Geraldo Magela Cáffaro

The House, the World, and the Theatre: Self-Fashioning and Authorial Spaces in the Prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Program in Literary Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Doctoral Degree in Literatures in English

Faculdade de Letras

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Belo Horizonte – Minas Gerais

May/2015

Ficha catalográfica elaborada pelos Bibliotecários da Biblioteca FALE/UFMG

C129h

Cáffaro, Geraldo Magela.
The house, the world, and the theatre [manuscrito] : self-fashioning and authorial spaces in the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James / Geraldo Magela Cáffaro. – 2015.
220 f., enc.

Orientador: Luiz Fernando Ferreira Sá.

Área de concentração: Literaturas em Inglês.

Linha de pesquisa: Poéticas da Modernidade.

Tese (doutorado) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Faculdade de Letras.

Bibliografia: f. 212-219.

1. Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 1804-1864 – Crítica e interpretação – Teses. 2. Dickens, Charles, 1812-1870 – Crítica e interpretação – Teses. 3. Henry, James, 1843-1916 – Crítica e interpretação – Teses. 4. Literatura – História e crítica – Teses. 5. Prefácios – Teses. 6. Crítica – Teses. I. Sá, Luiz Fernando Ferreira. II. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Faculdade de Letras. III. Título.

CDD : 809

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the guidance, support, and encouragement of my supervisor, Dr. Luiz Fernando Ferreira Sá. I am immensely grateful to him for all these years of partnership.

I would also like to express sincere appreciation and thanks to Dr. John Carlos Rowe, who supervised my research at the University of Southern California. I will never forget his kindness and generosity, and the precious advice he offered me during my stay in Los Angeles in 2013.

I am indebted to Professor Donatella Izzo, from the University of Naples L'Orientale, who has made important suggestions to chapters of this Dissertation; and to Luis Assis for helping me revise a first version of this work.

I want to thank my mother for the unfailing emotional support and also my friends, especially Murilo and Prof. José dos Santos, who have extended their hands to me on several difficult moments.

I would finally like to thank Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) for the grants without which I would not have completed this Dissertation; and to Programa de Estudos Literário da Faculdade de Letras da UFMG for creating conditions for the development of research and professional growth.

Abstract

This Dissertation examines self-fashioning processes in prefaces and introductions by Nathaniel Hawthorne, Charles Dickens, and Henry James. The general argument is that in these texts authorial identity is constructed through spatial metaphors and authorial figures of ideological and cultural resonance. The readings proposed connect these spatial metaphors and authorial figures – organized according to the groups "house," "world," and "theater – to the specific historical context and to ideologies circulating in the nineteenth century. The main theoretical perspectives that support these readings are genre criticism, Greenblattian new historicism, and literary history. Greenblatt's concept of *self-fashioning*, in particular, constitutes an important operative device that enables the perception of authorship as a category that blurs the boundaries between social life and *performance (*or between the *authorial* and the *actorial* modes). The authors studied appear, in this light, both as biographical subjects and participants in a "theatre of images;" and the prefaces that "house" these authors gain renewed interest for their historical relevance and imaginative quality.

Key Words: self-fashioning, preface, space, figuration, Hawthorne, Dickens, James

Resumo

Esta Tese examina processos de auto-modelamento em prefácios e introduções de Nathaniel Hawthorne, Charles Dickens e Henry James. O argumento geral é o de que a identidade autoral nesses textos é construída por meio de metáforas espacias e figuras autorais de ressonância ideológica e cultural. As leituras propostas ligam essas metáforas espaciais e figuras autorais – organizadas de acordo com os grupos "casa", "mundo" e "teatro" –ao contexto histórico específico e às ideologias em circulação no século XIX. As principais perspectivas teóricas que

apóiam essas leituras são a crítica dos gêneros literários, o novo historicismo greenblattiano, e a história literária. O conceito de auto-modelamento de Greenblatt, em particular, constitui um importante dispositivo de análise que viabiliza a percepção da autoria como uma categoria que confunde as fronteiras entre vida social e *performance*, (ou entre os modos *autoral* e *performativo*). O autores estudados aparecem, sob essa luz, como sujeitos biográficos e partícipes de um "teatro de imagens"; e os prefácios que "abrigam" esse autores ganham interesse renovado por sua relevância histórica e qualidade imaginativa.

Palavras-chave: auto-modelamento, prefácio, espaço, figuração, Hawthorne, Dickens, James

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Chronology of Prefaces by Author, Sources, and Abbreviations

Nathaniel Hawthorne

Nathaniel Hawthorne: Tales and Sketches (Abbreviated *TS*), and *Nathaniel Hawthorne: Collected Novels* (Abbreviated *CN*), both published by the Library of America, contain most of the prefaces consulted, with the exception of the ones to *Grandfather's Chair* and *Our Old Home*, whose sources appear on the Works Cited list.

1837-43 - "From the Writings of M. l'Aubépine:" Preface to "Rappaccini's Daughter"

November, 1840 - Preface to *Grandfather's Chair*

1846 - "The Old Manse: The Author Makes His Reader Acquainted with His Abode:" Preface to Mosses from an *Old Manse*

March 6, 1850 - "The Custom-House: Introductory to *The Scarlet Letter*"

March 30, 1850 - Preface to the Second Edition of *The Scarlet Letter*

January 11, 1851- Preface to *Twice-Told Tales*

January 27, 1851 - Preface to *The House of the Seven Gables*

July 15, 1851- Preface to *A Wonder Book for Girls and Boys*

November 1, 1851- Preface to *The Snow-Image and Other Twice-Told Tales*

May, 1852 - Preface to *The Blithedale Romance*

March 13, 1853 - "The Wayside: Introductory:" Preface to *Tanglewood Tales for Girls and Boys*

October 15, 1859 - *Preface to The Marble Faun*

July 2, 1863 - Preface to *Our Old Home*

Charles Dickens

I rely mostly on scholarly editions of Charles Dickens's works as sources for the analyses. These editions reproduce, in the same volumes and as appendixes, all the addresses published in serial form and the prefaces to the different editions (Collected, Cheap, Library, Later, and Charles Dickens Editions). Because of the large number of references consulted, in the Dissertation text I identify each by the abbreviations shown next to the titles below. The works are listed in chronological order according to the order of publication of their first editions or bound volume.

1836: *Sketches by Boz (SB)*

February 8, 1836 - Preface to the First Edition of the First Series

August 1836 - Preface to the Second Edition of the First Series

December 17 1836 - Preface to the Second Series

May 1839 - Advertisement to the First Collected Edition

October 1850 - Preface to the First Cheap Edition, reprinted in the 1968 Charles Dickens Edition

1837: *The Pickwick Papers (PP)*

January 1837 - Address to Readers (Series Number 10)

1847- Preface to the Cheap Edition of *Pickwick Papers*

1839: *Oliver Twist (OT)*

April 1841 – The Author's Introduction to the Third Edition

March 1850 - Preface to the Cheap Edition

1839: *Nicholas Nickleby (NN)*

1838 - Nickeby Proclamation by 'Boz'

1839 - Preface to the First Edition

May 1848 – Preface to the First Cheap Edition

1841: *The Old Curiosity Shop (OCS)* and *Barnaby Rudge (BB)* were originally serialized in the Periodical *Master Humphrey's Clock*. The histories of both novels is intimately intertwined with that of the periodical and its framing story (about Master Humphrey and his club).

September 1840 - Preface to Master Humphrey's Clock

March 1841 - Preface to the First Edition of *The Old Curiosity Shop*

September 1848 - Preface to the Cheap (1848), Library (1858), and Charles Dickens (1867) Editions

November 1841 – Preface to the Third Volume of Humphrey's Clock ("Barnaby Rudge")

March 1849 - Preface to the First Cheap Edition of *Barnaby Rudge*

1843: *A Christmas Carol (CC)*

December 1843- Preface

1844: *Martin Chuzzlewitt (MC)*

June 1844- Preface

November 1849 - Preface to the Cheap and Later Editions

1848: *Dombey and Son (DS)*

March 24, 1848 – Preface

1867 - Preface to the Charles Dickens Edition

1850: *David Copperfield (DC)*

October 1850 - Preface

1867 - Preface to the Charles Dickens Edition

1853: *Bleak House (BH)*

August 1853- Preface

1857: *Little Dorritt (LD)*

May 1857 - Preface

Our Mutual Friend (OMF)

September 2, 1865 - Postscript (In lieu of a Preface)

Henry James

Henry James's autographic Prefaces to the New York Edition are collected in a single volume, entitled The *Art of the Novel* (1934). *The Art of the Novel* is abbreviated (*AN)* in the citations and is the only source consulted here (I use the 1937 edition of the collection). The Prefaces contained in the collection are listed together with the number of the volume in which they appear in the New York Edition.

I. (1907): Preface to *Roderick Hudson*

II. (1907): (1907): Preface to *The American*

III. (1908): Preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*

V. (1908): Preface to *The Princess Casamassima*

VII. (1908): Preface to *The Tragic Muse*

IX. (1908): Preface *The Awkward Age*

X. (1908): Preface to *The Spoils of Poynton*

XI. (1908): Preface to *What Maisie Knew*

XII. (1908): Preface to *The Aspern Papers*

XIII. (1908): Preface to *The Reverberator*

XIV. (1908): Preface to *Lady Barbarina*

XV. (1908): Preface to *The Lesson of the Master*

XVI. (1908): Preface to *The Author of Beltrafio*

XVII. (1908): Preface to *The Altar of the Dead*

XVIII. (1908): Preface to *Daisy Miller*

XIX. (1909): Preface to *The Wings of the Dove*

XXI. (1909): Preface to *The Ambassadors*

XXIII. (1909): Preface to *The Golden Bowl*

Literature as well as criticism – the difference between them being delusive – is condemned (or privileged) to be forever the most rigorous and, consequently, the most unreliable language in terms of which man names and transforms himself.

--Paul de Man

1
Introduction

1.1. The Prefatory Site and the Construction of Authorship

> Few great writers have not placed before one of their books a verbal doorstep to help readers leave the ground they usually walk on and allow them a glimpse of the interior.
>
> --Alasdair Gray

One of the myths attached to books – illustrated in Alasdair Gray's maxim – is that they are special places that allow readers access to alternate realities. Notably, writers have often reinforced this myth by using a variety of spatial metaphors in their prefaces. In the epistolary Preface to *The Snow Image* (1851), for example, Nathaniel Hawthorne observes that "on several occasions, he has seen fit to pave the reader's way into the interior edifice of a book" (*TS* 1154). Also relying on a spatial metaphor in the Preface to *Martin Chuzzlewitt* (1844), Charles Dickens compares himself with "a troublesome guest who lingers in the Hall after he has taken leave" and who "cannot help loitering on the threshold of [his] book" (*MC* 841). While these metaphors illuminate the role prefaces have traditionally played in offering a transition to the books they antecede, they also call attention to the authors that either "build" or "occupy" the figured spaces. In this Dissertation I propose to discuss the ways in which these figured spaces help authors in the construction of authorship.

The specific texts to be discussed are autographic notes, addresses, prefaces, and introductions by Nathaniel Hawthorne, Charles Dickens, and Henry James. By examining metaphors and cultural references, I seek to establish relationships between those introductory texts, their historical context, and some of the ideologies and discourses circulating in the

nineteenth century.[1] The general argument is that authorial identity in these texts is intimately bound up with a spatial "imaginary" and with a multiplicity of related authorial figures. This "imaginary" can be understood both as synonymous with "imagery," that is, as a group of images that enhance visual and other sensory aspects of texts; or in ideological terms, as used by Larry J. Reynolds and Gordon Hutner in *National Imaginaries, American Identities* (2000), and by Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake in *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary* (1996). These authors draw from, but also re-signify Lacan's early formulation of "the imaginary" as the images, conscious and unconscious, perceived or imagined, which form the *imago*. Although I recognize the importance of Lacan for discussions on the construction of identity, a central topic here, I do not adopt his psychoanalytic theory in this Dissertation and my use of "imaginary" as a noun is more in consonance with the way contemporary cultural theorists employ it.

The three keywords composing the spatial imaginary framing this Dissertation – house, world, theatre – are associated with three important aspects of the prefatory production of the authors under consideration. These aspects are, respectively: 1) the appeal to privacy, intimacy, domesticity, and origin; 2) the reliance on narratives of dislocation, exploration, and conquest of space; and 3) the deployment of the theatrical analogy as a means to give the author visibility and control. Among the authorial figures I analyze in these "spaces" and situations are: *friend, confidant, guide, host, architect, aeronaut, navigator, stage manager, and dramatist*. I treat these figures as part of *self-fashioning* processes and also as instruments in the quest for authorial

[1] The period framed by this Dissertation extends from 1836, when Dickens published his first address to one of the serial numbers of the *Pickwick Papers*, to 1909, when Henry James published the last volume of the New York Edition. Although Henry James is an intermediary figure and his prefaces were written in the early years of the twentieth century, he was born in 1843 and some of his works, themes, and experiences intersect with those of Hawthorne's and Dickens's. By adopting the "nineteenth-century" designation, I can establish dialogue with the many scholars who have studied this period and contributed to the understanding about these three authors.

legitimacy and autonomy. The power of these figures is best understood in relation to ideologies such as domestic individualism, "the world literary space," imperialism ("planetary consciousness"), and also to the nineteenth-century culture of vigilance and visibility. Articulating these three groups of ideologies with the texts to be analyzed will help foreground the complexity of prefatory writing in the pre-modernist period, a complexity derived from the tensions between interiority and publicity in artistic life.

Louis Althusser's definition of "ideology" as "the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" has some bearing on my understanding of the term (44). But the "real conditions of existence," as Althusser conceives it, cannot be applied to all the groups of ideologies I examine. While these groups comprise images and metaphors which can sustain "imaginary relationships," their materialist basis is not so easy to determine in all the cases (the best example of this is perhaps the ideology identified as "the world literary space"). Furthermore, I subscribe neither to the notion of "false consciousness" formulated by Althusser in his theorization of ideology, nor with the idea of a superstructure according to the classic Marxist model. I complement the basic definition of ideology offered by the French philosopher with critic Lora Romero's own appropriation of the term as something that "give people an expansive logic, a meaningful vocabulary, and rich symbols through which to *think* about their world" (19).

While ideology and historical context play a major role in the readings proposed, it is also important to consider the inextricable relationships between prefaces and the texts they precede. Prefaces are immediately associated with Gérard Genettte's *paratexts*, defined as a series of "verbal or other productions," including the name of the author, the title, dedications, and

illustrations that "*present*" the literary work or "*make* it present" (1).[2] If on the one hand Genette underlines the unstable situation of the paratext through the notion of *threshold*, on the other hand he insists on a hierarchy between pre-text and main text which this work challenges. According to the French theorist "the paratext in all its forms is a discourse that is fundamentally heteronomous, auxiliary, and dedicated to the service of something other than itself that constitutes its raison d'être" (*sic* 12). In my view, both paratexts and literary works in general are enmeshed in intertextual ties of various natures. Furthermore, it is my contention that prefaces do more than simply present the works they antecede; they also produce aesthetic effects, promote images of their writers, and exert influence in the public sphere. Thus, they hold intrinsic value and should be seen as imbricated in the same web of cultural references and social experiences as the "main" texts.

Genette's *Paratexts* contains other controversial points I address in my work. One of these concerns his view that prefaces have not evolved over time and that writers simply recycle the "formulae" used as of the sixteenth century (163). One of my specific arguments is that the images and rhetorical strategies seen in the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James are related to a specific world view and result from historical, material, and social transformations taking place as of the late eighteenth century and affecting patterns of authorship in the prefatory discourse of the mid and late nineteenth century. The question, thus, is whether critics should consider only the universal "forms and functions" of that textual modality – as does Genette – or also tune in to its figurative dimension to find out what is specific about it in a given period of time.

[2] The definition comes from Genette's *Seuils* (1987), translated into English by Jane E. Lewin as *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Throughout this Dissertation I refer to the English version of the work.

Another debatable point in Genette's theory has to do with one of the taxonomical divisions he offers to establish distinctions among the different types of prefaces. Genette's classifications are helpful tools to the analyst and I shall discuss them in more detail in the section of this Introduction devoted to theoretical approaches to prefaces (1.3.). My reservation here is about the distinction between the *authorial* preface (written by the alleged writer of the work) and the *actorial* preface (written by a character in a story). The idea of *authorial performance* running throughout the Dissertation and elaborated in Chapter 6: "The Preface-Turned Stage," as well as the ambiguous (and multiple) forms of self-fashioning authors employ, suggest that the *authorial* and *actorial* modes may actually coexist in the prefaces without their being necessarily *fictive* (in the Genettean sense of imagined or not coincidental with the implied author). This is the other specific claim I make in this Dissertation.

Other theorists offer elements to think about prefatory writing. In section 1.3. I examine different perspectives coming from literary sociology (Claude Duchet), deconstruction (Jacques Derrida), poststructuralism (Antoine Compagnon), and frame theory (Werner Wolf), among others. I contend that while these authors employ spatial metaphors to define the position of paratexts in a book, they devote relatively little attention to symbolic space and figuration in their discussions of these texts. By contrast, scholars writing separately on Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, especially Laurence B. Holland (1964), Pamela Schirmeister (1990), John H. Pearson (2004), and Mario Ortiz-Robles (2011), among others, have devoted careful attention to these aspects of those authors' prefatory writing and thus provide support to my study.

Henry James stands out, among the three writers included here, as the one whose prefaces have received the most critical attention. The reason for this is that the author's prefaces to the New York Edition – the 24-volume collection of his works published between 1907 and 1909 –

gained the status of theoretical treatises after Richard P. Blackmur collected them in *The Art of the Novel* in 1934. Interest in James's prefaces has increased with time, culminating in the 1995 decisive collection of essays edited by David McWhirter, entitled: *Henry James's New York Edition: The Construction of Authorship*.[3] McWhirter's collection is a remarkable effort to reassess the monolithic image of modernist "Master" James envisioned for himself and which some of his early critics endorsed. By comparing Henry James's prefaces with those of two of his antecedents, I dislocate the focus from theory to a discussion of modes of authorial consciousness rooted in an earlier period than 1907-09. This does not mean I disregard the specific context of James in comparing him with Dickens and Hawthorne. The contexts of the three authors (Antebellum New England, Victorian, *Fin de Siècle*) are brought to bear on the analyses but they are eventually reconfigured within the scenario identified with the more fluid terms: *pre-modernism* and *proto-modernism*.

Hawthorne, Dickens, and James were all impacted by transformations occurring in the nineteenth century, such as the proliferation of newspapers and periodicals, the rise in literacy rates, and the expansion of the literary market. They all wrestled with the constraints imposed by the market on their production and sought to attain recognition in their respective literary fields. Additionally, they participated in the "celebration of personal difference as itself the growing institutionalization of authorship" and adopted ambivalent attitudes towards the demand for the "private" author that celebration brought about (Guy 10).

Hawthorne, Dickens, and James also participated in the nineteenth-century internationalization of literature. The internationalization of literature manifested in movements

[3] In Brazil, this interest reflected in two important works: Sergio Bellei's *Theory of the Novel* (Florianópolis, SC: UFSC, Pós-Graduação em Inglês, 1998); and Marcelo Pen Parreira's translation to Portuguese and commentary of the prefaces in *A Arte do Romance: Antologia de Prefácios*, (São Paulo: Editora Globo, 2003).

for the International Copyright Law, in the growing perception of a world literary space, and in the rise of cosmopolitanism. Although James is regarded as the quintessential cosmopolitan novelist, a status he conquered, among other things, by consigning Hawthorne to the position of provincial writer,[4] his ideas concerning the insufficiency of the United States in cultural terms are anteceded by his New England precursor. Dickens's campaign for the International Copyright Law and his reading tours in Europe and in the United States helped promote his books outside the United Kingdom and offer a counterpoint to his close identification with the British national space.

The relationship between Hawthorne and James has been the subject of a large number of appreciations over the years. James himself paved the way for such comparisons when he wrote his controversial biography of Hawthorne for the English Men of Letters Series. Controversies aside, one may find in this biography a specific connection between Hawthorne's prefatory writing and James's, specifically when James writes: "… I may say that there is always a charm in Hawthorne's prefaces which makes one grateful for a pretext to quote from them" (34). The connection goes beyond the simple expression of admiration; a prominent topic in James's prefaces is the distinction between "Novel" and "Romance," a distinction Hawthorne had continuously made in his prefaces as well. It is surprising, therefore, that no extensive work has taken the two authors' prefatory *corpora* as objects of inquiry.

Still, when comparing Hawthorne's prefaces with James's or Dickens's one needs to be aware of the enormous differences in length, scope, and circumstance separating them. Hawthorne's autographic prefaces (13 in total) were appended to his collections of short stories and novels as they were published. James's prefaces (18) were all written for the single

[4] See Henry James's *Hawthorne,* (New York: Harper, 1901, pp. 12-13).

commemorative Edition of his works and consist of long meditations and retrospective accounts of events taking place years, and sometimes decades, before they were put to paper. Dickens's prefaces (13, not including the slightly altered versions of each of them nor the "addresses" to the serial numbers) bear the imprint of the serialization fever of Victorian times and are much shorter and more direct than either Hawthorne's or James's. But, like James, both Hawthorne and Dickens wrote prefaces to later and collected editions of their works and indulged in retrospective narratives.

All in all, these three collections reflect the same obsession with the prefatory medium and the same impulse to create spaces for fashioning authorial selves and communicating with the public. Arguably, writers such as Herman Melville, William Makepeace Thackeray, Mark Twain, and George Eliot were not as prolific, obsessed with the prefatory medium – or even as successful in using it to construct authorial identities – as the writers included here. Still, these writers are part of the same context I am concerned with in this Dissertation and some of the conclusions I reach could apply equally to their prefatory writing. Instead of providing an overview of a large number of nineteenth-century authors and their prefaces, I opted for a more focused and detailed study of recurrent metaphors in some of the prefaces of three representative (and inter-related) writers in Anglo-American literature.

The methodologies I adopt in this Dissertation encompass genre criticism, literary history, and new historicism. Some specific issues require an expansion of the methodological scope toward other theoretical perspectives (such as poststructuralism, deconstruction, and queer theory).[5] Whereas new historicism (from which I draw the concept of self-fashioning and the rationale for a historical analysis of prefatory writing), is discussed in a separate section of

[5] Granted that these critical schools are not unified and cannot be ascribed to a single author or position, I do not capitalize them in this work.

Chapter 3: "Authorship, Self-Fashioning, and Authorial Spaces," the other methodologies are introduced and discussed in the first section of each of the chapters containing the analyses of the selected prefaces. This structure is justified by the fact that each of the three major topics of the Dissertation ("house," "world," "theatre") is related to different issues and ideologies.

As Marysa Demoor has observed, although *self-fashioning* is identified with Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*: *From More to Shakespeare* (1980), "the term has now entered critical jargon with respect to any period in which individual artists choose to self-mythologize, to, that is, construct an identity in and through language" (14). Still, I follow Greenblatt's specific critical method and some of his reflections in that book in addressing prefatory writing in the nineteenth century. One of Greenblatt's key points for the analyses to be carried out is the relationship he identifies between self-fashioning and power. In a statement I shall get back to further on, he claims that "the power to impose a shape upon oneself is an aspect of the more general power to control identity –that of others at least as often as one's own" (3). As we shall see in the prefaces selected, this power is enhanced by the establishment of authoritative (symbolic) settings (*loci* of enunciation, *poetic* or *representational spaces*) from which the author can speak and captivate audiences.

This Dissertation expands the knowledge about the construction of authorial identities in the nineteenth century and offers readers the opportunity to reflect about some antecedents to our own obsession with self-display in a world increasingly dependent on media technologies and on supports such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, among others. Being alert to the implications of the images constructed in prefaces – and by extension in those modern technologies and supports – can allow for a more critical attitude towards naturalized modes of perception and forms of authority. While this work foregrounds the ways in which authors strove to install authority in

their prefaces and relates these ways to their afterlives in contemporaneity, it is not a celebration of their mastery and resourcefulness as writers. Instead, it shows how that authority is plural, unstable, and elusive.

The other two sections of this chapter are dedicated to the history and theory of paratexts and prefatory writing. They are meant to situate the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James within a tradition of introductory texts, and to present and discuss different perspectives, concepts, and terms used in studies of the genre.

Chapters 2 consists of an overview of criticism on Hawthorne, Dickens, and James. It covers the historical background common to the three authors and defines some lines of convergence among them. This chapter also contemplates the critical history of the three collections of prefaces examined.

Chapter 3 offers a more detailed discussion on the history of authorship, including the social, historical, and ideological questions pertaining to this history and the changing roles of authors in the nineteenth century in particular. This chapter also looks at new historicism, some of its tenets, its relevance as a methodology to the Dissertation, and the concept of *self-fashioning*. This concept is articulated with aspects of the notion of power in Foucaultian theory. The chapter ends with the presentation and discussion of a few concepts and theories of "space." Emphasis is given to the idea of *loci* of enunciation, to Henry Lefebvre's definition of *representational space*, and also to Gaston Bachelard's *poetic space*, all of which support the approach to space adopted in the Dissertation. The section ends with a series of reflections on the choice of the sequence of metaphors in "house, world, theatre."

Chapter 4 departs from Gaston Bachelard's view of the "house" as a "body of images" to explore the themes of intimacy, domesticity, and origin in a selection of prefaces by the three authors. This exploration focuses on the figures of *friend, guide*, and *host*, as they are used by Hawthorne and Dickens, and analyzes James's use of the "house" metaphor as a means to assert authority and as a an access to the origins for his stories.

In Chapter 5 the figures examined are dislocated selves, such as the *aeronaut* in Dickens, the French writer in Hawthorne, or the *navigators* and *explorers* in James. The ideologies with which these figures are articulated are identified by the terms "world literary space" and "planetary consciousness." These concepts allow for a discussion of the different forms by which authors sought empowerment in transnational systems of reference and imperialist models of authority. The figures used by the authors also connect to the idea of *autonomy*; an emerging concept in the nineteenth century and a staple of modernist discourse, autonomy can be seen from different perspectives, and is part of the model of "world literary space" offered by Pascale Casanova.

Chapter 6 focuses on the theatrical analogy and on the topic of authorial performance in the prefaces. This chapter consists of a theoretical and historical analysis that help understand the way the three authors imagined and portrayed their anxieties concerning self-revelation and publicity. Hawthorne and Dickens are discussed in relation to the figure of the *stage-manager* and James is discussed in light of the figure of the "dramatist," recurrently used in the Prefaces to the New York Edition and affording different interpretations.

1.2. The "Antique Fashion of Prefaces:" Prefatory Writing in History

> The antique fashion of Prefaces recognized this genial personage as the 'Kind Reader,' the 'Gentle Reader,' the 'Beloved,' the 'Indulgent,' or, at coldest, the 'Honoured Reader,' to whom the prim old author was wont to make his preliminary explanations and apologies, with the certainty that they would be favourably received. I never personally encountered, nor corresponded through the Post, with this Representative Essence of all delightful and desirable qualities which a Reader can possess.
>
> --Nathaniel Hawthorne

This excerpt from Hawthorne's Preface to *The Marble Faun* offers a number of possibilities of interpretation. As a meta-commentary, it contains a definition of the prefatory genre, whose aim should be to woo the audience and guarantee a favourable reception for the work. As a personal testimony, it registers the author's dissatisfaction with the reader, an elusive entity who does not correspond to the qualities attributed to him/her in the formulaic epithets used by other preface writers. From a historical point of view, the situation described illustrates the widening gap between authors and readers following the expansion of the book market in the nineteenth century. Yet, this passage does more than illustrate the literary conditions in Hawthorne's time, register a complaint, or provide a definition. With his irony and parody of common prefatory formulae, Hawthorne invites a retrospective glance and evokes the long tradition of preface writing going back centuries before his time.

Readers may catch glimpses of "the antique fashion of prefaces" in anthologies such as *Prefaces and Prologues to Famous Books* (1909), *Anthologie des Préfaces de Roman Français du XIXe siècle* (1962), or in the more recent: *The Book of Prefaces: A Short History of Literate Thought in Words by Great Writers of Four Nations from the 7th to the 20th Centuries* (2000). In these anthologies, readers can have an insider's perspective of the world of literary production. Also, they can learn, among other things, about the material conditions surrounding the

publication of books, the authors' struggles for legitimation, their relationship with their audiences or with the works they antecede, and the aesthetic positions taken in different times. Some famous examples of prefatory material selected by the editors of the anthologies published in English include: William Caxton's allographic prefaces to the first books printed in England (*King Arthur* and *The Golden Legend*, for example); Chaucer's Prologue to *The Canterbury Tales* (1475); Spenser's "Letter of the Authors" from *The Faerie Queene* (1590); and Wordsworth's Preface to *Lyrical Ballads* (1798).[6]

These examples show that "the antique fashion of prefaces" does not constitute a homogenous body of texts. Prefaces have played different roles and come in the form of letters, narrative frames, dedications, or theoretical treatises. Notably, the list of alternative terms for "Preface" can be quite mystifying: "Introduction," "Foreword," "Preamble," "Proem," "Note," "Advertisement," "Prelude," "Prologue," "Prolegomenon." Although each of these variations carry their own specificities with regard to length, tone, and usage (the genre which they precede), in this section I follow Gérard Genette's use of *preface* to "designate every type of introductory (preludial or postludial) text, authorial or allographic, consisting of a discourse produced on the subject of the text that follows or precedes it" (*Paratexts* 161). This simplified approach will help in the identification of possible origins for the type of writing under consideration and in the establishment of links between older forms of introductions and their subsequent counterparts.[7]

---

[6] William Caxton's allographic prefaces are anthologized in Charles W Eliot, ed., *Prefaces and Prologues to Famous Books*. (New York: P.F. Collier & Son Corporation, 1938.) and the prefaces by Chaucer, Spenser, and Wordsworth may be consulted in Alasdair Gray's *The Book of Prefaces: A Short History of Literate Thought in Words by Great Writers of Four Nations from the 7th to the 20th Century*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2000).

[7] As I mentioned before, however, my *corpus* for the analyses consists primarily of autographic prefaces, notes, addresses, and introductions.

Philosophers, historians, and poets have always devoted some kind of attention to the beginnings of their accounts. As Edward Said puts it: "Every writer knows that the choice of a beginning for what he will write is crucial not only because it determines much of what follows but also because a work's beginning is, practically speaking, the main entrance to what it offers" (*Beginnings: Intention and Method* 3). Prefaces, as specialized beginnings, became more pervasive with the advent of print culture,[8] but the Greeks had been making extensive use of different forms of introductions and incorporated prefaces (not separated from the main body of the text) centuries before the invention of the press in the Middle Ages. Additionally, classical Greek rhetoric, especially the technique known as *captatio benevolentia*,[9] had a prominent influence in prefatory culture later on. The modern preface can be even likened to the Greek *exorde* (exordium), a discursive modality which also features *topoi* such as the choice of subject, the speaker's intentions, and the stance he/she adopts (Genette 164).

The word *preface*, however, is linked to the Latin *praefatio* – meaning "words spoken beforehand" – a term used by Livy to introduce a number of the books of his *Roman History* (Genette 165). Livy's account is noteworthy for his use of the first person, a stance "that would become characteristic of the modern preface," according to Genette (165). Still, it must be noted that the "I" of the classical period displays different characteristics from the "I" of the early modern or modern eras. Hence the need to examine the different forms of self-fashioning in prefatory accounts as well as their relationship with their historical moments.

It is remarkable, nevertheless, that the use of the first person by Livy adumbrates the authoritative impulse seen in prefaces from later periods. As Kevin Dunn observes in his book *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface* (1994): "Self-

[8] As Genette observes: "the manuscript era is characterized by an easily comprehensible economy of means" (163).
[9] The practice of trying to capture the goodwill of audiences.

authorization has always been part of the prefatory project, and the intersection of preface with authorizing strategies is as old as the preface itself" (19). Yet, Dunn makes an important distinction between authorizing strategies in the Middle Ages and in the Early Modern Period. According to him, "for the medieval writer, authority was a textual inheritance, a finite set of authorities who could be adduced and copied but rarely added to" (8). By the seventeenth century, writers became more aware of their power as individuals, and they also started to think of their authority in relation to communities of readers. Dunn thus summarizes the history of the rhetoric privileged in this period: "The story of this rhetoric is to a large extent the story of humanism. If humanism quickly made its peace with autocracy and courtly culture, it nonetheless had its origins in the Italian bourgeoisie and took its strength from the growing market for books that was created by the printing press" (9).

Dunn locates in the Renaissance some other issues that continue to be relevant in the nineteenth century, such as the ways in which "the private and public roles of the author intersect" (xi), and the emergence of the author-function as a consequence of the threat represented by some texts, that is, the appearance of the "author" when writers became liable to be punished for their works.[10] This is relevant because nineteenth-century authorship emerges in a culture marked by the increasing presence of mechanisms of vigilance and visibility, an issue I shall articulate with the role of the theatre in the prefatory discourse of the authors selected.

Thus, in historicizing the genre, it is important to consider the developments of one specific modality of prefatory/paratextual writing; I am referring to prologues and epilogues to

[10] For an account of the emergence of the "author-function," see Michel Foucault's "What is an Author?" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, (Donald F. Bouchard ed., trans Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977. 130-31).

dramatic works. A plausible starting point is Genette's "pre-history to the prefatorial situation of communication." In his account, he explains that

> the term *prologue*, which in ancient drama designates everything that, in the play itself, precedes the entrance of the chorus, must not mislead us: its function is not to make a presentation, and still less to comment, but to provide an exposition in the dramatic sense of the word – most often (for example, in Aeschylus and Sophocles) in the form of a scene in dialogue, but sometimes (in Euripides) in the form of a character's monologue. Apparently only comedy can endow this monologue with the function of warning the public, in a slick and possibly polemical or satirical comment about fellow playwrights, so that here the monologue must be regarded as a true theatrical paratext necessarily anticipating one of the most artful forms of the modern preface: the actor's preface, delivered by someone we assume is outside the action of the play but who then turns out to be one of the characters. Examples are the monologue of Xanthias at the head (or almost) of Aristophanes' *The Wasps*, and many of Plautus's and Terence's theoretical-polemical prologues. (166)

As Genette clarifies in his exposition of the notion of *threshold*, the position of paratexts in relation to what they introduce is an unstable one: "a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*: a privileged place of a pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public" (2). When it comes to the actor's preface, the unstable and transactional aspects of the prologue gain special relevance, and dramatists and authors alike capitalized on them to keep their hold over audiences.

Douglas Bruster and Robert Weimann make some important observations about the role of audiences in determining prologue strategies. According to them, prologues shape audience's expectations "by appealing to potentially common interests and experiences. They thereby seek temporarily to project or control a socially significant space" (vii). I shall get back to this crucial passage of Bruster and Weimann's *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Drama* (2004) when I discuss the role of space in Hawthorne's, Dickens's, and James's prefatory self-fashioning; for the moment, I will focus on other points of historical interest in Bruster and Weimann's account of the prologue.

The prologue, in Bruster and Weimann's words, is "a multifaceted phenomenon and term" as it can operate as "text, actor, and performance" (1). Notably, some of the introductory pieces of the Elizabethan theatre did not come to us in printed form, while others, such as the prologues to Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* (1597), *Henry V* (1600), and the epilogues to *As You Like it* (1623) and *The Tempest* (1623), have become key elements of those plays, being often reproduced in their adaptations. Bruster and Weimann observe that while some of these prologues were targeted at the public at large, others were written to be performed at court and included explicit addresses to members of the monarchy (11). It must be noted that the patronage system, according to which artists acquired privileges or financial rewards from nobles or monarchs, was largely established in the early modern period, and the relationship between authors and their patrons determined much of what was written and censored.

Therefore, establishing one's individual authority as an artist was a challenging task in the prologues from this period. This was complicated by the fact that prologues were delivered by actors, and the author-function of the dramatist had little importance to the success of a play. Still, in writing about the delivery of prologues, Bruster and Weimann observe that costume as

well as particular characterization cues and visual signs could communicate authority to the actor:

> The early modern prologue's outward show appears to have routinely included a 'long, black, velvet cloak,' hat, and beard, as well as papers, book, scroll, or other property conveying authority behind the information communicated to the playgoer. The various items here draw on diverse realms of authority. The prologue's black velvet robe, for instance, suggests academic, or ecclesiastical, or judicial authority. The bay garland he may have won on his head symbolizes poetic authority and tradition. The items that the prologue may have held – whether book, scroll, papers, or staff – could have signified not only literary authority but the *skeptron* of political power extending over theatrical affairs as well. (25).

Writers of subsequent periods, and of other genres, such as the novel, may have felt the same impulse to "dress up" to address their audiences, that is, to project images of themselves, and we may observe this in the imagery used by Hawthorne, Dickens, and James. Understanding how these later images also convey power is one of the goals of this Dissertation.

While Elizabethan prologues were restricted to the audiences who attended the performances, to a few readers who had access to them in manuscript form or in the few (and expensive) printed editions of dramatic works available at that time, by the eighteenth century this situation had changed. As Mary E. Knapp informs us in *Prologues and Epilogues of the Eighteenth Century* (1961):

> In the eighteenth century the turning of a prologue or epilogue attracted writers differing as widely as Addison and Sheridan or Fielding and Horace Walpole.

> Written as acting pieces to be spoken in the theatre, the prologues and epilogues were also a popular form of literature, appearing constantly in the magazines and, after the middle of the century, in the newspapers. (v)

As she subsequently adds: "By readers and audience alike, prologues and epilogues were considered independent performances to be judged without references to the plays which they preceded or followed" (8). This scenario shows how attitudes to paratexts such as prologues and prefaces change from time to time. Soon, these genres would be seen as strictly marginal to the "main text" and suspicion would arise as to the sincerity, necessity, or originality of introductory texts. On the other hand, their performative potential remained very much alive in the following century.

Because the eighteenth century was also the century that saw the rise of the novel, we need to understand the specific function of introductory texts in this context. Eric Leuschner remarks that "[t]his function was essential in the beginnings of the genre in the eighteenth century as authors focused their energies on validating, explaining and legitimating the new form" (4). Another important aspect to be noted in prefaces to novels of this period is that when they appear as dedications, they are no longer addressed to a patron but rather to the reader.

This shift in address did not mean that writers were immediately led to indulge in self-revelation to establish their authority over their productions. The autobiographical memoir and the epistolary novels of Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, and Henry Fielding, were some of the main literary innovations in the eighteenth century, but authors were more inclined to self-effacement than to self-display in prefaces to novels. The credibility of the account was, generally speaking, more important to audiences than the name of the author or his own story. Alexander Zipper elucidates this point in his study of eighteenth-century paratexts: "in the

preface, many authors deny to have written the main text themselves, but instead attribute the authorship to the protagonist of their narration" (34). In other situations, the responsibility for the text is transferred to an editor or to someone who collects and finds manuscripts containing the story. A paradigmatic example here is Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). The famous eighteenth-century story about a shipwrecked man who triumphs over the adversities of nature is told in the "realistic" mode of the private journal. The preface, nevertheless, is of the editor's responsibility. He prepares the terrain for the reader, underscoring the supposed truthfulness of the account – "a just history of fact" – and the power of its message – "to justify and honour the wisdom of providence" (xv).

Some of these conventions and *topoi* continue in the nineteenth century, but a lot of authors feel the need to cater to the increasing demand for a more intimate author-reader relationship. This demand may be ascribed to a number of phenomena I shall discuss in the next two chapters. The man, his life, his "abodes," and his methods of composition became as important as the works themselves and publishers saw the enormous potential of those elements to promote the sale of books and boost their profits. But the sense of being exposed or consumed by an ever larger community of readers was not always welcome by authors. Some of the autobiographical prefaces examined here register not only the authors' accounts of themselves but also their resistance to exposure.

