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This dissertation builds on recent innovations in empires studies to argue that the visual and textual representation of Native Americans in print culture worked in dialogue to shape imperial identities among the diverse peoples of North America. I suggest that rather than forming through the commonly accepted colonizer/colonized model that theorizes the figure of the Indian as pure other, imperial identities in North America emerged through image-text patterns of triangulation that located Native Americans between empires. By placing icons and illustrations of Indians in conversation with the textual representations that circulated alongside them in transatlantic books and broadsides, the project shows that the representation of Native Americans in print culture not only shaped ideas of race that justify imperialism against indigenous peoples, but ideologies of racialized difference between imperial peoples. This approach further demonstrates that marginalized peoples such as Native Americans and African-Americans employed triangularity not only to resist imperialism, but sometimes to position themselves within North American imperial networks. “Printing Indians” thus suggests that print cultures shape imperial identities through vectors of racialized difference that simultaneously justify conquest of indigenous peoples and warfare between empires in the contest to become North America’s ultimate empire. By studying this transatlantic system of signification as it
evolved between King Philip’s War (1676) and the conclusion of the U.S. Civil War (1864), each chapter examines how Anglo-Americans, Native Americans, and Africans used image and text to animate hierarchies among racialized degrees of whiteness and redness.
Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Published in Philadelphia between October 1757 and October 1758 at the height of the Seven Years’ War, each issue of William Bradford’s *The American Magazine and Monthly Chronicle* bears the same frontispiece illustration prominently displaying a figure of an American Indian. In this woodcut illustration, an Indian leans casually on a large rifle in the center of a forest clearing, while an Englishman and a Frenchman beseech him from either side. The composition of the image, as well as the Latin phrase “Prævalabit Æquior” that appears beneath the three figures, would have recalled for eighteenth-century viewers “the choice of Hercules,” which had appeared graphically in emblem books beginning in the sixteenth-century. According to this myth, two women appeared before Hercules one day as he meditated and offered him a choice between a life of virtue and a

1 This periodical typically circulated notices of astronomical events and natural disasters, philosophical and poetical essays, and significant events in the individual British Colonies in North America. But the *American Magazine*’s main purpose, as Bradford explained in its preface, was to disseminate accounts of recent battles in the war, which served as the North American theatre for a larger global imperial conflict between the British and French. Bradford and his investors were by no means neutral in this conflict. In the words of book historian Lyon Richardson, the publishers of the *American Magazine* sought to foment “a strong English hatred of the French and a strength of emotional animosity toward England’s Continental enemies beyond that which stirred in the mind of the average Colonial-born citizen.” Richardson, *History of Early American Magazines, 1741-89* (Taylor & Francis, 1967), 98.

life of vice. In evoking the choice of Hercules through this frontispiece, *The American Magazine* portrays Native Americans as a pivotal force in the global imperial war between France and England. This engraving thus asks its viewers: How will the Indian decide the contest of empires in North America?? Will dominion be achieved through an imperial project grounded in civilized virtue, or in seductive vice?

![Figure 1.1 Woodcut Engraving. *The American Magazine and Monthly Chronicle.* William Bradford, Philadelphia, October 1757. The Library of Congress, Washington, DC.](image-url)
It is ironic that in the frontispiece of a periodical published during the height of the fierce and bloody Seven Years’ War, which was perceived by Britons like Bradford as a contest between two European empires for North American supremacy, an Indian would occupy such a central narrative position. Even more so, given the extent to which the illustration visually reinforces European stereotypes of civilization and savagery that justify imperialism by portraying Europeans as superior to Native Americans. The artist has utilized variations in skin tone, clothing, and other cultural signifiers to indicate difference between Indians and Europeans. The artist shows the Indian’s dark skin through wide, parallel bands across his body, while signifying the light skin of the Europeans by leaving their faces devoid of such lines, save for those indicating the shadows of their hats. Nearly naked, the Indian wears only shoes, a cloth about his waist, a necklace, and a feather on his head. The Europeans, by contrast, are dressed in almost identical coats, pants, and tri-cornered hats in order to emphasize their likeness with one another and underscore their mutual difference with the Indian. The only divergence between the two European figures is the fur that lines the Frenchman’s coat and hat. The Indian’s nakedness and feathers denote his savage primitivism, while the Europeans’ tailored, full dress signify their superior civilizations.

