.
- ¹⁷² Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 164.
- ¹⁷³ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 88.
- ¹⁷⁴ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 80.
- ¹⁷⁵ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 80.
- ¹⁷⁶ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 80.
- ¹⁷⁷ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 80.
- ¹⁷⁸ Fuller, "*These Sad But Glorious Days*," 79-80.

-
- ¹⁷⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 88.
- ¹⁸⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 88.
- ¹⁸¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 88.
- ¹⁸² Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 61.
- ¹⁸³ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 77.
- ¹⁸⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 65-66.
- ¹⁸⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 66.
- ¹⁸⁶ Phillips, *Essays from the London Times*, 107.
- ¹⁸⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 91.
- ¹⁸⁸ One reason Fuller detested the *Times* was because of its reactionary response to the revolutions of 1848. Reynolds & Belasco Smith, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 91.
- ¹⁸⁹ The “People’s Journal” was one of the few “signs of the times” (along with *Punch* magazine) Fuller acknowledged amongst English publications. Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 91.
- ¹⁹⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 87.
- ¹⁹¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 87.
- ¹⁹² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 80.
- ¹⁹³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 87.
- ¹⁹⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 96.
- ¹⁹⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 98.
- ¹⁹⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 98.
- ¹⁹⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 100.
- ¹⁹⁸ Fuller went on to say: “Those who wish to form an idea of Mazzini’s mind could not do better than to read his sketches of the Italian martyrs in the “People’s Journal.” They will find there, on one of the most difficult occasions, an ardent friend speaking of his martyred friends, the purity of impulse, warmth of sympathy, largeness and steadiness of view and fineness of discrimination which must belong to a legislator for a CHRISTIAN commonwealth.” Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 98-99.
- ¹⁹⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 98.
- ²⁰⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 102.
- ²⁰¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 87.
- ²⁰² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 103.
- ²⁰³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 108.
- ²⁰⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 108.
- ²⁰⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 104.
- ²⁰⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 104-05.
- ²⁰⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 105.
- ²⁰⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 105.
- ²⁰⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 105.
- ²¹⁰ Alexandre Dumas père (1802-70) was a prolific writer of plays and novels, with his most famous work being *The Count of Monte Cristo*. Reynolds & Belasco Smith, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 107.
- ²¹¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 107.
- ²¹² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 112.
- ²¹³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 112.
- ²¹⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 164.
- ²¹⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 113.
- ²¹⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 113.
- ²¹⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 113-14.
- ²¹⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 113.
- ²¹⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 113.
- ²²⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 114.

-
- 221 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 113.
- 222 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 113.
- 223 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 114.
- 224 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 113.
- 225 Fuller, Nov. 30, 1834, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 250-252.
- 226 Fuller, Nov. 30, 1834, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 250-252.
- 227 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 114-15.
- 228 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 113.
- 229 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 113.
- 230 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 164.
- 231 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 74.
- 232 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 74.
- 233 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 74.
- 234 Breunig, & Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era*. 8.
- 235 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 78.
- 236 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 78.
- 237 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 80.
- 238 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 80.
- 239 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 80.
- 240 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 80.
- 241 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 80.
- 242 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 79.
- 243 In Paris alone, 50 percent of its working class faced unemployment. Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 9.
- 244 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 81-82.
- 245 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 82.
- 246 Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 22.
- 247 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 82.
- 248 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 82.
- 249 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.
- 250 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.
- 251 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 82.
- 252 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 82.
- 253 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 83.
- 254 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 85.
- 255 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 85.
- 256 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 87.
- 257 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 83-84.
- 258 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 83.
- 259 Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 32.
- 260 Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 33.
- 261 Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 32-33.
- 262 Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 33.
- 263 Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 33.
- 264 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 87.
- 265 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 87.
- 266 Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 92.
- 267 On June of 1793, they arrested a group of Girondins deputies on charges of counterrevolution. Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 35.