The autobiographical aspect of nineteenth-century prefaces coexists with a lot of critical commentary found in these texts. It can be argued that Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, anticipate, in their prefatory writing and in varying degrees, modernist writers T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound in their use of criticism to legitimize their aesthetic choices. According to Eric Leushchner, however, the use of the preface as a platform for criticism can be traced back to a

much earlier period than the nineteenth century. He argues that Thomas More's preface to *The Debellation of Salem and Bizance* (1533) "unlike dedicatory epistles and dedications, is not about the author or the reader, but about the text's purpose and why it was written. It enacts a first tentative step toward the preface as a critical component … " (31). Following Thomas More, John Dryden would discover "in the critical preface a new and congenial way of commending his work to its readers" (Parrinder 7). Different writers in the subsequent centuries follow in the footsteps of More, Dryden, and others, but in the nineteenth century, the critical component gains a different dimension; it becomes part of the authors' search for what Pierre Bourdieu has called *autonomy*, or the belief in the prerogative of literature to create its own rules (48).

For the moment, it must be noted that autonomy is one of the elements of a complex and hierarchically codified system known as "the literary field." This field elects particular aesthetic positions, languages, and cultural centers as models, and impels authors to take part in an elusive game. This game is elusive because the power that some positions give authors is not the result of "freedom," but of a pre-established set of principles in which they believe along with other producers and participants of the field.

Autonomy, authorship, and authority are thus intertwined in the nineteenth century. Other issues make this period particularly rich for a study of the prefatory genre: the privatization of culture and the consolidation of the middle class, the rise of cosmopolitanism, the advent of new forms of social control, and the increasing importance of visibility in a much more competitive market. While I focus on these issues to discuss the ways in which the selected authors fashioned themselves in their prefaces, I believe there are continuities between the nineteenth-century prefatory culture and the tradition of introductory texts of previous centuries.

Consequently, I acknowledge that nineteenth-century prefaces still perform a lot of the roles assigned to introductory texts in Greek and medieval rhetoric, in the early modern period, or in the eighteenth century. By extension, authors such as Hawthorne and Dickens, for example, were immediately influenced by the prefatory production of Walter Scott, Laurence Sterne, Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding, and others. The influence of the theater, especially of dramatic and actors' prologues, in the careers and prefaces of Dickens and James is also important to be considered. Lastly, it must be remembered that Henry James drew inspiration from Hawthorne, whose prefaces he greatly admired. From a different temporal perspective, analyzing how these authors used prefaces in the nineteenth century (the genre fell in disuse in the early decades of the twentieth century) may help us understand the ways in which postmodernist writers recycled this genre to produce a variety of aesthetic effects and call attention to the artificiality of art.[11]

In carrying out a comparative study of the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, I am aware of both the heterogenous nature of the genre – which may appear in many guises, different names, and with different functions – the changes pertaining to the period examined, and the ideologies shared by authors and audiences in this period. The authorizing role played by prefaces remains a key topic in this study, but authorizing strategies will be here articulated with the tropes used by authors to speak to their audiences.

[11] Here I am drawing from Werner Wolf's Introduction to *Framing Borders in Literature and Other Media.* (Werner Wolf and Walter Bernhart, eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006). Wolf underlines the importance of investigating the use of "frames" or paratexts in different historical moments: "A mere glance at some specific topics such as the 'disappearance of the dedication' (Lanser 1981: 129) or the development of titles reveal significant changes that await further elucidation: the original titles of plays in Elizabethan times and of eighteenth-century novels tend to be much longer than their modern counterparts, and modernist novels show a marked tendency to 'suppress the frame' by reducing framing elements, while post-modernist narratives tend to foreground the framed quality of discourse and at the same time undermine the difference of text and framing boundaries by multiplying or playing with framing" (33).

1.3. Frame, Threshold, and other Forms of Liminality: Theoretical Approaches to Paratexts and Prefaces

In addition to literary historians, scholars writing on individual authors have always devoted attention to prefaces in some way or another. Although these scholars have contributed to advancing debates on the genre, general and systematic theoretical interest in prefaces or paratexts is a relatively recent phenomenon. Gérard Genette's *Seuils,* or *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation,* is the most extensive work in paratextual studies to date and has become a key reference for anyone working with these marginal texts. But as Genette himself indicates, a number of authors writing in the 1970s (such as Claude Duchet, Jacques Derrida, and Antoine Compagnon) had paved the way for his work. Other theorists writing in the seventies – and from different theoretical perspectives – have also had impact on contemporary studies on paratexts and related phenomena, and because of this they deserve my attention.

What these theorists have in common is that they all analyze the different relationships between a given textual unity and the elements situated outside its limits, which include not only prefaces, titles, and illustrations, but also the author, the context, or the "world." Some of the relationships analyzed are structural in nature and concern the functions of specific elements in relation to the main work. Other analyses focus on the oppositions, hierarchies, and power relations evidenced at the margins of the text. Different concepts and metaphors such as *frame*, *border*, *frontier*, *parerga*, *perigraphy*, *liminality*, *paratext,* and *threshold* are employed in the analyses and constitute a conceptual vocabulary that can guide our understanding of the approaches in question. In what follows I shall discuss these approaches and evaluate their heuristic value to treat paratexts, and more specially prefaces. I will first compare two

perspectives coming from frame theory: one by John Frow and the other one by Werner Wolf. Next, I will examine texts by Genette's antecedents in chronological order: Duchet, Derrida, and Compagnon. After looking briefly at Bruster and Weimann's specific appropriation of Arnold van Gennep's theory of *the rites of passage* to analyze liminal situations in prologues, I will end this section with a more detailed discussion of Genette's theoretical model, giving emphasis to the categories that relate to the analysis of the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James.

***

Students of literature are familiar with the term "framing narrative" used to describe stories such as *Arabian Nights* or *The Canterbury Tales*. Likewise, the idea that Hawthorne's "Custom-House" works as a "frame" to *The Scarlet Letter* would not pose any problems to readers. The term, however, is not restricted to the fields of painting or literature. In his book *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience* (1974), Ervin Goffman proposed that "framing" is a cognitive process that orients our perception of a number of phenomena in everyday life. The book had a major impact in several areas, from linguistics to psychology, and informs important studies such as MachLachlan and Reid's *Framing and Interpretation* (1994), and Wolf and Bernhart's *Framing Borders in Literature and other Media* (2006).

Writing specifically about literature, John Frow defines the *frame* as the "limit, at once material and immaterial, literal and figurative, between adjacent and dissimilar ontological realms" (25). According to him, literary frames determine the value of what they frame and are controlled by a number of elements such as the author, publishing houses, and aesthetic conventions. This view is in keeping with those of other theorists' and works well as an initial definition for the preface, even though this genre is not explicitly mentioned in the article.

Undoubtedly, in this particular light the preface could take the "frame" label because it is adjacent to the main text and consists of an authorial defense or commentary on what it precedes.

However, when Frow illustrates what a frame to the novel should be, he identifies it with "the beginning of a text, the point at which the distancing between author and narrator usually occurs" (26). It could be easily objected that this "point" is not always so evident. Frow's insistence on clear-cut separations between the fictive and the real is also highly problematic. A number of prefaces and other framing devices defy these separations – a blatant example would be again Hawthorne's "Custom-House" preface to *The Scarlet Letter* – and because of this they require different approaches that can account for their complexities.

The idea that "framing borders" consist of distinguishing limits is also present in Werner Wolf's Introduction to *Framing Borders in Literature and Other Media*. However, Wolf does not oppose "real" and "fictive" but rather draws from Juri Lotman to describe the "frame" as that which "marks the border between the infinite world and the finite artefact as a model of the world" (26).[12] Wolf places particular emphasis on the role of "framing borders" in defining a reception for what they surround. As he explains,

> framing borders often contribute to the overcoming of what has become typical of Western, de-pragmatized art, namely the … seeming situational indeterminacy: in literature, for instance, framing borders thus frequently help to constitute or stabilize a real or imaginary reception situation in which the individual artefact makes sense. In this they cannot only highlight the artefact as such, but also its relation to the producer, to a certain context or to themselves as recipients. (26-7).

[12] Juri Lotman (1922-1993) was a Russian semiotician who studied a number of textual phenomena in his book *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (Trans. Gail Lenhoff and Ronald Vroon. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977), which also contains sections dealing with the frame and the extra-text.

Although some framing borders may enhance, rather than overcome the sense of indeterminacy, Wolf's position opens a myriad of possibilities of research and analysis. Instead of looking at the frame as secondary or simply as part of the structure of a given work (the ways in which it "highlights the artefact"), scholars can investigate the social forces, ideologies, the authorial images and interventions, and the historically specific situations that bring these semiotic unities to existence.

Claude Duchet proposes a similar methodological direction in "Pour une Socio-Critique: Variations sur un Incipit" (1971). In this article, Duchet laid the basis for what would become Genettte's paratext theory and claimed that texts are defined by a series of moving *frontiers* that point to what is outside them (6). Although he does not list or classify these moving frontiers as does Genette (he mentions only the incipit, the jacket, and the cover as examples) he sets a precedent for the use of spatial metaphors such as "territory" and "zone" as part of the vocabulary of paratextual studies. Duchet's view of the relationship between the inside and the outside of an "oeuvre" is particularly relevant to our discussion:

> Every encounter with the oeuvre, even without a prelude, in the absolute space between book and reader, is already oriented by the intellectual field in which it occurs. The oeuvre can only be read, take shape, and be written through the mental habits, cultural traditions, and differentiated practices of the language, which are their condition of reading. (7-8). [13]

The "mental habits, cultural traditions, and differentiated practices of the language" constitute the extra-text, but this extra-text does not depend on any paratextual apparatus to reveal it

[13] My translation. "Toute rencontre avec l'ouevre, même sans prélude, dans l'espace absolu entre livre et lisant, et déjà orientée par le champ intellectuel où elle servient. L'ouvre n'est lue, ne prend figure, n'est *écrite* q'au travers d'habitudes mentales, de traditions culturelles, de pratique differenciées de la langue, qui sont les conditions de la lecture." (7-8).

because it is an integrant, albeit implicit, part of the *oeuvre*. "The beginning of a text is no longer its opening: a text never begins, it has always begun before (8).[14]

Duchet's "socio-critique" constitutes an alternative to the oppositions text/extra-text and inside/outside which are often seen in texts dealing with paratexts. One year after the publication of "Pour une Socio-Critique," Jacques Derrida questioned the specific opposition preface/main text in his own preface to *La Dissemination* (1972), entitled "Outwork" in the English version. This questioning, however, is preceded by general reflections on prefatory writing and by an account showing how this genre was consigned to an inferior position in the philosophical discourse.

According to Derrida, one of the reasons why the preface has a low status in the hierarchy of genres is because it functions as a mere protocol, an empty and misleading discourse which pretends to be anticipatory when it is, in fact, written after the work is done. Derrida goes on to argue against the common prefatorial tendency to reduce "a text as such to its effects of meaning, content, thesis, or theme", a tendency which goes counter to the whole idea of *dissemination* which he endorses in the book (7). But soon we find out that Derrida is not attacking the preface *per se*, but a particular practice and conception of the genre.

As he examines Hegel's devaluation of the preface, he realizes that this textual modality finds itself trapped inside a logocentric economy: the preface would be external to the *concept* elaborated in the main body of the philosophical exposition. The concept should be able to present itself without the aid of prefatory remarks, and thus the preface would be unnecessary, or simply supplementary. In this sense, the preface would be analogous to the *parerga* – picture frames, adornments and embellishments used in sculpture and architecture – which Derrida

[14] "Le début d'un texte n'est pas plus son commencement: un texte ne commence jamais, il a toujours commencé avant." (8).

discusses in *The Truth in Painting* (1987). And these adjuncts, by the same logic of the supplement theorized in *Of Grammatology* (1967), expose the inherent insufficiency of the *ergon* (work): "What constitutes them as *parerga* is not simply their exteriority as a surplus, it is the internal structural link which rivets them to the lack in the interior of the ergon" (*The Truth in Painting*, 59). In other words, what makes a work of art be recognized as such is not immediately evident in its inner structure but is linked to the external appendages connected to the inner structure, and the *parerga* can be seen as some of the conventional signs that sanction that recognition.

It is incoherent, by extension, that Hegel should depend on the preface to present his argument against the preface in the *Phenomenology of the Spirit*. As Derrida concludes in *Dissemination*,

> while criticizing formalism, mathematism, scientism – which are always the errors of a philosopher – Hegel steers clear of rejecting the necessity for formal, mathematical, or scientific (in the restricted sense of the term) moments. He takes care not to fall into the opposite errors: empiricism, intuitionism, prophetism. The complicity among these symmetrical failings chooses to take up residence in prefaces as its favorite spot. But it is still up to a preface to unmask that complicity, according to the overflow of a re-mark (a preface on prefaces, a preface within a preface) of which dissemination must problematize the formal rules and the abyssal movement… (21).

The preface can eventually achieve the status of "a completely other structure," one that does not resemble teleological or strictly subservient prefaces and that challenges the hierarchies between the pre-text and the text, the text and the real (41-2).

While Derrida underlines the disseminative effect of prefaces such as Lautréamont's to *The Songs of Maldoror* (1869), or Swift's to *A Tale of a Tub* (1704), he also notes that some prefaces may have a conservative bias. "As the preface to a book, it is the word of a father assisting and admiring his work, answering for his son, losing his breath in sustaining, retaining, idealizing, reinternalizing, and mastering his seed"(45). This is a very important point to have in mind for the analysis of the rhetoric and imagery of nineteenth-century prefaces. Dickens, for instance, famously adopted a paternal stance towards his books – as in the Preface to *David Copperfield*: "It will be easily believed that I am a fond parent to every child of my fancy…" (15). James also strove to show "mastery" over his works by repeatedly referring to them as his "progeny" – "the awkward infants" of the Preface to the *Golden Bowl* (337) – and also by constantly resorting to metaphors such as "germ" and "seed" to recall the origins of his stories. These metaphors are clearly meant to convey possession, authority, and domesticate the reader. But as we read the prefaces from which they come more closely, we may conclude that authority is dependent on external instances to be affirmed and that these external instances may also threaten that authority.

Furthermore, we need to keep in mind that paternity – and other similar *tropes* I shall discuss further on – are effects of figuration and performance; to put it in Derridean terms: it is the text (the son) that "gives birth" to the father and not the other way round (*Dissemination* 77).[15] If the author finds it so necessary to resort to such roles to assert his authority, it is because that authority is not evident or transcendent. In this Dissertation, I see the author as an entity with no fixed place inside the rigid contours of nineteenth-century fiction, but someone who tries

[15] For a more comprehensive history and analysis of the different implications of *logos, father, and son*, see Derrida's reading of *Phaedrus* in the first section of the chapter entitled "Plato's Pharmacy" from the aforementioned *Dissemination* (pp. 65-117).

through omniscient narrators, commentators, prefatory impersonations, and autobiographical figurations, to convey the illusion of location, presence, unity, and control.

Antoine Compagnon's short text "La Périgraphie" (1979) puts some of these points in perspective. The term "perigraphy" is homologous to "paratext:" it encompasses the same elements (notes, prologue, appendixes) and is also conceived as an in-between category, "neither inside nor outside" the text (328). According to Compagnon, the "perigraphy" defines the limits of the autonomous and self-contained text: a fortified city whose guardian is the author (328). The image is quite striking and brings to mind the senses of augmenting, enlarging, "making richer," which derive from *augere*, one of the roman roots for the modern *author*.[16] Thus, Compagnon's view of the text as a "fortified city" and of authorship as the appropriation and surveillance of land corresponds to the figures of conquerors, explorers, and navigators used by nineteenth-century authors in their prefaces.

Compagnon makes other relevant remarks with regard to the relationship between authorship and the perigraphy. Firstly, he points out that the perigraphy is the site where the author observes himself. Then, he defines the site as "a 'scenography' which puts the text in perspective, whose center is the author" (328).[17] The first observation is in tune with my belief that prefaces are supports for self-fashioning. The second point he raises, however, is at odds with the perception of authorship as dislocated, which I expressed above. Still, the idea of the perigraphy as "scenography" undermines the very centrality Compagnon ascribes to the author. If we consider that prefaces are figured as "stages," the "scenography" metaphor could be construed in relation to the idea of authorial performance and not only as a visual apparatus that antecede the main text in the physical structure of the book, as Compagnon perceives it.

[16] See "Author" and "Augment" in *The Online Etymology Dictionary*.
[17] My translation. "une scénographie qui met le texte en perspective, et l'auteur en es le centre."

In underlining the performative aspect of prefatory self-fashioning, I am considering a type of situation which cannot be wholly identified with any of the forms of in-betweenness discussed above (Frow's *frame*, Wolf's *framing border*, Duchet's *moving frontier*, Derrida's *parerga*, Compagnon's *perigraphy*, or Genette's *threshold*). Generally speaking, these terms define the paratextual phenomenon as a property of the book (or of the work), and as part of its spatial configuration, even if it sheds light upon the social and economic dynamics involved in the processes of production or promotion of the work. The in-between category that seems more apt to describe authorial performance comes from anthropology: I am referring here to the concept of *liminality*.

In writing about the early modern drama, Bruster and Weimann note that the choice of actors for delivering prologues was based on their particular liminal status among the other actors of the company. "Richard Alleyn was apparently a hired man; Dick Juby was a young actor who on at least one occasion took both male and female roles; Richard Sharp had taken the very challenging role of the Duchess of Malfi as a boy actor before assuming adult male roles; the same trajectory marked the careers of Theophilus bird (or Bourne) and Ezekiel Fenn" (36). Bruster and Weimann go on to articulate the liminal status of these actors with the liminal situation of the prologue as a performance which enabled the audience to experience the transition from their everyday lives into imaginary worlds. (37). After acknowledging the contribution of Genette's *Paratexts* to reflections on textual thresholds, Bruster and Weimann resort to the theory of anthropologist Arnold van Gennep for a less strictly textual take on liminality. The authors give special attention to Gennep's theory of the *rites of passage,* which cover a range of transitional processes in society. While the rites of passage may be understood as individual experiences – especially in coming-of-age situations or in the delivery of prologues

for some of those liminal actors – the authors emphasize the force of the collectivity in codifying and recognizing these rites. Although this concept is not central in my readings of the prefaces, I believe there is room for studying prefaces from the anthropological perspective of van Gennep and others; in the nineteenth century in particular, momentous prefaces in the careers of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James (especially those *to* or *about* their first published works) bear witness to the senses of transition, of *becoming* an author, a gentleman, of going up in the social scale, prefaces which contain extravagant metaphors that transform the author into a hero.

The theoretical perspectives discussed above broaden the outlook on prefatory writing and allow for the establishment of relations among a variety of social phenomena and artistic manifestations. By contrast, the theoretical model of Gérard Genette is narrower, more rigidly defined. Although I have mentioned some of my quarrels with Genette's positions – his view of paratexts as strictly derivative, his idea that prefaces "have not evolved over time," and his distinction between prefatory *authorial* and *actorial* modes – his historical knowledge has been very helpful to my own account of prefatory history and his work as a whole is a source of inspiration to this Dissertation.

Seuils is the last book in Genette's trilogy devoted to the relationships among texts and everything considered extra-literary (or *transtextual*). The other two books of the trilogy are: *Introduction à L'architexte* (1979) and *Palimpsestes* (1982). While this trilogy might suggest that Genette was gradually abandoning his formalist tendencies and establishing dialogue with critical trends tuned in with social, historical, and ideological issues, this promise is not fulfilled. Genette does gesture towards some of those issues, but his work remains based on the classification and categorization of the events he describes, that is, the different forms of

transtextuality used to illuminate aspects of the structure of the texts around which they are identified.

This point is illustrated by one of the key claims made by Genette, the idea that the paratext is as a derivative form of discourse, always "dedicated to something other than itself" (12). In this respect, Genette differs from Derrida for whom the preface may constitute a completely other structure, a position more in keeping with the study I propose. Genette's theoretical limitation, however, allows him to focus on a series of specific variables such as *where* and *when* the paratext occurs in relation to the text.

According to Genette, "'location' means the possibility, over time and particularly from one edition to another of a change in location, which sometimes involves a change in status" (173). A preface occupying a *preludial* position in one edition may become *postludial* (a postface) in another one and vice versa. There are examples of internal prefaces (such as Sterne's to *A Sentimental Journey*, placed between chapters 20 and 21), and some prefaces may eventually become part of a separate collection of essays like James's *The Art of the Novel*. Conversely, essays published in different media (magazines or newspapers) may appear as prefaces in a particular edition of a work.

As for the temporal variable (*when*), Genette lists prefaces as follows: *original prefaces, later prefaces, delayed prefaces (*also called *pre-posthumous or testamentary prefaces), and posthumous prefaces* (necessarily allographic). Examples of original prefaces I shall examine include Dickens's addresses to the serial numbers of *Pickwick Papers* and Hawthorne's "The Old Manse" Preface to the collection of stories *Mosses from an Old Manse* (1846). *Later prefaces,* such as Dickens's to the Second Edition of the First Series of *Sketches by Boz,* are motivated by critical and popular responses to the first edition of the work and may contain

information not included in the original preface. Genette concedes that this is also the case with *delayed prefaces*; what distinguishes the latter from the former is the proximity to death, "which makes the delayed preface, generally, and in the strictest sense, a final preface" (247). This type of preface, usually written for collected editions of an author's work, may perform a distinctively autobiographical function. The examples I shall be concerned with are Dickens's Preface to the Cheap (1847), Library (1858), and Charles Dickens's (1867) Editions of *The Pickwick Papers*, and Henry James's Prefaces to the New York Edition. Antecedents for this type of preface come from François-René de Chateaubriand and Walter Scott.

In addition to the location and the "date of appearance," the other features Genette takes into account in classifying each of the paratextual modalities are: their "modes of existence (*how*?);" the "characteristics of [their] situation of communication – [their] sender and addressee, that is, *from whom?, to whom?*;" and the functions they serve: *to do what?* (4). The sender is one of the most complex categories in the system and one of special relevance to my analysis of authorial self-fashioning. The sender can be *authorial, allographic*, or *actorial*, according to the role played by the speaker; and *authentic*, *fictive* and *apocryphal*, according to the regime of the communicative situation (181). To quote some of Genette's examples, Victor Hugo's preface to *Cromwell* (1827) is *authorial* (written by the alleged author of the piece) and *authentic*, whereas Laurence Templeton's preface to *Ivanhoe* (1820) is *authorial* and *fictive*. Richard Simpson's introduction to Gulliver's first-person account in *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) is *allographic* (not written by the alleged author of the piece) and *fictive*. The apocryphal preface happens when the "attribution to a real person is invalidated by some paratextual sign" (179).

Genette shows awareness of the limits of his taxonomy. He acknowledges the difficulties in determining the nature of a speaker in a preface and grants that his typology is "cumbersome"

for this very reason (178). After discussing a series of examples of prefaces according to that typology, he is inclined to add yet two more variables to his table: the *assumptive* preface, in which the author (alleged or fictive) assumes the authorship for the work, and the *disavowing* preface, when the speaker denies having written it. Most of the prefaces I discuss are authorial and assumptive, with the exception of "From the Writings of M. l'Aubépine," which is pseudo-allographic, and "The Custom-House," which can be described as authorial and partially disavowing. As I argue, the figurations used by the authors in their authorial prefaces (including in the pseudo-allographic "From the Writings of M. l'Aubépine") show nuances of authorship that the categories used by Genette do not capture. In other words, these categories cannot explain the fact that in several situations the author of the autographic preface appear as Other, complicates referentiality, and shows authorship to be the result of performance. Such performance can be compared to that of the actor or the *stage manager* as I shall explain further on, but the implied author is not completely erased as would happen in a more explicitly actorial preface.

I have opted instead to treat these prefaces as both authorial and actorial, two mutually exclusive categories in Genette's model. This treatment will allow for analyses of the prefaces that take the roles employed by the authors into consideration as well as the implications of these roles in relation to a broader social context. Additionally, these roles, as I have mentioned before, will be discussed in relation to settings or *loci* of enunciation, which constitute a less formalist approach to "location" in prefatory writing.

2

Hawthorne, Dickens, James, and the "Destiny of Their Images"

2.1. Three Authors, Multiple Images: A Bibliographical and Critical Evaluation

Writing about Hawthorne, Dickens, and James poses a number of challenges to the critic. Firstly, these are writers with different styles, backgrounds, and reputations, whose points of contact are not so evident. Secondly, the amount of information we now have about each one of them is so extensive that any promise of novelty can immediately be transformed into fear of redundancy. Thirdly, these authors have long been treated as cultural monuments and this status can make them seem remote or detached from our times. Notwithstanding these challenges, comparative work involving multiple (and contrasting) canonical authors is quite common in the Anglo-American tradition and one may profit from other scholars' approaches and experiences in this area. Some antecedents figuring at least two of the three authors selected for this Dissertation are: Jonathan Arac's *Commissioned Spirits: The Shaping of Social Motion in Dickens, Carlyle, Melville, and Hawthorne* (1979)*;* Susan L. Mizruchi's *The Power of Historical Knowledge: Narrating the Past in Hawthorne, James, and Dreiser* (1988); and Pamela Schirmeister's *The Place of Romance in Hawthorne, Melville, and James* (1990).

Although there is not much new "information" to be shared about the three authors in question, their works remain relevant, compelling, and continue to stimulate revaluations and debates. Additionally, criticism has long been questioning the consecrated modes of thinking about the so-called "canonical authors." I believe, along with other critics, that these authors can only speak to us in the twenty-first century if we break the very aura associated with the

"canonical." In other words, we need to abandon the monolithic idea of the literary "Master" and explore the multiplicity of alternative images, versions, and discourses produced by and around them.

This premise finds support and illustration in John Rowe's book *The Other James* (1998). In his prefatory remarks, Rowe contends that James is no longer strictly attached to the titles of "master of realism, modernism, and postmodernism" (ix). This change, as he explains,

> begins with our recognition of certain impasses – repetitions and thus repressions – in our previously settled ways of thinking; this has certainly been the case in our transformation of the pompous figure of James as master of the novel – captured perfectly in John Singer Sargent's famous 1912 portrait of James at age seventy – into the vulnerable, sexually anxious, and lonely writer struggling with the new modern art and new age he had helped make possible (ix-x).

Further in his opening discussion, Rowe replaces the singular "other James" with the plural "Jameses," more sociable and accessible than the author primarily associated with the literary activity (xiii). As Rowe highlights in this book and also in *The Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James* (1984), these other Jameses are the products of critical perspectives that have brought new methodologies and questions to bear on the study of the author's life and works.

Authors have, in different times and in spite of criticism, been aware of the need to produce images of themselves to remain relevant and guarantee a place in posterity. With the increased emphasis on publicity and the proliferation of media technologies in modernity, this principle has been continuously reinforced. For twenty-first century writers seeking recognition, for instance, it may be advisable to give interviews on television, keep an account on Facebook, authorize a film version of their lives, and allow fans to take "selfies" with them in book fairs.

According to Reinaldo Marques in "The Literary Archive and the Writer's Images" (2012), "we only exist if submitted to the imperative of the icon, as participants in an inescapable theatre of images" (59). Still according to the Brazilian critic, "the destiny of writers and literature today seem to be more than ever inextricably linked to the destiny of their images" (61).[18] These images are now seen as fragmentary and the product of a collectivity, even if at times they are manipulated by the author, who fashions himself for an audience and according to experiences and beliefs he shares with society.

Whereas in the main body of the Dissertation (Chapters 4, 5, and 6) I examine the ways in which Hawthorne, Dickens, and James fashion themselves and create their own "theatre of images," below I continue exploring the way criticism has helped construct, mythologize, or even demystify these authors. Firstly, I shall point out some highlights in the critical history of each author individually; next, I shall provide the bases (geo-political, aesthetic, material, and social) for the comparative approach adopted in the Dissertation. Finally, I will focus on the critical responses the three collections of prefaces have generated.

Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-1864)

Among the most famous critical essays written on Hawthorne are those by two of his greatest admirers: Herman Melville and Henry James. Melville wrote his passionate "Hawthorne and his Mosses" in 1850, one year before he dedicated *Moby Dick* to his friend and role model.

[18] My translation from "O Arquivo Literário e as Imagens do Escritor," (*O Futuro do Presente: Arquivo, Gênero, Discurso.* Orgs. Eneida M. de Souza, Eliana da Conceição Tolentino, Anderson Bastos Martins. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2012. 59-89). "Só existimos se submetidos à potência do ícone, como partícipes de um inescapável teatro de imagens" (59). "O destino do escritor e da literatura parece estar hoje, mais do que antes, indissoluvelmente ligado ao destino de suas imagens" (61).

In 1879, 15 years after Hawthorne's death, James published his biography for Macmillan's English Men of Letters Series, a biography which will receive further mention later on. In 2002, Paul Auster, another admirer of Hawthorne, wrote "Hawthorne at Home," a review of a piece which might have passed unnoticed by most critics: *Twenty Days with Julian &Little Bunny, by Papa,* an excerpt from Hawthorne's *American Notebooks*. "Hawthorne at Home" is a remarkable text not because of its seemingly insignificant subject, but because of Auster's intelligent analysis and his great respect for Hawthorne.

In his review, Auster observes that Hawthorne is often associated with dark themes and a rather embroidered and difficult prose. He then produces a list that includes other aspects of the author's literary personality. Auster's list of alternative Hawthornes includes: "Hawthorne the allegorist, Hawthorne the high romantic fabulist, Hawthorne the chronicler of seventeenth-century colonial New England and, most notably, Hawthorne as reimagined by Borges – the precursor of Kafka" (471). His list captures, in a concise way, some of the key images Hawthorne came to have in the imaginary of readers and brings to mind a lot of famous works by the writer.[19] Additionally, it calls attention to the transformations in Hawthornian criticism, especially his recent alignment with modernism and postmodernism.

Despite this alignment, one of the commonplaces in Hawthorne scholarship is his status as a "precursor." This status is a dubious one: it can be a revitalizing element, which places Hawthorne in relation to later authors and movements; or a conservative one, a condition of being a fixed point of origin frozen in the past. Borges, to a certain extent, revitalizes Hawthorne; the story "Wakefield," in the essayist's account, evokes a typically modern experience in an urban environment and, just like Kafka's stories, puzzles the reader with an opaque character and

[19] One may, for example, think of "Young Goodman Brown," "The Artist of the Beautiful," *The Scarlet Letter*, and "My Kinsman, Major Molineux," to name one example for each of the aspects listed by Auster.

inscrutable secrets (78-9). By contrast, Harold Bloom defines Hawthorne as "the true beginning of American prose fiction, the absolute point of origin from which we can trace the sequence from Melville and James to Faulkner and Pynchon" (9). A similar position may be found in *The School of Hawthorne* (1986), by the renowned critic Richard Brodhead. In his book, Brodhead defines a whole literary tradition based on the idea of an original founder, the first writer committed to the project of writing genuine North American fiction outside the parameters of European models.

In Brodhead's assessment, Hawthorne's regionalism appears as a source of influence for Faulkner's mythographies. Notoriously, James had condemned this aspect of Hawthorne's writing in his biography and maintained that, despite his originality and talent, his fiction was the product of a provincial mind. As several critics have noted, James's Hawthorne lacked the sophistication and knowledge of European culture which could make James supplant his predecessor. Despite James's ambivalent attitudes towards his "master," *Hawthorne* triggered countless critical responses and contributed to the process of canonization of Hawthorne in the Anglo-American world.[20]

Outside the Anglo-American world, Hawthorne had to compete with Edgar Allan Poe for critical attention.[21] *The French Face of Nathaniel Hawthorne: the Second Empire Critics* (2011) traces the trajectory of contemporary responses to Hawthorne's works in France. Hawthorne's prefaces conquered critics such as Paul Émile-Daurand Forgues while Émile Montégut was fascinated by the author's special treatment of character psychology (Anesko 25). Montégut is particularly important because he was a reference for James's *Hawthorne*; his articles on U.S.

[20] Hawthorne was the only North American author to figure in Macmillan's English Men of Letters Series.
[21] For a study of Poe's favorable reception in France, see Jean Alexander, *Affidavits of Genius: Edgar Allan Poe and the French Critics, 1847-1924* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1971).

Literature and on the author of *The Scarlet Letter* appeared in the famous *Revue de Deux Mondes*. Some of these articles are: "Carlyle et Emerson" (1850); "Le General Franklin Pierce" (1852); and "Un Romancier Pessimiste en Amérique: Nathaniel Hawthorne" (1854).

The pessimism Montégut saw in Hawthorne can be understood in light of the author's puritan origins. Hawthorne was born in Salem, Massachusetts, a town which gained notoriety because of a series of witch trials in the late seventeenth century. John Hathorne, Hawthorne's great-grandfather, was a magistrate during some of those trials and sentenced more than one hundred women to death (Wineapple 15). Hawthorne was deeply ashamed of his ancestor and eventually added a *w* to his name to avoid being linked to his family's bloody past. The puritan legacy, however, remained present in his sketches, tales, and novels. Moral and religious issues, such as sin, guilt, repentance, innate evil, among others, are present in much of his fiction. Although puritanism has been a frequent topic in Hawthorne's criticism, Hawthorne's attitudes towards religious dogmas are often ambiguous. Moreover, as critics have concluded, Hawthorne's influences cannot be reduced to a single system of thought: the author's circle of friends included Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau, some of the leading philosophers of the period. Transcendentalist ideals were quickly absorbed by Hawthorne, who would later live among the radicals of the Brook Farm community, a utopian socialist experiment based on Transcendentalism[22] and on the precepts of Charles Fourier.

Other questions pertaining to the USA in the mid-nineteenth century have called the attention of Hawthorne critics over the last decades. According to Leland S. Person,

[22] Transcendentalism was a New England philosophical school that championed individual intuition and a holistic view of spirituality. It aggregated ideas from German Idealism, English Romanticism, Orientalism, Platonism, French Fourierism, and Christianity, and is considered as one of the most influential movements in the history of the United States.

> Hawthorne knew his seventeenth-century New England history, but the trend in Hawthorne studies, as it is generally in American literary studies, is toward stressing the political and social context offered by the politically volatile world in which he lived. The decade of the 1990s was dominated by New Historicist analyses of Hawthorne and his writing, which place him within the context of that culture, often unflatteringly, because of what critics regard as his relatively conservative views toward questions of gender, class, and race" (183).

It must be added that some new historicist critics analyze "the political and social context" in conjunction with other issues, such as the history of authorship and the relationships between literature and ideology.

The relationship between literature and ideology is the subject of a number of important works in Hawthorne criticism. Two prominent examples are Sacvan Bercovitch's *The Office of "The Scarlet Letter"* and Lauren Berlant's *The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Everyday Life*, both published in 1991. Bercovich sees the "darkest of Hawthorne's novels (as it has often been described) [as] a vehicle of continuity at a time of cultural disruption and social change" (xviii). Bercovich works with the concept of *cultural symbology* (instead of ideology), which he defines as "the system of symbolic meanings that encompasses text and context alike, simultaneously nourishing the imagination and marking its boundaries" (xvii). Lauren Berlant offers her own version of "ideology:" the *national symbolic*, defined as "the *political* space of the nation which is not merely juridical, territorial (*jus soli*), genetic (*jus sanguinis*), linguistic, or experiential, but some tangled cluster of these" (5). According to her, Hawthorne's work, including his preface to "The Custom-House," illustrates (and critiques) the

processes by which the national symbolic becomes a hegemonic force in the formation of citizens.

New historicists have additionally explored the specific cultural work of domesticity in Hawthorne's life and works. Gillian Brown's *Domestic Individualism*: *Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America* (1990) examines the depiction of female characters in Hawthorne's novels *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851) and *The Blithedale Romance* (1852), and relates it to the broader context of domesticity and its relationship to the burgeoning marketplace. Another important work dealing with domestic ideology is Joel Pfister's *The Production of Personal Life: Class, Gender, & the Pshychological in Hawthorne's Fiction* (1991). In Leland S. Person's words: "Pfister's study exemplifies New Historicist criticism at its best, as he situates Hawthorne's writing ("The Birthmark," "Rappaccini's Daughter," and the four major romances) within a rich context of medical discourse, advice, and conduct manuals, and Marxist and feminist theory" (198). Given Pfister's interest in Hawthornian psychology and middle-class domestic values, it could be read alongside *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthornes and the Making of the Middle Class Family* (1993), by T. Walter Herbert, a biography that demystifies the impression of Edenic harmony contemporaries had of Hawthorne and his family. Finally, Lora Romero's *Home Fronts: Domesticity and its Critics in Antebellum United States* (1997) – from which I drew the definition of "ideology" as "an expansive logic, a meaningful vocabulary, and rich symbols through which [people] *think* about their world" (19) – treats domesticity as a complex ideological system that defies binary oppositions such as male/female, popular literature/"high" literature, subversion/orthodoxy.

Authorship and its place in nineteenth-century culture is one last area of investigation that needs to be treated here. Most Hawthorne critics and biographers touch upon this issue in some

way or another. Before President Franklin Pierce granted Hawthorne the position of consul at Liverpool in 1851, the author struggled with financial difficulties and often depended on friends and family to support himself and his children. Additionally, Hawthorne continuously expressed his frustration with the precarious publishing conditions of his time and with the lack of audience for his works. The prefatory medium was one of his favorite outlets for expressing frustration and for airing his ideas about authorship. *American Romanticism and the Marketplace* (1985), by Michael T. Gilmore, is one of the most important references when it comes to discussing the economies of authorship in nineteenth-century U.S. Gilmore is a literary and social historian and a descendant of William Charvat – one of the editors of the *Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1962) and the author of the influential *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870: The Papers of William Charvat* (1968). *The Art of Authorial Presence: Hawthorne's Provincial Tales* (1993) , by G. R. Thompson, is another relevant work, especially as it deals with the idea of authorial figuration and "the representation of the artist figure worrying about his audience, puzzling over the interaction of waking life and a dream life, and musing on the relation of fiction and history…" (3). A more recent work in this area is Scott S. Derrick's *Monumental Anxieties: Homoerotic Desire and Feminine Influence in 19th Century U.S. Literature* (1997). In tune with the then emerging field of queer theory, Derrick brilliantly articulates "authorial self-making" with processes of masculine development in the U.S. in the nineteenth century. Derrick's work also traces the history of the professionalization of authorship and explores the way authorial (and sexual) anxieties are treated in the works of the authors in that period.

Hawthorne's prefatory images should be seen in relation to these other images and criticism. Whereas the authorial figures the author forged in his prefaces complement, support,

and illustrate some of the critics' versions, in other situations these figures expand, problematize and defy them. Furthermore, by comparing Hawthorne's prefatory writing with other writers', I shall bring to light other aspects not presented above, especially the ways in which authorship is performed, and the relationship between nineteenth-century authorial self-fashioning and the emergence of an international literary system around that time.

Charles Dickens (1812-1870)

In an afterword to *Dickens and Modernity* (2012), Florian Schweizer[23] explains the rationale behind the choice of a particular portrait of Dickens for promoting the Bicentennial celebrations of 2012:

> The lead image of Dickens 2012 is an engraving of a Nickleby portrait by Daniel Maclise (owned by Tate Britain and on display at the National Portrait Gallery)… Showing Dickens at the age of 27, it is to many people a new image which may, initially, confuse audiences owing to the unfamiliar appearance; the plan is, however, that the confusion will change to a greater understanding of Dickens the man and writer, who developed alongside his contemporaries from a late Regency dandified youth to the eminent and established figurehead of the age. One of the benefits of promoting a younger Dickens is his function as role model to younger writers and artists; considering that Dickens became the world's most famous writer before he turned thirty and wrote one of the most

[23] Florian Schweizer was Director of the Charles Dickens Museum in London and also Project Director of the International 2012 campaign.