Yet it is through this very figure of the savage Indian that the frontispiece constructs an additional layer of hierarchies on the level of empire. The illustration accomplishes this through the types of gifts that it depicts these imperial figures offering to the primitive Indian. The Englishman holds forth a bolt of cloth and a Bible, which symbolize commerce and religion—regarded as two of the most powerful elements of
civilization. Cloth links English civilization to the fabric covering the Indian’s nakedness, and suggests the potential to uplift the Indian from savagery. The Frenchman, extending gunpowder and a tomahawk, offers only tools of warfare and bloodlust. The Frenchman’s gunpowder pouch symbolically connects him to the Indian through the rifle, suggesting that the French offer no advancement toward civilization. In terms of the choice of Hercules, an alliance with the English corresponds to virtue and civilization, while support for the French leads to vice and an even more degenerate savagery. Thus, although this illustration visually authorizes both British and French imperialism in North America through the opposition between European civilization and Indian savagery, it simultaneously portrays the British Empire as morally superior to the French Empire through their respective imperial relations with Native Americans. Similar structural patterns of representation that situate a Native American between two European figures recur throughout colonial and antebellum print culture. This dissertation asks why, and how, the visual and textual representations of Native Americans play such a central role in the print cultures of the early transatlantic world. Image and text worked in tandem, I suggest, to portray Native Americans alongside two European empires in a racialized, triangular system that produced and maintained imperial identities in North America.

Read in the context of this frontispiece engraving, the printed text that followed offers a window into the strategy behind the centrality of Native Americans in American print culture. In The American Magazine’s inaugural issue, this engraving was accompanied by an extensive essay entitled, “Account of the North American Indians.” The article makes clear the stakes of the imperial contest depicted in the frontispiece. The anonymous writer declares that North America is “an exhaustible magazine of wealth”
for the British Empire. But if the continent is “suffered to fall into the hands of the
French,” Great Britain will not only “lose her former lustre,” but it will “cease to be any
longer an independent power.” According to the writer, the very sovereignty of the
British people hinges precariously on the outcome of alliances with the indigenous
peoples of North America. Native Americans are portrayed throughout the article
according to the conventions that characterized the Indian as noble savage during the
colonial and antebellum periods. Natives are stereotyped to “differ very little from one
another.” All Indians are a “nearly naked,” “uncivilized people,” who can act “very
humane and decent” toward their friends but exact “striking barbarities,” including
“eating of flesh,” of their enemies. After describing Native Americans as a primitive
people “natural” in both virtues and vices, the author turns to the subject of the French,
“an enemy martial, and bloody; committing murders rather than waging war.” Here, the
essay, purportedly focused on Native Americans, diverges to warn of the threat of
another European empire. “We must have a common interest,” warns the author. “Let us
value our liberty, valour, and religion,” he declares, by “extirpating the French savages
from the face of the continent.” The author thereby reveals his dual purpose in a call for
unity against both the French Empire and Native Americans.

3 “Account of the North American Indians,” The American Magazine and Monthly
Chronicle, October 1757, 9.

4 Ibid., 10–11.

5 Ibid., 16.

6 Ibid., 23.
In beginning with this illustration and article in *The American Magazine*, I want to foreground the main ways that American print culture conjoins visual and textual representations of Native Americans to shape conceptions of empire and race in North America. Against the backdrop of the Seven Years’ War, the Englishman and the Frenchmen both vie for the favor of the Indian. Even though Native Americans are portrayed as inherently inferior to both the English and the French Empires, this Indian symbolizes alliances that will swing the balance of the contest between European empires. Even though the text of the article presents the Seven Years’ War as a contest between two European empires, both the article and the illustration direct the reader’s attention toward the figure of the Indian. Taken together, the frontispiece image and interior text present the reader with a triangular structure that seeks to unify the British against the French by locating the figure of the Indian between the two empires.

“Printing Indians and the Imperial Contest in America” studies how the interplay of image and text in print culture enabled North Americans to animate hierarchies among racialized degrees of whiteness and redness. This dissertation argues that imperial identities in North America emerged through triangular, transmedia modes of racial signification in print culture between King Philip’s War and the U.S. Civil War (1676-1861). Rather than building from the colonizer/colonized model commonly accepted by scholars of race in America, I examine a pattern of triangulation that situates Americans in relation to both Native Americans and European counterparts. Native Americans function in this triangle as a source of difference between white empires, rather than as a pure other. Throughout the colonial and antebellum periods, I propose, imperial identities take shape for Native Americans, Africans, Europeans, and later the American Empire,
not through the binaries that we have come to expect, but triangular patterns of comparison between collectives that are racially coded as red, white, and white. In the mid-nineteenth century, this racial triangle would evolve into a structure of red, white, and black to enclose subaltern racial groups within the dominant American national identity. Yet on the level of empire, domestic print culture gazed beyond North America through a racial triangle that continued to encompass both colonized subalterns and rival European empires.