-
- ²⁶⁸ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 89.
- ²⁶⁹ The rapid alternations of regime—Directory (1795-9), Consulate (1799-1804), Empire (1804-1814), restored Bourbon Monarchy (1815-1830), Constitutional Monarchy (1830-48), Republic (1848-51), and Empire (1852-70)—were all attempts to maintain a bourgeois society while avoiding the double danger of the Jacobin democratic republic and the old regime. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 94.
- ²⁷⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 124.
- ²⁷¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁷² The play was entitled “Fat Ox,” and Fuller interacted with a description of the play written by Eugene Sue, and immensely popular chronicler of Parisian low life. Reynolds, & Belasco Smith, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁷³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁷⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁷⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁷⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁷⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 120.
- ²⁷⁸ The history of the July Monarchy is, in large part, the history of the mounting dissatisfaction of the *petite* (“lesser”) *bourgeoisie* with the government and the consolidation of opposition to it, which culminated in the Revolution of 1848. Breunig, & Levinger, *The Revolutionary Era*, 229.
- ²⁷⁹ Reynolds, & Belasco Smith, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 119.
- ²⁸⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 164.
- ²⁸¹ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 96.
- ²⁸² Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 96.
- ²⁸³ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 97.
- ²⁸⁴ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 97.
- ²⁸⁵ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 98.
- ²⁸⁶ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 98.
- ²⁸⁷ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 97.
- ²⁸⁸ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, 98.
- ²⁸⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 121.
- ²⁹⁰ Reynolds, & Belasco Smith, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 120.
- ²⁹¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 121.
- ²⁹² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 121.
- ²⁹³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 122-23.
- ²⁹⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 122.
- ²⁹⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 122.
- ²⁹⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 122.
- ²⁹⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 120.
- ²⁹⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 110.
- ²⁹⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 123.
- ³⁰⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 110.
- ³⁰¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 109-110.
- ³⁰² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 124-25.
- ³⁰³ Bewell, *Wordsworth and the Enlightenment*, 57.
- ³⁰⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 124-25.
- ³⁰⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 125.
- ³⁰⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 124.
- ³⁰⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 131.
- ³⁰⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 130.
- ³⁰⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 129.

-
- ³¹⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 131-32.
- ³¹¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 140.
- ³¹² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 144-45.
- ³¹³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 134.
- ³¹⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 134.
- ³¹⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 143.
- ³¹⁶ She goes on to list other cities, like Milan and Raveena, that also display tributes to women. Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 143.
- ³¹⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 129.
- ³¹⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 129-30.
- ³¹⁹ Hearder, *Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento*, 126.
- ³²⁰ A Lazzarone is a loafer or vagabond. Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 131.
- ³²¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 132.
- ³²² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 132.
- ³²³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 142.
- ³²⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 142.
- ³²⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 136.
- ³²⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 136.
- ³²⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 141.
- ³²⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 136.
- ³²⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 135-37.
- ³³⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 137.
- ³³¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 146.
- ³³² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 146-47.
- ³³³ On her way to Italy, Fuller followed a similar path through the countryside as did Charles Dickens, whose *Pictures from Italy* was published in 1846. Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 127.
- ³³⁴ The Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont); the Duchy of Milan, belonging to the Habsburg Empire; the republics of Venice, Genoa, and Lucca; the Papal State; the Duchies of Modena and Parma; the Grand Duchy of Tuscany; and the Kingdom of Naples, which included Sicily. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 25.
- ³³⁵ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*,
- ³³⁶ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 26.
- ³³⁷ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 27.
- ³³⁸ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 26.
- ³³⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 138.
- ³⁴⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 138-39.
- ³⁴¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 138.
- ³⁴² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 138.
- ³⁴³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 139.
- ³⁴⁴ He further secured his hold in April 1797, when Austria signed the Truce of Leoben, which all but ushered in Rome’s first Republic, under the rule of France. In October, Austria and France agreed to the Peace of Campo Formio, which ended the War of the First Coalition. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 27.
- ³⁴⁵ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 27.
- ³⁴⁶ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 28-29.
- ³⁴⁷ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 29.
- ³⁴⁸ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 31-32.
- ³⁴⁹ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 33.
- ³⁵⁰ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 40.