> popular stories ever written at the age of thirty-one, there is clearly potential to inspire young people to pursue their creative writing ambitions. (212)

This passage performs at least three functions: firstly, it reiterates Dickens's reputation as the greatest literary celebrity of his time; secondly, it reinforces the Victorian ideal of individual growth and development of which Dickens was not only an example but also an active supporter; and lastly, it illustrates how institutions manipulate writers' images according to particular agendas and purposes. In the case of the Bicentennial, the aim was to renovate Dickens's image by shifting the emphasis from the serious patriarch of his last years' photographs – one of which would eventually appear on the ten-pound bill – to the fresh-looking image of Maclise's portrait.

From Schweizer's excerpt we may derive some key topics that deserve to be treated more carefully in a discussion on Dickens's images and criticism. One of these is the author's popularity and celebrity status. Dickens's close identification with the Victorian age and the British national space constitutes another important topic to be discussed. By extension, the role of ideology in shaping Dickens's personality and his works should also be considered. There have been different trends in Dickens criticism and each of them sheds light upon different aspects of the authors' writing and life according to the time when they emerged and the theoretical assumptions underlying them. Although the following commentary does not consist of an overview of these trends, some of them may be identified in it; the main purposes of this commentary are to highlight key contributions by distinguished Dickensian scholars and promote greater understanding about the author's career.

Dickens's enormous popularity in his time may be seen as the result of personal ambition, hard work, affect, and right timing. The author achieved notable success with a series

of sketches depicting London scenes which were published in monthly and weekly papers between 1833 and 1836. After that, he became an easy target for publishers willing to capitalize on his success, but instead of becoming a victim of these publishers, he asserted his rights as a professional author and established himself in the Victorian literary market.

Since the beginning, Dickens understood that building rapport with his readers was essential to success; he managed to do this by offering comic and sentimental stories and also by addressing the readers directly and affectionately in his notes and prefaces. After *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club (The Pickwick Papers*, 1836*)*, his first hit in the market of serial novels, he stopped publishing under pseudonyms, experimented with more serious and darker themes, and invested more and more in the promotion of his works at home and abroad. The moment couldn't be better for him: not only was the market big enough for the type of fiction he produced but the valorization of artistic individuality was on the rise.

In addition to this, as Robert Douglas-Fairhurst writes in *Becoming Dickens: The Invention of a Novelist* (2011): "[Dickens] came to embody the defining values of his age: its irresistible energy, its self-divisions and self-doubts, its urgent striving for something beyond the present" (4). Fairhurst refers here to the Victorian Era (1838-1901), whose middle period (1848-1870) was known as The Age of Improvement (Abrams 1049). If on the one hand, the Victorian Era was known for major technological and scientific advancements that transformed the bases of society, on the other hand it was known for the emphasis on values such as domesticity, industriousness, and prudishness, among many others Dickens and his novels reflected to a certain extent.

The association of Dickens with this particular period and ideological configuration has been vastly explored in criticism. Robert L. Patten underlines this association by employing the

term "Industrial-Age author" in his account of Dickens's development from a writer of journalistic pieces to an accomplished novelist. According to Patten, Dickens is the central figure of the "beginning of an authorial power that would both fuel and stand up to capitalist material and cultural production during the heyday of British industrialism and that would eventually extend its powers and benefits to writers around the world" (19). This authorial power has much to do with the control Dickens exerted over all the stages of the editing and publication of his books and also over his identity as an author. This power, coupled with his unrelenting fight for The International Copyright Law, would transform Dickens into a model of professional authorship to writers in different parts of the world during the nineteenth century. Among the authors upon whom Dickens exerted influence are Hawthorne and James (in the Anglo-American world), and Machado de Assis (1837-1908), one of the most eminent figures in the Brazilian letters and an admirer of Dickens.

In a less celebratory tone, Angelia Poon explores Dickens's deployment of "his own person and public persona as a model of Englishness" (100). This Englishness was, more than ever, appealing to Victorian audiences who took pride in the expansion of the British Empire. In *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period: Colonialism and the Politics of Performance* (2008), Poon argues that "Dickens's relationship to Englishness cannot be fully understood without reference to his social reformist impulses and his related ambitions for cultural dominance in the Victorian society" (101). The author supports this argument with readings of Dickens's articles to his own weekly periodicals: *Household Words* (1850-1859) and *All the Year Round* (1860-1870). In contrast to Robert L. Patten, who saw Dickens's authorial supremacy as the signal of an emerging form of artistic and professional consciousness, Poon suggests that such supremacy was the means by which Dickens could "colonize national

opinion" (102). Furthermore, as she goes on to observe, in some of the articles he wrote for the aforementioned periodicals – especially "The Noble Savage" (1853) and "The Lost Arctic Voyagers" (1854) – Dickens emits racist opinions about non-English peoples coming from the outskirts of the Empire. These peoples, according to the author, constitute examples of "Otherness" against which Englishness could be defined.

Angelia Poon's text is just one among a series of more recent critical responses that tend to demystify Dickens by showing other sides to his personality besides the celebrated author, social reformist, and philanthropist.[24]These responses are inspired by a number of critical schools, such as poststructuralism, deconstruction, postcolonial studies, and gender studies, among others that have provided scholars with the tools to reassess Victorian literature and culture. Poon's work, in particular, is aligned with the thought of postcolonial theorists such as Edward Said, whose *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) addresses the influence of imperial discourses in authors such as Joseph Conrad and Dickens.[25]

A counterpoint to the stock view of Dickens as a model of Victorian Englishness comes from Juliet John's Introduction to the aforementioned *Dickens and Modernity*. In her text, John links Dickens to Shakespeare and justifies such linkage by arguing that both writers were able to cross temporal and geographical boundaries and continue to be recognized in contemporaneity (3). In John's view, this makes them consonant with "that state of uncertainty and instability we associate with the nebulous but resonant concept of modernity" (3). Although the idea that particular writers transcend their own places and times sounds like a return of the vague and

[24] As early as 1973, however, John Carey called attention to Dickens's violent impulses, prejudices, and inconsistencies, which he contrasted with the writer's predominant image as enlightened social reformist. See *The Violent Effigy: A Study of Dickens's Imagination*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1973).
[25] See also Grace More, *Dickens and Empire: Discourses of Class, Race, and Colonialism in the Works of Charles Dickens*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

exclusive concept of "universality," we have to give some credit to the fact that these authors remain very much alive in both academia and in mass culture. To confirm this, one has only to compare the number of works published on Dickens and Shakespeare, as well as the adaptations of these writers' works in different parts of the world, with those of their contemporaries William Makepeace Thackeray and Christopher Marlowe, respectively.

The modern Dickens, however, should not be seen as an incontestable truth, but rather as a "critical fiction," as Philip Collin observes (157). Such modernity has been emphasized as of the 1940s to the detriment of a more sentimental strand in Dickens's literature represented especially by *A Christmas Carol* (John 4). A landmark in Dickensian criticism, J. Hillis Miller's *Charles Dickens*: *The World of his Novels* (1958) follows this tendency to reinvent Dickens. Miller makes the radical proposal to "reverse the usual causal sequence between the psychology of an author and his work" (viii). By performing this reversal, the critic "sees a work of literature not as the mere symptom or product of a preexistent psychological condition, but as the very means by which a writer apprehends and, in some measure, creates himself" (viii). Here, Miller is already gesturing towards deconstructionist criticism with which he would be later identified. Although he seems to disregard the role of context and ideology in shaping a writer's "apprehension" of himself, his idea of an author who is the product of his text is partly in keeping with my own take on authorship in this Dissertation.

In addition to Miller, other scholars writing in the 1950s and 1960s were responsible for new developments in Dickens criticism. One of these scholars is Kathleen Tillotson, the author of *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties* (1954) and *Dickens at Work* (1957), co-authored with John Butt. According to James Eli Adams, Tillotson's scholarship emerged out of an interest to "recover a richer history of the novel as both literary form and material artefact" (Ch.3 Kindle

File). This richer history included specific attention to processes of composition and the ways in which these processes related to the demands imposed on the writer from publishers and the market. Thus, Tillotson (and others) combined intrinsic analysis (also advocated by the new critics, especially influential after World War II) with the social and material history of theorists such as Raymond Williams.

In the 1980s, studies on nineteenth century literature were profoundly impacted by the works of French theorist Michel Foucault. One of the best examples of Foucaultian scholarship is D. A. Miller's *The Novel and the Police* (1988), which explores mechanisms of surveillance and policing on the diegetic level of novels and considers omniscience as one of the manifestations of these mechanisms in narrative technique. The obvious source for *The Novel and the Police* is Foucault's *Surveiller et Punir* (1975), an analysis of a form of power that emerged in the late eighteenth century and whose efficacy depended not only on institutions but also on a variety of discursive practices and mobile agencies.

Also interested in power dynamics but focused on a different aspect of nineteenth-century culture is Mary Poovey, the author of *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (1988). With a chapter dedicated to Charles Dickens's *David Copperfield*, *Uneven Developments*, in James Eli Adams's words, "offers a different history of 'woman,' emphasizing the 'uneven' gendering of public and private spheres as a central dynamic in the construction of social order generally – here registered in discourses of marriage, law, professionalism, public health, and nursing" (Ch. 3 Kindle File). Writing specifically about *Copperfield*, Poovey argues that Dickens tries to inculcate in his readers the belief in individuality, universality, class, and masculinity as the defining qualities of subjecthood (90). Poovey's chapter on Dickens is particularly successful in combining close readings of the novel

with the history of the emergence of the British book trade in the eighteenth century and with the account of the resulting changes in the social status of literary men in this new scenario.

Although Foucault continues to exert influence on Victorian studies through the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century, scholars dealing with different forms of "spectacle" in the nineteenth century have adopted a more critical stance towards Foucault's theory. In *Dickens, Novel Reading, and the Victorian Popular Theatre* (1998), for example, Debora Vlock opens her book with the following remarks:

> If Foucault's voice is generally present here, it is here, much of the time, to be challenged, as a voice potentially as totalizing and controlling as the cultural forces it describes. If we accept as accurate the discursive shift he defines as a more or less material cultural change occurring around the eighteenth century, a shift from the spectacular to the speculative, from the corporal to the carceral, then we are led to accept as well a vision of novel reading and writing in Victorian England which emphasizes isolation, privacy, the contemplative reading subject – a reductive and romanticized view of a complex subject. Acts of novel reading and writing took place in "public spaces" – that is, in the terms of popular agreement, a framework of consensual cultural ideas and the signs assumed to represent those ideas – in the nineteenth century, even when performed in isolation and silence. Novel reading literally entered the public sphere when novelists like Dickens took to the platform and performed public readings, and, less obviously, when the novels themselves borrowed heavily from the theatre,

> employing almost casually and with confidence in their readers' collective understanding, some of the standard theatrical signs of the time. (1).

My views on the pair privacy/spectacle are in consonance with those expressed by Vlock in this passage. By extension, I see privacy and spectacle (or interiority and publicity) as dialectically intertwined in the way writers perform their authorship in the prefatory site; these writers both dramatize and amplify their "intimacies" in semi-autobiographical accounts and deploy theatrical metaphors to show personal engagement with their activity and continuity with the imaginative world of their works. Two other important works that adopt (and revise) Foucault's categories are Joseph Litvak's *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel* (1992) – a key reference in the discussion on nineteenth-century performativity I develop in Chapter 6 – and Karen Chase and Michael Levenson's *The Spectacle of Intimacy: A Public Life for the Victorian Family* (2000).

The critical views discussed above offer glimpses of the many Dickenses now available to audiences and scholars alike. Crucial among the different views is the idea of an emerging form of authorial power which Dickens symbolizes, a power that may be seen not only as the product of social and economic circumstances (and of narrative techniques), but also of prefatory figurations which inscribe that power in the imaginary of readers and establish relationships and geographies as forms of enhancing it. Still, if Dickens has become a "household" name, he constructed this condition in the public sphere and according to the ideological scenario he was part of. Thus, while (or before) he was reinvented by criticism, he invented himself many times throughout his career, which can partly explain his permanence in the rapidly changing environment of nineteenth-century England.

Henry James (1843-1916)

In the groundbreaking *Henry James and the Art of Power* (1984), Mark Seltzer aptly describes James Criticism up until the 1980s:

> Criticism of James has always been Jamesian, and this is the case not merely because James, in his own criticism and especially in his prefaces to the New York Edition, has so comprehensively set the term for his own evaluation but also because Anglo-American criticism of the novel, from Percy Lubbock's *Craft of Fiction* to Wayne Booth's *Rhetoric of Fiction* and beyond, has proceeded along the lines that James has so clearly drawn. A technical and formalist emphasis has dominated Jamesian criticism, and problems of social reference have characteristically been converted into problems of textual self-reference. (14)

Seltzer antedates D.A. Miller in the application of Foucault's theory to the study of realist fiction. The James we encounter in Seltzer challenges the formalist stereotype of the author as described in the passage; Seltzer's James is not detached from his context but someone who participated in the social processes of surveillance and control which were well established in the nineteenth century.

Seltzer is part of a group of scholars that changed the face of James criticism in the early eighties by bringing a range of new critical methodologies to bear on his works. Among these scholars are Paul Armstrong, John Carlos Rowe, and Michael Anesko. Richard A. Hocks notes how the period between1983 and 1984 was particularly fruitful with Seltzer's *Henry James and the Art of Power*; Armstrong's *The Phenomenology of Henry James* (1983); and Rowe's *The*

Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James (1984). Hocks describes Armstrong's work as "a beautifully written, highly perceptive, and philosophically illuminating analysis of the relation between James's fiction and the twentieth-century philosophical school that parallels his work more than any other" (17). Rowe's book, by contrast, is a daring exploration of the ways in which James's work relates not only to one but to a gamut of postmodern theories – poststructuralism, feminism, psychoanalysis, reader-response theory, and Marxism. Rowe is a fierce critic of what he calls "literary heroism" (xii) and his observations involving James's will-to-power and self-construction strategies are crucial to my own analyses of these issues in this Dissertation. Despite being outside the span 1983-1984, Michael Anesko's *Friction with the Market: Henry James and the Profession of Authorship* (1986) is also pertinent to a discussion on such issues; defined by the author as a work on the sociology of literature, it shows how James, often considered as a disinterested writer and aloof aesthete, maintained an ambiguous relationship with the market and the publishing industry throughout his life.

Although these works have stimulated new ways to think about Henry James until now, interest in the author has gone through different phases since he started his career. As Rowe points out in the Introduction to *A Historical Guide to Henry James* (2013), James's reception in the past century was rather unstable, "ranging from the solid, middle-class popularity of his work at the height of his career to the baffled, sometimes bemused response of readers to the modernist style of his later novels and tales" (1). To put it differently, the author who achieved popularity with *Daisy Miller* (1878) and *Portrait of a Lady* (1881) eventually became less accessible to the general public, especially during the so-called Major Phase, when he

experimented with new narrative techniques, adopted a profuse and conspicuously intricate prose, and delved deep into the psychology of his characters.[26]

James's difficult style, nevertheless, appealed to writers who went on to be associated with high modernism, such as Virginia Woolf, Joseph Conrad, and T.S. Eliot. Although it is widely believed that interest in James after his death would only come back in the 1940s, as Daniel Mark Fogel informs us:

> Though the James "revival" of modern times is supposed to have begun in the 1940s, to have picked up momentum in the fifties, and to have been snowballing ever since, the dedication to James of famous special issues of the finest "little" literary magazines in earlier decades – the August 1918 Henry James number of *The Little Review* (which interrupted the serialization of James Joyce's *Ulysses*) and the 1934 issue of *Hound and Horn*, titled "Homage to Henry James" – belies the idea of revival. (xv)

1934, it must be remembered, was the year Richard P. Blackmur published the collected prefaces of Henry James (*The Art of the Novel*). His introductory essay to the collection remains one of the most important evaluations of James's prefaces and was largely responsible for disseminating the view of James as theorist of the novel. This essay would resonate in the new critical school, especially via the aforementioned *Craft of Fiction* (1956), by Percy Lubbock, and *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961), by Wayne Booth.

The James of new criticism became, in Quentin Anderson's words: "the hero of Art, the man who had committed the novel to form as the fifteenth century had committed painting to

[26] The term "major phase" was used by F.O. Matthiessen to refer to the novels published around the start of the twentieth century: *The Wings of the Dove* (1902); *The Ambassadors* (1903); and *The Golden Bowl* (1904). See F.O. Matthiessen, *Henry James, The Major Phase*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944).

perspective" (166). The inflated language is reminiscent of Blackmur and other earlier critics. Anderson, nonetheless, is writing in 1971. His *Imperial Self: An Essay in American Literary and Cultural History* has become an important reference in Jamesian studies but the thesis it supports with regard to James's novels is that they are not as penetrated by the historical and social circumstances of that period as are those by Joyce, Yeats, Rilke, and Kafka (167).

Before the wave of new historicist readings of James following works such as Rowe's and Seltzer's, Lionel Trilling (1948) had already manifested interest in the historical, social, and political import of James's novel *The Princess Casamassima*. The novel, published as a serial between 1885 and 1886, was not often included in the Jamesian canon before Trilling's review. The reason may be because *The Princess Casamassima* addresses themes such as radical politics and international terrorism, and offers an overview of different social classes (in a way reminiscent of Dickens's later novels).

The Princess Casamassima, and also *The Bostonians* (1886), are not what some might consider as the typical Jamesian novels. This is what makes them so significant and what explains the growing number of critical responses to them after Trilling's review. These novels disrupt the coherence of James's canon and allow for the perception of unexpected contexts, situations, novelistic strategies, and affiliations that can prove rewarding to researchers. Notably, comparatist analyses involving James and other writers (or artists) have represented a large portion of Jamesian criticism. In addition to the obvious parallels with Balzac, Flaubert, Turgenev, the European modernists, and, above all, Hawthorne, comparative works are now expanding their networks and imagining encounters outside the Anglo-American axis. One example of this is Marcelo Pen Parreira's *Keys to Reality: Fiction Dilemmas in Henry James and*

Machado de Assis (2012), which identifies common responses to realist aesthetics connecting James and his Brazilian contemporary.[27]

Gert Buelens devotes some attention to this area of James studies in his chapter "Recent Criticism (since 1985)" from the collection *Henry James in Context* (2013). According to him: "recent James criticism, when it makes intertextual links between James and other artists an explicit subject of investigation, is likely to regard such links under the sign of echoes and traces, resonances and reverberations, rather than talking in terms of sources and influences, which imply a straightforwardly unidirectional model" (438). He goes on to argue that "the apparitional, slightly uncanny quality of one writer's afterlife in another" should be seen as another field to be explored in the future.[28] In his assessment, Buelens also highlights other key critical trends that continue to exert influence in James studies, especially the areas of gender and sexuality.

Alfred Habbeger turned to gender issues in 1982, when he published *Gender, Fantasy, and Realism.* In 1989, Habegger offered another book-length study on gender: *Henry James and the "Woman Business."* The book, as Hocks summarizes it, "presents the thesis that James was essentially paternalistic, primarily because he could not overcome his allegiance and quasi-affinity to the benighted, indeed bizarre views about women held by his father" (16). Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, one of the precursors of queer theory, took discussions on gender and

---

[27] *Realidade Possível: Dilemas da Ficção em Henry James e Machado de Assis*, (Cotia: Ateliê Editorial, 2012). Although the Brazilian critic may have offered the first book-length analysis focused on Machado and James, other critics have observed parallels between the two authors in different times. See, for instance, Earl Fitz's *Brazilian Narrative Traditions in a Comparative Perspective*, (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2005. p. 114).

[28] In a chapter I contributed to *Henry James Today* (2014), I trace the genealogy of the posthumous trope in works by Dickens, Chateaubriand, Hawthorne, Machado de Assis, and James, and discuss the ways in which these authors imagine their afterlives and anticipate theories of "the death of the author." See "From Beyond the Grave:" The Posthumous Trope in Nathaniel Hawthorne, Machado de Assis, and Henry James," (*Henry James Today.* Ed. John Rowe.Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. 113-29).

sexuality to a new level. With *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (1986) she provoked reflections upon the ways in which patriarchy has maintained itself through male bonds and illustrated her classic premise of the continuum between homosociality and homosexuality (and its relationship with homophobia) with readings of nineteenth-century authors, including two chapters on Charles Dickens: "Homophobia, Misogyny and Capital: The Example of *Our Mutual Friend*;" and "Use the Postern Stair:" *Edwin Drood* and the Homophobia of Empire." Sedgwick's sequel to *Between Men – Epistemology of the Closet* (1990) – was equally provocative and consolidated the author as one of the leading theorists in the areas of gender studies, queer theory, and critical theory in the next two decades.[29] As Buelens observes with regard to the chapter on Henry James from *Epistemology*: "'The Beast in the Closet,' reprinted and translated several times, definitively located James's story in a moment in the history of sexuality, showing how John Marcher's basilisk fear of the mere possibility of his being gay should be regarded as the true psychosexual motor of his failed life" (436). In Chapter 6, I draw specifically from Sedgwick's last book *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*, to discuss the idea of performance in Henry James's Prefaces to the New York Edition. Sedgwick's particular attention to the use of language and to Jamesian slippery vocabulary and figures is a source of inspiration to my own readings of the New York Edition prefaces.

One last point that has always required attention from James scholars is the author's relationship to and treatment of national and foreign space. This is an enormously complex issue especially because James was born in the United Stated but spent most of his life in Europe,

[29] Sedgwick died in 2009 after publishing three other important books: *Tendencies,* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993); *A Dialogue on Love*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999); and *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity,* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003).

having towards the end of his life adopted British citizenship. Books such as Quentin Anderson's *The American Henry James* (1957), Edwin S. Fussell's *The French Side of Henry James* (1990), and Jonathan Freedman's *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture* (1993), bear witness to the complexity of James's national affiliation. A more convenient solution has been to treat James within the context of nineteenth and early twentieth-century cosmopolitanism, as Adeline Tintner has done in *The Cosmopolitan World of Henry James: An Intertextual Study* (1991). Yet, the cosmopolitan position is far from being a comfortable one, as Henry James himself acknowledges in his travel writing (*Collected Travel Writings*-2, 721). In any case, the tensions underlying cosmopolitanism (especially the one between having a localizable identity and having no identity at all) are reflected in much of James's fiction and also in his aesthetic views. In consonance with the idea of a cosmopolitan James, in Chapter 5 I consider the author's identity as nomadic and discuss the implications of his use of different authorial figures and different narratives of dislocation in his prefaces to the New York Edition. But my focus in that chapter will fall specifically on the ways James seeks empowerment in the European colonial imaginary.

The Jameses Rowe referred to in his preface to *The Other James* have become more and more complex with new critical approaches and revaluations of the author. If we can see James as an American, English, or French writer, an exponent of realism, modernism, and postmodernism, we can also, given the liminal situation of the period in which he lived, place him in the larger context of individualism, domesticity, visibility, surveillance, transnationalism, and the search for autonomy which characterize nineteenth-century authorship as a whole. Thus, James can be placed side by side with Hawthorne and Dickens, which challenges the usual hierarchical and linear perception of the relationship among these authors. Placing them side by

side, as we will see next, does not mean eliminating the differences among them; instead, it means seeing points of convergence and contrasts as opportunities to illuminate different sides and images of each.

2.4. Lines of Convergence

The comparative model I adopt in this Dissertation, as I have pointed out above, is based on lines of convergence rather than on the pattern of sources and influences that predominated in the Comparative Literature field for a long time. The source-influence paradigm, as poststructuralist and postcolonial critics have shown, was based on binary relationships that consigned authors from colonial regions to the position of passive recipients of European models.[30] In my work I distance from such model by avoiding binarism and by granting the three authors the same importance in the illustration of nineteenth-century processes of authorial self-making. Still, as I shall explore in more detail in Chapter 5, "'Citizens of Somewhere Else:' Dislocated Selves in the Prefaces of Dickens, Hawthorne, and James," the hierarchical system of the literary world is not an invention of early comparatists but a function of a geo-political and ideological configuration that determined the criteria of appreciation of works of art in the nineteenth century, impacting the authors' perceptions of themselves in relation to writers from other nations.

Hawthorne, Dickens, and James help illustrate the force fields in that geo-political and ideological configuration. Hawthorne wrote most of his fiction in antebellum U.S (a recently emancipated English colony), and although he developed a distinctive regional voice and

[30] For a historical and critical analysis of the geo-politics of Comparative Literature, see Eduardo Coutinho, *Literatura Comparada na América Latina*, (Rio de Janeiro: Editora UERJ, 2003).

explored themes and events intimately tied to his place of origin, he was well read in the European literary tradition and a keen observer of the situation of U.S. literature in relation to that tradition. As a representative of metropolitan culture, Dickens did not have the same perception of the power relations among different nations in the world literary space; instead, he constantly affirmed his connection to his English homeland and worked to expand his influence and popularity to the continent and the U.S. James stands in the middle of these poles: a writer with strong ties with U.S. culture and tradition, he went on to assimilate models and experiences from different parts of Europe. Granted that James's life was always divided between both sides of the Atlantic, the international dynamics and tensions already at play in both Hawthorne and Dickens gained more relief in his views and fiction than in any of those writers'.

It can easily be objected that the triangle U.S.-Britain-Continental Europe checks the idea of convergence because the lines are not meeting at a single, unequivocal point, but are rather shifting from one point to another. What justifies the idea of convergence in this case is the fact that the three writers lived in a world divided and polarized by the colonial enterprise. I shall continue using the term *convergence* to refer to other similarities and parallels among the three writers, but the convergence lines I draw are flexible and selective; they may be seen as delineating a network of aesthetic, material, and social circumstances that support the establishment of relationships and articulations among the authors in question.

One of the main lines of convergence on the aesthetic level relates directly to the prefatory genre. The three writers deployed, in their prefaces, rhetorical strategies common to public speeches, theoretical treatises, autobiographical essays, and even fictional accounts. The language in these texts is, in most cases, highly figurative, which con(fuses) with their instrumental, self-reflective, critical, or performative functions. They might at times even

resemble the *sketch*, a genre that served both Dickens and Hawthorne in their apprentice years. In fact, the three writers began their careers publishing short pieces: journalistic sketches, in the case of Dickens; fictional and historical sketches, in the case of Hawthorne; short stories and criticism in James's. The transition from short pieces to novels (serialized novels for Dickens and James) was, for the three writers, a challenge in their processes towards becoming authors. They all refer to this transition in their prefaces at some point of their careers, which confirms the importance of this genre as support for self-observation and self-fashioning.

Having had most of their works published after the 1840s, the three writers were part of a special period in the history of literature. According to Raymond Williams, "for the next 80 years the novel was to be the major form in the English literature. And this was unprecedented" (9). During these 80 years, this literary form underwent several transformations: the romantic and gothic settings of the first quarter of the century eventually gave way to grim urban environments in stories dealing with social issues epitomized by Dickens's *Hard Times* (1854). Realism soon took over as the prevailing aesthetic direction for the novel and Émile Zola's scientific methods of social observation and depiction became widespread after the 1880s. Towards the end of the century, George Eliot's psychological novels had acquired considerable prestige and inspired Henry James's in his major phase. At the turn of the century, the inward universe and modes of perception of characters gradually took the place of the "detached" portrayal of the external world. This period anticipates some of the aesthetic elements that would be re-worked in modernism.

Periodical divisions and aesthetic schools (such as romanticism, realism, naturalism, and modernism) serve as didactic signposts for understanding particular practices, concerns, and beliefs with regard to art in modernity. However, when we look at the production of prolific

writers such as Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, whose careers extend from mid to late nineteenth (and early twentieth century in James's case), it seems difficult to reduce these writers to a single label or aesthetic school. It has been observed that these writers incorporate (and sometimes anticipate) a wide range of narrative techniques and aesthetic modes in ways that sanction different perspectives on their *oeuvres*. Therefore, the terms *pre-modernism* or *proto-modernism*, often used in scholarship, seem convenient (and provisory) designations for accommodating the three authors in the same group.[31] Despite the teleological outlook those terms suggest, they make the authors equally influential to twentieth-century literary developments and foreground the instability so characteristic of the period in which they lived.

To Jonathan Arac, the principle that connects mid-nineteenth-century authors is their desire to impose cohesion upon the chaos of social life and thus reach a total and unified image of it. Arac argues that this desire is manifested in the several techniques of narrative overview deployed by Dickens, Carlyle, Melville, and Hawthorne – the four authors he examines in *Commissioned Spirits* (1979). As he writes: "In building up 'systems of vision and knowledge,' their writings parallel the activity of the centralizing agencies of government that were studying and shaping the new human problems of a society much larger and more mobile than had ever before been known" (7). In historicizing those "systems of vision and knowledge," Arac mentions texts such as Barker's "The Panorama" (1792) and Bentham's "Panopticon" (1787), the latter of which would become central in Foucault's historical analysis in *Surveiller et Punir*.[32]

[31] The two terms are more often applied to *fin de siècle* literature and literary impressionism. Henry James and George Eliot are the most immediate exponents of that tendency in English literature. Alternatively, scholars like Rajeeve Patke (*Modernist Literature and Literary Studies*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), use the term to refer to literary innovators in general, one example being Laurence Sterne in the eighteenth century. I keep both perspectives in view in working with Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, but I recognize that both of them can be put to exclusive and subjective uses.

[32] For Barker's "Panorama," see Hubert J. Pragnell's *The London Panoramas of Robert Barker and Thomas Girtin, Circa 1800*, (London: Topographical Society, 1968).

The author additionally links the techniques of narrative overview with the material transformations of the age, such as the building of railroads.

> At the same time… that they compressed England as a whole, by reducing the time of intercity travel, the railroads also acted as forces of compression within each city. This compression increased the 'knowability' of the city, both by condensing certain districts right along the railroad into epitomes of social problems and clearing a space from which an observer could survey the scene, as Engels did in Manchester. (20).

The "railroad" furnishes Arac with the theme for his chapter on Hawthorne and Dickens: "The House and the Railroad: *Dombey and Son* and *The House of the Seven Gables.*" By juxtaposing these two novels, the critic undermines strictly "nationalist approaches, whether through the American 'romance' or the English 'Great Tradition,'"[33] and his chapter serves as a model of transatlantic comparative work such as the one I am proposing. By extension, if we consider that James was also under the influence of the Foucaultian logic underlying Arac's exposition, we would not be wrong in grouping him with Carlyle, Dickens, Melville, and Hawthorne.[34]

Although *Commissioned Spirits* does not deal specifically with the authors' prefatory writing, its main argument could also be tested against some of the authorial figures used by Hawthorne, Dickens, and James in their prefaces. It is particularly important to observe that in his book Arac bridges the gap between aesthetics and materialism, two areas that do not always

[33] "The Great Tradition," in F.R. Leavis's appreciation, included Henry James, George Eliot, and Joseph Conrad, and incurred criticism for being a biased, exclusivist, and elitist category. F.R. Leavis later revised his "canon" and published books on other important authors. See *The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, and Joseph Conrad*, (New York: New York UP, 1963).

[34] I refer the reader to my discussion on Mark Seltzer's *Henry James and the Art of Power* in the previous section.

go together in criticism. In addition to the railroads, other material and economic transformations occurring both in antebellum U.S. and in Great Britain led to changes in the way literature was produced and conceived in the mid and late nineteenth century. Firstly, with the Industrial Revolution manual labor was replaced by machines, a class of anonymous workers emerged, and values such as originality and individuality proved fragile in this new scenario. Secondly, the processes of urbanization brought about by the Industrial Revolution represented the possibility of a much more varied social experience, and writers could observe peoples, habits, and situations that were hitherto inaccessible to them. Thirdly, new technologies made the production of paper cheaper, which resulted in the reduction on the price of books and in the expansion of the literary market. Such expansion was also the result of the rise in literacy rates, a process that had begun in the eighteenth century and which became even more pronounced later on.

As literature (both in the form of books and periodicals) became a profitable business, the interests of publishers collided with those of authors. Copyright laws were the object of disputes and authors became more and more divided between the expectations of a growing multitude of readers and their own sense of artistic integrity. What intensified even more the author's anxieties was the very social status of authorship. Authorship was considered a futile or even feminine activity, one that did not correspond to middle class families' expectations of professionalism and success for their sons. Although the story of each of the authors examined here shows different nuances and details in respect to professional authorship, the many authorial figures used by them in their prefaces point to the very indefiniteness of authorship in that period. The three writers resorted to ideologies linked to domestic individualism, imperialism, and to other artistic genres (such as the theatre) to negotiate different identities for themselves and thus achieve the legitimation they did not have in society.

Specific points of convergence between Hawthorne and Dickens, Dickens and James, and Hawthorne and James have been noted by scholars. Edward Stokes, for example, concentrates on the Hawthorne-Dickens pair while also dedicating a section of his book on the relationship between the New England writer and George Eliot.[35] The author identifies similarities in point of view, narrative technique, characterization, and themes in some of these authors' novels. Thematic similarities, in special, make sense in as much as Hawthorne's puritan New England shared common concerns and ideologies with Victorian England in moral, social, and gender matters.

For our purposes, it is interesting to note that Stokes identifies specific references made by Hawthorne to Dickens in his letters, in two of his short stories ("A Virtuoso's Collection" and "P's Correspondence") and also in his *English Notebooks*, in which Hawthorne refers "not to Dickens as writer, but to Dickens the man, who obviously fascinated Hawthorne" (9). Additionally, according to Stokes,

> [w]hile Hawthorne was working as surveyor in the Salem Custom House from 1846 to 1849 and (according to "The Custom House," which serves as introduction to *The Scarlet Letter*) unable to write, he read a good deal of contemporary fiction, and Dickens was one of his favourite authors for reading aloud to the family circle. *David Copperfield*, soon after it was published, was among the books read. Later, in England, he read *Dombey and Son*. (9).

Although Stokes focuses more on Hawthorne's influence on Dickens – an argument based on the different direction Dickens gave to his fiction after reading *The Scarlet Letter* and *The House of*

[35] *Hawthorne's Influence on Dickens and George Eliot*, (Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1985).

the Seven Gables – the previous passage suggests that Dickens was also part of Hawthorne's universe of literary references, and was probably one of his models in his late years.

Other works dealing with influence between the two authors include Ghulam Ali Chaudry's "Dickens and Hawthorne" (1964) – one of Stokes's main sources – and Edwin M. Eigner's *The Metaphysical Novel in England and America: Dickens, Bulwer, Hawthorne, Melville* (1978). In contrast to Arac, who compares *The House of the Seven Gables* with *Dombey and Son*, Eigner compares Hawthorne's novel with *The Old Curiosity Shop*.

When it comes to discussing the relationships between Hawthorne and James and James and Dickens, two contrasting situations arise. In the former case, the situation is marked by an overwhelming number of studies and analyses going back as far as 1879, when James's biography on Hawthorne was published.[36] By contrast, bibliography on James and Dickens is remarkably scarce. In both cases, James set the tone for future appreciations of his work in relation to those authors. In *The Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James*, John Rowe elucidates this point by remarking that

> the uncritical acceptance of an author's statements about his predecessors may often cause critics merely to repeat the terms of a particularly strategic mythology that the author perpetrates as part of his own bid for *authority*. We have considered already how literally James's criticisms of Hawthorne's innocence, provinciality, unintellectual qualities, and the like were taken by subsequent critics. (60).

Rowe is here reinstating conclusions from the first part of his chapter on literary influences, entitled "James's *Hawthorne* and the American Anxiety of Influence." The second part – from

[36]Thaddeo K. Babiiha offers one of the most comprehensive studies on the relation between the two authors in *The James-Hawthorne Relation: Bibliographical Essays*, (Boston: G.K. Hall and Company, 1980).

which I took the passage above – is entitled "James, Trollope and the Victorian Anxiety of Influence," and brings the argument that "we might find the best measure of influence in those works and figures that our author finds the most troublesome, unsuccessful, trivial, or contrary to his avowed program" (60). This argument applies not only to Trollope but also to Dickens, who was often the object of James's criticism.

Perhaps the harshest of James's verdicts on Dickens, and one of the most symptomatic in terms of the anxiety of influence analyzed by Rowe, is the one that maintains that it would be "an offense against humanity" to regard Dickens as one of the best novelists (*Literary Criticism* 856). Still in the same text, James writes that Dickens "has created nothing but figure,' and 'he becomes a moralist as well as an artist" (857). As the most popular, and one of the most prolific, writers of the previous generation, it is understandable that Dickens should represent a threat to James's ambitions in the English literary field. Moreover, James elected the French realists Balzac and Flaubert as his most immediate sources of inspirations, compared to whom Dickens lacked the theoretical and philosophical mind James admired and cultivated both as a writer and critic.

In the prefaces, Dickens appears recurrently, especially when James wants to prove a theoretical concept or provide examples of what one *ought not* to do in novelistic practice. One of the most conspicuous examples is his critique of the first person narrator of *David Copperfield*, at the same time the subject and object of the story, a recipe he considered doomed to failure because of its tendency to looseness (Preface to *The Ambassadors*, *AN* 321). Again, in a movement of self-affirmation, James links the first person narrator to romantic fiction, from which he wanted to be dissociated. But James also makes some flattering mentions to Dickens, for instance, when he calls him "expert painter" or "fine painter" – together with other great

names in Western Literature – in the prefaces to *The Portrait of a Lady* (49) and to *The Princess Casamassima*, respectively (67). Furthermore, scholars such as William Veeder have written on the role of Victorian popular fiction in James's early writings;[37] likewise, I have observed before that *The Princess Casamassima* has a lot in common with Dickens's late novels (the same applying to *The Bostonians*).

For a comprehensive history of the Hawthorne-James relation, including some specific parallels between novels by the two authors, I recommend Babiiha's comprehensive collection and John Rowe's aforementioned book. The most important thing to take into account is that a number of contextual and inter-textual lines of convergence bring these three writers together. They responded to similar transformations in the book trade, transportation, and social life; they recognized the importance of inscribing their marks in the new literary scenario both at home and abroad; and they also shared and tapped into the ideologies and beliefs that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century. The rise of a new form of authorial power exerted influence in the three writers and their prefaces is the privileged place to look for the traces of that influence.

2.5. The Prefaces: A Critical Overview

In this section, I shall not review works focused on individual prefaces, or those dealing more obliquely (and sparsely) with the prefaces or with specific issues treated in the chapters. My goal is to establish a dialogue with critics who have perceived thematic, rhetorical, or figurative threads running through the prefaces of each author. Notably, criticism on the three authors' collections of prefaces has been very uneven: Dickens's scholarship has not yielded

[37] See William R. Veeder, *Henry James: The Lessons of the Master: Popular Fiction and Personal Style in the Nineteenth Century*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

many extensive studies in this area while Hawthorne's and James's prefaces have accumulated a lot of critical responses over the years. The insights gathered in these responses can help illuminate aspects of the other authors' prefatory production and expand our understanding of the issues forming the core of this Dissertation.

I begin with what may be the only comprehensive evaluation of Dickens's collection of prefaces: Mario Ortiz-Robles's "Dickens Performs Dickens" (2011).[38] As the title shows, the author approaches Dickens from the perspective of authorial performance, one of the main supporting concepts to my treatment of self-fashioning. According to Ortiz-Robles, "Dickens's prefaces offer the first modern instance of a literary space solely devoted to the performance of public authorship" (457). This is a rather contentious statement, especially considering the long history of prefatory writing preceding Dickens. Walter Scott is an example of an author who also used his prefaces to perform authorship, but his performance was rather shy in comparison with Dickens's. In Ortiz-Robles's words: Dickens's prefaces "show someone who is self-conscious about his fame, his legacy, and his royalties" (457).

Ortiz-Robles's treatment of Dickens's prefaces matches Robert L. Patten's perception of Dickens's career as an epitome of the rise of the "industrial-age author." As Ortiz-Robles puts it, "his prefaces act as a force field where there converge the ideological lines of industrial capitalism, middle class enterprise, and communal affect that render the figure of the author into both measure and emblem of individualism" (458). In comparing Dickens's prefaces with those by Scott, Honoré de Balzac, William Wordsworth, and Victor Hugo, he concludes that these authors were more inclined to meta-commentary in their texts, which may explain why they attracted more attention than Dickens's. Still, he goes on to note that

[38] There is, of course, extensive commentary on the history of publication of Dickens's works by important critics in the scholarly editions consulted here and which contemplate the prefaces as well.