Recognizing the proliferation of triangular racial structures offers an explanation into the tension between continuity and rupture with old world imperial structures in print culture: writers, artists, and printers would reproduce the visual and textual representations of Native Americans as a dual means of divergence and consistency with the empires of Europe. Despite the centrality of the primitive American Indian in print culture as either the noble or demonic savage, civilization and empire function as both the baseline and alternative to American imperial identity. North American print cultures thus perpetuate formations of empire in the United States, even when they ostensibly seek alternatives to empire.

While criticism commonly studies early ethnic print cultures for their resistance to empire, this project further shows how marginalized peoples such as Native Americans and African-Americans mastered triangularity not only to resist imperialism, but sometimes to position themselves within North American imperial networks. “Pontiac’s Speech at Detroit” offers a productive example of how Native Americans appropriated categories of whiteness and redness to construct their own collective identities in relation to multiple European empires. On April 27, 1763, the Ottawa war chief Pontiac addressed
an assemblage of Ottawas, Hurons, and Pottawomis near Detroit. Only three years earlier, the British Empire had seized Fort Detroit from their French rivals during the French and Indian War. Seeking to unite native nations to mount an attack on Detroit, Pontiac described the dream of a Delaware prophet named Neolin. As told by Pontiac, the Indian deity known as The Great Prophet appeared to Neolin in a dream as a “beautiful woman arrayed in white.” From the crest of a mountain “of dizzying whiteness,” she advised Neolin that she had created the land for the Delaware people. “Why do you suffer the white man to dwell among you?” she admonished. The Great Prophet continued to chastise Neolin and his people for having “forgotten the customs and traditions” of their ancestors, neglecting to dress in “skins” and “use the bows and arrows.” Instead, she scolded the Indians for buying “guns, knives, kettles, and blankets, from the white men,” and worst of all “the poison firewater.” The Great Prophet then told Neolin that she would make the Delaware people “once more happy and prosperous” if they will only “raise up the hatchet against these English—these dogs dressed in red” and “wipe them from the face of the earth.” Much like the frontispiece to The American Magazine,

7 The French had respected the indigenous peoples of the region as imperial allies, and distributed valuable trade commodities to them while they held the fort. The British now considered the natives of the region imperial subjects, and demanded high prices in return for food and gunpowder. The natives, decimated by the war, found it impossible to pay. See Daniel Richter, Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 191–193.

“Pontiac’s Speech” overwrites the common experiences of Europeans and Indians in North America, and replaces them with differences in customs, traditions, clothing, and weapons. Additionally, the speech invokes the practice, which we would more commonly associate with Europeans, of racially dividing the inhabitants of North America into binary categories of “whites” and “Indians.”

Yet Pontiac’s speech also offers a vision of a more complex racial dynamic of collective identity formation in early North America. Recently, scholars such as Colin Calloway and Daniel Richter have described Pontiac’s War as a key point in a “newly deepening racial divide” in North America. According to this interpretation, the words of the prophet Neolin supplied the foundations of a “racial identity” among Indians by essentializing Europeans and Native peoples. However, after imploring its listeners to purge whites from the continent, Pontiac’s speech takes a surprising turn that exceeds a binary racial system of Indians versus whites. The Great Prophet, Pontiac claims, told Neolin that “the children of your great Father, the King of France are not like the English. Never forget that they are your brethren.” Neolin also says that the French are “very dear” to the Great Prophet because “they love the red men, and understand the true mode of worship.” If racial identities form in North America through binaries, then why does

10 Ibid., 190.
Pontiac invoke the memory of the French, now banished from North America, in his bid for pan-Indian unity against the British Empire? Where does Pontiac’s speech racially locate the French in relation to “red men” and “white English?” If the French are not like the British, are they implicitly “red” like their Native “brethren”? How, perhaps most importantly, do redness and whiteness signify as racial qualities, given that the white English wear red coats, and the red man’s Great Prophet is “arrayed in white?”