-
- ³⁵¹ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 36.
- ³⁵² These areas included Piedmont (annexed in 1802); Liguria (1805); Tuscany (1808); Parma and Piacenza (1808); and Umbria and Lazio, including Rome (1809). Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 46.
- ³⁵³ This also made it easier for Napoleon to draft Italian troops as well as increase public revenue. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 49.
- ³⁵⁴ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 35-36.
- ³⁵⁵ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 34.
- ³⁵⁶ Specifically, “Code Napoleon” was its name. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 50.
- ³⁵⁷ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 6.
- ³⁵⁸ In the eighteenth century, the Papal States consisted of Lazio, Umbria, the Marches (the district to the east of Umbria), the Legations (which included the cities of Bologna and Ferrara, across the Apennines to the north), and two isolated towns to the south—Benevento and Pontecorvo, entirely surrounded by Neapolitan territory. Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 96.
- ³⁵⁹ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 47.
- ³⁶⁰ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 101.
- ³⁶¹ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 48.
- ³⁶² Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 48.
- ³⁶³ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 7.
- ³⁶⁴ In addition, four other states received rulers from the House of Habsburg: Tuscany went to the emperor’s brother, Ferdinand III (1814-1824) and thereafter to his descendants; Parma to Francis I’s daughter—Napoleon’s second wife—Marie Louise for life, and both Modena and the tiny state of Massa and Carrara were given to members of the cadet d’Este branch of the family. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 51-52.
- ³⁶⁵ Two states received Bourbon rulers: the small Duchy of Lucca was given for life to a Bourbon princess, and the Neapolitan branch of the family was restored to its mainland territories, administratively united from 1816 with Sicily as the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 52.
- ³⁶⁶ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 58-59.
- ³⁶⁷ Klemens Von Metternich was Austria’s Chancellor from 1821-1848. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 52.
- ³⁶⁸ All of Italy’s dynasties after 1815 were essentially absolutist in nature. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 54.
- ³⁶⁹ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 3.
- ³⁷⁰ Thus, when insurrection erupted in Sardinia-Piedmont in 1821, Victor Emmanuel was forced to abdicate and a new moderate conservative reformer took control, Charles Felix (1821-31). Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 55-56.
- ³⁷¹ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 55.
- ³⁷² Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 3.
- ³⁷³ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 56.
- ³⁷⁴ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 103.
- ³⁷⁵ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 3.
- ³⁷⁶ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 103.
- ³⁷⁷ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 53.
- ³⁷⁸ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 53.
- ³⁷⁹ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 2.
- ³⁸⁰ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 53, 56.
- ³⁸¹ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 59.
- ³⁸² Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 61.