> after Dickens, the preface becomes the privileged site for authorship without the legitimacy of which it would be impossible to conceive of subsequent examples, from the minimalist, lapidarian preface to Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* to the magisterial prefatorial performance in Henry James's New York Edition. As a peripheral apparatus, Dickens's prefaces have unfortunately been treated as nothing but peripheral to both literary history and Dickens Criticism. (459).

Marysa Demoor expresses a similar view when she states that "Dickens's talent at selling himself and his books prefigured in many ways the more sophisticated marketing techniques of subsequent generations" (4). While the prefaces certainly illustrate those techniques and Dickens was undoubtedly an example of authorial professionalism in the nineteenth century, we should not forget the importance of his eighteenth-century antecedents, such as Swift, Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, and Sterne, authors who also explored the commercial potential of prefaces.

While Ortiz-Robles is interested in understanding the full import of Dickens's prefaces to nineteenth- century literary and social history, the goals of some of the first critics of Hawthorne's prefaces were more modest. Jesse Bier, for example – one of the first critics to analyze the whole body of Hawthorne's prefaces – focuses his attention on Hawthorne's theory of the Romance in "Hawthorne on the Romance: His Prefaces Related and Examined" (1955). According to him, the prefaces, which were written between 1843 to 1859, are characterized by a remarkable homogeneity: "when do they differ, they do so but to vary the emphasis placed on this or that facet of what is, after all, a general, steady, and rather deep artistic view" (17). Bier identifies characteristics of Hawthorne's attitude and tone in his prefaces, such as in his famous

self-deprecating remarks, but most of the article is dedicated to the author's non-realist aesthetics, his belief that art (or Romance, for that matter) should not be judged according to the same criteria we use to judge reality.

Dan MacCall also addresses Hawthorne's insistence on non-realist aesthetics in "Hawthorne's 'Familiar Kind of Preface'" (1968), but he sees this insistence as a protective strategy, a means by which Hawthorne could create a distance between the private author and the audience. When MacCall discusses the irony and self-deprecation seen in several passages of Hawthorne's prefaces, he observes that "often the irony in the prefatory remarks is self-indulgent rather than self-critical, a public pose to avoid the problem he had with adapting himself to the novel form" (425). MacCall makes a valid point here with regard to Hawthorne's self-indulgence; however, self-criticism is not necessarily antithetical to self-indulgence and in most situations it is difficult to determine the sincerity or seriousness of Hawthorne's poses.

In 1977, two studies on Hawthorne's prefaces were published in the periodical *ESQ*: *A Journal of the American Renaissance*: one by Kent Bales, entitled "Hawthorne's Prefaces and Romantic Perspectivism;" and another one by Timothy Dow Adams, "To Prepare a Preface to Meet the Faces that you Meet: Autobiographical Rhetoric in Hawthorne's Prefaces." Bales reads Hawthorne's prefaces as part of a series of pictorial and perspectivist techniques the author employed to create particular spatial relationships and suggest symbolical meanings for elements framed by those techniques. The critic links such practice to the European Romantic tradition and discusses several examples of perspectivism in Hawthorne's prefaces, including "The Custom-House," "The Old Manse," "From the Writings of M. l'Aubépine," the Preface to *The Marble Faun*, among others.

In contrast to Bales, Timothy Dow Adams calls attention to a crucial aspect of Hawthorne's prefaces: the status of the authorial statements made in them. As he analyzes the autobiographical passages of those prefaces, he concludes that "unlike the modern authors of fiction-aware-of-itself whose purpose is to make the reader more conscious of the artifice of the fiction, Hawthorne's aim was to keep the reader off balance, to prevent him from knowing how to take his semi-autobiographical fiction" (92). Adams's subsequent observation is partly in consonance with my perception of Hawthorne's authorial claims in the prefaces: "The narrator of Hawthorne's major prefaces is a consistent figure, but he is not Hawthorne himself; he is a literary mask rather than an actual author speaking in his natural voice. The persona of the prefaces is an unreliable narrator acting as a dramatized spokesman for the implied author" (92).

Nonetheless, instead of speaking of "*an* unreliable narrator" and "*the* implied author," as if the latter were the signified for the former in all the prefaces, we could perhaps understand Hawthorne's poses along the lines laid out by Thomas More in *A Thick and Darksome Veil: The Rhetoric of Hawthorne's Sketches, Prefaces, and Essays* (1994):

> Hawthorne's relationship with his audience is an uncomfortable one, and the various poses he assumes in his prefaces reveal a narrator who evades a fixed identity, a persona who wishes to "open an intercourse with the world" and at the same time to delineate a self through his writing. We are never able truly to untangle the speaker's rhetoric or fully to remove his veils or fictive guises: M. de l'Aubépine, the "decapitated surveyor," "the obscurest man of letters in America," and Eustace Bright. The uncomfortable relationship with his audience that Hawthorne sustains in the prefaces is reinforced by an oppositional rhetoric,

> his frequent use of antithesis sets up frictional partnerships between reader and author, the real and the imagined, fact and fiction. (73).

I propose to read the "veils" and "fictive guises" as elements of "a theater of images" in which referentiality becomes as elusive as the masks played out in the prefaces. The oppositional rhetoric identified by More is indeed constitutive of Hawthorne's prefatory writing, but the oppositional elements – fact/fiction, real/imagined, reader/author – are complicated when the critic treats authorship as performance.

While Adams and More shed light on Hawthorne's personas and the ways in which they relate to the author's authorial anxieties in the prefaces, Pamela Schirmeister looks at the role of space – a crucial element in the structure of this Dissertation – in both fictional and prefatory writing in *The Consolations of Space: The Place of Romance in Hawthorne, Melville, and James*. "Place" for Schirmeister takes on the meanings of point of view and literary *topoi* and her discussion of these meanings in those authors' works help us understand how the spatial category was used by authors as a means of empowerment. In regard to Hawthorne, she notes that the author "in his prefaces, quite overtly and consistently, ties his preferred mode to being in the right place, and being in the right place always means being able to see particular things in a particular way, free from the constraints that usually govern these things and our vision of them" (4). The right places for Hawthorne, as we know, were "the Old Manse," "The Wayside," the "theatre," among many other houses and settings that allowed him to write on particular subjects and in particular ways. More than privileged points of view, these were also places in which relationships were established and in which the author fashioned himself for his audience, the literary field, and posterity.

In the chapter dedicated to Henry James, Schirmeister notes that in the prefaces to the New York Edition place is the site of composition, usually the cities or abodes in which James lived when a story came to being in his mind. Schirmeister is one of the few critics who compare the role of place in Hawthorne's prefaces and in James's, especially in what concerns the way these two authors use places as keys to the past. This critic informs my treatment of space in many respects and provides support to some of my readings of the two collections of prefaces, but I differ from her in treating space as *loci* of enunciation, platforms, and also geographical locations that give readers and critics access to power relations and ideological configurations shaping the authors' self-fashioning.

Before Pamela Schirmeister, Henry James's renowned biographer Leon Edel had called attention to James's habit of recollection in the prefaces: "And in these pages, filled indeed with the remembrance of a good many things past – almost Proustian at moments in their attention to fine sensation, light, colour, and atmosphere – we are given the ripe fruit of a life-time of sincere and consistently directed effort" (17). Edel's is the first book-length study on James's New York Edition; it was published in 1931 under the title *The Prefaces of Henry James* (it was published three years before Blackmur's volume of collected prefaces). Before these two studies, the earliest appreciation of the New York Edition had been Percy Lubbock's review in the *Times Literary Supplement* (1909).

Blackmur and Lubbock, as I have noted before, emphasize James's achievement as a theorist; they praise his critical acumen, precision, and intelligence. Blackmur goes at lengths, in his Introduction to *The Art of the Novel*, to compare the New York Edition with Aristotles's *Poetics* (vii). Although Blackmur calls attention to the meandering, eccentric prose of James in the prefaces, and mentions James's own definition of each of his accounts as "the story of a

story," the autobiographical and figurative aspects of the prefaces serve only as backdrops for the discussion and the listing of the "themes" and formal precepts identified in them.

These aspects were taken up by several critics as of the 1960s, such as Laurence B. Holland, Mutlu Konuk Blasing, and William R. Goetz. In *The Expense of Vision: Essays on the Craft of Henry James* (1964), Holland sees James's project in the prefaces divided between "*objectivity* and *intimacy"* (155). Opposing Blackmur's placid view of the prefaces, Holland claims that "the strength as well as the tenor of the essays derives rather from the euphoria and anxieties of James's intimate involvement with his fiction, from what he called, in the preface to *The Ambassadors*, 'the thrilling ups and downs, the intricate ins and outs of the compositional problem' which kept 'the author's heart in his mouth'" (155-6). Holland's attention to affect in his analysis runs parallel with his interest in James's figurative language: some specific metaphorical domains explored by the critic, such as religion, capitalism, and marriage makes *The Expense of Vision* a key reference to my work.

In The Art of Life: Studies in American Autobiographical Literature (1977), M. K. Blasing links James's New York Edition to the tradition of autobiography in U.S. literature represented by Thoreau, Whitman, Henry Adams, and even Hawthorne's and Melville's prefaces (xiii). According to Blasing, the prefaces of Henry James fit within that tradition because they transform the "private self into a public hero, since the simple act of self-consciousness itself involves the recognition of oneself as representative and, therefore, as functioning in and as history" (xiv). William R. Goetz, in "Criticism and Autobiography in James's Prefaces" (1979), complements Blasing's description by noting that the story told in the prefaces is meant to give preeminence to the author's existence as independent from his literature. Although Goetz places a great deal of emphasis on the "referential status that belongs to any autobiography" (a rather

objectionable point as I shall demonstrate further on), he concludes his article with an acknowledgment of the blurry lines between the critical and the autobiographical realms in James's texts, which coincides with some of the views on prefatory writing already discussed.

Whereas Goetz sees James's prefaces divided between criticism and autobiography, John Rowe and John H. Pearson discuss the ways in which the author of the New York Edition prefaces is divided into many different selves. To John Rowe in "Forms of the Reader's Act: Author and Reader in the Prefaces to the New York Edition" (1984), "James's Prefaces constitute a unique work in the history of modern literature: the explicit exploration of what it means for an 'author' to become 'a reader'" (234). Anticipating McWhirter's *The Construction of Authorship* (1995), Rowe recovers the whole context of the preparation of the New York Edition and ascribes James's self-divisions to the many roles the author assumed in the process of putting the edition together: the roles of revising, rewriting, reading, recollecting, and taking possession of his *oeuvre*, all of which are perceivable in the text of the Prefaces.

John H. Pearson explores James's self- divisions in "The Art of Self-Creation: Henry James in the New York Edition Prefaces" (2004). Not only does the critic offer fresh insight into James's authorial figurations (a task undertaken before by Holland), but he also views these figurations as instruments of authorial performance (51). In 1997, Pearson had published *The Prefaces of Henry James: Framing the Modern Reader*, a more extensive evaluation of the Prefaces. In his 1997 book, Pearson touches upon the issues he addressed again in 2004 but his main claim is that "James created the modern reader… by assuming authority over his work both as its creator and ideal consumer, and then overtly and covertly instructing his readers how to appreciate and discriminate Jamesian literary art" (2). As we can see, another point connecting

these two important Jamesians is that both relate the acts of authoring oneself with the reading activity.

I end this overview with a few words on David McWhirter's *Henry James's New York Edition: The Construction of Authorship*. I shall not review each of the texts in the volume – which count on contributions from Ross Posnock, Sara Blair, Alfred Habegger, Julie Rivkin, Michael Anesko, J. Hillis Miller, among others – but I shall identify some of the principles that give coherence to the collection. As I mentioned before, this collection was meant as a revaluation of the monolithic image of literary master James acquired over time. The essays treat the New York Edition not only as a body of works, but also as an act, an authorial statement, and a key to a series of contextual and biographical factors. One of the factors discussed by the authors is James's frustration with his failure as a dramatist prior to the conception of the Edition and also his recognition that his last novels did not reach a satisfactory number of readers. The status of *deluxe* editions in the literary market in James's time and James's desire – expressed in letters – that he could reach the standard of Balzac's *Comédie Humaine* is another relevant point. James's negotiations with his publishers, his intimate involvement with everything pertaining to the presentation of the works (including the illustrations commissioned to Alvin L. Coburn), and the subsequent failure of the Edition to sell are also examined by the critics. Naturally, the texts of the prefaces are given due consideration, especially in Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's "Shame and Performativity: Henry James's New York Edition Prefaces" (later extended and reproduced in *Touching Feeling*). Finally, James's multiple identities and conflicts are brilliantly analyzed by Ross Posnock and Michael Anesko.

The works discussed in this section show common themes and characteristics linking the three collections of prefaces. As I have pointed out, the idea of authorial performance, the

problem of authorial identity, the authors' affective involvement with their works, and the individualism underlying their emphasis on the private life and their claims to authority, justify the analytical and comparative project proposed here. The views expressed by Hawthorne, Dickens, and James scholars support my work in many respects. In bringing more elements from the historical context of the nineteenth century, and in expanding the discussion on authorship, self-fashioning, ideology, and space in the next chapter, I will be able to continue the conversation with these scholars, clarify my positions, and provoke new reflections on the prefatory writing of the three authors.

3

Authorship, Self-Fashioning, and Authorial Spaces

3.1. The Authorship Question and the Changing Roles of Authors in the Nineteenth Century

Our current views of authorship have been largely shaped by concepts from literary theory disseminated in the second half of the twentieth century. These concepts – among which are the ones identified by expressions such as "intentional fallacy," "death of the author," and "author-function" – have been so influential that they have almost eclipsed historical research in the subject. While it is important to identify the ways theory has challenged the divine rule of authors – a rule that clashed with the increasing suspicion about authority in the aftermath of WWII – it is also necessary to understand under what conditions that "divine rule" emerged, what rhetorical strategies supported it, and what conflicts and contradictions underlay it. Examining these factors is crucial to establish connections between the pre-modernist period and our time; and evaluating alternative approaches to authorship can bring to light different aspects of this phenomenon that have gained currency more recently.

***

The 1940s and 1950s were the golden decades of new criticism, a critical practice which enjoyed great popularity in English and in the USA, especially through the influence of critics such as John Ransom Crowe and I.A. Richards. New criticism inaugurated a program of interpretation that considered authors and their historical contexts as less important to the critical activity than the careful analysis of the inner structure of texts. This program represented a

reaction against a long tradition of man-and-work criticism that reduced the text to the author's intentions and psychology. In the "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946), W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley claimed that an author's intentions are inaccessible and that all a reader needs to know about a work can be objectively grasped through close readings of the text. This essay had a key role among revaluations of the place of the author in criticism, but as in other new critical works authorship is still a principle orienting the critics' choices of texts for analysis.[39]

Rolland Barthes's 1967 essay "The Death of the Author" also presented a reaction against man-and-work criticism. Barthes's argument was based on the belief that the individualistic ideology that conferred privileges on the author encroached upon the rights of the reader. According to Barthes, who was influenced by developments in structuralism, the very linguistic medium of literature made the identification of referents for textual voices an impossible task. Deriving his argument from the analysis of a passage in Balzac's *Sarrassine* (1830), he shows that the sources of the ideas expressed therein cannot be unequivocally traced back to the empirical author, to his narrative persona, or to the ideologies shared by the author and his readers. Although Barthes revised his ideas about the author in his late work, his declaration/announcement of the death of the author – which he saw then as a prerequisite for the consequent "birth of the reader" – remains one of the most debated passages in his whole *oeuvre* (148).

Two years later, in his conference "What is an Author?" (1969), Michel Foucault presented his own ideas on the author as a product of individualism and expanded the historical analysis so as to account for the discursive forces that produced the belief in this construct.

[39] "The Intentional Fallacy" and "The Affective Fallacy" (another influential text by the two authors) were later collected in William K. Wimsatt's *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*, (Lexington, Ky: University of Kentucky Press, 1954).

Foucault argues that the author cannot be identified with a single individual or the empirical subject who wrote the text. The author, in his exposition, is rather a "function," a principle that unites, around a single name, a multiplicity of subject positions, voices, and personas. Historically, this function made it easier for writers to assert their property over their productions, enabled the commodification of books around the brand-name pattern, and also allowed authorities to assign responsibility for anything considered improper or subversive.

Barthes's and Foucault's theories arose from the anti-authoritarian and anti-theological environment of 1960s France and inspired important critical schools such as reader-response theory and feminist criticism. Deconstructive criticism offered further support for attacks on the author through the critique of logocentrism and the view of the author as a product of figuration endorsed by both Derrida and Paul de Man. The repercussions of these theories are enormously various and far-reaching; despite empowering the reader and allowing for the creation of different methodologies and reading perspectives, however, the death of the author came under scrutiny over time, especially after postcolonial and new historicist critics called attention to the embodied experience and the ethical engagement of discursive and literary practice.

In the illuminating *The Death and Return of the Author* (1998), Sean Burke discusses at length the implications and shortcomings of theories of the death of the author. The following passage shows how he questions the particular intervention made by Barthes:

> In appraising an essentially iconoclastic work, the most telling questions are often not to be addressed to the operations performed on the object, nor to the conclusions thereby reached, but rather to the manner of the representation of the object to be destroyed. How much, we should ask, of the joyous work of destruction consists in badly constructing the house? … Roland Barthes in 'The

> Death of the Author' does not so much destroy the 'Author-God', but participates in its construction. He must create a king worthy of the killing. (26)

As he concludes a few lines down, "The Author in 'The Death of the Author' only seems ready for death precisely because he never existed in the first place. Like the reader whom Barthes would instate in his stead…. Barthes's Author is a metaphysical abstraction, a Platonic type, a fiction of the absolute" (27). Burke is aware of the specific historical circumstances underlying Barthes's treatment of the author in that early text. He also notes that Barthes returned to the topic with a completely different frame of mind in his subsequent books. In *Sade Fourier Loyola* (1971), for example, "the author will reappear as a desire of the reader's spectre spirited back into existence by the critic himself" (Burke 30). Barthes's "returned" author will be characterized by discontinuity and detachment from referentiality; not fitting the old "man-and-work" pattern, this author becomes someone whose life may be read as text.

Thus, the author who returns is no longer a unifying element, but rather an element of dispersion and indeterminacy. I have argued before, drawing from Reinaldo Marques's "The Literary Archive and the Writer's Images," that the afterlives of authors depend on the multiplicity of images and figurations found in their works , in their prefatory writing, in their criticism, and in the popular imaginary. While this may lead to the perception that the author I discuss is as abstract as the one criticized by Burke, my work posits the existence of a borderline between an embodied individual who has a social life and partakes of the ideologies circulating in his time, and the imaginary roles he envisions for himself as he thinks about his relationship to society, his readers, and his works.

In "Who Speaks and from what Place: Simulated Subjects and Post-Constructivism" (2005), Nestor Garcia Canclini warns against the complete dissolution of empirical subjects in

the twenty first century: "The possibility that there may be subjects and that they may be recognized as such is increasingly limited to imaginary fields: cinema, soap operas, celebrity's or sportsmen's biographies" (183).[40] According to Canclini, the world of "simulated subjects" in which we live, characterized by anonymity on different levels (especially on the World Wide Web), leads to increasing irresponsibility, and, at the same time, creates a sense of impotence on individuals (185). Canclini does not advocate a return to the anthropocentric certainties of the Enlightenment but he suggests that we may need to rethink the role of individual agency if we are to combat social inequalities and the oppressive influence of capitalism. On a different note, he calls attention to the different forms of hybrid identities and inter-cultural situations in today's world, and emphasizes the geopolitical inequalities that assign different degrees of power to individuals according to the place from which they speak.

Canclini's observations encourage a readjustment of our deep-seated views of the author. The author may mediate a recovery of the sense of connectedness as well as of the sense of the ethical and political involvement which an individual who speaks from a particular place inevitably conveys. This author is not simply a pronoun, an abstraction, a convention, or a discursive function, but someone who makes specific choices, who treats particular subjects according to their own background and experiences, and who are unique because of the networks of people, places, and events they convoke.

As Sean Burke complements, "So far from consolidating the notion of a universal or unitary subject, the retracing of the work to its author is a working back to historical, cultural and political embeddedness" (202). This premise coincides with some of the principles Stephen

[40] My translation from "Quem Fala e em qual Lugar: Sujeitos Simulados e Pós-Construtivismo,"(Canclini, Nestor Garcia. *Diferentes, Desiguais e Desconectados: Mapas da Interculturalidade*, (Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ, 2005. 183-208). "A possibilidade de que existam sujeitos e sejam reconhecidos é cada vez mais limitada a campos imaginários: o cinema, as telenovelas, as biografias de ídolos ou desportistas."

Greenblatt defines for his new historicist practice. I concur with Burke's view that the author should remain a "principle of specificity" (202) but this specificity can only make sense if it is re-connected to the circuit of "social energy,"[41] thus allowing for the exploration of symbols, tropes, *topoi*, and a host of other shared references.

This exploration has been undertaken by literary historians in the 1990s and the 2000s. For instance, in *The Making of the Victorian Novelist: Anxieties of Authorship in the Mass Market* (2003), Bradley Deane surveys different patterns of authorship according to recurrent metaphors attached to the author in the nineteenth century. These metaphors unveil what Deane calls "a society's ideals of authorship." These ideals are "constructed collectively rather than individually, and they coalesce at the nexus of a wide array of public discourses and material practices so that writers can be as constrained by authorship as readers" (x). *The Making of the Victorian Novelist* is an invaluable reference to a historical investigation of the roles of authors in the nineteenth century but it needs to be examined alongside works by other scholars. Josephine Guy, Marysa Demoor, Mary Poovey, Michael Newbury, and Scott Derrick all shed light upon the nexus between the "wide array of discourses" and "the material practice" mentioned by Deane. Additionally, they can help identify other interwoven factors (ideological, literary, and social) that influenced representations of the author.

I see Deane's "wide array of public discourses" as encompassing not only ideologies and institutions, but also literary works, criticism, prefatory statements, speeches, theatrical adaptations, and public reading events. In turn, the "material practice" of the period may be grasped through an account of the several transformations which occurred around that time and which were intimately intertwined with the economic/material aspect. Although I have

[41] I draw the phrase from Stephen Greenblatt's book*: Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

mentioned some of these transformations in previous sections, it is worth attending to the detailed summary provided by Josephine Guy in "Authors and Authorship" (2010): In this summary these transformations comprise:

> an expanding population driven by patterns of sustained economic growth (of particular importance was the role of foreign trade and the export market for English-language books in Europe, in the USA and in British colonial territories); changes in work-practices and employment legislation which increased leisured time; improvements in education and literacy; structural changes in the mechanisms of distribution and in the selling of books; cheaper raw materials, particularly paper; and technological developments such as the mechanization of type-setting and printing which, by increasing the speed of production, lowered unit costs. Taken together, these phenomena made possible mass publishing, whereby a best-selling novel could mean tens and sometimes hundreds of thousands of copies sold. In the early 1800s first print runs for an average novel were around 1,000 copies; those for works by Walter Scott, one of the most popular authors at that time, were around ten times this figure. In 1886 Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* sold 40,000 in six months, while *The Christian* (1897), by Thomas Hall Caine, was reported to have sold, within a year, over 150,000 copies in Britain and America. (13).

We can have a broader view of the whole chain of material changes in that period if we add, to the summary provided by Guy, components such as the phenomenon of large-scale urbanization, the advances in transportation (see the discussion on J. Arac's *Commissioned Spirits* on p.75), the increasing importance of the role of advertising (and of mechanisms of visibility), the rise of

the British Empire, and the growth of transatlantic travel. Still, the facts and numbers listed by Guy give us a precise idea of the extent of the literary market expansion both at national and international levels in the course of the nineteenth century. More precisely, these data bear witness to the intense exchange of literary capital going on between England and the USA at that time.

Notably, the commodification of literature in the two expanding literary markets became increasingly linked with the commodification of the author's image. In Josephine Guy's words:

> Creating consumer demand also required the selling of the author, a process which we have already glimpsed in Dickens's career, and the origins of which can be traced back even earlier, to figures such as Chatterton and Byron – namely the development of the author as a media celebrity, and the explicit practice of selling a work by selling its author, or, more precisely, a carefully cultivated image of its author. (19).

Whereas Marysa Demoor, *in Marketing the Author: Authorial Personae, Narrative Selves, and Self-fashioning, 1880-1930* (2004), locates the selling of the author's personality in the latter part of the century, when literary agents came to the fore and the Society of Authors was founded (5), Guy traces that phenomenon back to the "Romantic emphasis on an intimate connection between expressive authenticity and felt experience" (19). In other words, Romantic authors opened precedents for the exploration of the biographical author and the intimate sphere which would serve the flourishing market in the mid-nineteenth century. An additional (and relevant) piece of information Guy provides in his essay concerns the beginning, in the first quarter of the century, of a tourist activity around settings of literary interest, such as the Lake District and the Scottish

Highlands (19). As I shall discuss further on, by Hawthorne's time authors' homes had become distinctly fetishized and this is reflected in their prefatory production.

If on the one hand the commodification of culture led to the fetishizing of the author and his homes, on the other, the possibility of having their privacy exposed and being consumed as a commodity did not appeal to a great number of authors. The rise of the *autonomy* principle, to which I shall get back in chapter 5, was partly a reaction to the increasing dependence of literature on the imperatives of the market. Dickens is perhaps the only author, among the three selected for this study, who seemed to feel at ease with these imperatives and also with the selling of his image. By contrast, in one of his many whimsical prefatory statements, Hawthorne expresses that he had never been "one of those supremely hospitable people, who serve their own hearts delicately fried, with brain-sauce, as a tidbit for their beloved public," which signals the author's awareness of the demand for a consumable author and his serious misgivings about it ("The Old Manse," *TS* 1147). James also expressed, in letters and in short stories, his belief that writers should be only known through their writing, even though he eventually indulged in acts of self-revelation in both the New York Edition Prefaces and in his autobiographies later on.[42]

The authors' unease with the processes of commodification they had to submit to can be explained on ideological and social grounds. In "The Man-of-Letters Hero: David Copperfield and the Professional Writer" (1988), Mary Poovey argues that in the mid-Victorian period literature helped stabilize the belief in a subject who was "individualized, psychologized, ahistorical" and male (90). This stabilization was necessary in view of the alienation brought about by the changes in labor conditions after the industrial revolution. According to Poovey, in

[42]A detailed analysis of Henry James's relationship with publicity is offered by Richard Salmon in *Henry James and the Culture of Publicity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

this period the literary man's social status became problematic and generated a great deal of discussion in different literary media.

> Part of it focused on the inadequacy of domestic and international copyright laws; and part of it was concerned with the issue of whether literary men could or should organize themselves into a single professional association. All of these approaches to the problem of literary labor, however, ultimately derived from the vexed issue of the relationship between this kind of labor and other kinds of professional or waged work. (102).

In Victorian England, this issue was aggravated by the advent of serialized publication. Poovey notes that serialization made the writer subject to the wishes of publishers and to the law of profit (104). In this scenario, images such as "the man-of-letters hero," the inspired genius or prophet, championed by Romantics and promoted by Thomas Carlyle in Britain and by Emerson in the USA served to attenuate the sense of alienation and also mark the distinction of the writer from other "waged" workers. Nonetheless, these images did not erase the inherent tensions between individual, artistic, and commercial motivations at the heart of the writing activity at the time.

Michael Newbury addresses some of these tensions in his examination of the changing status of authors in antebellum U.S. He is particularly interested in the way writers struggled with the lack of recognition of literature as a profession in the mid-nineteenth century. He identifies similar transformations in U.S economy and culture to those happening at a more accelerated pace in England but emphasizes that we need to think of these transformations as part of a "transition of consciousness, of the possibilities of self-definition available to writers during the period of emergence of professionalization" (3). As he illustrates next in the same

excerpt: “We know, for example, that the move from avocation to profession is intertwined with authorship’s conceptual evolution from teaching or public service to entertainment for an increasingly leisured middle class of readers” (3). I will shortly discuss how this evolution is taken up and expanded by Bradley Deane in his analysis of nineteenth-century patterns of authorship. What needs to be underlined in Newbury’s account is the relationship between male authors’ forms of self-definition and the domestic and sentimental literature produced by women at that time.

> When male romantic writers such as Hawthorne and Melville come to dismiss or attack female, domestic, or sentimental writers of the period, they do so not only, and maybe not even primarily, by accusing them of womanly emotionalism, hysteria, or intellectual incapacity. They imagine them simultaneously as a mass of working-class factory operatives who have no legitimate claim to individuated imagination and autonomy of a romantic and independent agent of creativity. On the other hand, when sentimental writers construct their own vision of authorship, they not only rely on their femininity to suggest moral and emotional authority, but specifically invoke images that divorce that femininity from working-class modes of labor and production. (29).

This analysis is very much in keeping with the broader context I have been examining and with the use of domestic tropes in the prefaces I shall analyze. However, in the passage above Newbury downplays (or fails to note) that the male writers he mentions were under the influence of a patriarchal ideology and that they felt that women writers threatened their established superiority in intellectual matters. Moreover, I would argue that the simultaneous embracing and

devaluation of the feminine is not restricted to the rigid boundaries of "Romantic" literature. This pattern can be found, with different nuances, in other pre-modernist and modernist writers.

The gender conflicts underlying nineteenth-century processes of authorial self-definition are also discussed by Scott Derrick in *Monumental Anxieties: Homoerotic Desire and Feminine Influence in 19 th Century U.S. literature* (1997). With a broader analytical scope, including not only Hawthorne, Poe, and James, but also Upton Sinclair, Stephen Crane, and F. Scott Fitzgerald, Derrick claims that the instances of authorial self-making seen in these authors' texts correspond to "the general cultural narrative of masculine development, which assumed a stable and important shape in the first half of the nineteenth century" (2). This narrative consisted in the movement from the domestic sphere controlled by the mother to the male world of "vocational choice" (2). Because writing did not enjoy the same status as careers such as law and medicine in middle-class circles, writers typically underwent vocational crises, and they eventually sought to conquer legitimacy by appealing to masculine authority while keeping their female audiences and influences in perspective. Some of the prefatorial figures to be examined in this study are clear indications of this appeal to masculine authority – *aeronaut* and *navigator* being the most prominent ones – and others link the literary activity with well-established and masculine "vocational" professions, such as those of *architect, builder, geometer, scientist,* among others.

Placing more emphasis on the "widening sphere of fiction's reach" than on gender questions, Bradley Deane conceives a four-part model to analyze the historical progression of authorial metaphors. The phases of his model and their corresponding metaphors are articulated as follows:

> the post-revolutionary concern with literary popularity during the Romantic period's skirmish of genres; the advent of serialized fiction and

> other early-Victorian experiments with mass-market publishing; the mid-Victorian explosion of the periodical press and the panic over sensationalism; and the late-nineteenth century contest between best sellers and classics. The particular debates in each period gave rise to new images of the novelist – the impersonal public servant, the sympathetic friend, the professional story-teller, and the proto-modernist artist – which encoded distinct ideological assumptions about the growing public's engagement with literature. The level on which these ideological clashes occurred was largely rhetorical – the chief weapons were metaphors, analogies, and symbols – and their influence on the mediating tropes of authorship remains especially apparent in the pages of popular novels. (xii).

For each of the four images of the novelist Deane finds particular representatives or illustrations: the impersonal public servant is linked with Walter Scott; the sympathetic friend with Charles Dickens; the professional story teller with Wilkie Collins and Walter Besant (the founder of the Society of Authors); and the proto-modernist artist with Henry James. With regard to James, Deane writes: "His alienated 'vessel of consciousness' technique and his understanding of the novelist as the invisible deity reigning over the meaning of his fictional world mark the demise of the Victorian paradigm of sympathetic novelists and heralds the advent of modernist literary authority" (xiv). The sympathetic novelist was indeed gradually surpassed in the last decades of the nineteenth century but the James Bradley Deane describes is the same Master of the novel the new critics appropriated and that has been revised recently. The "anxious" James of the New York Edition Prefaces often belies the self-possessed, modernist Master, and reveals a facet that

would be also close to the professional story teller or even to the sympathetic novelist always eager to please his audience. Deane's model is quite enlightening in many respects but in illustrating the authorial metaphors, the critic risks essentializing some authors around specific positions, stereotypes, and aesthetic affiliations. As I have been arguing, authors like Hawthorne, Dickens, and James display a gamut of facets and such complexity requires that we consider not only the immediate affiliations but also the more ambiguous positions and the crossing of classificatory boundaries. Yet, because of his attention to authorial metaphors, Deane remains a strong influence in my work, and I shall return to his book, especially to his chapter "Making Friends: Dickens, Pickwick and Industrial Romanticism" to discuss Dickens's techniques of reader domestication in his prefaces.

Authorship appears, in this narrative, as an exceptionally challenging category, involving questions related to identity, authority, gender, and ideology. It has occupied a crucial role in modernity when multiplicity was repressed for the sake of social control, market relations, and the individualistic ideology; it has been the site of contestation of authority in the twentieth-century theoretical discourse and has gained renewed relevance in our increasingly anonymous digital era. The commodified author of the nineteenth century is still extant today but he/she has disseminated through different media and supports, and has acquired different functions. As a product of the nineteenth-century expansion of the literary market, he/she should also be seen as enmeshed in the social matrix, as someone who registered the anxieties accompanying the alienation of labor in industrial society. This social, embodied subject replaces the Author God condemned by Barthes and defies the abstract entity that was put in his place. My alignment with this position does not mean I totally disregard poststructuralist and deconstructionist views of the author. The idea that the author is a product of figuration and is constructed in the text, as

proposed by exponents of those critical trends, remains crucial to my approach to authorship in this work. By reading the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, we can have access to these different versions of authorship as well as to the forces that produced them. We can witness their will-to-power but also their willingness to communicate their experiences and engage the readers in the game of figurations they create. Not only does this game check the idea of unitary identity and authorial tyranny, but it testifies to the fact that authors were also constrained by external instances to the writing activity.

3.2. New Historicism, Self-Fashioning, and Power

As I have pointed out in Chapter 2, new historicism has exerted a considerable influence on Hawthorne, Dickens, and James criticism in the last decades. To many scholars, this critical trend represented an alternative to some formalist and poststructuralist methods of criticism which were dominant up until the 1980s. With revaluations of the author figure, new historicism gained even more currency, as it welcomed the analysis of phenomena that, just like the author, were considered external to the literary text. At the same time, critics such as Stephen Greenblatt, Louis Montrose, Jonathan Goldberg, and Jean Howard embraced perspectives from a variety of fields, among which were anthropology, Marxism, psychoanalysis, and, above all, Foucaultian theory. Despite the variety of perspectives these critics adopted, they shared some key concerns: they all questioned the status of history in literary criticism, highlighted the importance of social context to the interpretation of texts, and devoted special attention to the relationship between culture and power.

New historicists promoted a major re-signification of the role of history in comparison with traditional historicist practices; instead of an *a priori* condition for the critical activity or a stockpile of facts and documents serving as background to the analyses of literary texts, history became a textual event, a process of interpretation subject to contingency. Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher's particular approach to history in *Practicing New Historicism* (2000) challenges the old model of foreground/background in textual analysis. According to them, there should be no hierarchy or priority between the historical/cultural text and the literary text. However, as Edward Pechter argues in "The New Historicism and its Discontents: Politicizing Renaissance Drama" (1987):

> Greenblatt's characteristic interpretive strategy is to begin from cultural history, typically with a colonialist episode, and then proceed to the literary text. Despite the reassuring disavowals of privilege, the cultural text tends to be the prior phenomenon, chronologically if not ontologically, at least for the reader who negotiates the course of Greenblatt's writing" (293).

Pechter supports his argument with the classic example from "Invisible Bullets" – a chapter in *Shakespearean Negotiations* (1988) – in which Greenblatt starts from Thomas Harriot's *Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* and moves to Shakespeare's *Henry IV* only after a lengthy discussion of the former text. Pechter's critique calls attention to the gap between what theorists preach and what they actually do when examining texts. Still, I argue that Greenblatt's procedure is not so "characteristic" as Pechter labels it; in both *Marvelous Possessions* (1991) and *Practicing New Historicism*, for example, the attention dedicated to historical accounts and to literary texts is quite balanced, when it is not altogether compellingly interwoven in the author's (or authors', in the case of *Practicing New Historicism*) narratives.

Furthermore, Greenblatt never claims to be laying down a neat program of interpretation nor does he presume to absolute coherence with his precepts. The image he promotes of his version of new historicism is that of a practical activity – instead of a theoretical/critical school – a position which makes it less vulnerable to criticism.

Although I subscribe to the idea of lowering the boundary between the historical account and the literary text, I acknowledge I have followed a more conventional method in my Dissertation in beginning with the background to the texts I shall examine. Furthermore, in the body chapters I concentrate on the analysis of the prefaces and their authorial figures while relating those figures to contextual and ideological issues. My choice of focusing on prefatory writing, nevertheless, is in keeping with the principle of destabilization advocated by Greenblatt. Below I quote the passage in which Greenblatt's position with regard to the hierarchy between "minor" texts and canonical works is clarified.

> The notion of culture as text …vastly expands the range of objects available to be read and interpreted. Major works of art remain centrally important, but they are jostled now by an array of other texts and images. Some of these alternative objects of attention are literary works regarded as too minor to deserve sustained interest and hence marginalized or excluded entirely from the canon. Others are texts that have been regarded as altogether nonliterary, that is, as lacking the aesthetic polish, the self-conscious use of rhetorical figures, the aura of distance from the everyday world, the marked status as fiction that separately or together characterize belles letters. There has been in effect a social rebellion in the study of culture, so that figures hitherto kept outside the proper circles of interest….

> have now forced their way in, or rather have been invited in by our generation of critics. (9-10)

This social rebellion in the study of culture had begun decades before Greenblatt wrote these words. Precursors to cultural studies such as Walter Benjamin, Roland Barthes, and Raymond Williams began to analyze a variety of objects hitherto regarded as "minor" as early as the 1930s and the two subsequent decades. Although Greenblatt maintains the opposition between "minor" and "major" objects in the excerpt, his position may be grasped in the ironic reference to "belles lettres" following the list of criteria used to exclude particular works from the canon.

Prefaces are examples of works excluded for not meeting those criteria. In this Dissertation I am proposing to treat prefatory writing as bearing the same cultural, historical, and aesthetic interest as the texts they antecede. Although I do not intend to completely erase the differences between pre-texts and "main" texts, I share Greenblatt's view that there may be "an unanticipated aesthetic dimension in objects without pretensions to the aesthetic. It can suggest hidden links between high cultural texts, apparently detached from any direct engagement with their immediate surroundings, and texts very much in and of their world…" (10).

The "hidden links between high cultural texts" and "texts very much in and of their world" resonate in Greenblatt's presentation of his thoughts on *self-fashioning.* As the author ponders,

> self-fashioning derives its interest precisely from the fact that it functions without regard for a sharp distinction between literature and social life. It invariably crosses the boundaries between the creation of literary characters, the shaping of one's own identity, the experience of being molded by forces outside one's control, the attempt to fashion other selves. (*Renaissance Self-Fashioning* 3)

It must be added that to Greenblatt it is important not to "wall off literary symbolism from the symbolic structures elsewhere," a principle I have entirely incorporated in establishing links between authorial metaphors and broader ideological and cultural fields of reference (3). The bilateral movement in Greenblatt's formulation of self-fashioning (*fashioning* oneself and *being fashioned* by external forces) is also of utmost relevance to my analyses.