Pontiac’s speech and *The American Magazine* illustrate the main contradictions of race facing the inhabitants of North America in the eighteenth century. Each from their own ethno-centric positions, Pontiac’s “Speech at Detroit” and *The American Magazine* construct unified identities through identical, if differently configured, racialized triangles. Pontiac uses a triangular hierarchy that locates Red Indians and the French above white English “dogs.” *The American Magazine*, on the other hand, places these same white English at the height of civilization, while locating noble savage Indians between the British Empire and degraded French savages. The two speakers even rely on the same sentence structures and imagery in their racialized, imperial pleas for cultural unity: Pontiac calls on Indians to “wipe [the English] from the face of the earth,” while *The American Magazine* demands that English colonists “extirpat[e] the French savages from the face of the continent.” The historical British Empire and indigenous peoples of North America developed their ethnocentric views at opposite ends of the North American imperial power structure, yet triangularity remains for both groups ever in play. Pontiac seeks to unify Ottawa identity through triangulation with the French and the British, while the *American Magazine* attempts to consolidate a British colonial identity through contrasts with both the French and Native Americans.
To fully appreciate the ways these racial structures work, though, we also must recognize how both Pontiac and the *American Magazine* rely in part on pictorial languages to transmit their content. Although Pontiac delivered his speech orally, he tells his listeners that the prophet Neolin recorded his own dream by “cut[ting it] into hieroglyphics on a stick.” Ojibwa-speaking peoples such as Pontiac and his listeners recorded and disseminated important communication by carving glyphs into bark and other pieces of wood. Such glyphs, as Birgit Brander Rasmussen has explained, combined pictographs—pictures that could not be directly translated into verbal sound—with characters more closely related to spoken language. Neolin’s speech, therefore, reached Pontiac through a form of writing that relied on combinations of pictorial and phonetic characters. Likewise, *The American Magazine* fuses image and text. Its prominent frontispiece engraving occupies approximately a third of the page, and is located between the word’s “Magazine” and “And.” Such a prominent size and position effectively integrates the image into the periodical’s title, making it impossible for the reader to read the title without also viewing the image. *The American Magazine*’s frontispiece image thus mediates the entirety of the textual content within its pages. In both “Pontiac’s Speech” and *The American Magazine*, image and text function as inseparable, equally vital components of a composite sign system. In the remainder of this introduction, I trace the major issues that influenced the production of this composite sign system between the colonial era and the mid-nineteenth century.


13 Ibid., 36–37.
Image, Text, Race

Imperial identities in North America have taken shape in large part through the circulation and consumption of print culture, of which the book enjoyed a prominent place. Benedict Anderson has argued that print culture fostered the emergence of national identities by connecting individuals who might never meet, but shared the same language and reading experiences, across space and time.¹⁴ This experience not only played a key role in the formation of nation states, but in shaping the collective identities of which readers imagined themselves members. Although print itself is a culturally-produced medium, the cultural content of print shapes the identities of consumers. Print, as Michael Robertson has put it, is “a medium of and for social formation.”¹⁵ Thus, through print, readers can imagine themselves as a distinct community.

In the colonial and antebellum world, the term “print culture” includes objects produced, copied, and multiplied through the use of hand, and later steam presses by pressing paper, ink, and moveable type. In addition to the type that often dominates studies of print, however, print culture also includes the pictorial images produced by engraving, etching, and by the mid-nineteenth-century lithography. Print culture circulated primarily in the form of paper, distributed as flat broadsides, folded into newspapers and pamphlets, bound into books. In producing multiple copies, print had the


advantage over manuscripts of circulating identical cultural content that could be consumed by multiple readers across distances both great and small—from citizens within Boston itself to as far away as London. “Printing Indians” studies how this print culture and its cultural content participated in the formation of empire in North America.16

American imperialism has relied on the concept that Native Americans lived and thought in ways inherently different and primitive. But as Daniel Richter has observed, “Indian and British-American histories moved along parallel paths in a single, ever-more consolidated transatlantic imperial world.”17 “Printing Indians” studies one of those important parallel paths: how Native Americans used print culture to interact with and articulate alternate versions of imperial identity. As I discuss, Native Americans were transatlantic cosmopolitan intellectuals looking not only inward to their own communities, as we often have been taught, but outward to the transatlantic imperial world.18 In the American republic’s early years, Native Americans mastered the technologies of writing and printing. In Georgia, for example, the Cherokee used a


17 Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*, 150.

printing press to publish their own newspaper, *The Cherokee Phoenix*, beginning in 1828. Through such publications, Native Americans participated in the production of imperial identities in the transatlantic world of print, collectively imagined their identities using the same technologies mastered by white Americans, and thus proved the falsity of white claims to Native inferiority. Concurrently, Native uses of print often contain the triangular patterns of imperial identity that parallel those of the Europeans who sought to dispossess them and erase Native agency.