-
- ³⁸³ The pope's refusal, for example, to permit railway construction hampered economic development, while his fiscal policy was a disaster. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 62.
- ³⁸⁴ His successor and son, Ferdinand I, was completely incompetent as to international politics Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 61.
- ³⁸⁵ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 63.
- ³⁸⁶ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 153-54.
- ³⁸⁷ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 154.
- ³⁸⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 154.
- ³⁸⁹ Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 14.
- ³⁹⁰ Among the States she was referring to were Florence, Bologna, Parma, Ferrara, and Modena. Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 154-55.
- ³⁹¹ Mack Smith, Dennis. *Mazzini*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, 14.
- ³⁹² Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 137.
- ³⁹³ Azelgio was the son-in-law of the famous Italian poet and novelist, Alessandro Manzoni. Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 137.
- ³⁹⁴ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 137.
- ³⁹⁵ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 138.
- ³⁹⁶ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 155.
- ³⁹⁷ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 63.
- ³⁹⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 160.
- ³⁹⁹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 155.
- ⁴⁰⁰ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 64.
- ⁴⁰¹ Fuller, Nov. 30, 1834, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 315.
- ⁴⁰² Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 62.
- ⁴⁰³ His reforms, according to Davis, helped lay the basis for Piedmont's rise as the most dynamic state in the peninsula in the 1850s. Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 62.
- ⁴⁰⁴ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 158.
- ⁴⁰⁵ Fuller, Nov. 30, 1834, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 315
- ⁴⁰⁶ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 158.
- ⁴⁰⁷ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 155.
- ⁴⁰⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 156.
- ⁴⁰⁹ The Moderate party was mainly located in Sardinia and had supporters in Lombardy and Venetia. Reynolds & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 156.
- ⁴¹⁰ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 158.
- ⁴¹¹ Reynolds & Belasco Smith. "These Sad But Glorious Days," 156.
- ⁴¹² Reynolds & Belasco Smith. "These Sad But Glorious Days," 234.
- ⁴¹³ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 63.
- ⁴¹⁴ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 156.
- ⁴¹⁵ For example, he thought that Germany and Holland should compose a single nation; that Hungary should be joined with Rumania, and Greece with Bulgaria; and that Scandinavia should be a single united nation; whereas Ireland, for whatever reason, he did not consider to be a nation. Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 11-12.
- ⁴¹⁶ Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 63.
- ⁴¹⁷ Fuller, Nov. 30, 1834, *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, 240.
- ⁴¹⁸ She would repeatedly import this popular maxim into later dispatches. Reynolds, & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 98.
- ⁴¹⁹ Giovine Italia (Young Italy), founded in 1831 by Mazzini in exile at Marseilles, was a subversive organization that worked for Italian unification under a republican form of government, with Rome as the capital. Reynolds, & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 147.

-
- 420 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 193.
421 Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, 11.
422 Davis, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*, 64-65.
423 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 157.
424 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 157.
425 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 98.
426 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 146.
427 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 166.
428 Fuller, "Farewell," 2.
429 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 163.
430 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 164.
431 Reynolds, & Belasco Smith, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 165.
432 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 165.
433 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 154.
434 Quoted in Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life* 147.
435 Quoted in Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life* 145.
436 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 163.
437 See Burke, *Symbols and Society*
438 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 167-168.
439 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 168.
440 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 168-69.
441 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 169.
442 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 163, 169.
443 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 169.
444 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 169.
445 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 18.
446 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 30.
447 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 31.
448 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 14.
449 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 21.
450 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 31.
451 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 30-31.
452 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 71.
453 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 74-75.
454 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 50.
455 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 6-7.
456 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 76.
457 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 38-39.
458 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 48.
459 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 7.
460 Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 10.
461 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 199.
462 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 205.
463 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 169-70.
464 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 184-85.
465 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 172-73.
466 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 177-180.
467 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 182.
468 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 173.
469 Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 172, 199.

-
- ⁴⁷⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 191.
- ⁴⁷¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 184.
- ⁴⁷² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 186.
- ⁴⁷³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 187.
- ⁴⁷⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 188-89.
- ⁴⁷⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 201.
- ⁴⁷⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 208.
- ⁴⁷⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 216.
- ⁴⁷⁸ Quoted in Reynolds & Belasco Smith, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 225.
- ⁴⁷⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 229.
- ⁴⁸⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 226.
- ⁴⁸¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 226.
- ⁴⁸² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 227-28.
- ⁴⁸³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 243-44.
- ⁴⁸⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 232.
- ⁴⁸⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 244.
- ⁴⁸⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 230.
- ⁴⁸⁷ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 237.
- ⁴⁸⁸ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 250.
- ⁴⁸⁹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 253.
- ⁴⁹⁰ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 249-50.
- ⁴⁹¹ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 251.
- ⁴⁹² Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 262-63.
- ⁴⁹³ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 264.
- ⁴⁹⁴ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 259.
- ⁴⁹⁵ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 258, 261.
- ⁴⁹⁶ Fuller, “*These Sad But Glorious Days*,” 261.
- ⁴⁹⁷ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 276. Also, see Sternhell (mentioned in an earlier note) for a description of ideology as something that is more pure than its concrete political installation.
- ⁴⁹⁸ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 273.
- ⁴⁹⁹ See Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric,” for discussion of “the rhetoric of interpellation.”
- ⁵⁰⁰ Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 190. Also, see M. C. McGee, (1980), “The ‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology.”
- ⁵⁰¹ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 211-12.
- ⁵⁰² Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 192-94.
- ⁵⁰³ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 196.
- ⁵⁰⁴ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 218.
- ⁵⁰⁵ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 180.
- ⁵⁰⁶ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 181.
- ⁵⁰⁷ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 71.
- ⁵⁰⁸ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 221, 222, 224.
- ⁵⁰⁹ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 286.
- ⁵¹⁰ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 33.
- ⁵¹¹ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 291-92.
- ⁵¹² Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 294.
- ⁵¹³ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 219.
- ⁵¹⁴ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 289.
- ⁵¹⁵ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 219.
- ⁵¹⁶ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 295.