Greenblatt opens his book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* with a discussion of the growing awareness of identity as a "manipulable, artful process" in the more secular scenario of the sixteenth century. After probing into the origins and meanings of the verb "to fashion," he offers the following possibilities of interpretation for the term: "the imposition upon a person of a physical form;" "the achievement of a distinctive personality;" and "a characteristic address to the world" (2). The last two meanings alone serve as departure points for understanding the way Hawthorne, Dickens, and James used the prefaces to produce images of themselves. The "characteristic address to the world," in particular, is very much in keeping with the often explicit reader-oriented nature of those texts, which are characterized by the frequent use of performatives and by the establishment of relationships between authors and readers through specific *tropes*.

As he focuses on the more particular characteristics of the early modern writers he analyzes, Greenblatt produces an extensive list of the "governing conditions common to most instances of self-fashioning" in the period (9). Among these conditions are the ideas that self-fashioning "involves submission to an absolute power or authority" and also the belief that "self-fashioning is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile" (9) It is possible to attend to those conditions in a study of the nineteenth century as long as the instances of power and the "aliens" are qualified. Whereas in the sixteenth century, these instances are

identified with the king or the church, for example, and the aliens with "heretics" or "adulteresses," in the nineteenth century power was located in the figure of the publisher, in the images of ancestry, domesticity, and in different models of heroism and literary/intellectual achievement; in turn, women, the market, or the reader could at times be considered "alien" to the literary activity and "threatening" to the authority of the author.

In any case, the deployment of authorial *tropes* by nineteenth century authors, their use of disguises and *personas*, can be read in light of Greenblatt's view that "any achieved identity contains within itself the signs of its own subversion or loss" (9). In other words, appearing as "the obscurest man of letters in America," to quote one example from Hawthorne's prefaces, belies the desire to be just the opposite, to become popular and successful as an author ("Preface to *Twice Told Tales*," *TS* 1150). Conversely, the use of figures signaling power, such as the preposterous ones of conquerors and adventurers used by Henry James, suggests the attempt to disguise the self-doubts and anxiety underneath those masks.

It is not difficult to trace the points of contact between Greenblatt's tenets about self-fashioning and Michel Foucault's highly influential ideas about subjectivity, discourse, and power. Greenblatt's emphasis on the constructedness of identity is congruous with Foucault's rejection of the belief in the autonomous subject forged in the Enlightenment. Jan R. Veenstra additionally notes that

> Greenblatt sees 'the world of the text' in ideological terms, or in terms of Foucault's concept of power, which does not allow of a dissociation of the 'world of the text' from the world of the sociohistorical context. Discourse is never free from the social structure in which it is embedded and in which it acquires meaning. (184)

It must be noted that what is specific to Foucault with regard to the issue of subjectivity is that the individual who is immersed in the socio-historical context is both the product of disciplinary measures imposed upon them by central agencies of power (such as the penal system) and an agent which also reflects and irradiates power through different discursive practices.[43]

Discipline and Punish is the immediate reference, in Foucault's *oeuvre*, for a discussion of disciplinary measures. This book is particularly important because it provided scholars such as Jonathan Arac and Joseph Litvak, among others, with a theoretical framework to think about literature in the nineteenth century. Foucault's description of the emergence of a type of power closely related to visibility and to centralized mechanisms of surveillance is extremely relevant to a discussion of forms of authority exerted in the prefatory site and also to the different forms of narrative omniscience and techniques of narrative overview.

Also worthy of mention in regard to the approach to the period and genre adopted here is the connection Foucault establishes between power and disciplinary spaces, "whose aim was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others…" (143). In Foucault's account, it must be remembered, these spaces were part of a bureaucratic apparatus set up by the state to exert control over individuals. They were linked with activities such as registering, documenting, and identifying individuals that could not be tracked down otherwise because of the growth in the population. Authorship itself, and particularly the rituals of self-revelation and confession performed by authors in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, were responses to the demand for individuation within the broader context analyzed by Foucault. A closer reading of "What is an

[43] The specific argument that power is not located in a central point but is something that operates at the most micro levels of social relations is offered in *Discipline and Punish* and in many other works by Foucault. A collection of interviews, conferences, and articles organized around this specific argument is available in Portuguese under the name *Microfísica do Poder* (Org. Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1979).

Author," a text I have commented on in the previous section, gives us access to the details of this narrative.

There is certainly room for a more detailed analysis of the relationship between authorship and "space" in the prefaces in light of Foucault's theory. Although I return to this subject again in the next section, it is not within the scope of this Dissertation to carry out an in-depth study of Foucault here. My purpose is to indicate some key points in Foucaultian theory which resonate in my work and in those by theorists and critics with which I converse, Greenblatt being one of them.

I have opted to work with *self-fashioning* because it supports readings that situate authorial identity within a network of power relations and also because it bridges the gap between the socio-historical narrative with which I started this chapter and the symbolical/figurative aspect of the texts under consideration. The concept is particularly in tune with my perception of the fine line between the *authorial* and the *actorial* modes in the prefatory writing. The version of new historicism "practiced" by Greenblatt contains principles that are also in consonance with my approach to generic hierarchies and to my treatment of texts that have often been considered as just support for criticism of other texts. More than a series of fixed precepts ready to be applied to all the readings proposed, new historicism and self-fashioning are transversal operative devices that shall aid the analysis in some particular moments of the chapters.

3.3. Authorial Spaces: The House, the World, and the Theatre

In the Introduction to this Dissertation, I presented the triad "house-world-theatre" as delineating the spatial "imaginary" which relates to the construction of identity and works as an organizing principle for the issues to be addressed. Although I have also pointed out some of the ways in which these "spaces" are used by the authors in their prefaces, an overview of theories and concepts of "space" is still required for a more detailed understanding of the different nuances of such uses. This overview can never be exhaustive because the space category has received increasing attention from scholars in several fields in the last decades. I have selected definitions that illuminate the many possibilities of understanding "space" in its relationship to authorship and to the examples to be considered. After discussing these definitions I offer some thoughts on the choice and implications of the specific arrangement formed by the three words in my triad.

One of the meanings attached to space is the one derived from Foucault's historical analysis in *Discipline and Punish* which I introduced in the previous section. In that framework, space is linked with the disciplinary procedures of state institutions that seek to exert control over individuals. The power of surveillance held by these institutions is materialized in the image of the Panopticon, the central structure, envisioned by Bentham, from which an officer could watch the inmates in a penitentiary. This image brings forward a different meaning to space: that of a vantage point or "a trope of perspective," in Pamela Schirmeister's words (3). The "trope of perspective" applies to some situations identified in the prefaces – Henry James in the House of Fiction in the Preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*, for example – and is in consonance with Bruster and Weimann's description of the function of Prologues which I quote here one more time:

"Prologues shape audience's expectations by appealing to potentially common interests and experiences. They thereby seek temporarily *to project or control a socially significant space*" (viii, my emphasis).

If the preface can be perceived as the privileged place from which authors can *see* things, it can also be conceived as the place from which they can *speak*. This conception confers upon the prefatory site the status of a *locus* of enunciation.[44] Both situations (vantage point and *locus* of enunciation) empower the author by giving him/her a priority over the reader (a priority which is also challenged at times). My use of "authorial space" in this Dissertation is primarily identified with the *locus* of enunciation. This is a useful notion because it brings into focus the communicative aspect of the preface, its quality of an event adumbrating the participation of social agents. In turn, the status of *locus* of enunciation might be related to the production of the illusion of presence (a living voice) in prefaces, and also to the enforcement of the belief in the empirical/biographical author in some situations.

Henri Lefebvre's classic book *The Production of Space* (1974) helps expand the discussion of space as a socially embedded category. His ideas have exerted enormous influence on the works of current urban theorists such as Edward Soja and David Harvey[45] and continue to provoke responses and revaluations. Lefebvre draws from Marxist theories to discuss the relations of production and exchange in the capitalist system as well as their influence in the constitution of spaces in modern society. Like Foucault, he is interested in the exercise of power

[44] In *Local Histories/Global Designs*: *Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000), Walter Mignolo employs the term "*loci* of enunciation" to refer to the lopsided geo-politics of knowledge production in the academic world and the lack of epistemic authority of intellectuals coming from postcolonial nations. I am also employing "*loci* of enunciation" to discuss forms of authority and privilege and in Chapter 5 I examine relations of power between different literary nations in the nineteenth-century world literary space.

[45] See Edward W. Soja's *Postmodern Geographies:The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989), and David Harvey's: *Spaces of Hope*, (Berkely: University of California Press, 2000), and *Spaces of Global Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2006).

underlying the production of these spaces but the scope of his work is wider, encompassing the ownership of land, the planning of urban spaces, and the relationship between local and global spaces. I am particularly interested in how he conceives space as fostering and dissimulating social relationships which I connect especially to the domesticating tactics used by the authors in their prefaces (83). I also think of the spatial metaphors and references used in these texts in terms of his definition of *representational space*, defined as "directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users,' but also of some artists and perhaps of those, such as few writers and philosophers, who *describe* and aspire to do no more than describe" (39). This space is distinguished from *representations of space*, materialized in the form of maps and projects of engineers who plan and conceptualize the construction of spaces. *Representational space* also contrasts with *spatial practice*, the "perceived" space of everyday life, the allocation of different spaces for different activities, such as the private space, the work space or the leisure space. It is possible to see a continuum between the *spatial practice* and the *representational space*, and Lefebvre suggests some ways in which the three categories might overlap. I do not incorporate Lefebvre's theory systematically in all the chapters, but I keep the idea of *representational space* in perspective because it complements the view of space as a "trope of perspective" and "*locus* of enunciation," and connects to the metaphorical dimension of the places which are "imagined" or described by the authors in their prefatory addresses and autobiographical accounts.

This "space *lived* through its associated images and symbols" conflates, in a seemingly paradoxical way, the empirical and the semiotic realms. This conflation is paradoxical only if the *lived* space is understood as neutral, but what happens is that this space is apprehended as an image or sign. This image becomes part of a chain of relations and of processes of interpretation.

It is appropriated, in the case of the author, to convey particular messages and is tinged with his/her own preconceptions or with meanings from the collectively shared body of ideologies acquired prior to the moment of *living*.

We can alternatively talk about a mental space; the *lived* space processed in the mind; or the mind as a space of production of memories, dreams, and stories, as some examples will show. This perception of space is in consonance with the phenomenological approach of Gaston Bachelard. In his admirable book *The Poetics of Space* (1958), he considers both the way spaces are rendered in poetry and the "intrasubjective" (xix) nature of individuals' relationship with the external world. The following passage summarizes the rationale behind his theoretical discussion in the book: "Only phenomenology – that is to say, consideration of the *onset of the image* in an individual consciousness – can help us to restore the subjectivity of images and to measure their fullness, their strength and transubjectivity" (xix). I have been deeply inspired by Bachelard's view of space – specifically by his view of the "house" as *a body of images* – and I have also been influenced by his discussion of the play between exteriority and intimacy in the domestic space.

The fields of geography, anthropology, and history, to name just a few, have each contributed to an expansion of our understanding of space. Geographical space is within the horizon of the discussion proposed for chapter 5 and I have commented briefly on the idea of *liminality* theorized by anthropologist Arnold van Gennept, an idea that connects specific spaces and situations to rites of passage in society. Historian Michel de Certeau offers an alternative way in which to view the relationship of the individual to the rigid spaces designed to constrain their actions. De Certeau sees a form of resistance in the way individuals subvert these constraints through everyday activities such as walking in the city. According to him "To walk is

to lack a place; it is the indefinite process of being absent and in search of a proper" (103). In Chapter 5 I look at situations of dislocation in the prefaces that also point to a "lack of place." What is most crucial to attend to in de Certeau's theory for the purposes of this section is the differentiation he makes between "place" and "space." Place (*lieu*) is defined by propriety; it refers to a precise location and fixed coordinates. By contrast, space (*espace*) is characterized by mobility; it is unstable, crossed by different forces and conflicts within the same place (171). This space is a product of the different uses individuals make of it. On the one hand, the house, the world, and the theatre are best understood as *spaces,* given the tensions and movements identified in each of them (for instance, between interiority and exteriority, location and dislocation, self-display and self-effacement). On the other hand, *place* is also applicable to the authoritative use the authors make of those metaphors.

Still in light of de Certeau's distinction, I approach "the house, the world, and the theatre," regarded as a group, as producing an immediate effect of mobility. Not only does it have a rhythmic pattern, but it also suggests a trajectory, a journey from one place to the other in the sequence. One way to conceive this trajectory is to consider the movement described by Scott Derrick from the domestic space to the male world of "vocational choices." Following Derrick's line of thought, that movement would lead to the authors' subsequent abandonment of that male world to live an artistic life and cater to the desires of a public through different kinds of performance. The possibilities are countless and could take different shapes for each of the authors analyzed.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Dissertation as a whole relies on narratives of different kinds (historical, literary, theoretical), the triad does not necessarily produce a teleology. Its structure is paratactic, that is, it posits no hierarchy among the individual terms (the same applies

to the triad of authors studied here). The idea is that of horizontality, a simultaneity of different spaces and discourses in the prefatory site. Each of the terms is independent and activates a whole set of assumptions that are discretely analyzed in the chapters; at the same time, these discrete unities and set of assumptions are connected to the broader historical context.

The terms of the triad can alternatively be seen as pointing to the complexity I alluded to earlier on in commenting on the prefatory discourse in the nineteenth century. Authors had to respond to the demand for individuation and privacy, to the increasing competition in the literary market at home and abroad, and to new patterns of visibility that required variety and novelty. Thus, instead of a crystalized view of authorship in the nineteenth century –as trapped inside the culture of domesticity, seeking expansion to different regions, or increasingly self-promotional and theatrical – the triad helps develop a more nuanced perception of that category that contemplates the three aspects. Additionally, the triad promotes an understanding of prefatory writing and authorial self-fashioning beyond the dual structure (the same rule applies to the triad of authors). Dialectical pairs and oppositions play an important role in the Dissertation, but the general goal is to show the tensions, impasses, and coexistence of multiple and contradictory motives, a goal I shall pursue in the following chapters.

4

The Preface as House: Privacy, Intimacy, Domesticity, and Origin

4.1. The House as a "Body of Images" and Dialectical Structure

> A House constitutes a body of images that give mankind proofs or illusions of stability. We are constantly reimagining its reality: to distinguish all these images would be to describe the soul of the house. It would mean developing a veritable psychology of the house.
>
> --Gaston Bachelard

The "house" – understood as a "body of images"– had a marked influence in the nineteenth-century literary imagination. It stood in close relationship to intimacy and introspection – considered essential elements for authorial production – and embodied the values of stability and domesticity that were crucial for the development of the novel.[46] The particular connection of the house to literary creativity reflects in the increasing fetichization of writers' homes over the nineteenth century. As Barbara Hochman shows in *Getting at the Author* (2001), books such as Jeanette and Joseph Gilder's *Authors at Home* (1888) had become more and more common by the end of the century (23).[47] What these books offered readers was a closer look at the biographical author's intimate space, an access they could not have through their fiction. But instead of publishing sketches of their own homes in periodicals, the three authors under consideration tried to fulfill their readers' demand for intimacy in their prefatory writing. And

---

[46] For an analysis of the relationship between domesticity and the rise of the novel see Nancy Armstrong's *Desire and Domestic Fiction*: *A Political History of the Novel*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[46] The full title of this collection of sketches is: *Authors at Home: Personal and Biographical Sketches of Well-Known American Writers*, (New York: A. Wessels Co, 1902). The sketches were originally published in the periodical *The Critic*.

using the house as a metaphor or building their prefaces around it – or around the "body of images" associated with it – were ways to achieve that goal.

In what follows I explore how the house figure and some of its associated images are used in the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James. As I argue, the house in these prefaces is not simply a static, self-contained, and protective space, but rather a dialectical structure in which the boundaries between interiority and exteriority (as well as those between intimacy and publicity, self and other, pre-text and text) are constantly being foregrounded, questioned, or trespassed.[48] In these texts, authors define roles, create hierarchies, and fashion themselves in relation to the reading public and to ideologies circulating in their times. The house takes on different meanings and functions according to the author and situation examined. I concentrate my analyses on two of these meanings and functions: 1) the house works as a domesticating device by which the reader is entangled within "friendly" relations; and 2) it constitutes a vehicle for the inscription of authorial presence in spaces associated with literary creativity/production, and a means by which authors claim property and originality over their works. Thus, the *house* to be explored in this chapter is not only a physical structure or a unified category; it is instead a focal point from which derive the themes of privacy, intimacy, domesticity, and origin.

The theme of privacy offers a good example of how the preface operates dialectically. Distinctly contaminated by the autobiographical discourse, the preface at this historical moment privileges the individuality, consciousness, and uniqueness of a self-reflective speaker. To clarify the analogy with the overarching metaphor of this chapter, the interiority of the house should, to a certain extent (and with some exceptions), stand for the interiority of this speaker. But on the

[48] By "dialectics" I mean a relationship or interdependence between two opposing elements; a dynamics according to which each of these elements can only be defined if placed in contrast with the other. Even though I acknowledge that the term has a long history in philosophy, from Plato to Hegel, I am not employing their specific theories and concepts here.

other hand, as soon as this house is transformed into a sign and is translated into a common linguistic system, it becomes public; and as soon as the self-reflective speaker uses this system, he is already experiencing the exteriority of publicity. Mutlu Konuk Blasing's observation with regard to James's autobiographical prefaces illuminates this dialectics: "The Prefaces of Henry James … constitute a transformation of the private self into a public hero, since the simple act of self-consciousness itself involves the recognition of oneself as representative, and, therefore, as functioning in and as history" (xiv). There are other modalities of dialectical occurrences to be examined in the three authors' texts; the specific opposition between the private and public spheres, however, bears special historical importance and because of this I give it priority in the discussion.

Scholars agree that the private/public division is tied to the division of labor and the rise of a business-oriented middle-class in the eighteenth century. One of the main characteristics of this class is that it was dissociated from the class of manual laborers and artisans that had constituted the "middling rank" earlier on in the century (Blumin 33). The male members of this new middle class, as Joel Pfister notes, "typically worked outside the home, often in the employ of others, and left behind a 'woman's sphere' in which affective ties had become less communally based and more concentrated around the individual hearth" (4). The division of labor, thus, brought about a new ideological configuration in which men, women, and the home played distinctive roles. The home in this new configuration became more and more associated with the private realm of the family and of the emotions, while a sharp distinction was drawn between this realm and everything that lay outside it.

A lot has been written on the role the domestic space, or the "woman's sphere," played in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century literature and culture. Whereas scholars such as Ian

Watts[49] and Nancy Armstrong tend to emphasize the centrality of women in the emerging market of fiction, with more women writers and a large number of women readers, others, like Lora Romero, observe how misleading this assumption may be when most publishers – and, we could add, the authors who went on to accumulate more literary prestige – were male (13). Hawthorne, Dickens, and James are three good examples of male authors who achieved prestige by tapping into the culture of domesticity in their fiction and prefatory writing. Each of them, however, adopted highly ambivalent attitudes towards the participation of women in the literary field. While they could depict domestic scenarios and communicate with female audiences by appealing to emotions, they felt anxious about losing their established status when women were gaining artistic prominence.[50]

It is in light of this threat and also of the increasingly competitive literary market that we need to read the presence of the domestic ideology in the prefaces selected. As Gillian Brown states in her classic book on domestic individualism: "In the midst of change the domestic sphere provided an always identifiable place and refuge for the individual: it signified the private domain of individuality apart from the marketplace" (3). The domestic spaces and relations evoked in the prefaces show how writers coped with the challenges of their times and how they appropriated domesticity to assert their authority. If it was necessary to speak from, or to evoke, a particular place to assert literary authority, this place had to have the ideal qualities that the domestic ideology afforded. That is, the authority is still often patriarchal or paternalistic, as we will see, but charged with the affectivity of "the woman's sphere."

---

[49] See Ian Watt's *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957).

[50] This is the subject of Scott S.Derrick's aforementioned *Monumental Anxieties: Desire and Feminine Influence in 19th Century U. S. Literature*, (Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 1997).

I divide the analyses that follow into two sections according to the two main themes to be discussed. While the methods of reader domestication used especially by Dickens and Hawthorne are discussed in 4.2., the inscription of authorial presence in spaces connected to literary creativity, which I discuss in light of Henry James's prefaces, is the subject of 4.3. In all the situations, authorial figures are central to the understanding of the three authors' different responses to the domestic ideology and to the changes in the profession of authorship in the nineteenth century.

4.2. Domesticating the Reader: Friend, Confidant, Guide, and Host

The evocation of the domestic space in the preface is best understood in light of Henri Lefebvre's premise that "any space implies, contains and dissimulates social relationships – and this despite the fact that a space is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things, objects and products" (85). It is tempting to find out, then, what kind of relations are established in the prefatory discourse and what gets dissimulated in these processes. The two immediate participants of the communicative situation set in motion in the prefatory discourse are, evidently, the writer and the reader. But the patterns of interaction between these two elements and the roles into which they are put are various. In most situations analyzed, the writer asserts, directly or indirectly, his priority and authority over the reader's. In Garrett Stewart's terms, the reader is "conscripted," that is, "as a member of an audience, your private reading – along with that of *you* reading – along with that of every other reader – is actually convoked and restaged, put in service to the text" (8). Departing from this view, we can observe that the writer also puts himself in service to the text and the reader, and thus we have a two-way dynamics.

In his aforementioned essay on Charles Dickens's prefaces – "Dickens Performs Dickens" – Mario Ortiz-Robles classifies the prefatory personae used by the author into *Friend, Truth-Teller, Advocate, Professional Writer,* and *Famous Author* (464). While this classification foregrounds key Dickensian prefatorial poses, it can obscure specific impersonations and nuances of those types, such as the "charity boy" in *Sketches by Boz*, the conjuror of the Christmas spirit in *A Christmas Carol* (1843), or the patriarch in the preface to the First Cheap Edition of *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club* (1847). As I will show, nonetheless, the "friend" is intermingled with all of these figures. Notably, houses serve as backdrops for Dickens's figures to interact with their audiences. These houses (or homes)[51] can be both the readers', as in the examples of *Sketches by Boz* and *A Christmas Carol*, and the writer's, as in *Pickwick Papers*.

Sketches by Boz was originally published in two volumes: the First and the Second Series; Dickens wrote prefaces to the First and Second Edition of the First Series (1836); to the Second Series (1836); to the First Collected Edition in 1839; and to the Cheap and the Charles Dickens Editions in 1850, and 1868, respectively. The charity boy appears in the Preface to the Second Series following the author's formal introduction:

> With these few words, he gives a modest tap at the door of the public with this Christmas Piece, when, perhaps, he may imagine the following dialogue to ensue, founded on the well-known precedent of the charity boys and the housemaid.
>
> *Publisher* (to author) – *You* knock.
>
> *Author* (to publisher) – No – you. (Here the Publisher seizes the knocker, and gives a loud rap at the door.)

[51] I shall also use "home" in my discussion to underline the private and affective aspect of the house.

> *Public* (suspiciously, and with the door ajar) – Well; what do *you* want?
>
> *Publisher* – Please, will you look at this Christmas Piece; me and the other boy goes partners in it. (xl-xli)

Subsequently, the *Public* reacts in a typically impatient way and tells them to "go away," but the two "partners" persist. The use of dialogue softens the formality of the address and adds a fictional dimension to the preface. The author, figured here as a charity boy, is accompanied by the Publisher, who supports him as he ventures to win the sympathy of the housemaid-Public. The boy stays at the threshold of the Public's house but that is just enough for him to express his "sincerity" and to establish the pact of friendship with the Public after the Publisher retires, "while the author lingers behind, for one instant, to repeat an old form with much sincerity; and to express his hearty wish that *his best friend*, the Public, may enjoy 'a merry Christmas, and a happy new year'" (xli, my emphasis).

Although the private or autobiographical element is not yet present in this preface (the author was not known as Dickens then), we can see how important the domestic space is in defining the elements constituting the transaction, which occurs between the gendered Reader – and stock character (housemaid) – located in the domestic space, and the itinerant young author (the charity boy), who visits different homes to sell his production. More than that, the domestic space and the relationship of friendship and of sincerity established at its threshold dissimulate the commercial nature of the visit. Affect and sympathy are superimposed upon selling and promotion. Moreover, although the Publisher is present almost throughout the interaction, his voice eventually blends with that of the "author;" his tone is supplicant rather than professional, and commerce is confused with charity: "do look at it please. It's all his own doing,…" (xli).

The humble tone reappears in the Preface to *A Christmas Carol*. In a way reminiscent of the patronage system of the early modern period and also of Walter Scott's prefatory custom, Dickens uses the formula "Faithful Friend and Servant" to conclude this preface (29). While Scott's prefaces were typically anonymous, however, this one is signed "C.D" (Charles Dickens)." Additionally, "Friend" comes before "Servant," consolidating the type of relationship Dickens had been cultivating with his readers in his periodical addresses. In this most epigrammatic of prefaces, the readers' houses are referred to in a more generic form, but they are no less important.[52] The author wishes that the book, just like the Spirits responsible for Scrooge's conversion in the story, "haunt [the readers'] houses pleasantly, and no one wish to lay it" (29). Because the "author" is the one who "raises the Ghost of an Idea," the book can be understood as a metonymy for him. The author once again conflates the authorial with the actorial modes, and the reader, again as the writer's friend, is invited into the fictional universe of *A Christmas Carol*, which makes this preface a good example of the permeability of the frontier between the extra and the intra-text.

Dickens's appeal to domesticity can be seen as an astute deployment of a *topos* that resonated with contemporary Victorians. Domesticity, together with decorum and devotion to duty, were some of the key values of the Victorian period and these were modeled upon and reinforced by Queen Victoria and her husband, Prince Albert (Abrams 1049). Bradley Deane further contributes to our understanding of the influence of ideology in Dickens's prefaces in his analysis of the "friend" metaphor in particular:

> Indeed, this personalizing metaphor for novelists offers insight not only into the gradual rise of authorship itself as a central criterion of the novel's literary value.

[52] I explore Dickens's view of his readership as a totality in Chapters 5 and 6.

> The sympathetic friendliness attributed to novelists was not perceived as an end in itself, but as the fountainhead of a great current of social sympathy, which would in turn work to promote public stability and naturalize class divisions. The emerging focus on novelists as personalized, affective subjects is unmistakably a shift towards the author-centered aesthetics elaborated by the Romantic poets, though the novelists were thought to wield a degree of immediate and pragmatic social influence with which the Romantics, in even the most charitable view, could not be credited. (29).

The friendly aspect of Dickens's self-fashioning is, thus, a multifaceted one, the product of a gamut of factors. One of these factors is related to the transformations in the patterns of authorship resulting from an industrial context of production. The increased awareness of the need to unify the different groups contained inside the diverse social body of Victorian England is another factor to be considered. Finally, Dickens's deployment of a biographical self (manifested in the signature and the emphasis on spectral presence in the Preface to A *Christmas Carol*) has its roots in models set by Romantic authors, who prized the individuality of the biographical author. Nonetheless, what is distinctive about novelists such as Dickens, and what sets them apart from the Romantics, is that their identities are not imagined as transcendental or fixed. These identities are the product of multiple roles and of imagined situations of collaboration between authors and their dialectical counterparts (the readers, the publishers, and the illustrators).

In the Preface to the Cheap Edition of the *Pickwick Papers*, Dickens is much more at ease with the "friendly" metaphor and is capable of detaching it from the humble connotation it had in his previous prefaces. In this preface, the now celebrated author treats his readership with more

liberty, he "takes his friend by the button at a Theatre Door, and seeks to entertain him with a personal gossip before he goes in to the play" (883). I examine this preface in detail in Chapter 6, so for now I will just underline the different character this reader assumes; this reader plays the role of *confidant*, someone with whom the author can share stories about his past in a confessional mode. The stories the author tells are about the origins of the *Pickwick Papers*, but here Dickens has the opportunity to mythologize the beginnings of his career and to show his intimate (and affective) engagement with his activity. His domestic space, in this mythologizing narrative, gains the aura of a stage (as I shall discuss further on) and his gesture of opening the door to his future business partner is rendered as a momentous event, one that would change the course of his life. Whereas in the early prefaces the author is tapping at doors or haunting the readers' homes – in an effort to establish rapport with readers and to portray himself as belonging to the lower social classes – the gesture of opening the door here signals a change in status: the author is the aristocratic patriarch inside the home and the one who can act generously towards the reader/public.

Hawthorne also used the "friend" metaphor in a few occasions in his prefaces but his uses differ substantially from Dickens's. The New England author was not as successful as Dickens in dissimulating his tactics for domesticating readers, even though he also strove to do it. It follows that the author was much more sensitive to the issue of reader address and to the intimacy it implied, and his approach to this kind of virtual contact was much more conflicted and self-reflexive than Dickens's.[53] What is behind Hawthorne's sensitivity and self-reflexivity is his frustration with what he perceived as the lack of an audience for his publications.

[53] The Preface to *David Copperfield* (1850), however, resembles those of Hawthorne in this respect. The implicit metaphor of the *confidant* is the same used in the Preface to *Pickwick Papers* three years later, but in the former address Dickens feels "divided between pleasure and regret – pleasure in the achievement of a long design, regret in

In his 1851 Preface to *The Snow Image,* which appears as a letter to Hawthorne's friend Horatio Bridge, Hawthorne recalls his former instances of reader address:

> Some of the more crabbed of my critics, I understand, have pronounced your friend egotistical, indiscreet, and even impertinent, on account of the Prefaces and Introductions with which, on several occasions, he has seen fit to pave the reader's way into the interior edifice of a book. In the justice of this censure, I do not exactly concur, for the reasons, on the one hand, that the public has generally negatived the idea of undue freedom on the author's part, by evincing, it seems to me, rather more interest in these aforesaid Introductions than in the stories which followed, … (*TS* 1154).

In the excerpt, Hawthorne is responding to criticism of his prefatory style, and his use of the epistolary mode and the third person – "your friend," "he has seen fit" – makes his response less harsh and more indirect. Additionally, the "letter" is a private form of writing and it gives the author vent to express himself more freely. We should note the meta-referential nature of these opening lines and the role space plays in the author's conception of the prefatory mode of communication. The idea of giving readers access to an "interior" space reveals the importance of the culture of domesticity and intimacy in the Antebellum period.

A distinction needs to be made with regard to the two classes of "friends" mentioned in this preface. One of these is identified with a specific individual (Horatio Bridge); this friendship helps the author mark the limits of his "intimate" space. The other class is more generic and appears in the phrase "a very limited circle of friendly readers" (1154). Hawthorne recurrently expressed his anxieties about exposing himself too much. This furnished one of the main

---

the separation from many companions," and is thus "in danger of wearying the reader whom I love, with personal confidences, and private emotions" (lxxxi).

subjects of his prefatory discourse and the Preface to "The Old Manse" (1846) in particular, will help me further explore the tensions between privacy and publicity the author experienced. Still on the Preface to *The Snow Image*, it needs to be observed that the author polarizes "his limited circle of friendly readers" and the "public at large." The latter is not as comprehensive of the author's literary intentions as the more faithful readers of his circle and is thus perceived as a hindrance to the continuation of his pseudo-autobiographical accounts: "the habits thus acquired might pardonably continue, although *strangers* may have begun to mingle with my audience" (1154, my emphasis). Greenblatt's premise that "self-fashioning" "is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile" could not be better illustrated (9). The image of exclusivity and intimacy "Hawthorne" seems willing to convey – of an author who is not accessible to the masses – can only be realized if contrasted with the very "strangers" that are part of this anonymous group of readers.

"The Custom-House" Preface (1850) shows another example of Hawthorne's exclusivist approach to his audience: "the author addresses, not the many who will fling aside his volume, or never take it up, but the few who will understand him, better than most of his schoolmates and lifemates" (*CN* 121). Further in the same paragraph, he conjectures that "it may be pardonable to imagine that a friend, a kind and apprehensive, though not the closest friend, is listening to our talk" (121). Although it must be recognized that Hawthorne comes close to the image of the *confidant* identified in Dickens's Preface to *The Pickwick Papers*, the speaker's many concessions make this confidant more elusive. Moreover, there is an implicit hostility towards the ones who do not meet the criteria to be in his group, and a reserved tenderness towards the ones who do.

In the Preface to *the Marble Faun* (1859), Hawthorne attenuates the tone of his discourse while keeping its exclusivist content. He also contradicts some of his earlier positions and convictions about the limits of self-exposure in the autobiographical account. He reveals that the addressees of his previous prefaces were the general public but more specifically "a character with whom he felt entitled to use *far greater freedom*" (*CN* 853, my emphasis). This individual is described as "that one congenial friend – more comprehensive of his purposes, more appreciative of his success, more indulgent of his short-comings, and, in all respects, closer and kinder than a brother – that all-sympathizing critic, in short, whom an author never meets…" (853). I examine the continuation of this account, including the unexpected destiny Hawthorne reserves for this reader, in Chapter 6. Two things worthy of mention in the excerpt are the confluence of "friend" and "brother" and the reinforcement of the idea of "sympathy" and "indulgence" towards the author, which are the qualities he seeks in his audience.

The other figures I am interested in here, the *guide* and *host*,[54] will help expand the discussion on Hawthorne's ambiguous domesticating tactics and are especially important for an analysis of "The Old Manse," the long biographical sketch that antecedes the collection of stories *Mosses from an Old Manse*. In this Preface, subtitled: "The Author Makes his Reader Acquainted with his Abode," the house is given more prominence than in the prefaces examined above. The *guide* and *host* figures, however, are analogous to those of "friend" or "confidant,"

[54] The guest figure appears in Dickens's Preface to *Martin* Chuzzlewitt ("the troublesome guest" "loitering at the threshold of the book") – one of the examples with which I opened this Dissertation – and also in the 1841 Preface to *The Old Curiosity Shop*: "In the present instance, the host or author, in opening his new establishment, provided no bill of fare" (604). Although I did not include an extensive analysis of the former preface here, I recognize its relevance to this chapter and its similarities with Hawthorne's "The Old Manse." The Preface to *The Old Curiosity Shop* is a remarkable example of the dissimulation of commercial interest which I have pointed out in the beginning of the discussion, but it does not fit within the overarching metaphor of the chapter. Yet, it is also constructed around a spatial metaphor (a restaurant, to judge from the conclusion: "now that one dish has been discussed and finished, and another smokes upon the board, he drinks to his guests in a loving cup").

even though they presuppose a greater distance between speaker and listener.[55] On the other hand, readers are not invited merely to *listen* to stories, but also to *visit* places and *see* particular scenes and objects. "The Old Manse" gives as much emphasis to the themes of privacy and intimacy as "The Custom-House," which can be considered its sequel and with which it is often compared. Both prefaces foreground the author's self-reflexive attitude towards the need to construct and identity as well the anxieties that this process entails. However, while "The Custom-House" Preface deals with controversial (political) matters – Hawthorne's ambivalent portrayal of national symbols, his satire of the Custom-House officers who worked with him, and his dismissal from his job after the election of President Zachary Taylor – The "Old Manse" is a more meditative, introspective text, besides having the house as its main topic. Because of this, it renders itself better for the discussion that follows.[56]

"'The Old Manse'," writes Hawthorne's biographer Brenda Wineapple, "is an elegiac evocation of time past and passing, for the Manse itself had come to represent a last summer in the haze, lovely, enchanted, doomed to slide into the meaner seasons of obligation and middle age" (192). This idealized epoch had begun right after Hawthorne's marriage in 1842 and ended in 1845, when the family left the Old Manse to move to Salem, where Hawthorne would assume the position of surveyor at the Custom-House. While the house came to symbolize the happiness of conjugal life and harmony with nature, the Hawthornes faced major financial difficulties there and the author did not accomplish his plan to write a lengthier, more substantial work. Still,

[55] Towards the end of the piece, Hawthorne refers to his guests as the "circle of friends" (*TS* 1149), prefiguring the image used in the Preface to *The Snow Image.*

[56] For a detailed discussion on the political implications of "The Custom-House," see Laurent Berlant's *The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Every Day Life*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991).

during this period, Hawthorne continued writing short stories; these were published in a number of periodicals until they were finally collected under the aforementioned title.

One of the most special features of the Manse is that it had been occupied by generations of religious men – the latter being a parson – and also by highly accomplished and inspired men such as his friends Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau. In the piece, Hawthorne struggles with the weight of this legacy and launches himself in a journey of exploration. One of the aims of this journey is to find the source of inspiration and enlightenment that had aided the former inhabitants of the house. In addition to being a voyage of discovery and self-definition, the narrative is also punctuated by historical anecdotes, personal intimations, and descriptions of the house and its surroundings.

Because of its diverse nature, the narrative is far from linear; it is best described as meandering, erratic, marked by temporal shifts and abrupt changes of settings and point of view. There is a noteworthy interplay between inside and outside, as well as the characteristic tension between private and public I have pointed out before. These characteristics can be observed right at the outset, when the reader gets a description from the outside of the house, "we beheld the gray front of the old parsonage" (1123); and then from inside a few lines down: "From these quiet windows, the figures of passing travelers looked too remote and dim to disturb the sense of privacy" (1123). In the same paragraph, the reader goes from the time prior to the Hawthornes' arrival, when the last occupant had died, to the moment of their arrival, and then to a more generic past comprising the succession of clergymen who had lived there. The tension between private and public is reflected in the phrases "near retirement" and "accessible seclusion" in the same paragraph. In a way, thus, these first lines illustrate some of the main elements, strategies, and themes of this remarkable preface.

The tour of the Old Manse and its surroundings officially begins right after the author indicates the place where the battle between the North American and British soldiers had occurred. "Perhaps the reader – whom I cannot help considering as my *guest* in the old Manse, and entitled to all courtesy in the way of *sight-showing* – perhaps he will choose to take a nearer view of the memorable spot. We stand now on the river's brink" (1125, my emphasis). It should be noted that Hawthorne conflates the two figures (*guest* and *sight-seer*) in this passage. It is also worth observing that in order to fully engage the reader/guest's attention, he turns from the past tense of the previous paragraphs to the future and present tenses: "perhaps he will choose," and "we stand." From then on, Hawthorne will direct the reader's movements through imperatives such as "Come; we have pursued a somewhat devious track" (1127); he will also try to influence their perceptions as in "The reader must not… contract a dislike towards our slumberous stream" (1126). As Roberta F. Weldom comments in "From 'The Old Manse' to 'The Custom-House:' The Growth of the Artist's Mind" (1978), in "The Old Manse" "The audience-writer relationship is somewhat paternalistic… They are his 'circle' (36) and he is at its center, firmly defining its circumference" (43-4). We should not forget, however, that by figuring the reader as "guest," he needs to be constantly aware of their needs, for the sake of "the truest hospitality" (1133), and this awareness influences the course of the narrative, which confirms the dialectical hypothesis I have set forth at the beginning of this chapter. The concern with the reader is further illustrated in the following passage: "What with the river, the battle-field, the orchard, and the garden, the reader begins to despair of finding his way back into the Old Manse" (1133).

Yet, these interpositions are also rhetorical strategies, means by which the author can feign concern for the reader, when in fact the Old Manse – more specifically the author's study – is the most important part of the journey. Hence the delay in returning to the Manse; while this

return is delayed the speaker indulges in long digressions. These digressions divert the readers' attention from the present "sight-seeing" activity around the Old Manse to accounts of the period when the author used to go on boat rides on the Assabeth with his friends. Even so, these digressions re-create the idea of a tour while also giving Hawthorne vent to express his concern with privacy right in the opening lines: "The winding course of the stream continually shut out the scene behind us and revealed as calm and lovely a one before. We glided from depth to depth, and breathed new seclusion at every turn" (1140). Nature, throughout the Old Manse, replicates the values Hawthorne cherishes in the domestic space – peacefulness, seclusion, and affect. The domestication of nature is quite clearly manifested earlier on in the preface, when the speaker notes that "An orchard has a relation to mankind, and readily connects itself with matters of the heart. The trees possess a domestic character; they have lost the wild nature of their forest-kindred, and have gone humanized by receiving the care of man" (1130). Hawthorne domesticates nature just as he domesticates the reader and the ghosts of the previous occupants of the Old Manse. Joel Pfister also reflects upon this passage: "This is the contemporary middle-class ideology of domesticity as a humanizing institution. Domesticity humanizes husband, wife, orchards, and presumably, the fruits of one's literary labors" (14). This ideology is so powerful that even when Hawthorne has thoughts of being free from all the social customs and constraints, he is again comforted, or contained, by the thought of homeliness which the sight of an also Humanized Manse grants him. Still, according to Pfister this is Hawthorne's sentimental side; his darker counterpart can be found in his fiction.