The question of how writers and artists imagined collective identities through the narratives that revolve around Native Americans occupies a prominent place in contemporary studies of early American culture. The titles alone of recent monographs, such as Laura L. Miekle’s *Moving Encounters: Sympathy and the Indian Question in Antebellum Literature* (2008), James L. Cox’s *Muting White Noise: Native American and European Novel Traditions* (2006), and Renee Bergland’s *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects* (2000), to name only a few examples, attest to the frequency of such studies. While current criticism contributes innovative approaches to the subject, the field is rooted in a basic understanding of identity formation developed during the 1970s and 1980s in studies such as Richard Slotkin’s *Regeneration Through* 19

———

19 Rather than adopting the Roman alphabet, the Cherokee even invented their own written syllabary. See Ellen Cushman, *The Cherokee Syllabary: Writing the People’s Perspective* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), esp. 23–89.

Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier. These studies argue that European and, later, American writers and artists formed ostensibly cohesive European identities through a series of oppositions to a stereotypical, and ultimately inferior, “Indian.” Redness developed as a racial category strategically to signify everything that the European purportedly was not. Whiteness, in this formulation, developed from contrasts with the representation of Indians. Through this binary opposition, European and American writers justified colonization and westward expansion as well as genocide and exploitation of Native peoples.

Slotkin and others of his intellectual generation in turn based their theories on the work of Roy Harvey Pearce, particularly his Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian in the American Mind (1953). Although the basic propositions of Pearce and Slotkin have been updated by modern critics to incorporate psychoanalytic theory (Bergland), current understandings of sentimentalism and sympathy (Miekle), and to incorporate “red” critical methods developed by Native Americans themselves (Cox), our basic methodologies for analyzing how white identity takes shape through the

---


22 Pearce theorized that American identity formed through a contrast between savagism and civilization that runs throughout American writing. Pearce describes “savagism” as a “set of interrelated propositions” that “held together” knowledge developed by Europeans to portray themselves as superior to the indigenous peoples of North America. Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian in the American Mind, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 76.
representation of Native Americans still derive from a binary model theorized in the 1950s during an early nationalist era of American literary criticism.

The turn to empire in American studies requires that we broaden our focus and incorporate the transatlantic, even global, dimensions of identity formation. The turn to empire is often marked by the publication of Donald Pease and Amy Kaplan’s anthology *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (1993), which argued that empire constituted a central paradigm for the formation of American identity in literature. More recent studies such as Laura Doyle’s *Freedom’s Empire: Race and the Rise of the Novel in Atlantic Modernity, 1640-1940* (2008), or Anne Laura Stoler’s essay collection *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (2006), speak to the continuing, intertwined importance that race and empire play in American studies. Yet all of these influential works also rely on a binary model of the nation. Doyle’s *Freedom’s Empire*, for example, cites Horsman’s *Race and Manifest Destiny*, and otherwise relies heavily on binary, nationally-focused studies such as Bergland’s *National Uncanny*, which in turn cites Slotkin and Dippie. Even Hardt and Negri, seeking to develop an extra-national conception of empire suitable to the twenty-first century, describe the history of empire in the same binary terms developed to analyze national identity.23 A twenty-first century understanding of North American imperial identity requires reassessment beyond the binaries associated with national identity.

We can most accurately study formations of imperial identity produced by the multi-ethnic cultures of early America through text (which thus far has served as the