-
- ⁵¹⁷ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 315.
⁵¹⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 321-22.
⁵¹⁹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 321-22.
⁵²⁰ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 238-39.
⁵²¹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 257.
⁵²² Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 248.
⁵²³ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 249.
⁵²⁴ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 240.
⁵²⁵ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 262-64.
⁵²⁶ Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 179.
⁵²⁷ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 274.
⁵²⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 260.
⁵²⁹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 280.
⁵³⁰ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 298.
⁵³¹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 302.
⁵³² Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 292-93.
⁵³³ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 300.
⁵³⁴ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 304, 306.
⁵³⁵ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 302.
⁵³⁶ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 307.
⁵³⁷ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 308-09, 318.
⁵³⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 322-23.
⁵³⁹ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 148-49.
⁵⁴⁰ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 148.
⁵⁴¹ Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 191.
⁵⁴² Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 161.
⁵⁴³ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 180.
⁵⁴⁴ Crick, *The Keys of Power*, 177.
⁵⁴⁵ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 322.
⁵⁴⁶ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 186.
⁵⁴⁷ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 258.
⁵⁴⁸ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 266.
⁵⁴⁹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 165.
⁵⁵⁰ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 230.
⁵⁵¹ Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 230.
⁵⁵² Fuller, "These Sad But Glorious Days," 151.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso Books, 2006.
- Arnt Aune, James. "Democratic Style and Ideological Containment." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*. vol. 11, no. 3, 2008, pp. 482-490.
- Bewell, Alan. *Wordsworth and the Enlightenment: Nature, Man, and Society in the Experimental Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Breunig, Charles and Matthew Levinger. *The Revolutionary Era: 1789-1850*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002
- Burke, Kenneth. *On Symbols and Society*. Ed. Joseph Gusfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Permanence and Change*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Capper, Charles. *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life; The Public Years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Crick, Nathan. *The Keys of Power: The Rhetoric and Politics of Transcendentalism*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2017.
- Davis, Jonathan A. *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Deiss, Joseph Jay. *The Roman Years of Margaret Fuller: A Biography*. New York: Crowell, 1969.
- Farrell, Thomas. "Practicing the Art of Rhetoric: Tradition and Invention." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. 1991, vo. 24, no. 3, 1991, pp. 183-212.
- Fisher, Walter R. "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm—The Case of Public Moral

Argument.” *Communication Monographs*. vol. 51, 1984, pp. 1-22.

Frazier, Nancy. “Rethinking the Public Sphere—A Contribution to Critique of Actually Existing Democracy.” *Social Text*, Coda Press, 1990, 56-80.

Fuller, Margaret. *Margaret Fuller Critic: Writings for the “New-York Tribune.” 1844-1846*. Eds. Judith Mattson Bean & Joel Myerson. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2000.

—“The Two Herberts.” *Present*, 1, Mar. 1, 1844.

—“The Modern Drama.” *Dial*, 4, Jan. 1844.

—*Summer on the Lakes, in 1843*. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1844).

—“Woman in the Nineteenth Century.” *The Portable Margaret Fuller*, ed. Mary Kelley, (New York: Penguin Books, 1994).