Hawthorne's sentimentality is related to the fact that he shares, with the Romantics, the view that nature can be an antidote to the decay of modern civilized life. There is tension, as I have been arguing, between an outward impulse and its opposite, which can also be seen in the

contrast between the vagrancy of summer and the quietness of Autumn and Winter. After his description of the changes effected by the coming of Autumn, Hawthorne reinforces the hospitality of the Manse and refers to the guests that came to visit him during that season. These visits are received by the speaker as a "compliment to his abode" and to "his qualities as a host" (1144). Here, the speaker takes the opportunity to remind the audience of the roles assigned to them at the beginning of the narrative. But this is also the moment when he momentarily abandons the mask of host and begins to assume that of author and man.

In the end of the sketch, Hawthorne confesses he has never found the intellectual treasure supposedly buried in the Manse. He finally goes back to the framing roles and gives his readers/guests access to his study, in which they will "hear" the stories written in the Manse. Hawthorne becomes more self-reflexive before the conclusion. He apologizes for being overly self-indulgent in his narrative but also defends himself by insisting he did not transgress the limits of decorum in terms of self-revelation: "So far as I am a man of really individual attributes I veil my face" (1147). He makes a similar statement four years later in the "Custom-House," and uses the same "veil" figure: "we may prate of the circumstances that lie around us, and even of ourself, but still keep the inmost Me behind its veil" (*CN*, 121). It is possible to see the tension between self-concealment and self-display in these prefaces as a calculated effort to draw interest to and arouse curiosity about the author. Thus, these statements Hawthorne repeatedly makes may be seen not only as the result of his unease with the culture's demand for intimacy but also as the process by which the author creates a mythic image of himself, one based on mystery rather than on popularity (as was Dickens's case.)

4.3. Fathering the Text: Origin in James's "Houses of Fiction"[57]

Henry James did not "conscript" his readers through friendly metaphors in his prefaces as did Dickens and Hawthorne in theirs, but his writing in those texts is also contaminated by the domestic imaginary. The best example of this is his use of the *father* metaphor which establishes a link between author and work (rather than between author and reader, as discussed in the previous section). Dickens also used this metaphor in his famous Preface to the Charles Dickens Edition of *David Copperfield* (1868): "Like many fond parents, I have in my heart of hearts a favourite child. And his name is David Copperfield" (752). Nevertheless, while occurrences of this metaphor are not so common in Dickens's prefaces, in James's, "father," "parent," and "child" – let alone their variants – are used frequently, with different connotations.[58] Although I acknowledge that these metaphors are relevant to the general topic of this chapter (and especially to the theme of origins), I shall devote my attention to James's obsession with origins and to the descriptions of his various dwelling places. These places are special because they provide the first sparks of inspiration for the author's stories; they also connect to the author's reflections on the technical challenges underlying the creative process or to his theorizations about "the art of the novel." Moreover, they constitute sites for the inscription of his authorial presence and authority. Like the other houses discussed in this Chapter, these are also dialectical spaces in which the play between interiority and exteriority can be seen.

---

[57] I use "Houses of Fiction" here to refer both to James famous metaphor discussed in this section and also to the authors' places of residence. These places can be understood as "houses of fiction" because they afford the conditions for the production of fiction and also because they are "poetic spaces" in the phenomenological sense of Bachelard; they matter not only because of their objective physical attributes, but also because of how the author apprehends them in his mind, re-signifies them, or charges them with subjective qualities.

[58] For an analysis of these metaphors, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "Shame, Theatricality and Queer Performativity: Henry James's *The Art of the Novel*," in *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*." (Full reference on p. 172).

The widely known "house of fiction" excerpt from the Preface to *The Portrait of Lady* can be taken as point of departure for a discussion of James's originary settings. This house is not yet one of the actual spaces which served as temporary accommodations for the author and which he describes in his accounts of how stories originated or "grew," but it deserves our attention because of its enduring relevance to the field of literary theory and also because of its relationship to the domestic ideology. In the Preface, the author, trying to recover the germ of his story through recollection (the *topos* used as a frame for the accounts in the introductions to all of the volumes), concludes that he could not locate such germ in any idea of a plot but rather in the character of Isabel Archer. This character had come to him as a promising "center of consciousness" for the story and everything else would be built around her.

The architectural metaphor is thus introduced in these preliminary considerations on the conception and structure of the novel. He acknowledges that he is often critiqued for "not having 'story' enough," to which he concedes by admitting that his novels are more about the way characters relate to each other and less about architecture (43). Still, he defends himself by showing a parallel between his method of privileging character over plot and the one endorsed by Ivan Turgenieff. The Russian author, like many other models of literary authority cited in the New York Edition Prefaces, confers legitimacy on James's artistic vision. The house of fiction also performs this task: it is conceived as a structure composed of countless windows, "every one of which has been pierced, or is still pierceable, in its vast front, by the need of the *individual vision* and by the pressure of the *individual will*" (46, my emphases). These "pierced windows" or "apertures," allow different viewers to see different aspects of the same scene outside.

James thus specifies the elements of his phenomenological model: "The spreading field, the human scene, is the 'choice of subject': the pierced aperture, either broad or balconied or slit-

like and low-browed, is the 'literary form': but they are, singly or together, as nothing without the posted presence of the watcher – without, in other words, the consciousness of the artist" (46).[59] The house in this model is a vantage point and the position of the author is clearly defined inside its limits. Although the author is situated in its interior and his individuality and consciousness are emphasized, the movement is unequivocally towards the exterior. The position of the author is that of a "watcher," a surveyor; the house is depicted as the center of a piece of land or territory ("the spreading field"), which in turn carries authoritative, aristocratic, and patriarchal overtones.

The author's position in this house is indeed clearly different from the one he assigns to Isabel. Isabel is described as "a cornerstone" of "the large building of 'The Portrait of a Lady'" (48), the center of consciousness around which the whole story gravitates. But the house has here the quality of an enclosed space rather than of an open one: "it had to be put round my young woman while she stood there in perfect isolation" (48). It is also curious that Isabel should be treated as a possession – "the precious object," (480) – "a young feminine nature" at the author's disposal, and one who should be an asset to the house, which points to a model of domesticity based on the woman's passivity. It is not a coincidence that James should go at lengths to justify his choice of "an intelligent *but* presumptuous girl" (48, my emphasis) for his heroine and also establish a genealogy of heroines in classic literature to compare her with. It may be argued that Isabel is "enclosed" in that way inside the house of fiction because of those very characteristics that define her and make her so appealing as a character; that is, her intelligence and presumptuousness are threatening and should be somehow contained.

[59] Throughout the Dissertation, I maintain the punctuation, spelling, and emphases as they are reproduced in the *Art of the Novel*. I indicate my own emphases together with the page number inside brackets.

In "In the House of Fiction: Henry James and the Engendering of Literary Mastery" Sara Blair reads the domestic trope and gender roles in the Preface in a different way:

> [b]y figuring the work of authorship as a kind of domestic activity, James strategically revises a powerful romance of origins that resonates throughout modern Anglo-American literary doctrine. Redirecting available metaphors for the locus of self-consciousness – the palace of art, the museum, the narrow chamber of the individual mind, the Emersonian place of experience – he mobilizes sentimental ideologies of femininity, purity, and awakened consciousness and makes them intrinsic to his version of the literary act. He thereby naturalizes, in the performance of a self-consciously ironic mastery, fictions of gender that novels like the *Portrait* so resonantly challenge (60-1)

I have observed that the woman's sphere was antithetical to the market which threatened authors' sense of individuality and Blair's excerpt helps us perceive how domesticity is intimately linked with the establishment of a male canon which eventually included James. On a different note, Blair's main argument holds true for the collection of Prefaces as a whole and can be supported with examples of other metaphors James uses in them. In the particular Preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*, however, I would argue that while the house metaphor points to the influence of the domestic ideology and to a tradition of fetishizing origins in a space traditionally associated with femininity, engendering in the Preface operates along a more conservative male/female paradigm, according to which the author's identity is forged in contrast to this engendered character and is associated with typically male activities (build, watch, survey). In other prefaces, as I will show, James resorts to other traditionally male activities, as well as to images associated with specific male models of power and authority, which undermines Blair's more general

contention that "his own images of origin betray a certain psychic distance from those distinctively foreign activities, military and commercial, of the public sphere he surveys" (62).

The next example comes from the Preface to the *American*. This Preface serves as a good illustration of James's peripatetic life and also of the various ways in which different places affected his imagination. Additionally, it shows how intricate – and, sometimes, also conflicted – the relationship between the fictional settings of the stories and the sites of creation/composition are in James's prefaces. For instance, in the process of re-reading *The American* for the Edition, he remembers how distracting Paris was while he was composing the story set in that city. In one of the most lucid passages of the Prefaces, he concludes: "I have ever, in general, found it difficult to write of places under too immediate an impression – the impression that prevents standing off and allow neither space nor time for perspective. The image has had for the most part to be dim if the reflexion was to be, as is proper for a reflexion, both sharp and quiet: one has a horror, I think, artistically, of agitated reflexions" (27). If the "agitated reflexions" are not welcome in the finished product, they are definitely part of the author's recalled experiences in a variety of places:

> [The novel] had to save as it could its own life, to keep tight hold of the tenuous silver thread, the one hope for which was that it shouldn't be tangled or clipped. This earnest grasp of the silver thread was doubtless an easier business in other places – though as I remount the stream of composition I see it faintly coloured again: with the bright protection of the Normandy coast… ; with the stronger glow of southernmost France, breaking in during a stay at Bayonne; then with the fine historic and other "psychic" substance of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, a purple patch of terraced October before returning to Paris. There comes after that the

> memory of a last brief intense invocation of the enclosing scene, of the pious effort to unwind my tangle, with a firm hand, in the very light (that light of high, narrowish French windows in old rooms, the light somehow, as one always feels, of 'style') itself that had quickened my original vision. (27-28).

This is a remarkable testimony of the difficulty of keeping to one's own theoretical principles. James's conflict becomes apparent from the moment he starts listing the places; there is a clear discrepancy between "*faintly* coloured" and the qualifiers he uses in the following phrases: "*bright* protection," "*stronger* glow," "brief *intense* invocation." These adjectives prefigure the more explicit connection between light and "original vision" in the last sentence. In other words, these places are associated, in the author's mind, with the moment of conception; he has been particularly enlightened or inspired in the terraced room with the "narrowish French windows" and he finds it hard to detach this light and place from the "enclosing scene" of the novel.

It is, perhaps, noteworthy that "windows" are again elements in James's rendering of his "homes." This time they let in the light of inspiration, and the movement is from outside to inside. This movement pictures a more introspective subject who contrasts with the surveyor of the Preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*. This subject, however, is the possessor of a "firm hand" which signals the author's control over the composition process. As Pamela Schirmeister aptly summarizes: "James returns to a particular setting in memory in order to put himself in place, to locate himself, so that, he may remember, for himself and for us, a kind of infinite potential, both inner and outer, before any choices were made" (150).

John H. Pearson complements Schirmeister's view by observing that the valorization of the "actual" settings in these tales of origins is meant to confer legitimacy upon the extra-literary.

That is, "the story of the story," to use Richard P. Blackmur's phrase, gains precedence over the final literary product and gives relief to the author and his creative consciousness. James is right, at the same time, when he writes that "the accessory facts in a given artistic case," which we can identify with the extra-literary elements to which Pearson refers – "looms with its own completeness in the rich ambiguous aesthetic air" (Preface to *Roderick Hudson* 4). This ambiguity may be more or less pronounced according to the passage one reads in the Prefaces, but since the extra-literary aspect is only accessible through the linguistic medium, or better, through James's highly figurative and subjective prose, it is not possible to draw rigid lines between these two realms (the extra-literary and the literary). Furthermore, most critics agree that the Prefaces are literary pieces – including Pearson and Blackmur – and that the author we read in them is not anterior to the text, but a product of self-fashioning and fictional processes.

The Preface to *The Spoils of Poynton* (Volume X in the NY Edition, which also includes the stories "A London Life," and "The Chaperon") contains memorable passages that help confirm this view. In this Preface, James begins by locating the germ of the title story in the course of a conversation at a Christmas Eve two years before. This germ is "dropped" by a lady who tells the story of a dispute between a mother and son over the furniture of an old house bequeathed to the son by his father. James is deeply impressed by the story and decides to appropriate it to concoct his own "little drama." Although the germ itself is not associated with any particular home or setting, its composition occurs in a very special one. James introduces his description of this place with one of his striking metaphors for the pages of his revised work: "the barred seraglio-windows behind which, to the outsider in the glare of the Eastern street, forms indistinguishable seem to move and peer" (125). Here James positions himself as the privileged reader of a past that remains inaccessible to readers. The windows – given prominence

once again in the Prefaces – represent the lines of the page, and the inside/outside dynamics separate the reader from the author (contained inside those lines). But James is capable of situating himself on the outside as well, as a reader of his own past, "Peering through the lattice from without inward I recapture a cottage on a cliff-side," thus reversing the dynamics.

The description of the cottage goes on as follows:

> The cottage was, in its kind, perfection; mainly by reason of a small paved terrace which, curving forward from the cliff-edge like the prow of a ship, overhung a view as level, as purple, as full of rich change, as the expanse of the sea. The horizon was in fact a band of sea; a small red-roofed town, of great antiquity, perched on its sea-rock, clustered within the picture off to the right; while above one's head rustled a dense summer shade, that of a trained and arching ash, rising from the middle of the terrace, brushing the parapet with a heavy fringe and covering the place like a vast umbrella. Beneath this umbrella and really under exquisite protection "The Spoils of Poynton" managed more or less symmetrically to grow. (125)

The initial image gains the quality of a "picture," and is thus objectified and aestheticized. This procedure is quite common in James's descriptions in his novels and bears witness to the enduring presence of Romantic elements even in his more "modernist" works. Indeed, the passage contains several Romantic picturesque elements – the cliff-edge, the antique town, the sea-rock, and also the analogy with the ship, which, as I will show, is associated with heroism and adventure. But this subtle suggestion of adventure (a view "full of rich change") is counterbalanced by the protective influence of the shade projected by the ash tree. As in Hawthorne's "The Old Manse," there is tension between the freedom of outdoor life and the

inwardness of domesticity; it should be added that the tree is the element providing the shade for "protection," which makes it akin to Hawthorne's domesticated trees. And finally, it is this suggested domesticity that is conducive to the creative production.

If the author's home became an object of interest to readers in the nineteenth century because of its association with the private author, a private author considered as the source of originality and creativity, James partly catered to this public by engaging in extensive accounts of the origins of his stories and placing them in specific settings imbued with special attributes. James's attempt to fashion himself as a theorist and professional artist, the "architect" of fiction, is related to a more modern view of the author which would eventually resonate in modernist aesthetics, but the author is still quite romantic in his imagery and belief in inspiration, individuality, and genius. While origin for James represented the tracing back of the circumstances of creation or of the moment of conception, it was also a means by which he could inscribe his figured selves in spaces and thus acquire a more tangible existence that could grant him authority and precedence over the text. The inscription of the author in the space of creation or production, however, pictures an author that is a character in the recollected scenes, that is, a character who is both an author and an actor of his own autobiographical account.

The domestic ideology, in turn, underlies the roles and authorial fantasies seen not only in the Prefaces of James but also in those of Dickens and Hawthorne. This ideology provided them with a universe of references, relations, metaphors and beliefs which they could use to reach audiences. If this ideology allowed them to detach themselves from the market and preserve their distinction amidst an increasing number of competitors, it also situated them within their culture, placed them in relation to a literary tradition and to the social body with which they shared those references. As I have argued, domesticity makes affect part of the literary discourse and

entangles the reader within this web of affect. The reader becomes, as a result, the author's Other, the "friend," "guest," or "stranger" who help him/her forge multiple identities.

5

"Citizens of somewhere else:" Dislocated Selves in the Prefaces of Dickens, Hawthorne, and James

> … authority is nomadic: it is never in the same place, it is never always at the center, nor is it a sort of ontological capacity for originating every instance of sense.
>
> --Edward Said, *Beginnings: Intention and Method*

5.1. The Transnational Imaginary and the Quest for Autonomy

In this chapter I look at examples of authorship imagined as dislocation, exploration, and conquest of space in the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James. I argue that such *topoi* are related to the three authors' struggles for cultural legitimacy and autonomy in the nineteenth century. The dream of having a place in the literary market and the ambition to be part of an international literary community take on different contours according to the narrative, metaphor or model of authority employed. In most cases, the author appears as an Other (a figure or persona) and the boundary between the *authorial* and *actorial* modes is destabilized as in some examples analyzed in the previous chapter. The personas used and the spaces evoked are articulated with different accounts dealing with transnational systems of reference in literature and culture. Geographical spaces are part of the field of references in the excerpts analyzed but these spaces are conceived as *representational space*s, that is, as spaces "*lived* through [their]associated images and symbols" (Lefebvre 39).

For a general historical account of the transnational literary system, I draw from Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* (2004). Casanova traces the genesis of the "world literary space" from the formation of the first European nation-states in the sixteenth century, through the nationalist movements for independence in the nineteenth century, and the decolonization of Africa and the India subcontinent in the twentieth (11). These events created the conditions for competition among different nations and paved the way for a unified system of appreciation of works of art.

According to Casanova the unified "literature-world" is "a literary universe relatively independent of the everyday world and its political divisions, whose boundaries and operational laws are not reducible to those of ordinary political space" (xii). Despite this "relative" independence of the "literature-world," it follows the same principle of domination seen in the political sphere. In this "literature-world," the principle of domination is reflected in the division of the literary nations into hegemonic forces with more symbolic capital, and the dominated ones on the other side of the scale. In turn, this principle is founded on the idea that symbolic capital is directly proportional to the age of a particular region. Therefore, while England, for example – to stay within the Western scope of Casanova – would rank among the hegemonic forces in the world literary scenario, Brazil would figure among the dominated regions.

The concept of *autonomy*, prominent in Casanova's work, is particularly pertinent to my discussion in this chapter. The term *autonomy* derives from Pierre Bourdieu's comprehensive study in the sociology of cultural products, an acknowledged influence in Casanova's literary history. *Autonomy* in Pierre Bourdieu's *The Rules of Art*: *Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field* (1992) refers to the institutionalization of literature as dissociated from the economic and political realms and to the codification of specific positions of more or less literary prestige

(symbolic capital) within the institutionalized literary space (literary field) (47-8). *In Fictions of Autonomy*: *Modernism from Wilde to Man* (2013), Andrew Goldstone acknowledges the influence of Bourdieu on contemporary discussions on autonomy and also the relevance of Casanova's application of the term to an analysis of literature within an international context.

Goldstone explores different versions of autonomy in literature and theory and identifies four main associations linked with the term in the literary discourse across history. These associations are: the idea that aesthetics should be dissociated from social reference; the defense of the author's detachment from the aesthetic product; the avoidance of involvement with politics in artistic production; and the principle that language is non-referential (4). Although these associations are more commonly applied to the study of modernism (and Goldstone reinforces this linkage in his book), he acknowledges that "Ideas of aesthetic literary autonomy predate the late nineteenth century and the problems of the independence of artists and their works appear in many times and places" (2). I endorse this view because it allows us to consider earlier positions – such as that of Hawthorne's in his privileging of "Romance" over the realist Novel – as part of the same movement that led to different formulations of autonomy later on. Autonomy is not a unified concept and I keep in perspective the different associations listed by Goldstone, as well as the theoretical models of Bourdieu and Casanova, in my analyses of the examples selected.

In keeping with the approach to autonomy as congregating different perspectives, I also consider Stepehen Greenblatt's understanding of this concept as a dialectical category (*Renassaince Self-Fashioning* 1). Autonomy is the departing point for Greenblatt's historical discussion of self-fashioning as an imperative in the modern period. It follows that, if autonomy in the nineteenth century meant a desire to detach oneself from local barriers, it was also

inextricably dependent on them. A similar rationale applies to the shaping of one's personality: the construction of identity is dependent on elements that lie outside the self; hence my emphasis on the authors' shifting between autographical and figurative forms of self-definition in the prefaces studied. For writers coming from the periphery of the "literature-world" in the nineteenth century, for example, autonomy could be imagined through an identification with other, more powerful literary regions.

For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to stress that the emergence of the autonomy principle is linked, in Casanova's historical account, with the consolidation of France as a hegemonic force in the European cultural scenario in the nineteenth century. Casanova ascribes French hegemony to a series of factors, including: the literary capital France accumulated with an early unification as a nation-state; the adoption of the French language as a *lingua franca* by European elites; and the impact of the French revolution ideals in the continent and abroad. Writing specifically about Paris, Casanova notes: "[the city] was connected with the demand for political freedom, which in turn was directly associated with the invention of literary modernity" (25). Therefore, writers from the recently emancipated New World nations (including the United States) saw in this French denationalized model an opportunity to achieve international recognition. But this new criterion of evaluation, which manifested itself in different forms of cosmopolitanism, did not do away with the old hierarchical model; instead, it disguised the prerogative of France in determining what was literary and what was not. Additionally, the criteria that measured cultural capital according to the age of a particular country continued to give the European nations a large advantage over the emerging ones.

While awareness of the world literary space exerted influence in the careers of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, these writers also conceived of authorial legitimacy in terms

other than literary. Living in an age of technological innovations, mass transatlantic travel, and imperialism, they were exposed to a host of models of authority and heroism that could be used in the quest for cultural legitimacy. These models, as Henry James's prefaces illustrate, come from different phases of European maritime exploration and expansionism, and are related to a world view largely shaped by the colonial enterprise.

As Marie Louise Pratt and others have shown, figures such as Alexander von Humboldt and Christopher Columbus owed their authority not only to actual feats but also to the narratives resulting from them.[60] In *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992), Pratt devotes special attention to narratives associated with the eighteenth-century "planetary consciousness," defined as "a version marked by an orientation toward interior exploration and the construction of global-scale meaning through the descriptive apparatuses of natural history" (15). Two prominent exponents of this new "planetary consciousness" are the Swedish naturalist Carl Linné and the French geographer Charles de La Condamine. According to Pratt, Linné's *Systema Naturae* had a major impact in travel and travel writing, giving way to the figure of the "herborizer," who, with his sampling and description of flora and fauna, would "naturalize the bourgeois European's own presence and authority. This naturalist's narrative was to continue to hold enormous ideological force throughout the nineteenth century, and remains very much with us today" (28). Similarly, the fame of de La Condamine's South American expedition exceeded the immediate reception of the explorer's narratives in the eighteenth century. Again, in Pratt's words: "The tales and texts it occasioned circulated round and round Europe for decades, on oral circuits and written" (18).

[60] Both Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993), and Stephen Greenblatt in *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991) note the relationship between imperialism and narration.

Pratt's account of this new moment of colonial exploration helps us understand the origins of the eighteenth-century bourgeois figures of authority that went on to exert influence in the nineteenth-century imagination together with the heroes of earlier European expansionism. As embodiments of physical, political, and symbolical/literary power, they appealed to writers who wanted to overcome their relative lack of social influence. The ways in which these figures and heroes are used in the preface are particularly significant as this textual modality is the privileged site where authorship and authority are negotiated.

The examples to be discussed in the next section do not fit neatly within the two models of transnational relationships outlined above ("literature-world" and "planetary-consciousness"). These models (as well as the different takes on *autonomy* presented) guide my discussion on the relationship between authorial legitimation and the large array of models of authority available outside the literary realm, but they are not here treated as rigid contextual or theoretical paradigms. Dickens, for example, did not think of literature as independent from national boundaries, politics, or society, and often reinforced the verisimilitude and realism of his characters in the prefaces. The author worked under quite heteronomous conditions in the market of serialization but he also strove to impose his individuality and artistic vision amidst the pressures imposed by his publishers, and was aware of the increasing exchange among different literary regions. And while Hawthorne's preface to "Rappaccini's Daughter" is in direct relationship with Casanova's account of French hegemony, it is James who provides the best examples for discussing the "imperial self"[61] in prefatory self-fashioning in the period. In the next section, I show how the differences might be revealing of each author and particular context, and how parallels might be drawn from apparently disparate examples.

[61] I refer here to Quentin Anderson's influential book: *The imperial Self: An Essay in American Literary and Cultural History,* (New York: Knopf, 1971).

5.2. Conquering Spaces: Boz, Aubépine, and Columbus

As the examples discussed in the previous chapter suggest, Dickens was largely responsible for his association with Victorian domesticity. In turn, his Victorian readers responded favorably to his family dramas in the novels and to his appeals to intimacy in the addresses, and learned to admire the man for the qualities and images he borrowed from the universe of cultural references he shared with them. In what follows I continue to examine aspects of Dickens's self-fashioning, the ways by which the man eventually became "Charles Dickens," the Victorian icon and patriarch. It is worth recalling that "Charles Dickens" was preceded by another authorial self, fashioned not as a patriarch at the outset, but as an ambitious writer of journalistic sketches aspiring to success in the market of Victorian England.

The sketches Dickens published in periodicals in the early years of his career carried the rather curious pseudonym Boz, a nickname originally given to Augustus (Dickens's youngest brother) after a character in *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), by Oliver Goldsmith. "Boz" was actually the short for "Bozzes," a nasalized version of "Moses," the name of Goldsmith's character in the novel. Through "Boz," Dickens started shaping his authorial personality and experimenting with ways to conquer audiences. Eventually, as Robert Patten observes in *Charles Dickens and Boz: the Birth of the Industrial Age Author*:

> … "Boz" came to name a genre as well as an author. People referred to "Bozzes," meaning sketches similar in tone and subject to Dickens's. But "Bozzes" named not the newspaper tales and sketches but the illustrated ones gathered in the three volumes of *Sketches by Boz*. In time, this genre became more generalized. Since *Pickwick Papers* was also attributed to "Boz," "Bozzes" named a kind of

> illustrated serial representing middle-and lower-middle-class life, chiefly about London, and narrated with humour, sympathy, and more than a modicum of distancing coolness and irony. (76)

The identification of the sketches with the space of England's capital is an important feature to take into account in reading the prefaces to the two Series of *Sketches by Boz*. For instance, in the preface to the First Edition of the First Series (1836), the city is the implied launching site and stage for a balloon carrying Boz and his illustrator George Cruikshank.

Boz opens his preface with the traditional *humilitas trope* of the prefatorial genre – "In humble imitation of a prudent course" – but the trope is immediately linked with the metaphor of the aeronaut, whose "course" the author is about to imitate. In his address, the "volumes" which the preface antecedes are thrown up as "a pilot balloon," and the author expresses the wish that "it may catch a favourable current" (xxxix). He then explains that

> Entertaining no inconsiderable feeling of trepidation, at the idea of making so perilous a voyage in so frail a machine, alone and unaccompanied, the author was naturally desirous to secure the assistance of some well known individual, who had frequently contributed to the success, though his well earned reputation rendered it impossible to ever have shared the hazard of similar undertakings. (xxxix)

Boz pays the due homage to his friend – the eminent illustrator George Cruikshank – but the emotional theatre he builds around the enterprise through phrases such as "the feeling of trepidation," "the perilous voyage," and "alone and unaccompanied," places him at the center of the passage. The heroic rendering of the profession of authorship, heavily dependent on the language of affect, testifies to the affiliation of Dickens's prefatorial discourse to the

individualistic tradition that shaped Romantic autographic writing. As a marketing strategy, the technological apparatus of the balloon, softened by the rhetoric of affect, betrays Dickens's authorial arrogance while raising, so to speak, the author above his peers and fellow citizens.

The idea of a voyage in a balloon would have appealed to audiences in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first hydrogen-filled balloon was developed and flown by Jacques Alexandre César Charles in 1783, only 53 years before the publication of *Sketches by Boz*. But Dickens could have drawn the image from the theatre. As Robert Douglas-Fairhurst suggests, the young Dickens "might have been struck" by the play '*Travels in Air, on Earth and Water*,' which featured the actor Charles Matthews "dismounting from a hot-air balloon on stage, and informing the audience that, knowing of the world's misfortunes, 'the only way in which I could effectually rise in life, was to go up in a Balloon'" (85). Matthews's theatrical extravaganza parallels Dickens's use of the metaphor in the preface: they both express, in a grand and comic way, the ambition of a performer. Yet, Dickens does not dismount from the balloon in his preface, but rather goes up in it, and the fact that he does so in a "pilot-balloon" – used to test meteorological conditions – reinforces the role of the preface as a rehearsal piece for the work readers are about to read and also for the whole career the author anticipates: "Unlike the generality of pilot balloons which carry no car, in this one it is very possible for a man to embark, not only himself, but all his hopes of future fame." (xxxix)

Alluding to the Second Series Frontispiece by Cruikshank, in which the balloon metaphor appears as an illustration featuring Dickens and Cruikshank waving flags at a cheering crowd below, Robert L. Patten argues that "the metaphor could be construed as belonging more to the visual than to the verbal realm, as panoramas of the city had become quite familiar from balloon-perspective prints as well as from views displayed at the London coliseum and obtained from the

top of the Monument" (75). I would add that what makes Dickens's preface effective is that it captures the visual and technological imaginary of his time in a meaningful and impressive metaphor, and through this metaphor "Boz" makes his presence felt, figured, and connected to the landscape in an overpowering way.[62]

Dickens created more intimate metaphors to establish more direct patterns of interaction with his audience, and the image of the parish boy knocking on the door of English housemaids to offer them Christmas stories – which appears in the preface to the Second Series of *Sketches by Boz* - confirms this tendency. The idea of focusing on the house, either that of the author or of that of the reader (discussed in chapter 4), follows the pattern of authorial self-fashioning through the evocation of spaces. The author, in most cases, is meant to be thought of as physically present to his audience and this presence depends on particular spaces or on the sense of dislocation in spaces.

In the preface to *Dombey and Son* (1848), Dickens, now the celebrated author known at home and abroad, tells us specifically of where he composed the story, a formula James would explore extensively in his own prefaces a few decades later. As he writes:

> I began this book by the Lake of Geneva, and went on with it for some months in France, before pursuing it in England. The association between the writing and the place of writing is so curiously strong in my mind, that at this day, although I know, in my fancy, every stair in the little midshipman's house, and could swear to every pew in the church in which Florence was married, or to every young gentleman's bedstead in Doctor Blimber's establishment, I yet confusedly

[62] Jonathan H. Grossman provides more information and expansion on Dickens's use of the balloon metaphor in relation to the context of advances in transportation and mobility in the nineteenth century in: *Charles Dickens's Networks: Public Transport and the Novel*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. p. 58).

> imagine Captain Cuttle as secluding himself from Mrs. Macstinger among the mountains of Switzerland. (xix-xx)

In this passage, Dickens conflates two separate levels or fields of reference: the space of composition, represented by the Lake of Geneva, France, and England; and the fictional settings of the novel. This is an example of what Wolfgang Iser calls "boundary-crossing" and shows how the author, by a process analogous to that of the "fictive," claims his place and presence in that fictional universe (xiv). Readers should be reminded, as they read the story, that the author is behind every line and that the setting cannot be separated from the composition settings rooted in his experience.

Given his strong connection to his homeland, Dickens was not seen as a cosmopolitan writer like Henry James in his time. Still, the passage places the writer in the continent and enhances his image by creating an association between him, Geneva, and France (besides England). On a different note, the preface to the 1864 French Edition of *Barnaby Rudge* (*Barnabé Rudge* par Ch. Dickens) bear witness to Dickens's awareness of his presence in the foreign market and of the need to exert control over it. I reproduce the French translation of an excerpt quoted by Mario Ortiz-Robles's in "Dickens Performs Dickens:" "Hitherto less fortunate in France than in Germany, I have only been known to French readers not thoroughly acquainted with the English language, through occasional, fragmentary and unauthorized translations over which I have no control, and from which I have derived no advantage" (468). His concern here is mostly commercial but is connected to his active participation in campaigns for the International Copyright Law. In 1842 Dickens had toured The United States as a literary celebrity and took advantage of this situation to express his views on the subject. Arguably, campaigns for Copyrights paved the way for the development of the idea of *autonomy* later on in the century

since they contributed to the idea of authorship as a profession and were meant to make the author more independent and less vulnerable to the exploitation of publishers.

Dickens's first tour of the United States provided him with the theme and protagonist for his novel *The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewitt* (1844). In the Preface to the First Edition, which features the trope of the "troublesome guest" "loitering on the threshold of [his] book," the composition itself is figured as a "journey," a subtle reminder of the tour that had given origin to the novel: "I set out, on this journey which is now concluded" (841). The analogy with a journey fictionalizes the writing activity and the author appears as the character of his own prefatory fantasy. Towards the end of the preface, the *actorial* quality of this preface becomes even more evident as Dickens refers to his characters as his friends and again connects himself (and also the readers) to the universe of the story:

> At any rate, if my readers have derived but half the pleasure and interest from its perusal, which its composition has afforded me, I have ample reason to be gratified. And if they part from any of my visionary friends, with the least tinge of that reluctance and regret which I feel in dismissing them; my success has been complete, indeed. (841)

Again, the language of affect punctuates the rhetoric of Dickens's prefatory remarks. Affect is, differently from what happens in other Prefaces, directed to the author's own work (his characters), and the speaker assumes not only the role of "author," and "character," but also that of "reader" of his own story, a pattern that recur in James's prefaces as well.

The prefaces discussed above represent distinct moments in Dickens's career. While the earlier Preface to *Sketches by Boz* shows an image of a young writer striving to conquer an audience and to mark a position within his own hometown, the ones to *Barnabé Rudge, Martin*

Chuzzlewitt, and *Dombey and Son* are the products of a writer who gradually capitalizes on his early self-fashioning tactics and who learns the importance of becoming international to increase his influence. A similar pattern may be seen in Hawthorne's prefaces to "Rappaccini's Daughter" (1844) and *The Marble Faun* (1859). But coming from the emerging North American literary field, Hawthorne's approach to space in these prefaces is inextricably linked with his perception of the hierarchical configuration in the international universe of literary works.

In the preface to "Rappaccini's Daughter," titled: "From the Writings of Aubépine" (1837-43) Hawthorne, like Dickens in the preface to *Sketches by Boz,* seeks recognition for his first experiments as a writer of short pieces. As in the *Sketches,* Hawthorne also utilizes a penname but his form of presentation is even more oblique than Dickens's. An unnamed speaker introduces the reader to "the productions" of M. de l'Aubépine, underlining, from the beginning, the obscurity of that writer, "whose name is unknown to many of his own countrymen, as well as the student of foreign literature" (975). What follows is an attempt from the reviewer to describe the writer's style and situate him among other writers in "the current literature of the world" (975). Some of Hawthorne's future prefatorial commonplaces with regard to his own art are there expressed in the third person: Aubépine is described as "remote," a writer "without an audience," and a lover of allegory; in turn, his works are described as having "the aspect of scenery and people in the clouds" (975).

The preface ends with a catalogue of Hawthorne's own works published by the time, but with their titles translated to French. The catalogue is just a confirmation of what the reader might suspect from the reviewer's presentation or from the very name "Aubépine," a literal

translation for "hawthorn."[63] More than a linguistic joke, the name is a key to the underlying ideology of the world literary space, which connects a number of references in the preface, such as "foreign literature," "the current literature of the world," and "Eugene Sue." Sue, in particular, serves as a model for the reviewer to compare Aubépine with: "Our author is voluminous: he continues to write and publish with as much praiseworthy and indefatigable prolixity, as if his efforts were crowned with the brilliant success that so justly attends those of Eugene Sue" (976).

The French literary space is the destination of Hawthorne's imaginary dislocation in the pseudo-allographic preface to "Rappaccini's Daughter." But while imagining himself as a French author through his reviewer – or third degree deputy – he gives prominence to his "obscurity" (which is also that of the North American literature at that time), and foregrounds the peripheral situation of this literature in relation to that of France. To a certain extent, the movement from the periphery to the center enacted by Hawthorne in his preface parallels the verticality of Dickens's dislocation towards a higher place in his preface to *Sketches by Boz*.

In his preface, Hawthorne gestures towards basic cosmopolitan ideals which would be developed later, such as universality, literary freedom, and detachment from national boundaries: "His fictions are sometimes historical, sometimes of the present day, and sometimes, so far as can be discovered, have little or no reference to time or space" (975). In "The Custom-House" preface to the *Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne would reinforce the idea of detachment in his frequently quoted statement "I am a citizen of somewhere else" (157). As Pascale Casanova explains in her account of the nineteenth-century world literary space: "French literary space, having imposed

[63] As Lea Bertani Vozar Newman informs us in *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*: (Boston: G.K.Hall, 1979): "the easily identifiable pseudonym was bestowed many years earlier by a Mr. Schaeffer who taught Hawthorne French during the summer he spent in Maine in 1837" (237).

itself as universal, was adopted as a model: not insofar as it was French, but insofar as it was autonomous – which is to say purely literary" (87).

Interestingly, the story, which was originally published in the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, attracted the attention of French critics to the hitherto unknown North American author. In his *Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1968), Daniel Moncure Conway ascribes this interest to the author's *nom de plume* Aubépine (40). One critic in particular, the aforementioned Émile Montégut, seems to have taken very seriously the metaphorical link between "Aubépine" and the story that follows the preface, set on a garden of poisonous plants created by the scientist Giacomo Rappaccini in medieval Padua. As Michael Anesko notes in reviewing the critic, Montégut conflates Monsieur de l'Aubépine and Sir Giacomo Rappacini by using imagery derived from the story to judge the author (29). In Montégut's words: "there is something unhealthy in his work that at first we do not discern, but that in the long run acts upon us like a very weak and slow poison" (qt. in Anesko 29). Hawthorne's preface, thus, may be seen as a clever market move: not only did it establish an authorial connection with the story it antecedes (a strategy he would return to in "The Custom-House") but it also served as a means to reach literary audiences outside the United States. The story, nevertheless, an explosive combination of religious and sexual themes, seems to have required the protection of a preface deflecting attention from the topic to the author (likewise protected by the pseudonym). The quest for autonomy in this case is checked by the very moral horizon of Hawthorne's time.

In *The Marble Faun* fifteen years later, Hawthorne would resort to Italy once again as a source for his fiction. In his preface, the author focuses on another characteristic lacking in the North American space besides the freedom France embodied. In a passage that has become famous in studies on the Hawthorne/James relation, Hawthorne elects antiquity as a crucial

element for Romance.[64] His "native land," with its "common place prosperity" did not offer the writer "the mystery" or "the picturesque and gloomy wrong" necessary for the development of that genre. In his aphoristic and poetic conclusion: "Romance and poetry, like ivy, lichens, and wall-flowers, need Ruin to make them grow" (855).

What Hawthorne expresses in relation to themes for Romance extends to the structure of the world literary space in his time. In this perspective, The USA appears again as a dominated literary region, less endowed with symbolic capital because of its short history. In order to assert his authority, the author needs to resort to the symbolic capital of the older European literary traditions and also to other artistic forms, sculpture being the one Hawthorne focused on in the *Marble Faun*.

Surprisingly, the models of artistic authority mentioned are not European, but rather North American. In the preface, Hawthorne pays tribute to expatriate artists Paul Akers, William W. Story, Randolph Rogers and Harriet Hosmer. He explains his appropriation of Aker's bust of Milton, the Pearl-Diver statue, and Story's statue of Cleopatra, all of which he transferred to the fictional universe of *The Marble Faun*. This appropriation is somewhat playfully referred to as "robbery" but the author takes great pains to clarify he has not stolen the personalities of the aforementioned artists. He expresses the wish that he had also used Roger's *Columbus Doors* (1871), a series of bas-relief commissioned for the United States Capitol and which tells the story of the discovery of America. The fact that he mentions, with admiration, this particular work by Roger (not even used in the novel), bears witness to the iconic force of the Genoese explorer and the epic tale of conquest in the nineteenth century U.S. consciousness. Among the texts that provide further evidence for this influence are Washington Irving's biography *The Life and*

[64] I refer again to Thaddeo K. Babiiha's *The James-Hawthorne Relation: Bibliographical Essays*.