focus of scholarship) and the interplay between image and text. This is because reading image and text together allows access to a wider view of the racial dynamics available to consumers of print culture, bringing us closer to the constellations of signs available to readers. As scholars of book history and material culture studies have shown, readers experienced books as material objects composed of a set of parts that exceeds the main textual bodies that postmodern criticism has taught us to privilege.24 Even in the earliest colonial printing presses, but with ever-greater and more frequent advances in print technology, publishers on both sides of the Atlantic printed illustrations and images alongside text in the material cultures of the transatlantic world. Books contain visual materials in the form of frontispieces and illustrations that precede or are embedded within their textual information. Newspapers printed not only engravings and etchings, but also icons and symbols in their mastheads and borders. Publishers of broadsides attracted the attention of prospective buyers through visual components. Based on our disciplinary structures, scholars are likely to analyze either the visual or the textual, but not both, nor consider how the image and the text work together. Yet as we have seen from The American Magazine, with its use of an elaborate frontispiece image that frames the text, readers experienced interwoven worlds of visual and textual representations in print culture. Therefore, we might profitably consider discourses of race and empire as a dialogue between image and text. W.J.T. Mitchell has described "a war-torn border" of image and text that is largely manufactured by scholars who have sought to "legislate the

boundaries between the arts.”25 Mitchell further argues that these two representational forms are not so different after all, and often reach across borders to produce meaning. If Mitchell is right, then image and text work together within the same printed objects to produce a composite narrative.

At the same time that image and text work together, however, the two types of representation function quite differently from one another. Within the print cultures of early America, images operate as paratexts that mediate reader experiences of textual information. As Gerard Genette has argued, paratexts act as “thresholds” that readers must inevitably cross in their experience of the text. These thresholds, in turn, operate “as sites of transaction: a privileged place of pragmatics and strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that—whether well or poorly understood or achieved—is at service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it.”26 Based on such theories of paratext, illustrations and icons in books and broadsides invariably mediated contemporary readers’ experiences of a work’s content. Thus, the frontispiece engraving would influence a reader’s experience of “Account of the American Indians,” and in fact all the textual content of The American Magazine. To ignore the visual is to ignore crucial information that readers experienced when they read and viewed their contemporary print cultures.

“Printing Indians” suggests that studying the interaction of image and text reveals key insights into how print culture constructed collective identities through race. Print


culture produces racial dynamics, I argue, through a process of signification in which neither text nor image unilaterally determines the meaning of one or the other. Literary studies sometimes assume that illustrations merely repeat textual information in visual form. Art historical studies, on the other hand, presume the primacy of the image. These foci, however, are determined by disciplinary assumptions rather than the dual role of image and text within a given work. Illustrations and images have their own significations that can work with textual representations in a number of ways not limited to mimicking scenes from text. In *The American Magazine*, for example, the frontispiece affords its own narrative that works in conjunction with the text that follows, rather than depicting a specific event within the text. J. Hillis Miller theorizes that images “illuminate a text” and bring something new to it; rather than being merely “representational,” he writes, illustrations are “constitutive.” When text and image are juxtaposed, each constitutes a separate sign system, with different meanings. Instead of privileging one sign system over another, we should instead seek to read these

---

27 The ubiquity of triangular, transatlantic, and racial systems that underwrite the cultural foundations of American Empire has remained understudied because institutional disciplinary structures encourage critics to consider the textual and visual as separate forms of representation. Scholars of art history focus on visual, and increasingly on material culture. Scholars of literature focus on textual representation. In recent years an interdisciplinary turn has taken shape, with art historians considering the textual, literary historians considering the visual, and scholars of history considering both. Yet the overwhelming tendency among current critics is for scholars of one field to use cultural representations from another as documentary evidence to support their arguments within their field. Literary scholars, for example, employ prints and paintings as evidence to support their cultural arguments about the text. Seldom do we study how the image and the text work together as a composite system of signification.

28 Ibid, 151.
independent sign systems in dialogue, each participating to construct meaning of the overall conceptual system.

Miller’s theory allows us to see the visual and the textual as constructing a complete meaning in concert, with neither sign system totally determining the meaning of other. In the frontispiece illustration of *the American Magazine*, for example, the French look like the English in terms of clothing and skin tone. But culturally, the text reveals, the French savages are more like the Indians, and possibly more degraded. The viewer can see that the French attempt to corrupt the noble savage Indians through vice, but requires the text to complete the circuit of signification and see that the French are also “savages,” albeit not noble ones. Image and text work in tandem to produce the comparisons between red Native Americans, white Americans, and another white empire that underwrite the project of empire in North America. Whether produced by Europeans or Americans, Native Americans or Africans, the print cultures of North America rely on redness to separate American from European imperial identities.