—“Miss Barrett’s Poems.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Jan. 4, 1845.

—“Browning’s Poems.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. July 10, & Apr. 1, 1846.

—“First of August, 1845.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Aug. 1, 1845.

—“1st January, 1846.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Jan, 1846.

—“The Rich Man—An Ideal Sketch.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Feb. 6, 1846.

—“The Poor Man—An Ideal Sketch.” *New-York Daily Tribune*, Mar. 25, 1846.

—Review of Waddy Thompson’s *Recollections of Mexico*, *New-York Daily Tribune*. June 2, 1846.

—“Deutsche Schnellpost.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Jan. 25, 1845.

—“Farewell.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Aug. 1, 1846.

—“Our City Charities.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Mar. 19, 1845.

-
- Papers on Literature and Art*. 2 vols. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846.
- “American Facts.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. May 25, 1845.
- “Study of the German Language.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Dec. 11, 1845.
- “French Novelists of the Day.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Feb. 1, 1845.
- Review of George Sand’s *Consuelo*. *New-York Daily Tribune*. June 14, 1846.
- “Prince’s Poems.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Aug. 13, 1845.
- “Thom’s Poems.” *New-York Daily Tribune*. Aug. 22, 1845.
- Review of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s *Poems*. 3rd ed. *New-York Daily Tribune*. Dec. 10, 1845.
- “The Literati in New York City.” in *The Complete Works of Edgar Allen Poe*. ed. James A. Harrison. 17 vols., New York, 1902.
- Greeley, Horace. *Recollections of a Busy Life*. New York: J. B. Ford and Company, 1868.
- Gura, Philip. *American Transcendentalism: A History*. New York: Hill & Wang, 2008.
- Habermas, Jurgen. “The Public Sphere—An Encyclopedia Article (1964),” *New German Critique*. vol. 3, 1974, pp. 49-55.
- Hariman, Robert. “Decorum, Power, and the Courtly Style.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. vol. 78, issue 2, 1992, pp. 149-172.
- Hauser, Gerard. “On Publics and Public Spheres—A Response to Phillips.” *Communication Monographs-Virginia*. vol. 64, issue 3, 1997, pp. 275-279.
- Hearder, Harry. *Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento 1790-1870*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution: 1789-1848*. London: Orion, 2010.
- Jensen, Robert. “The American Paradox—More Freedom, Less Democracy.” *Global Dialogue*.

-
- vol. 4, issue 2, 2002, pp. 47-58.
- Kelley, Mary. *The Portable Margaret Fuller*. Ed. Mary Kelley. New York: Penguin 1994.
- Mack Smith, Dennis. *Mazzini*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Québécois*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. 73, Issue 2, 1987, pp. 133-150.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Vol. 66, Issue 1, 1980, pp. 1-16.
- Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*, ed. R. W. Emerson, J. F. Clarke, and W. H. Channing, 2 vols. (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, 1852).
- Miller, James. "The Paradox of Popular Culture and Democracy in America." *Salmagundi*. issue 157, 2008, pp. 138-152.
- Packer, Barbara. *The Transcendentalists*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007.
- Phillips, Samuel. *Essays from the London Times: A Collection of Personal and Historical Sketches*. New York: D. Appleton, 1852.
- Rufus W. Griswold, *Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold*. Cambridge, Mass., 1898.
- The Letters of Margaret Fuller*, ed. Robert N. Hudspeth, 6 vols. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983-84.
- "*These Sad But Glorious Days*": *Dispatches from Europe, 1846-1850*. Ed. Larry J. Reynolds and Susan Belasco Smith. New Haven, Conn: Yale University, 1990.
- Vivian, Bradford. "Freedom, Naming, and Nobility: Convergence of Rhetorical and Political

Theory in Nietzsche's Philosophy." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. vol. 40, issue, 4, 2007, pp. 372-393.

Von Mehren, Joan. *Minerva and the Muse: A Life of Margaret Fuller*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.