Voyage of Christopher Columbus (1828), Walt Whitman's poem "A Prayer of Columbus" (1900) and Henry James's Preface to *The Aspern Papers* (1908).

Before looking at James's preface to the *Aspern Papers*, however, I will discuss how the image of the navigator is used in the opening pages of James's first preface in the New York Edition. In the Preface to *Roderick Hudson*, James recreates the process by which he became a novelist. He writes:

> "Roderick Hudson" was my first attempt at a novel, a long fiction with a 'complicated subject,' and I recall again the quite uplifted sense with which my idea, such as it was, permitted me at last to put quite out to sea. I had but hugged the shore on sundry previous small occasions; bumping about, to acquire skill, in the shallow waters and sandy coves of the 'short story' and master as yet of no vessel constructed to carry a sail. The subject of 'Roderick' figured to me vividly this employment of canvas, and I have not forgotten, even after long years, how the blue southern sea seemed to spread immediately before me and the breath of the spice-islands to be already in the breeze. (4).

As in the early prefaces of Dickens and Hawthorne, James's early self is linked with the writing of short stories. By contrast, the voice in the preface to *Roderick Hudson* is more blatantly autobiographical than in the prefaces by Hawthorne and Dickens discussed above. Yet, figuration is as much a self-fashioning procedure in James as it is in the other authors. Thus, whereas in Genettean terms this preface would be read as unequivocally authorial, from the perspective of self-fashioning adopted here it is poised between James's autographical stance and the impulse towards performing different identities and appearing as an Other, which could be likened to the *actorial* mode. Notably, James suppresses most analogy signals and appropriates

the metaphor consistently in the passage: "permitted me to… put quite out to sea;" "I had but hugged the shore on previous occasions."

What explains James's use of an image of such imperialist resonance in this preface? In order to dramatize his authorial growth, he employs not only an image, but a narrative intimately bound up with sixteenth-century colonial expansionism in the pacific. Just as "the spice-islands" were expected to reward the Portuguese explorers with products of commercial value – the spices – the novel should reward James with the prize of success and recognition. Like Dickens's aeronaut, the navigator can only achieve such prize by showing "mastery" over his vehicle and affective involvement with his work.

But James's image is not as fortuitous as the one used by Dickens. The author returns to the naval metaphor in the Preface to *The American*: "I ask myself indeed, if possibly, recognizing after I was launched the danger of an inordinate leak – since the ship has truly a hole in its side more than sufficient to have sunk it – I may have managed, as a counsel of mere despair, to stop my ears against the noise of waters and pretend to myself I was afloat…" (21). Here James writes about his infatuation with the topic of his second novel, an infatuation largely accountable for his lack of control over its overall structure during the course of serialization.

The tale shifts then from the difficulties and anxieties the author experienced during this course to a more reassuring episode: the development of the story in the author's consciousness. This episode begins in an American "horse-car," where James first got his "theme" of a North American wronged by snobbish socialites in Paris, and moves to the French capital where he had "everything that was needed to make my conception concrete" (23). The movement parallels that of his protagonist Christopher Newman, but instead of disappointment, James finds answers: "The objectivity it had wanted it promptly put on, and if the questions had been, with the usual

intensity, for my hero and his crisis – the whole formidable list, the who? the what? the when?... – they gathered their answers in the cold shadow of the Arc de Triomphe, for fine reasons, very much as if they had been plucking spring flowers for the weaving of a frolic garland" (23).

Paris is more conducive to the growth of one's imagination than the US. James reinforced the insufficiency of his native country in comparison to Europe in countless moments in his career, especially in his book on Hawthorne for The English Men of Letters. The celebration of Paris – "the great Paris harmony" (27) – runs parallel to the author's self-celebration in the preface, for which the Arc de Triomphe serves as a perfect symbol. The reference to the Arc de Triomphe resonates in other passages such as the one in which James recalls hearing, with pleasure, "a troop of curaissers" (26) outside his window, or when he mentions a "black-framed Empire portrait-medallion suspended in the centre of each white panel of my almost noble old salon" (28) in his house on the Rue de Luxemboug. These details help compose an image of the author as closely associated not only with Paris – the city of his master Balzac and the most prestigious literary city at the time – but also with the imperial power of its recent past.

As he surrounds himself with elements connected to imperial power, James is not only projecting an image of achievement and nobility but he is also defending himself against criticism for his short-comings in *The American*. As John H. Pearson notes: "One of the primary tasks of the New York Edition prefaces is to draw a defensible boundary around James's works and thereby to protect his aesthetics of fiction, which is to say, his literary career" (*The Prefaces of Henry James* 29). But as John Carlos Rowe suggests, James's defensiveness is related to his difficulty in locating the originary moment of creation, "the point at which it would mark its difference from life and thus justify the author's identity" (*Theoretical Dimensions* 237).

In the preface to *The Aspern Papers,* James offers an alternative way in which to think about the originary moment:

> Not that I quite know indeed what situations the seeking fabulist does "find:" he seeks them enough assuredly, but his discoveries are, like those of the navigator, the chemist, the biologist, scarce more than alert recognitions. He *comes upon* the interesting thing as Columbus came upon the isle of San Salvador, because he had moved in the right direction for it – also because he knew, with the encounter, what "making land" then and there represented. Nature had so placed it, to profit – if as profit we may measure the matter! – by his fine unrest, just as history, "literary history" we in this connexion call it, had in an out-of-the-way corner of the great garden of life thrown off a curious flower that I was to feel worth gathering as soon as I saw it. I got wind of my positive fact, I followed the scent. It was in Florence years ago; which is precisely, of the whole matter, what I like most to remember.

Rendering the process of creation in these terms helps James guard himself against the accusations of failure. There is an element of passivity in the mere accident of encountering the subject, but the result of such an encounter depends on the ability of the observer to recognize its value. The moment of recognition requires preparation and the right frame of mind from the observer. This frame of mind seems in tune with Pratt's "planetary consciousness" and is adjusted to exploration and invasion, two key activities in the colonial enterprise.

James's alignment with the ideology of "planetary consciousness" can account for the fact that the image of the Genoese navigator is intertwined with the reference to the Garden of Life. In several passages of the New York Edition Prefaces, James uses botanical metaphors

("germ" being one of the most common words) and appears in the guise of a "herborizer," one of the bourgeois figures Pratt mentions. In the passage above, James lists the "chemist" and "the biologist" alongside the navigator; other bourgeois professional figures such as painter, architect, and geometer are used consistently throughout the New York Edition.

But the predominant domain in the passage is that of exploitive capitalism, signaled not only by "making land" but also by "profit." According to Laurence B. Holland, the metaphors in James's Prefaces "are neither incidental nor symptomatic of a narrowed range of interest but reveals the essays' profundity and daring" (156). Holland goes on to observe how the language of exploitive capitalism is connected with that of religious sacrifice, a connection that indicates James's deep involvement with his art. Holland's view reinforces the idea of James as a tormented master that several biographers, including James himself, sought to convey. Alternatively, we may see the vocabularies of exploitive capitalism and religious sacrifice as James's willingness to tap into powerful narratives to monumentalize particular places, advertise his cosmopolitanism, and reach more audiences, with the implicit increase of sales these audiences could yield.[65]

In this respect, I would go along with Quentin Anderson when he states that "In [James] the nascent imperial self conquers the great world of European culture and carries it home in triumph" (*The Imperial Self* 167). This idea is in keeping with the role Florence plays in the Columbus passage quoted above. Inconsistently, James evokes Columbus landing in San Salvador, but it is Italy that supplies him with what he needs. His effort resides in the projection of an image of authority that is more appealing to European audiences.

[65] Michael Anesko has convincingly shown that the image of Henry James as disinterested aesthete, indifferent towards the commercial aspect of his work, is at odds with the author's reactions to the lack of popularity of some of his novels, and especially to the poor sales of the New York Edition of his works. See: *"Friction with the Market:" Henry James and the Profession of Authorship*, (New York: Oxford University Press: 1986).

What John Carlos Rowe notes about Poe and other nineteenth-century American intellectuals can help expand the discussion on the analogy with Columbus established in the Preface to *The Aspern Papers.*

> Poe admires and emulates powerful men and mythic heroes, striving to ally literature with military conquest, scientific knowledge, economic wealth, and political rule. His envy and ambition are by no means unusual among his contemporaries. Emerson's "Man Thinking" is variously compared with God, Napoleon, and such scientists as Newton and Herschel; Whitman models his poetic self on Jesus, Columbus, and Lincoln. Despite his criticism of the American Transcendentalists, Poe endorsed their claims regarding art's powerful influence in modern societies, especially in its ability to expand our horizons and carry us into new territory ("Space, the Final Frontier," 2-3).

Notably, though, as we can see in James's preface to *The Aspern Papers*, the "new territory" evoked in James's reference to Columbus does not represent an expansion of horizons. The reason for this may be that instead of seeking empowerment and enlightenment, as was the case of the Romantics mentioned in the passage above, James is after empowerment, enlightenment, but also literary autonomy, which he could only find in European cosmopolitanism.

Naturally, the images and metaphors used in the New York Edition are so various, and encompass so many domains, that the analysis carried out above inevitably runs the risk of being reductive. It must be observed, once again, that the prefaces are the product of interplay of different selves: the mature writer recollecting the apprentice years; the young James striving with the initial difficulties in the quest for autonomy; the reader and critic of the old works; the theorist of the novel, among others. These selves, however, are part of a single effort of self-

monumentalization, and as I have shown above, this self-monumentalization underlies a lot of the vocabularies employed throughout the prefaces.

The dislocations examined above put geographical *spaces* in perspective, spaces that are not neutral but that carry specific ideological associations. The dislocated selves of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James dwell on such associations as means of empowerment or as ways "to project and control a socially significant space" (Bruster/Weimann vii). At the same time, these authors seek to enhance their images through these associations and be recognized as autonomous artists. Autonomy, however, appears as misleading as the disguises used by those authors: as they try to detach themselves from national, economic, or political constraints, they reveal the force of these constraints in their careers: the exertions imposed by the publishing industry in Dickens's case, the drama of being an author in a country without symbolic capital in Hawthorne's, or the competition one faces with other writers, artists, or activities in James's. In all these cases, the reader gets a sense of authorship as a belief and an elusive place around which writers wander through their many impersonations.

6

The Preface-Turned-Stage: Authorial Performance and the "Theatre of Images"

6.1. The Theatrical Trope, the Performative and the "Theatre of Images"

In the previous chapters I discussed examples of the unstable boundary between the *authorial* and *actorial* modes in the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James. In this chapter, I articulate this instability with a discussion of the theatrical analogy in those texts. The theatrical *trope* gives relief to the performative aspect of authorship and puts the whole game of figurations seen in the prefaces under a new light. While this game of figurations shows the fluidity of authorial identity, it also testifies to the authors' painstaking search for legitimacy and authority.

The authority of the theater in the nineteenth century stemmed from its being a much older genre than the novel and a more popular form of entertainment. Although the genre is the underlying instance of authority in most cases, this authority is best perceived in a host of figures and theatrical elements evoked by preface writers. The two main figures I shall be concerned with in my analyses are the stage manager and the dramatist. I shall also give particular attention to the *stage*, the controlling metaphor of this chapter and one of the *loci* of enunciation for preface speakers. Other elements pertaining to the theatrical field, such as *actors*, *drama*, *audience*, among others, assist the discussion at some points. More than part of a catalogue of references to the theatre, these elements matter because they illuminate aspects of authorial performance.

The idea of authorship as performance has been frequently used in analyses of the authors under consideration. In my reading of the prefaces I draw from studies such as Mario Ortiz-Robles's "Dickens Performs Dickens;" Joseph Litvak's *"*Making a Scene: Henry James's Theater of Embarrassment*;*" and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's "Shame, Theatricality and Queer Performativity: Henry James's *The Art of the Novel*," among others.[66] In addition to helping in the analysis of authors such as Dickens and James, Litvak and Sedgwick offer, respectively, the historical and theoretical bases for my discussion of the theatrical *trope* in the prefaces. The two main concepts I shall be working with are "the performative" and "the theatre of images," the latter of which I draw from Reinaldo Marques's aforementioned "The Literary Archive and the Writer's Images."

In *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth Century English Novel*, Joseph Litvak contends that nineteenth century novels by Jane Austen, Charles Dickens, and Henry James destabilize the "distinction between a society of spectacle and a society of surveillance" (ix). The nineteenth century, according to him, was marked by a "fall from the theatricality of eighteenth-century culture into the world of domesticity, subjectivity, and psychology, whose intimate, personalized scale, far from providing refuge from surveillance, installs it…" (ix). But as he goes on to add, the nineteenth century texts he examines are theatrical (albeit less overtly than in the eighteenth century) because they are caught in the Foucaltian web of "vigilance and visibility – of looking and being looked at" (x).

[66] The volumes in which Litvak's and Sedgwick's chapters were published contain other important sections for the historical-theoretical framework of this chapter and because of this I provide their full information here with the specific page number of the chapters: Joseph Litvak, *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel*. (Berkeley: U of California P, 1992. 195-235); Eve K. Sedwick. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*." (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.35-67).

Notwithstanding the fact that Litvak deals mostly with novels, I see prefatory writing in the period as a product of the same "fall from theatricality" and the privatization of culture. Moreover, the pattern "vigilance/visibility" is largely applicable to the general use of the preface as a means of audience control and self-promotion. The specific argument I shall be supporting throughout the next two sections is that the theatrical *trope* in the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James reveals a conflict between self-display and self-preservation – or between the desire to appear and the impulse to disappear (or appear as an Other). It follows that whatever the mode of self-fashioning (self-display or self-preservation), it is dependent on a particular platform (the stage) for its manifestation and performance.

My immediate source for using terms such as "performance," "performativity," or, more aptly, "the performative," is Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy and Performativity*. As the author puts it, "'Performative' at the present moment carries the authority of two quite different discourses, that of theater on the one hand, and of speech act theory and deconstruction on the other" (7). Still according to Sedgwick, whereas the theater is associated with the extroversion of the actor's performance, the speech act testifies to an introspective movement of the speaker (7). This is because in J.L. Austin's theory of speech acts, the performative is characterized as being an utterance always in the *first-person*, singular, present, indicative. In Austin's taxonomy, the *performative* is distinguished from the *constative*, a type of utterance whose function is to describe events. By contrast, the "performative" is linked with the act which the verb is meant to perform in real situations of communication, that is, "I promise" promises, "I apologize" apologizes, "I declare" declares.

Where Austin sees a linkage between signifier (the performative verb) and the act, the deconstructive take on "performativity," especially in Paul de Man and J. Hillis Miller, finds a

"*dis*linkage precisely of cause and effect between the signifier and the world" (Sedgwick 7). There is also in de Man, as Sedgwick notes, the possibility of seeing the relationship between the performative and its reference as one of "torsion" and "mutual perversion" (7).[67] Given the odd nature of the prefaces being examined, turned both to the reader and to the "inmost me" of the speaker, all of the above perspectives are pertinent to the analyses. In this light, the "mutual perversion" of performativity and reference is especially productive when it comes to looking at the images convoked by the authors in their texts.

Reinaldo Marques indicates an alternative way in which to understand the "mutual perversion" of performativity and reference when he writes about the roles played by authors in modernity. Instead of focusing on single acts or utterances, he treats the author within the scope of a multiplicity of figurations disseminated through media technologies. As he explains: "the writer is broken into several figurations: the craftsman of words that emerges out of the work; the intellectual who represents particular positions to the audience and who is capable of challenging power institutions; … fragments of life disseminated in interviews, narratives, chats and reports" (61).[68] The author disseminated in this way cannot be reconciled with a single official image created either by the author himself or by institutions such as the family, the academy, the state or the literary market. He is, as are all of us, part of a "theatre of images," an array of scenic identities mediated by countless supports such as "photos, blogs, twitter, facebook, orkut, youtube, podcasts" (60). As Marques goes on to note: "Dissociated from the empirical personage, the author constitutes itself as a discursive strategy, thus signaling the existence of

[67] Another major theory of performativity is Judith Butler's, which also operates along the lines of unsettling fixed notions of identity. See *Gender Trouble: Gender and the Subversion of Identity*, (New York: Routledge, 1999).
[68] My translation. "O escritor se decompõe em diversas figurações: o artista da palavra testemunhado pela obra; o intelectual que representa um ponto de vista para a audiência, capaz de dizer verdades ao poder; ... fragmentos de vida disseminados em entrevistas, depoimentos, bate-papos, reportagens."

discontinuities between discourse and the real, which problematizes the play of identities and symmetries" (65).[69]

Also persuasive in Marques's text is the argument according to which the condition of "subject-image" is what guarantees the afterlife of authors. Although the authors I discuss had access to fewer media for disseminating their images, they were aware of the need to become icons to survive. Still, Hawthorne, Dickens and James were immersed in diverse cultural environments blistering with media such as newspapers, magazines, books, theatre, photography, painting and others. Their world was already a world of words, images, performance, and wide circulation. Their prefaces, in particular, evidence the need to constitute "theaters" and to perform roles in accordance with their ambitions, times, and readership.

The "theater of images" adds a different level of interpretation to "the performative." Not restricted to speech acts or to theatrical performance, it can refer to a whole range of activities, behavioral patterns and interventions. In this sense, it can be read along Stephen Greenblatt's self-fashioning, which "invariably crosses the boundaries between the creation of literary characters, the shaping of one's own identity, the experience of being molded by forces outside one's control, the attempt to fashion other selves" (3). Thus, authorial performance, one of the means by which self-fashioning processes are made public, is seen as a result of both intentional impulses and unconscious forces. Authors fashion themselves in and through their *choices* of images, *representational spaces*, tones, narratives, but they are also fashioned by history, location, and by the systems of signs and cultural references they share with society as a whole.

[69] My Translation. "Dissociado do personagem empírico, o autor se constitui então como estratégia discursiva, indiciando a existência de descontinuidades entre o discurso e o real, que problematizam o jogo das identidades e simetrias."

Examining the theatrical *trope* and the performative in the prefaces can help us understand how "fashioning" and "being fashioned by" operate. However, I recognize the difficulty of this enterprise, especially because verbal discourse, the medium of the prefaces and of my criticism, often blurs the lines between those two events. Moreover, as I write about Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, I also "give shape" to images, views, and versions of these authors, which I select according to several instances of power, including not only verbal discourse, but also academia, and my own conscious and unconscious motivations.

5.2. Dickens and Hawthorne as Stage-Managers

From a formalist point of view, the theatrical *trope* can be seen as one of the several framing strategies used by authors in paratextual writing. It duplicates the framing function of the paratext itself and creates an effect of self-reference or *mise en abyme* in the paratext. References to the theatre within the preface in particular may also be seen as forms to minimize the effect of reality the supposedly referential nature of the preface is meant to convey. Additionally, as I mentioned in the previous section, the theatrical *trope* constitutes an appeal to authority, and an acknowledgment of the superiority of drama in relation to the more recent genre of the novel. As I also indicated in the previous section, I look at this *trope* as an instrument for authorial performance, which allows for a perception of the preface as an arena (or *locus* of enunciation) for the exertion of authority through role-playing and figuration.

"Before the Curtain," William Makepeace Thackeray's introduction to *Vanity Fair,* is a plausible point of departure for a discussion on the theatrical *trope* in nineteenth-century prefatory writing. This iconic text was published at the end of the novel's serial run in 1848 and

called attention for its confluence of author and "manager of the Performance." This theatrical persona mediates between the world of the "fair" – which extends to that of the readers – and the puppet show standing for the novel. As an outside observer, he sees the fair with condescension and "melancholy," and after introducing the audience to the contents of the story, he thanks them for welcoming his "show," bows to "his patrons," and "retires" before the curtain rises (5). As Joan Stevens explains with regard to the theatrical analogy and the serialization of *Vanity Fair*: "The novel, like an established play, has been making regular appearances; its author may well have a sense that the characters are an acting company and he their stage manager" (291).

Despite the popularity of *Vanity Fair* and its introduction, Thackeray was not the first Victorian writer to use the theatrical analogy. As Stevens observes, Dickens had used the image of the stage manager ten years before: first in an "Address to Readers" appended to series Number 10 (January, 1837) of the *Pickwick Papers*; and later in his "Editor's Address on the completion of the First Volume" of *Bentley's Miscellany* (June, 1837). It is worth adding that, although the stage manager is absent from the 1847 preface to the Cheap Edition of *Pickwick Papers*, the theatrical analogy is also present there. In what follows I shall deal exclusively with the two authorial prefaces accompanying the novel: the Address to series Number 10 and the 1847 preface to the bound volume.

I reserve some space here, before reading the prefaces, for a few words on the relationship of Dickens with the theatre. According to Simon Callow, the acclaimed British actor responsible for one of Dickens's latest biographies, *Charles Dickens and the Great Theatre of the World* (2012), Dickens's character was often regarded as theatrical by his contemporaries (xi). Before becoming a novelist, Dickens had taken part in several amateur theatricals, had written his own plays, and continued to perform later on in life with his reading tours. His novels

often feature characters and situations associated with the dramatic arts, even if, as Joseph Litvak argues in "Dickens and Sensationalism,"[70] these portrayals do not explore the full subversive potential of the theatre (115). What is interesting to keep in mind with regard to Dickens and the theatre is the way he fashioned himself as a performer and the several roles he created for himself in his career.

The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club marked the beginning of Dickens's long career in the market of novel serialization. Immediately following the success of the sketches collected under the title of *Sketches by Boz*, *Pickwick* gave Dickens the opportunity to develop his skills at speaking with the public through his Bozzian persona. The preface to series Number 10 contains a formula Dickens would use in several subsequent prefaces (including the one to the first series of *Sketches by Boz*, published a month later). This formula consisted of the use of a third person voice, a deferential tone, and the celebration of the success and popularity of the series.

In the preface, Boz starts by promising not to prolong the story beyond the previous estimate of twenty numbers. He also refers back to the fictional device of the papers of the *Pickwick Club* – which he kept under his supervision – to maintain interest in the numbers to come. He then ends the piece with the theatrical metaphor Thackeray adopted in *Vanity Fair*:

> With this short speech, Mr. Pickwick's Stage-Manager makes his most grateful bow, adding, on behalf of himself and publishers, what the late eminent Mr. John Richardson, of Horsemonger Lane Southwark, and the Yellow Caravan with the Brass Knocker, always said on behalf of himself and company, at the close of every performance –

[70] "Dickens and Sensationalism" is another chapter in *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel* (109-47).

> "Ladies and gentlemen, for these marks of your favor, we beg to return you our sincere thanks; and allow us to inform you, that we shall keep perpetually going on beginning again, regularly, until the end of the fair." (882).

In this passage, the image of the stage manager is reinforced by the reference to the famous itinerant dramatic showman, John Richardson. While the allusion and the speech make the dramatic effect seem more concrete, they disrupt the unity of the authorial voice and make "Boz" appear as a ventriloquist. "Performative" here operates on two registers: that of role-playing (Boz appearing as Richardson) and of a speech act in the Austinian sense: the speaker "begs," asks for permission, and promises to offer more performances to the public. With a formulaic speech and the reference to Richardson, Boz selects a contemporary and popular form of entertainment, and thus aims to reach larger audiences.

The formality of the address ventriloquized by Boz contrasts with the liberty conveyed through the image of the "friend taken by the button" in the preface to the Cheap Edition. Dickens opens his preface with the following words: "An author who has much to communicate under this head, and expects to have it attended to, may be compared to a man who takes his friend by the button at a Theatre door, and seeks to entertain him with a personal gossip before he goes in to the play" (883). The passage is reminiscent of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner," in which an old grizzled sailor approaches a young wedding-guest and starts telling his story.[71] In both cases, the story-teller stands in the way of another performance (the play in Dickens's preface and the wedding in Coleridge's poem), thus displacing the "stage" and turning it to himself. This displacement subverts the marginal place of

[71] Hawthorne also "seizes the public by the button" (121) in his 1850 preface to "The Custom-House," a metaphor he might have taken from either Dickens or Coleridge.

the preface itself in relation to the novel: it becomes a center of attention and aesthetic experience in its own right.

Also noteworthy in the passage is that the stated purpose of the address is not initially to express intent, define a theory of art, offer dodges for criticism, or any of the functions listed by Genette.[72] The author "seeks to entertain," a role associated with the fictional/theatrical universe. The theater-goer, however, stands at the door of the Theater, and he hears the story as a friend of the author's. Figuring the reader as a friend, as we have seen, was a common tactic in Dickens's prefatorial self-fashioning. In turn, the situation sets the scene for Dickens to perform his identities through an account of origins.

In this account, he appears as a "man of three-and-twenty" twelve years before the present address. He narrates how the publishers offered him the chance to write something to be published in "shilling numbers," associated in the author's mind with the material "carried about the country by pedlars, and over some of which I remember to have shed innumerable tears, before I served my apprenticeship to Life" (884). The narrative shifts to an even earlier time when Dickens was possibly a child and a *reader* of the stories that made him cry. Everything is magnified and intensified: his growth is depicted as "apprenticeship to Life" and the reader sheds tears over the books he reads.

Dickens's appeal to emotions continues in the next paragraph in which he tells the story of his becoming an author with the publication of his first sketch in a magazine. The passage is introduced in a suggestively theatrical manner and the display of feelings and reactions gains prominence as the narrative unfolds:

[72] See Chapter 9, "The Functions of the Original Preface" in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (196-237).

> When I opened my door in Furnival's Inn to the managing partner who represented the firm, I recognized in him the person from whose hands I had bought two or three years previously, and whom I had never seen before or since, my first copy of the Magazine in which my first effusion – dropped stealthily one evening at twilight, with fear and trembling, into a dark letter-box, in a dark office, up a dark court in Fleet Street – appeared in all the glory of print; on which occasion by the bye, – how I recollect it! – I walked down to Westminster Hall, and turned into it for half-an-hour, because my eyes were so dimmed with joy and pride, that they could not bear the street, and were not fit to be seen there. (884).

The dramatization of the moment is conveyed through feelings ("fear and trembling") and through the repetition of the adjective to describe the place where he had deposited his "hopes of future fame:" "dark letter-box," "dark office," "dark court." Dickens interrupts the narrative with an exclamation: "how I recollect!" which adds to the theatrical effect of his account. And if the mere description of emotions is not enough, he ends by rendering those feelings visible: "my eyes were so dimmed with joy." The passage additionally shows Dickens's sense of "being looked-at" –"[my eyes] were not fit to be seen there" – one of the characteristics of the Foucaultian "vigilance/visibility" pattern which Litvak articulates with nineteenth century theatricality.

As Mario Ortiz-Robles remarks in "Dickens Performs Dickens," "the prefaces can be said to stage a curious confluence of history-of-the-book narratives with those of the construction-of-the-subject by virtue of their performativity" (474). As he writes further on in his essay: "The fictionalization of Dickens in the prefaces thus becomes a disfiguration of Dickens the author insofar as it is a deliberate attempt to transform the author into a character, the agent

into an actor" (476). I would add that this disfiguration happens by virtue of a multiplicity. The several personas, narratives, and roles enacted by the author (stage manager, reader, child, friend) are engulfed in the "theatre of images" Reinaldo Marques has described and show how Dickens's prefaces confuse the authorial and actorial modes.

Hawthorne also created his own "theatre of images" in the figures of guide, host, decapitated surveyor, obscure man of letters, and displaced national author. Although Hawthorne was prone to dramatize his own authorship in the prefaces just as Dickens had done in his, his tactic was based more on self-deprecation than on self-celebration. Lacking the confidence (and popularity) of Dickens to approach his readers more directly, Hawthorne opted instead to thematize the difficulty of the relationship between author and reader, a difficulty largely rooted in his resentment over not having enough readers. His use of the theatrical *trope* in the preface to the *Marble Faun*, thus, is motivated less by a fit of extroversion than by his clinging to a formal and distant form of address to compensate for his failures to establish an intimate contact with the reader in the model of Dickens's stance.

Still, his awareness of prefatory writing as a special instance of performance is notable in the opening lines of that preface: "It is now seven or eight years (so many, at all events, that I cannot precisely remember the epoch) since the Author of this Romance last appeared before the Public" (853). The author's "appearances" refer to Hawthorne's previous prefaces, "addressed nominally to the Public at large, but really to a character whom he felt entitled to use far greater freedom" (853). After expressing disappointment at never having "encountered" this character, he mentions that he wrote for him despite being completely ignored by "the great Eye of the Public." Although this great "Eye" is unequivocally linked with the reader in the text, it could also be brought to bear on the experience of a theater-goer witnessing the author's

"appearances." The great "Eye" may be additionally linked with Bentham's Panopticon and with Jonathan Arac's description of the wholeness of perception sought by authors such as Dickens, Carlyle, Hawthorne, and Melville, in their fiction. The difference here, nevertheless, is that the author is not the one who has the viewing power, but rather the object of the viewer's scrutiny.

The impulse to go public seen in the preface to the *Marble Faun* is at odds with a more private tendency found in this text. The author superimposes the epistolary over the theatrical, thus creating a clash between the public and private metaphorical domains and enhancing even more the resentment which is at the heart of the address as a whole:

> Unquestionably, this Gentle, Kind, Benevolent, Indulgent, and most Beloved and Honoured Reader, did once exist for me, and (in spite of the infinite chances against a letter's reaching its destination, without a definite address) duly received the scrolls which I flung upon whatever wind was blowing, in the faith they would find him out. But is he extant now? In these many years, since he last heard from me, may he not have deemed his earthly task accomplished, and have withdrawn to the Paradise of Gentle Readers, wherever it may be ...? If I find him at all, it will probably be under some mossy grave-stone, inscribed with a half-obliterated name, which I shall never recognize. (853).

The author finally accomplishes his vengeance on the reader; he has consigned him to the same place of obscurity as the one he occupies as a writer. The antagonism between author and reader suggested in the passage is tinged with jocularity, but it is still capable of maintaining the tension between both parties and of contributing to the dramatic effect of the address.

Thomas R. Moore comments on the tensions created by Hawthorne in his prefaces in "Poses in the Prefaces: A Rhetoric of Oppositions" (1994): "Hawthorne's strategy in the prefaces

– his double purpose – is first, to address both his popular audience and a more discerning readership. But second, and more important, his purpose is to employ the dialectical tension created by his rhetoric of oppositions to say what he could not say outright" (74). Moore also notes that Hawthorne used his "rhetoric of oppositions" when he was writing "outside the parameters – and masks of fiction" (74). Hawthorne's rhetoric of oppositions can alternatively be understood as pointing to a lack of definite reference in the prefatory discourse (the "mutual perversion" of performativity and reference I mentioned earlier on); in such case, Hawthorne would not be writing as if he were "outside the parameters of fiction" because the fictive – as an intentional act which selects and appropriates elements from other referential fields (Iser xiv) – is already at play both at the threshold and in the main text.

The theatre as a referential field returns more explicitly in the preface to *The Marble Faun* after Hawthorne imagines the death of his reader: "I stand upon ceremony now, and, after stating a few particulars about the work which is here offered to the Public, must make my most reverential bow, and retire behind the curtain" (854). Hawthorne might have drawn the image from Thackeray, whose novels he read and whom he met during his consulship in England. In any case, the reference stages the abandonment of the personal and intimate form of address he attempted in his earlier prefaces.

Hawthorne makes a different use of the theatrical *trope* in his 1852 preface to *The Blithedale Romance*. Still, just as the theatrical in the former preface marks a distance from his intended "real" reader, in the latter this distance is marked in relation to the historical or "real" elements serving as immediate points of comparison for the story. Naturally, Hawthorne cannot disavow the relationship completely: he based his satire of utopian socialism on his own sojourn in the Brook Farm community in 1841. The novel also features one of Hawthorne's few first-

person narrators: Miles Coverdale, a bachelor poet whose misanthropic nature and self-doubt parallels Hawthorne the prefacer.

"…his present concern with the Socialist Community is merely to establish a theatre, a little removed from the highway of ordinary travel, where the creatures of his brain may play their phantasmagorical antics, without exposing them to too close a comparison with the actual events of real lives," thus writes Hawthorne in the preface to the novel. The theatrical analogy reinforces the proximity between the author and Miles Coverdale. As Brenda Wineapple notes: "Hawthorne's first-person narrator… believes he can best hold himself together by holding himself apart and conceives the world as a theatre, the book's dominant image" (247). The immediate subtext of a *Blithedale Romance* is indeed Shakespeare's *As You Like It*; the rural community of the novel is compared to the Forest of Arden and their members with the banished Duke and his party. Thus, the passage in Hawthorne's preface can be seen as an example of the fine line between the *authorial* and *actorial* modes, and Coverdale could actually be taken as a case study for understanding Hawthorne's continuing "Poses" in his prefaces.

The theatre aligns with the "neutral territory," ("The Custom-House," *CN* 149) another image Hawthorne uses to defend his theory of the Romance. In both cases, Hawthorne insists on the disconnection of fiction from reality and guides the reader towards the adoption of a "picturesque" view of the situations described. In the preface to the *Blithedale Romance,* he shows hints of the perception he would express more clearly in 1859 with regard to the place of The United States in affording elements conducive to producing that "picturesque" effect. The passage I quote comes immediately after the reference to the "theatre:"

> In the old countries, with which Fiction has long been conversant, a certain conventional privilege seems to be awarded to the romancer; his work is not put

> exactly side by side with nature; and he is allowed a license with regard to every-day Probability, in view of the improved effects which he is bound to produce thereby. Among ourselves, on the contrary, there is as yet, no Faery Land, so like the real world, that, in a suitable remoteness, none cannot well tell the difference, but with an atmosphere of strange enchantment, beheld through which the inhabitants have a propriety of their own. (633)

As in the passage from the preface to *The Marble Faun* I discussed in Chapter 5, Hawthorne idealizes the "Old Countries," in which writers supposedly have more freedom to do as they please in representing reality. In what seems to be an example of bad faith, however, Hawthorne shifts the attention from the writer to the "setting," which contains in itself the qualities that place it at a remove from nature.

The idea of bad faith can be further demonstrated if we note that the theatre in the preface works as a protective device against accusations that Hawthorne "robbed" the personalities of people he met during his sojourn. Margaret Fuller, the reformist and advocate for women's rights was a frequent visitor of Brook Farm, and has often been considered a model for Zenobia, the tragic heroine of the novel. Hawthorne's portrait of Zenobia is mostly negative and attests an anxiety towards feminine emancipation which the author expressed in several other occasions.

Hawthorne's theatre, thus, shows his attempt to control the reader, his images before the public, and the social threats he encountered in his times. But while staging authorial surveillance, he also reveals fragility in relation to the elements that imposed constraints upon his imagination, literary production, and autonomy. The "neutral territory" he finds in the stage allows him, despite that fragility, to imagine himself as merging with the stories he creates and transforming himself into spectacle before "the great Eye of the Public."

5.3. Drama and "Dramatist" in Henry James's Prefaces

The prefaces to The New York Edition are some of the most prominent examples of authorial performance in literary history. Not only was the Edition conceived as a monumental "act" and an authorial statement, but the texts abound in analogies to the theatre. In these texts, James often appears as the "dramatist," a figure analogous, in its prefatory use, to Hawthorne and Dickens's stage managers. But James also plays the roles of actor and spectator of his own autographical dramas as he tells them in the prefaces. James's stage is as ambiguous in its seeming extroversion as Hawthorne's, and the uses which it serves are related not only to his affective involvement with the composition of the works but also to his theory of the novel. Understanding these uses entail going through several of the prefaces, which in turn justifies placing James once again in a separate section from the other authors.

The epithet "dramatist" is one of the most pervasive substitutes for "author" in the New York Edition prefaces. Its frequency is perhaps only comparable to "painter" and "adventurer," and it needs to be understood in relation to James's sustained obsession with the theater. As Leon Edel notes in *Henry James:A Life* (1958), much of James's autobiography *A Small Boy and Others* is dedicated to "detailed recounting of nights at the play – pantomimes viewed in early childhood, old theatrical billboards with their lurid synopses of the plays and picturesque names of the stage folk, excursions to the theaters of New York and later of London and Paris" (31). Among the many performances he saw were "hastily cobbled up versions of Dickens's novels, the very names of whose characters – the Scrooges and Pickwicks, Oliver Twists and Paul Dombeys –assured full house" (31). But by the time James wrote the prefaces to the New York

Edition, the theater had come to be associated with failure as well, as his play *Guy Domville* "was howled off the stage" at its premiere in 1895 (Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling* 38).

The Tragic Muse and *The Awkward Age* (volumes V and VI in the New York Edition), bear witness to the strong influence of the theater in James's novelistic production in the last decades of the nineteenth century. In their respective prefaces, the theatrical analogy acquires special significance and illuminates aspects of James's authorial self-fashioning. I begin the discussion of James from the Preface to *The Awkward Age*, the one in which James makes the most extensive use of the "dramatist" figure.

One of James's purposes in the Preface to *The Awkward Age* is to respond to criticism for his overuse of dialogue in the story of a young girl coming of age in *fin de siècle* English society. After acknowledging his emulation of the style of the French writer knows as "Gyp," an emulation he did his best to dissimulate, he reproduces his publisher's grim verdict with regard to the novel's reception – "I'm sorry to say the book has done nothing to speak of" (108). Next, he sets about to giving himself the "reward" denied him, a reward rooted in "the singular interest attaching to the very intimacies of the effort" (109). What follows is a translation of this effort into the vocabulary of architecture. In contrast with the Preface to the *Portrait of a Lady*, the evoked space is not the space of domesticity, but rather something more akin to a ballroom or a stage, as the following passage shows: "… amusement deeply abides, I think in any artistic attempt the basis and groundwork of which are conscious of a particular firmness. On that hard fine floor the element of execution feels it may more or less confidently *dance*…" (109). A couple of lines later, he writes:

> I was thus to have here an envious glimpse, in carrying my design through, of that artistic rage and that artistic felicity which I have ever supposed to be intensest

> and highest, the confidence of the dramatist strong in the sense of his postulate. The dramatist has very to build, is committed to architecture, to construction at any cost; … This makes the active value of his basis immense, enabling him, with his flanks protected, to advance undistractedly, even if not at all carelessly, into the comparative fairy-land of the mere minor anxiety. … I rejoiced by that same token, to feel my scheme hold, and even a little ruefully watched it give me much more than I had ventured to hope. (110)

In this passage, the role of "dramatist" conflates with those of actor and spectator (and architect). The speaker "builds," moves in his projected stage, and "watches" his performance in retrospect. There is also a military suggestion in the phrase "with the flanks protected," which links this excerpt with some of the other situations I discussed in Chapter 5. Assuming several roles helps James convey the sense of control he has over the many phases of the composition process. The reader is supposed to "watch" this exhibition of control and recognize the author's effort and engagement with his *métier*. At the same time, he/she may have a more vivid perception of this effort through the figurative rendering of this engagement. As John H. Pearson argues: "James fashions himself just as he has created characters in the novels and the tales by forming a central consciousness upon which the world is reflected and then revealed to the reader." (*The Prefaces of Henry James* 43). By extension, the passage shows that the world that gets reflected is also the writer's "consciousness," that is, central consciousness and world converge in the prefaces.

James stretches the limits of the theatrical metaphor as he shifts the focus from "the dramatist" to his story. His object in *The Awkward Age* was to be thought of as illuminated by "lamps," each of which "would be the light of a single 'social occasion' in the history and intercourse of the characters concerned, and would bring out to the full the latent colour of the

scene in question and cause it to illustrate, to the last drop, its bearing on my theme" (110). Each of these lamps would correspond to an "Act" in the play, that is, a separate section in the novel. This method would, eventually, allow the story to tell itself without any interference from the author or "dramatist." In other words, once the curtain rises, the author is nowhere to be seen, even though he has already performed his own act before the audience.