**Redness and Whiteness in North America**

In the cultures of print that influenced the formation of empire in North America, redness bleeds into whiteness; racialized qualities most recognizably associated with Indians are applied to supposedly racially pure and stable white imperial peoples. In his 1809 poem “On the Symptoms of Hostilities,” the American Philip Freneau derided British alliances with Native Americans as the cause of a racialized degeneration of both peoples: “Then Indian and English/ No longer distinguish/ They bribe, and are bribed, for
a warfare accurst; / Of the two, we can hardly describe which is worst.”

Freneau’s couplets equate British imperial relationships with Native Americans as a cause of the fall of British civilization: where once existed two distinct cultures, one civilized and one savage, now exist two savage cultures. In Freneau’s formulation, improper British imperial relationships threaten not only Americans, but the British themselves, who devolve into savages by inciting Native Americans to violence against American empire. Freneau “reddens” the British Empire, describing its whiteness as degraded, and not suiting an imperial people. In this same poem Freneau asserts that British alliances “made the native a beast,” and therefore degraded even those who are already red savages. Such characterizations open the way for the United States to take up the mantle of white imperial civilization in North America, and even justify future aggression against a racially impure British Empire. Refracted through redness, empire remained at the center of shaping American imperial identity during the nineteenth-century.

As these examples suggest, understanding triangulation requires an awareness of redness beyond the biological definitions most often associated with skin color. Eighteenth century Europeans, metropolitans, and diasporic colonists alike frequently wrote and spoke about indigenous peoples, as well as one another, in terms of race. But this conception of race was rooted in nation and culture, not biology. In his “Speech at


30 Ibid., 3:292.

Detroit,” Pontiac categorized Indians and English in terms of redness and whiteness, with the French somewhere in between, based not only on kinship, but also on clothing and technologies. Around the same time, General Jeffrey Amherst declared Indians “the Vilest Race of Beings that ever Infested the Earth,” and ordered that his soldiers “Destroy their Huts and Plantations, and put to Death everyone of that Nation.” Amherst’s orders bring into relief the ambiguity between the terms race and nation during the eighteenth century. Does Amherst believe Indians are a race, a nation, a race with national qualities, or a nation with racial qualities? Words such as “Ottawa,” “French,” and “English” appear to signify “discretely bounded and unambiguous political entities,” yet their use demonstrates the slippage between intertwined and ambiguous concepts of race and nation. If Etienne Balibar is right that “the discourses of race and nation are never very far apart,” it should not be a surprise that metropolitans employed such vivid depictions of racial otherness to subordinate creoles, nor that Americans should deploy these racial discourses against white European empires to stabilize their own identity during the eighteenth and early nineteenth-century transatlantic contest between Anglo-American empires.


34 Etienne Balibar and Wallerstein, Immanuel, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London: Verso, 1991), 37. Michel Foucault has analogously theorized that nationalism produces racism to unify ethnically diverse populations into an imagined homogenous community not only by constructing difference between the nation and external groups,
When Europeans and Native Americans initially encountered each other, they did not consider the other as racially different. Much British colonial writing of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century refers to Native Americans as white. Despite this apparent color-blindness, though, most Europeans considered Native American culture and religion to be barbarous. In textual and visual records of early colonization, Europeans delineated the cultural boundaries between barbarous Natives and civilized Europeans through apparel and ornament—e.g., a feathered headdress, a tomahawk, moccasins—that marked the Native as inferior to the European. Over the course of the eighteenth century, as the availability of land decreased and Europeans coveted Native land and resources, Europeans increasingly marked Native Americans as racially different by categorizing them as “red.” Not until the end of the century, after the conclusion of the War of American Independence, would redness, and the supposed irredeemable inferiority that accompanied it, become the justification for denial of Native sovereignty.

Whiteness and redness signify a cluster of categories of difference that in the nineteenth century would be consolidated and incorporated into scientific discourses of racism based on physical attributes. According to such categories of difference, red Native Americans dressed themselves only partly, and in feathers, while Europeans

but also internal ones. Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976* (New York: Picador, 2003), 53.

dressed fully in fine finished garments. Red Native Americans lived nomadic hunting lifestyles in wigwams while Europeans lived in houses in settled agricultural communities. Cultural practices involving the use of clothing and tools served as physical signs of the differences that separated red and white nations, savage and civilized peoples, from one another.