A similar idea is expressed in the Preface to *The Tragic Muse*. According to James, the "triumph" of the artist – otherwise called the "charm-compeller" – is to be strictly attached to the work he performs or creates (96). This position raises doubts about the status of the prefaces and the authorial statements they mediate. If the "triumph" of the artist were so self-evident in the work, the author wouldn't need to strive so hard to justify it in these texts. This is complicated by the fact that James suggests, right at the outset, in the Preface to *Roderick Hudson*, that "the private history of any sincere work… looms with its own completeness in the rich, ambiguous aesthetic air" (4). Thus, the effort he makes in drawing attention to his authorial presence in the prefaces is at odds with the image of detached master he projects.

We may find a better articulation of this contradiction in the preface to *The Golden Bow.* James explains that the "central consciousness" is actually a "deputy" for the "creative power otherwise so veiled and disembodied" (327). The use of this deputy, someone in the story who can give the reader a more direct access to the events described, was one of the touchstones of the type of criticism practiced by new critics following in the footsteps of James, such as Richard P. Blackmur and Percy Lubbock. The concept of the central consciousness was a clever intervention in the literary field of the time and served James in his effort to superimpose literary modernity over the Realist novel of the previous generation. What the Preface to the *Golden Bowl* reveals, however, is that James maintains the belief in "the majesty of authorship" despite

seeming to go against it: "It's not that the muffled majesty of authorship doesn't here *ostensibly* reign; but I catch myself again shaking it off and disavowing the pretence of it" (328).

The principle of dissimulation, evident in the Preface to the *Golden Bowl*, is repeatedly exposed in other prefaces. I quote another passage from the preface to *The Tragic Muse*:

> If the art of the drama, as a great French master of it has said, is above all the art of preparations, that is true only to a less extent of the art of the novel, and true exactly in the degree in which the art of the particular novel comes near that of the drama. The first half of a fiction insists ever on figuring to me as the stage or theatre for the second half, and I have in general given so much space to making the theatre propitious that my halves have too often proved strangely unequal. Thereby has arisen with grim regularity the question of artfully, of consummately masking the fault and conferring on the false quantity the brave appearance of the true. (86)

Here James accounts for the lack of balance in his tripartite division in *The Tragic Muse*, a division based on three different cases or characters in the story, corresponding to actress Miriam Rooth, aspiring painter Nick Dormer, and Peter Sherringham. The theatrical metaphor in this context assumes a different function from the other situations examined so far. Still, the rationale behind the conception of the first half of the novel resembles that of "building" I examined in the Preface to *The Awkward Age.* The result is that the building, by contrast with the latter preface, threatens to weigh down on the body of the work as a whole. The author comes to rescue the safety and harmony of the architecture, but this rescue is performed after the construction, and one could wonder whether it happens in the novel or is only an effect of the Preface's rhetoric.

James might have failed to achieve the organic unity so crucial to his reputation as a novelist, but in the *Tragic Muse* he delivers one of his most successful heroines, Miriam Rooth, who also serves as a point of comparison with the author. It must be noted that the "triumph" of the artist I have discussed above is a reference to both the actress and to the dramatist. Additionally, Miriam Rooth exerts strict control over her public image while forging "private" identities to satisfy her audiences, an attitude that antedates the practice of contemporary celebrities and that parallels James's careful manipulation and selection of his personal experiences in the prefaces.

The senses in which James's prefaces engage performativity are thus various: firstly, they create spaces in which both authorial and actorial performance can be thematized and enacted; secondly, they dislocate the empirical author and foreground the disconnection of reference and discourse; thirdly, they evoke the authority of the theater and "invent" literary modernity; and lastly, they participate in the phenomenon of the promotion of private life, a phenomenon intimately related to Reinaldo Marques's "theatre of images." Still, one last aspect of James's performativity has not been fully articulated here: the ways in which the author relies on affect in his accounts of the processes of creation.

Affect is as important an aspect of James's prefatory discourse as it is of Dickens's and Hawthorne's, and in the three authors one gets a sense of the relationship between different modes of affect (pride, resentment, pleasure) and the theatrical. But the expression of affect takes on unprecedented variety and intensity in James's collection of prefaces. As I have shown before, the author often finds solace for his failures in the recollection of the "excitement" the adventure of composition afforded him. The act of revising the old works also triggers a series of reactions which the author displays in graphic and erotic terms.

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick brilliantly traces some of the erotic undercurrents in James's New York Edition. In her essay "Shame, Theatricality, and Queer Performativity: Henry James's *The Art of the Novel*," these erotic undercurrents get mapped around a number of lexical occurrences of sexual resonance, such as "fond," "issue," "center," "glove," among others. The critic's argument is that "tuning in" to these lexica, which are closely related to James's intimate involvement with his younger selves, his works, and with the act of "reparenting" them in The New York Edition, gives readers access to James's eroticism "not as superior, privileged eavesdroppers on a sexual narrative hidden from himself; rather, it is an audience offered the privilege of sharing in his exhibitionistic enjoyment and performance of a sexuality organized around shame" (54). The shame Sedgwick identifies in James's rendering of his early stories as immature or monstrous is, thus, one of the means of self-display in his prefaces.

Shame might additionally be related to embarrassment, another affect very much present in those texts. Both embarrassment and shame are related to the Foucaultian pattern "vigilance/visibility" which characterizes the "fall from theatricality" in the nineteenth century. Joseph Litvak uses the phrase "theater of embarrassment" as he analyzes some of James's works from the middle period. According to him, embarrassment, or "the experience of making a spectacle of oneself, presupposes one's lack of cognitive control over one's own signifying power, whose consequent excesses become available for identification, interpretation and supervision by others" (203). This view is in consonance with the premise I endorse according to which the author "fashions" himself at the same time as he is "fashioned by" forces outside the self. James's self-preservation in the prefaces, his effort to protect his privacy and to project an image of detached professional master, is undermined by an inherently desiring, anxious,

involved subject, who is prone to transform himself into a spectacle to gain the sympathy of the reader.

Although James's "theatre" is more multivalent and less formulaic than Dickens's and Hawthorne's, it is also dependent on affect, play, audience, and a tradition. Underlying the theatrical analogy in the texts examined above is the belief in authorship as a "drama" performed before the reader. This drama coordinates positions, allows for the establishment of authority, and disseminates "images" of the author. Asserting one's authority in this theatre involves, paradoxically, denying that authority at some moments. Additionally, the multiplicity of images the author sends out does not produce coherent unities that are so convenient for canonization and appropriation by different media and institutions. Still, the examples analyzed may be seen not only as dissimulation, theatricality, and manipulation, but also as registers of lives, of personal experiences, and historically specific systems of belief.

7

Conclusion

"… a figure is nothing without a setting."

--- Henry James

This statement from *The Bostonians* constitutes a suitable point of departure for some final considerations on prefatory self-fashioning. It must be remembered, at the outset, that in the novel the authorial remark does not carry major implications: instead of establishing a connection between the character and the setting, James dismisses the connection, justifying that the places described have no influence on his character, but are used merely "for old acquaintance sake and that of local colour" (190). When transposed to the context examined here, the Jamesian axiom acquires new meaning. According to the argument proposed, self-fashioning is constructed through spatial metaphors and authorial figures. If the "author" replaces the Jamesian "figure," and the spatial metaphors the "settings," these spatial metaphors (and also the preface figured as a space) become the elements that make the author go from "nothing" to something worthy of attention and admiration.

The metaphors that effect this transformation are not chosen at random. They are drawn from ideological systems, whose symbols, images, and narratives, have cultural currency and power. Using the house as a *locus* of enunciation, for example, made sense to the authors here analyzed because it was part of the domestic ideology with its extended ramifications in capitalist individualism. Domesticity was associated not only with the house (as property and private sphere), but also with the family, the woman, intimacy, and the affective ties that

protected individuals from the alienation of cities and from the nineteenth-century processes of modernization. When Hawthorne wrote the "Old Manse" and "The Wayside," he heightened the sentimental, escapist aspect of this particular *representational space*, and appeared in guises such as *host* and *guide* in order to establish intercourse with his readers, give them access to his thoughts and experiences, and downplay (or deflect the attention from) his anxieties concerning the commercial aspect of the literary activity.

Dickens also dissimulated the commercial aspect of literature when he used the house *trope* in his prefaces. As I have argued, the author owed much of his popularity to Victorian domesticity, and the house *trope* assumes different functions according to the moment of his career. Dickens sought to attain visibility and make himself present in society through the many situations he created in his prefaces to *Sketches by Boz*, *Pickwick Papers*, and *A Christmas Carol*, among others. The "friendly" relationships he established with his readers were based on affect and constituted the means by which he mythologized himself around the qualities of sincerity, dedication, and accomplishment.

James also employed the house *trope* to fashion himself, but the figures he used in the prefaces examined were the Master Builder, the Father, and the Land Surveyor. These images suggest a shift in perspective in prefatory self-fashioning in the transition from romantic to modernist aesthetics. James strove to project the images of professional artist and proprietor, images which conveyed more authority and were somehow in tune with the emerging principle of *autonomy*. James contributed to this belief by creating a set of rules for novelistic composition and also by defending the detachment of the artist from the fictional world of his stories, which can be seen in the Preface to *The Golden Bowl* discussed in Chapter 5. By contrast, the Prefaces to the New York Edition also reveal sentimental and romantic associations attached to the

domestic ideology or the home; these associations may be perceived not only in images of "parenting", but also in picturesque descriptions of the spaces of composition and in the fetichization of the mental space (the originary or *poetic space*).

Conflicting tendencies and contrasting impulses stand out in James's prefaces but they are also present in Hawthorne's and Dickens's. Romantic sentimentality coexists, in most of Hawthorne's prefaces, with self-deprecation – a characteristic commonly associated with modern and post-modern first-person narratives. Dickens's domesticating tactics, affect, playfulness, and romantic ethos, intermingle with a more professional, serious, and detached stance in some cases. The complexity of prefatory writing, as I have argued, is a function of the tension between interiority and publicity, which unfolds into the ones between location and dislocation, self and Other, self-display and self-concealment, pre-text and text, among others.

This is one of the points that connects the three authors' prefatory texts and provides support to the convergence hypothesis. Nevertheless, the points of intersection identified and the premise that Hawthorne, Dickens, and James are transitional, proto-modernist artists does not erase their differences. By extension, "ideology" is not understood here as unified, nor the same in all the three situations, but is rather a point of departure for the analyses of images or ideas that are inter-related and that connect to similar thought patterns in different moments and places of nineteenth-century Anglo-American literature.

Following the same rationale, it must be noted that "the world literary space" and "the planetary consciousness" did not affect the writers in the same way. Although the three writers, in some way or another, had to confront the problem of competition in foreign markets, the perception of the symbolic privileges ascribed to European countries in this market came from Hawthorne and James, the two authors identified with the periphery of the nineteenth-century

geopolitical space. The images and values that compose the imaginary associated with "the world literary space" gravitated around antiquity, cosmopolitanism, and particular places, Paris being the most important one. "Planetary consciousness" also provided images ready to be adopted by authors in their bid for cultural authority, and the heroes of European expansionism proved useful to James, in particular. As the examples discussed in Chapter 5 also show, *autonomy* is far from being a homogenous principle and it was not until the late nineteenth century that it took on the meanings modernist theory adopted later on. Although Hawthorne and Dickens may have anticipated positions and reflections with regard to autonomy, this principle was more explicitly developed only in James's Prefaces.

One other point to be observed in this discussion is that although the three main metaphorical domains (house-world-theatre) are treated in separate chapters, they are interwoven in several moments of the analyses. Dickens's balloon metaphor in the Preface to *Sketches by Boz* had antecedents in the theatre; in turn, Hawthorne's address in the Preface to *The Marble Faun* juxtaposes the epistolary (private, domestic) and the public (the theatre) forms of presentation. Finally, James compares an English cottage, one of his several abodes described in the Preface to *Spoils of Poynton*, with a ship, thus building a bridge between the domestic realm and the universe of sea exploration and adventures I discussed in the "world" chapter.

The entanglement of metaphorical domains justifies the use of the term "theatre of images" to refer to the several figures employed by the authors in their prefaces. The *performative* (both as representation and speech act) help describe the various roles examined, and the proposition that authorship is performed is complemented by Stephen Greenblatt's formulation of *self-fashioning* as a category that destabilizes the frontiers between "the achievement of a personality" and the creation of fictional characters. I have followed this

formulation to support the claim that the prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James are both *authorial*, that is, written by the implied author to make interventions in a "socially significant space" (Bruster and Weimann vii), and *actorial*, which means that they also involve the projection of images and the performance of identities.

Self-fashioning is a key conceptual point in a network of theoretical, critical, and historical references convoked to illuminate the texts selected. Conceived as a form of power, it connects to the ideas of surveillance and visibility which illuminate one of the aspects of prefatory self-fashioning , the "trope of perspective" examined in the chapter on the theatrical analogy. As "a mode of address to the world" it relates to the idea of "*locus* of enunciation," one of the ways by which the spatial metaphors are conceived. Since Greenblatt also posits the idea that self-fashioning "happens according to a model," and that "it happens in language," it supports the articulation of the authorial figures with historical or authoritative models authors drew from ideological systems to project images of themselves. Finally, the idea that self-fashioning is "achieved in relation to an Other" can only make sense if this Other is qualified and contextualized, as I have observed.

Seen through the concept of self-fashioning, authorship becomes a category that is both historically embedded and constructed in language. When I refer to Hawthorne, Dickens, and James here, I am writing about biographical individuals living in a specific historical moment, under particular material, social, and cultural circumstances. For instance, I could not write about Dickens, or even understand some aspects of his texts, without knowing about the advent of the serialized mode of publication (which the author helped popularize), or even without learning about the industrial revolution and its several implications in society. Nonetheless, my access to historical phenomena, which have a prominent role in my approach to the texts discussed,

happens through a wide array of texts and is contaminated by my own historical situation as a twenty-first century individual. Hence my particular interest in the ways by which authors survive in the digital-era through their texts, photographs, films and other cultural forms.

As I have remarked before, the poststructuralist take on authorship, especially the ideas that authors congregate multiple subject positions or that they are not anterior to their texts, is also part of the approach to authorship adopted in this Dissertation. In this respect, this work would profit from a more detailed articulation with Foucaultian theory, especially with his analysis of the emergence of the author-function in the modern period. This work would also benefit from Jacques's Derrida archive theory. In *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* (1996) Derrida investigates the history of the archive and shows how it connects both to self-preservation and destruction. His images of the *arkheion* (an administrative building) and of the *archons* (the rulers) allow the theorist to treat the archive as *topos* (place), *nomos* (law), and *logos* (origin), a reading that is congruous with the view of prefaces as authoritative sites (1-3).

Archives could alternatively inspire new directions for the discussion started here. Comparing the ways the authors in question fashion themselves in the prefaces and in other supports (including diaries and letters) with iconographic material such as portraits and photographs could lead to new insights into the relationship between images – both verbal and graphic – and ideological and cultural formations. It is worth recalling how specific portraits mentioned here (Sargent's portrait of James or Maclise's of Dickens) serve particular institutional and ideological purposes. The nineteenth century witnessed not only the proliferation of periodicals and other varieties of printed material, but also the advent of the daguerreotype and of cinema. Although Hawthorne did not accumulate as vast an iconography as Dickens and James (who were some of the first celebrities to be widely photographed), I draw

inspiration from Rita K. Gollin's book *Portraits of Nathaniel Hawthorne: An Iconography* (1983), and also from the Brazilian *A Olhos Vistos: Uma Iconografia de Machado de Assis* (2008), organized by Hélio de Seixas Guimarães e Vladimir Sacchetta. Two other preliminary sources I would consider for this expansion are Larry J.Reynolds and Gordon Hutner's *National Imaginaries, American Identities: The Cultural Work of American Iconography* (2000), and Nancy Armstrong's *Fiction in the Age of Photography: The Legacy of British Realism* (1999).

My "journey" began with the invaluable contributions of paratext theorists and I have supported the claim that prefaces can have historical relevance and imaginative quality. The specificity of nineteenth-century prefatory discourse resides in spatial and authorial figures associated with ideological configurations and historical phenomena. The prefaces of Hawthorne, Dickens, and James, however, absorb and parody formulae used by previous preface writers, who were sometimes also role models for them.[73] More synchronic and diachronic studies are needed to bring new figurative patterns to light. Although I have examined (or referred to) 24 prefaces here, a lot of prefaces were left out of this work and could yield new evaluations and hypotheses. But as James has astutely observed: "relations stop nowhere, and the exquisite problem of the artist," and, we may add, of the critic as well, "is eternally but to draw, by a geometry of his own, the circle within which they shall happily appear to do so" (Preface to *Roderick Hudson* 5).

[73] Dickens's 1841 Preface to *The Old Curiosity Shop* reproduces a passage from Fielding's Introduction to Tom Jones, which ends up occupying two of the three paragraphs of the preface (*OCS* 604).

Works Cited

Abrams, M. H., Stephen Greenblatt, eds. Introduction. "The Victorian Age (1830-1901)." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Vol. 2. 7th ed. New York; London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000. 1043-64. Print.

Adams, James Eli. "A History of Criticism of the Victorian Novel." Ed. Deirdre David. *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Ch.3. Kindle File.

Adams, Timothy Dow. "To Prepare a Preface to Meet the Faces that You Meet: Autobiographical Rhetoric in Hawthorne's Prefaces." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance 23* (1977): 89-98. Print.

Alexander, Jean. *Affidavits of Genius: Edgar Allan Poe and the French Critics, 1847-1924.* Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1971.Print.

Althusser, Louis. "From Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Eds. Antony Easthope and Kate McGowan. *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2004. 42-51. Print.

Anderson, Quentin. *The American Henry James.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1957. Print.

---*The Imperial Self; an Essay in American Literary and Cultural History.* New York: Knopf, 1971. Print.

Anesko, Michael. *"Friction with the Market:" Henry James and the Profession of Authorship*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

Anesko, Michael, and N. Christine Brookes, eds. *The French Face of Nathaniel Hawthorne: Monsieur De l'Aubépine and His Second Empire Critics*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2011. Print.

Arac, Jonathan. *Commissioned Spirits: The Shaping of Social Motion in Dickens, Carlyle, Melville, and Hawthorne*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1979. Print.

---. "The House and the Railroad: *Dombey and Son* and *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Commissioned Spirits: The Shaping of Social Motion in Dickens, Carlyle, Melville, and Hawthorne*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1979. 94-138. Print.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. New York: Oxford UP, 1987. Print.

---. *Fiction in the Age of Photography: The Legacy of British Realism*. London: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.

Armstrong, Paul. *The Phenomenology of Henry James*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1983. Print.

"Augment." *The Online Etymology Dictionary*. 8 Aug. 2014. <http://www.etymonline.com>.

Auster, Paul. "Hawthorne at Home." *Collected Prose: Autobiographical Writings, True Stories, Critical Essays, Prefaces and Collaborations with Artists*. New York: Picador, 2003. 470-89. Print.

Austin, J. L. *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962. Print.

"Author." *The Online Etymology Dictionary*. 8 Aug. 2014. <http://www.etymonline.com>.

Babiiha, Thadeo K. *The James-Hawthorne Relation: Bibliographical Essays*. Boston: G.K. Hall and Company, 1980. Print.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston: Beacon P, 1994. Print.

Bales, Kent. "Hawthorne's Prefaces and Romantic Perspectivism." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 23 (1977): 69-88. Print.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977. 142-9.

Bellei, Sérgio L.P. *Theory of the Novel: Henry James*. Florianópolis: Pós-Graduação em Inglês, UFSC, 1998. Print.

Bentham, Jeremy. "From Panopticon (1791)." *Literature and Science in the Nineteenth Century: An Anthology*. Ed. Laura Otis. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 449-52.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Office of the Scarlet Letter*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1991. Print.

Berlant, Lauren G. *The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Everyday Life*. 1991. Chicago: The U of Chicago P. Print.

Bier, Jesse. "Hawthorne on the Romance: His Prefaces Related and Examined." *Modern Philology*, 53.1 (1955): 17-24. Print.

Blackmur, Richard P. Introduction. *The Art of the Novel*. By Henry James. Ed. R. P. Blackmur. New York; London: C. Scribner's Sons, 1937. vii-xxxix. Print.

Blair, Sara. "In the House of Fiction: Henry James and the Engendering of Literary Mastery." Ed. David McWhirter. *Henry James's New York Edition: The Construction of Authorship*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 1995. 58-77. Print.

Blasing, Mutlu K. *The Art of Life: Studies in American Autobiographical Literature*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1977. Print.

Bloom, Harold. *Nathaniel Hawthorne*. New York: Chelsea House, 1986. Print.

Blumin, Stuart M. *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. Print.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1961. Print.

Borges, Jorge Luis. "Nathaniel Hawthorne." *Outras Inquisições*. Trans. David Arrigucci Jr. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007. 66-91. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 1996. Print.

Brodhead, Richard. *The School of Hawthorne*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

Bruster, Douglas, and James Weimman. *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Drama*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Buelens, Gert. "Recent Criticism (since 1985)." *Henry James in Context*. Ed. David McWhirter. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 435-43. Print.

Burke, Sean. *The Death and Return of the Author*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1998.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Gender and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Butt, John, and Kathleen Tillotson. *Dickens at Work*. London: Methuen, 1957. Print.

Cáffaro, Geraldo M. "'From Beyond the Grave:' The Posthumous Trope in Nathaniel Hawthorne, Machado de Assis, and Henry James." *Henry James Today*. Ed. John Carlos Rowe. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. 113-29. Print.

Canclini, Nestor Garcia. "Quem Fala e em Qual Lugar: Sujeitos Simulados e Pós-Construtivismo."*Diferentes, Desiguais e Desconectados: Mapas da Interculturalidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ, 2005. 183-208. Print.

Carey, John. *The Violent Effigy: A Study of Dickens's Imagination*. London: Faber and Faber, 1973. Print.

Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2004. Print.

Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Randall. Berkely: U of California P, 1984. Print.

Charvat, William. *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870: The Papers of William Charvat*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1968. Print.

Chase, Karen, and Michael H. Levenson. *The Spectacle of Intimacy: A Public Life for the Victorian Family*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 200. Print.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner and Other Poems*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc, 1992. Print.

Collins, Philip. "Enter the Professionals." *Dickens and Fame 1870-1970: Essays on the Author's Reputation*. Ed. Michael Slater. London: Dickens Fellowship, 1970. Print.

Compagnon, Antoine. "La Périgraphie." *La Seconde Main: Ou, Le Travail de la Citation*." Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1979. 328-9. Print.

Conway, Moncure Daniel. *Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne.* New York: Haskell House, 1968. Print.

Coutinho, Eduardo. *Literatura Comparada na América Latina.*Rio de Janeiro: Editora UERJ, 2003. Print.

De Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979. Print.

Deane, Bradley. "Making Friends: Dickens, Pickwick, and Industrial Romanticism." *The Making of the Victorian Novelist*: *Anxieties of Authorship in the Mass Market*. New York: Routledge, 2002. 27-57. Print.

---. *The Making of the Victorian Novelist*: *Anxieties of Authorship in the Mass Market*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. New York: Signet Classic, 1998. Print.

Demoor, Marysa, ed. *Marketing the Author: Authorial Personae, Narrative Selves and Self-fashioning, 1880-1930*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.

Derrick, Scott S. *Monumental Anxieties: Homoerotic Desire and Feminine Influence in 19th Century U.S. Literature*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers UP, 1997. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

---. *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1981. Print.

---. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University press, 1976.Print.

---. "Outwork, Prefacing." *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1981. 1-61. Print.

---. *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987. Print.

Dickens, Charles. *A Christmas Carol and Other Christmas Writings*. Ed. Michael Slater. London: Penguin Books, 2010. Print.

---. *Barnaby Rudge*. Ed. Clive Hurst. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

---. *Bleak House*. Ed. Stephen Charles Gill. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

---. David Copperfield. Ed. Nina Burgis. New York: Oxford UP, 1981. Print.

---. *Dombey and Son*. Ed. Andrew Sanders. London: Penguin Books, 2002. Print.

---. *Hard Times*. Ed. Susan Kingsley. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

---. *Little Dorritt*. Ed. Harvey Peter Sucksmith. New York: Oxford UP, 1979. Print.

---. *Oliver Twist, Or, The Parish Boy's Progress*. Ed. Philip Horne. London: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.

---. *Martin Chuzzlewitt.* Ed. Margaret Cardwell. New York: Oxford UP, 1982. Print.

---. *Nicholas Nickleby*. Ed. Paul Schlicke. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

---. *Our Mutual Friend.* London; New York: Penguin Books, 1997. Print.

---. *Sketches by Boz and Other Early Papers: 1833-39*. Ed. Michael Slater. *The Dent Uniform Edition of Dickens' Journalism*. London: Dent, 1994. Print.

---. "The Lost Arctic Voyages." 'Gone Astray and Other Papers from Household Words 1851-59'. *The Dent Uniform Edition of Dickens's Journalism*. Ed. Michael Slater, vol. 3. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1999. 254-69. Print.

---. "The Noble Savage." *Selected Journalism, 1850-1870*. Ed. David Pascoe. London: Penguin, 1997. 560-65. Print.

---. *The Old Curiosity Shop*. Ed. Elizabeth M. Brennan. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.

---. *The Pickwick Papers*. Ed. James Kinsley. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1986. Print. Print.

Douglas-Fairhurst, Robert. *Becoming Dickens.* Harvard UP, 2011. Print.

Duchet, Claude. "Pour un Socio-Critique, ou Variations sur un Incipit." *Littérature,* 1 (1971): 5-14. Print.

Dunn, Kevin. *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 1994. Print.

Edel, Leon. *Henry James, a Life*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985. Print.

---. *The Prefaces of Henry James*. Paris: Jouve, 1931. Print.

Eigner, Edwin M. *The Metaphysical Novel in England and America: Dickens, Bulwer, Hawthorne, Melville*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978. Print.

Eliot, Charles W, ed. *Prefaces and Prologues to Famous Books*. New York: P.F. Collier & Son Corporation, 1938. Print.

Fitz, Earl. *Brazilian Narrative Traditions in a Comparative Perspective*. New York: The Modern Association of America, 2005. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.

---. *Microfísica do Poder*. Org. Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1979.

---. *Surveiller Et Punir*: Naissance de la Prison. Paris: Gallimard, 1975. Print.

---. "What is an Author?" *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1977. 113-39. Print.

Freedman, Jonathan. *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism and Commodity Culture*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 1990. Print.

Frow, John. "The Literary Frame." *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 16.2 (1982): 25-30. Print.

Fusssel, Edwin S. *The French Side of Henry James*. Columbia UP, 1990. Print.

Gallagher, Catherine, and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000. Print.

Gennep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1960. Print.

Genette, Gérard. *Introduction à L'Architexte*. Paris: Seuil, 1979. Print.

---. *Palimpsestes: La Littérature au second dégre*. Paris: Seuil, 1982. Print.

---. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Gershman, Herbert S., and Kernan B. Whitworth, eds. *Anthologie des Prefaces de Romans Français du XIXe Siécle.* Paris: Julliard, 1964. Print.

Gilder, Jeanette L., and Joseph B. Gilder, eds. *Authors at Home: Personal and Biographical Sketches of Well-Known American Writers*. New York: A. Wessels Co, 1902. Print.

Gilmore, Michael T. *American Romanticism and the Marketplace*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985. Print.

Goetz, William R. "Criticism and Autobiography in James's Prefaces." American Literature, 51.3 (1979): 333-48. Print.

Goffman, Ervin. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. Print.

Goldsmith, Oliver. *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith: The Vicar of Wakefield and Other Writings*. Roslyn, N.W: Black's Reader Service Co, 1955. Print.

Goldstone, Andrew. *Fictions of Autonomy: Modernism from Wilde to de Man*. New York: Oxford UP, 2013. Print.

Gollin, Rita K. *Portraits of Nathaniel Hawthorne: An Iconography*. Dekalb, III: Northern Illinois UP, 1983. Print.

Gray, Alasdair, ed. *The Book of Prefaces: A Short History of Literate Thought in Words by Great Writers of Four Nations from the 7th to the 20th Century*. London: Bloomsbury, 2000. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. Print.

---. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

---. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988. Print.

Grossman, Jonathan H. *Charles Dickens's Networks: Public Transport and the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Guy, Josephine. "Authors and Authorship." *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1830-1914*. Ed. Joanne Shattock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 9-30. Print.

Habegger, Alfred. *Gender, Fantasy, and Realism in American Literature*. New York: Columbia UP, 1982.

---. *Henry James and the "Woman Business*." Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1989. Print.

Harvey, David. *Spaces of Global Capitalism*. London: Verso, 2006. Print.

---. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkely: U of California P, 2000. Print.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *Collected Novels*. New York: The Library of America, 1983. Print.

---. *Grandfather's Chair: True Stories from History*. London: Standard Book Co, 1931. Print.

---. *Our Old Home: A Series of English Sketches.* Ed. Fredson Bowers. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1970. Print.

---. *Tales and Sketches*. New York: The Library of America, 1982. Print.

---. *The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Ed. William Charvat et al. 23 vols. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1962-97. Print.

Hochman, Barbara. *Getting at the Author: Reimagining Books and Reading in the Age of American Realism*. Amherst: U of Massachussetts P, 2001. Print.

Hocks, Richard A. "From Literary Analysis to Postmodern Theory: A Historical Narrative of James Criticism." *A Companion to Henry James Studies*. Ed. Daniel Mark Fogel. Westport, Conn: Greenwood P., 1993. 3-25. Print.

Holland, Lawrence B. *The Expense of Vision: Essays on the Craft of Henry James*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1964. Print.

Irving, Washington. *A History of the Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. London: John Murray, 1828. Print.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore: J. Hopkins UP, 1993. Print.

James, Henry. *A Arte do Romance: Antologia de Prefácios*. Trans. Marcelo Pen Parreira. São Paulo: Globo, 2003.

---. *Collected Travel Writings: The Continent, A Little Tour of France, Italian Hours, Other Travels*. New York: Library Classics of the U.S, 1993. Print.

---. *Daisy Miller.* Ed. Geoffrey Moore. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986. Print.

---. *Hawthorne*. New York: Harper, 1901. Print.

---. *Literary Criticism: Essays on Literature, American Writers, English Writers*. New York: Library Classics of America, 1984. Print.

---. *The Art of the Novel*. Ed. R. P. Blackmur. New York; London: C. Scribner's Sons, 1937. Print.

---. *The Bostonians*. New York: Random House, 1966. Print.

---. *The Portrait of a Lady*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996. Print.

---. *The Princess Casamassima*. Ed. Derek Brewe. Hermondsworth: Penguin Books, 1986.

John, Juliet. "Introduction." *Dickens and Modernity*. Ed. Juliet John. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2012.1-19. Print.

Knapp, Mary. E. *Prologues and Epilogues of the Eighteenth Century*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1961. Print.

Lautréamont, Comte de. *Maldoror and Poems*. Ed. Paul Knight. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978. Print.

Leavis, F.R. *The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad*. New York: New York UP, 1963. Print.

Leuschner, Eric D. "Prefacing Fictions: A History of Prefaces to British and American Novels." Diss. University of Missouri, 2004. Print.

Litvak, Joseph. *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992. Print.

Lotman, Juri. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Trans. Gail Lenhoff and Ronald Vroon. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977. Print.

Lubbock, Percy. *The Craft of Fiction*. New York: Viking P, 1957. Print.

---. "The New York Edition of the Novels and Tales of Henry James." *Times Literary Supplement* 8 (July 1908): 249-50. Print.

MacLachlan, Gale L., and Ian Reid. *Framing and Interpretation*. Carlton, Vic: Melbourne, 1994. Print.

McWhirter, David B. *Henry James's New York Edition: The Construction of Authorship*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 1995. Print.

Marques, Reinaldo Martiniano. "O Arquivo Literário e as Imagens do Escritor." *O Futuro do Presente: Arquivo, Gênero, Discurso.* Orgs. Eneida M. de Souza, Eliana da Conceição Tolentino, Anderson Bastos Martins, orgs. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2012. 59-89. Print.

Matthiessen, F.O. *Henry James, the Major Phase*. London: Oxford UP, 1944. Print.

Melville, Herman. "Hawthorne and his Mosses." Leaf.com Books: Kindle File.

Mignolo, Walter. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 2000. Print.

Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988. Print.

Miller, J. Hillis. *Charles Dickens: The World of His Novels*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1958.Print.

Mizruchi, Susan L. *The Power of Historical Knowledge: Narrating the Past in Hathorne, James, and Dreiser*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton UP, 1988. Print.

Montégut, Émile. "Carlyle et Emerson." *Revue des Deux Mondes* (15 Aug. 1850): 722-37. Print.

---. "Le Général Franklin Pierce." *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1 Feb. 1852): 605-16. Print.

---. "Un Romancier Pessimiste en Amérique: Nathaniel Hawthorne." *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1 Aug. 1860): 668-703. Print.

Moore, Thomas R. "Poses in the Prefaces: A Rhetoric of Oppositions." *A Thick and Darksome Veil: The Rhetoric of Hawthorne's Sketches, Prefaces, and Essays*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1994. 73-99. Print.

---. *A Thick and Darksome Veil: The Rhetoric of Hawthorne's Sketches, Prefaces, and Essays*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1994. Print.

More, Grace. *Dickens and Empire: Discourses of Class, Race, and Colonialism in the Works of Charles Dickens* .Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. Print.

More, Thomas. *The Debellation of Salem and Bizance*. Ed. J. A. Guy. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987. Print.

Newbury, Michael. *Figuring Authorship in Antebellum America*. Standford: Standford UP, 1997.

Newman, Lea Bertani Vozar. *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1979. Print.

Ortiz-Robles, Mario. "Dickens Performs Dickens." *ELH* 78.2 (2011): 457-78. Print.

Parreira, Marcelo Pen. *Realidade Possível: Dilemas da Ficção em Henry James e Machado de Assis*. Cotia, SP: Ateliê Editorial, 2012. Print.

Parrinder, Patrick. *Authors and Authority: A Study of English Literary Criticism and Its Relation to Culture 1750-1900*. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1977. Print.

Patten, Robert L. *Charles Dickens and 'Boz:' The Birth of the Industrial-Age Author*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.

Pearson, John H. "The Art of Self-Creation: Henry James in the New York Edition Prefaces." *Marketing the Author: Authorial Personae, Narrative Selves and Self-Fashioning, 1880-1930*. Ed. Marysa Demoor. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 40-54. Print.

---. *The Prefaces of Henry James: Framing the Modern Reader*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State UP, 1997. Print.

Pechter, Edward. "The New Historicism and Its Discontents: Politicizing Renaissance Drama." *PMLA*. 102.3 (1987): 292-303. Print.

Person, Leland S. "Bibliographical Essay: Hawthorne and History." *A Historical Guide to Nathaniel Hawthorne.* Ed. Larry J. Reynolds. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.183-211. Print.

Poon, Angelia. *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period: Colonialism and the Politics of Performance.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Poovey, Mary. "The Man-of-letters Hero: David Copperfield and the Professional Writer." *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988. 89-126. Print.

---. *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988. Print.

Pragnell, Hubert J. *The London Panoramas of Robert Barker and Thomas Girtin, Circa 1800. London*: Topographical Society, 1968. Print.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Rajeev, Patke S. *Modernist Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2013. Print.

Reynolds, Larry J, and Gordon Hutner. *National Imaginaries, American Identities: The Cultural Work of American Iconography*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton UP, 2000. Print.

Romero, Lora. *Home Fronts: Domesticity and its Critics in Atebellum United States*. Durham Duke UP, 1997. Print.

Rowe, John Carlos. "Forms of the Reader's Act: Author and Reader in the Prefaces to the New York Edition." *The Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James*. Madison, Wis.: U of Wisconsin P, 1984. 219-53. Print.

---. Introduction. *A Historical Guide to Henry James*. Ed. John Carlos Rowe and Eric Haralson. New York: Oxford UP, 2013. 1-14. Print.

---. "Space, the Final Frontier: Poe's Eureka as Imperial Fantasy." *Poe Studies/Dark Romanticism* 39-40.1-2 (2006): 19-27. Print.

---. *The Other James*. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. Print.

---. *The Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James*. Madison, Wis.: U of Wisconsin P, 1984. Print.

Said, Edward W. *Beginnings: Intention and Method*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. Print.

---. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1983. Print.

Salmon, Richard. *Henry James and the Culture of Publicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Schirmeister, Pamela. *The Consolations of Space: The Place of Romance in Hawthorne, Melville, and James*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990. Print.

Schweizer, Flora. "Afterword: The 2012 Bicentenary." *Dickens and Modernity*. Ed. Juliet John. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2012. 209-23. Print.

Sedgwick, Eve K. *A Dialogue on Love*. Boston: Beacon P, 1999. Print.

---. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial*. Desire. New York: Columbia UP, 1985. Print.

---. *Tendencies*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993. Print.

---. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003. Print.

Seltzer, Mark. *Henry James & the Art of Power*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. B. Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974. Print.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory. London*: Verso, 1989. Print.

Sterne, Laurence. *A Sentimental Journey and Other Writings*. Ed. Tim Parnell, and Ian Jack. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

Stevens, Joan,. "A Note on Thackeray's 'Manager of the Performance.'" *Nineteenth-Century Fiction Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 22.4 (1968): 391-7. Print.

Stewart, Garrett. *Dear Reader: The Conscripted Audience in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996. Print.

Stokes, Edward. *Hawthorne's Influence on Dickens and George Eliot*.Queensland: U of Queensland P, 1985.

Swif, Jonathan. *A Tale of a Tub, and Other Satires*. Ed. Kathleen Williams. London: Dent, 1975. Print.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. "Before the Curtain." *Vanity Fair*: *A Novel Without a Hero*. London: Penguin, 2002. 5-7. Print.

Thompson, G.R. *The Art of Authorial Presence: Hawthorne's Provincial Tales*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993. Print.

Tillotson, Kathleen. *Novels of the 1840s*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1954. Print.

Tintner, Adeline R. *The Cosmopolitan World of Henry James. An Intertextual Study*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1991. Print.

Trilling, Lionel. "*The Princess Casamassima*." *The Liberal Imagination.* New York: Viking P, 1950. 91-2.

Veeder, William. Henry James: *The Lessons of the Master: Popular Fiction and Personal Style in the Nineteenth Century.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1975.

Veenstra, Jan R. "The New Historicism of Stephen Greenblatt: On Poetics of Culture and the Interpretation of Shakespeare." *History and Theory* 34.3 (1995): 174-98.

Vlock, Debora. *Dickens, Novel Reading, and the Victorian Popular Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Watts, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Berkely: U of California P, 1957. Print.

Weldon, Roberta F. "'The Old Manse' to 'The Custom-House:' The Growth of the Artist's Mind." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 20.1 (Spring 1978), 36-47. Print.

Whitman, Walt. "A Prayer of Columbus." *The Delphi Poet Series: Walt Whitman*. Delphi Classics 2012. XXVII. Kindle File.

Williams, Raymond. *The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence*. New York: Oxford UP, 1970. Print.

Wilson, Rob, and Wimal Dissanayake. *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996. Print.

Wimsatt, William K. *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington, Ky: U of Kentucky P, 1954.

Wineapple, Brenda. *Hawthorne: A Life*. Alfred A. Knopf : New York, 2003. Print.

Wolf, Werner, and Walter Bernhart, eds. *Framing Borders in Literature and Other Media*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Zipper, Alexander. *Thresholds of Interpretation: Forms and Functions of Paratexts in English Narrative Literature of the 18th Century*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Miller, 2010. Print.