Redness and whiteness would even become associated with the process of civilization and the development of culture. During the late eighteenth century, philosophers of the Scottish enlightenment developed the stadialistic theory that all peoples followed the same cycle of savagism to civilization, and that Native Americans simply occupied a savage state resembling that of England’s own Celtic ancestors. According to such a theory, Native Americans could conceivably grow civilized in an environment more conducive to “advancement.” The nineteenth century witnessed even more insidious theories of difference in the forms of scientific racism which posited that Native Americans were biologically inferior to Europeans, and could never become civilized. Accordingly, civilization became a racial characteristic of white Europeans, savagism a characteristic of red Native Americans. In the United States, Americans coupled scientific racism with stadialistic theory to create the myth of the vanishing Indian, which held that Native Americans were biologically doomed to become extinct in direct proportion with the advancement of American civilization.


37 Thomas M. Allen, A Republic in Time: Temporality and Social Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008);
same stadialism, American civilization would naturally continue to advance, making the extinction of red Native Americans, and the total occupation of North America by white Americans, racially predestined. Grounded in these models of history, redness and whiteness defined civilizations as inferior and superior, primitive and advanced, savage and civilized.

Redness has served as a powerful and versatile force for shaping imperial identities due to the very fact that it is not really a representation at all, but a simulation. As traditionally theorized by semiologists, ideal and ethical systems of representation function through equivalence between the socially-constructed sign and a signifier that independently exists in the world. This theory of representation rests on the assumption that the sign will represent something that exists in the real world outside of language. As Jean Baudrillard argues, however, modernity and imperialism have distorted the equivalence between sign and signified to the point which the sign or image "bears no relationship to any reality whatsoever" to the signified. The sign has instead become a "simulation" that "masks the absence of basic reality."  

Baudrillard specifically cites the supposed “discovery” of the Americas as a crucial point where signs transitioned from representing to simulating reality. According to Baudrillard, European sign systems “entirely reinvented” Indians as “a simulated sacrifice” of real Native Americans in order to preserve and perpetuate European beliefs that would have been otherwise shattered by


their experiences in North America. Gerald Vizenor has expanded Baudrillard’s premise, arguing that the idea of the American Indian is itself a symbol created not to represent, but instead to dominate the indigenous peoples of America. For this reason Vizenor theorizes that American literature has utilized American Indians as a vehicle to produce a “literature of dominance” that seeks to create an absence of Native Americans to make way for Euro-American imperialism.39

Redness functions in print culture as an empty vessel created and developed over centuries to contain the plethora of European anxieties, fantasies, horrors, and desires of Western imperialism. Redness erases real Native Americans and replaces them with a racial simulation. Redness and whiteness functioned as racial discourses that the British, and later American Empires used to justify genocide and exploitation of Native Americans, as well as construct hegemonic relationships between one another and competing European powers such as the French and Spanish. After the American Revolution and into the nineteenth century, Americans would justify their imperialist and genocidal actions in North America through redness as they expanded toward the Pacific Ocean and sought to displace their white imperial rivals from North America, and later the western hemisphere. “Printing Indians” allows us to see that behind every simulation of redness in print culture lies the desire of one empire to supplant, through either the domination or absorption of the Native American empire, as the ultimate empire of North America.

Empire’s Triangles

As he began his 1787 Fourth of July oration to the Connecticut Society of the Cincinnati, the U.S. poet and politician Joel Barlow proclaimed that he commemorated “the birth of an Empire.”\(^{40}\) Barlow’s choice of the word “empire,” rather than “nation,” is not incidental. Barlow refers to America as an empire eleven times in his short speech, linking empire to the very birth of the United States. The “declaratory Act of Independence,” Barlow claims, “gave being to an Empire” (7). Throughout Barlow’s tribute, American empire unfolds seamlessly from American independence. Barlow was not a minority in conceiving of America in terms of empire. As Edward Larkin has shown, British colonists, and later Americans, frequently envisioned themselves as members of a great empire.\(^{41}\) “The logic of empire,” writes Larkin, “understood as a structural relationship between a series of discrete peoples that could be, but need not be, hierarchical, provided the basis for the conceptualization of the U.S. from the very beginning.”\(^{42}\) By showing how nation and empire existed simultaneously in early America as founding principles for the relation between the federal republic and the states, Larkin expands empire studies to include the internal

---


\(^{42}\) “Nation and Empire in the Early U.S.,” 3.
structures of an American empire. But despite the overlap between nation and empire, colonialism remained central to U.S. sovereignty. As Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri write, “in the imperial conception” of the United States, “power finds the logics of its order always renewed and always re-created in expansion.” According to this definition, colonialism remains central to U.S. sovereignty. As Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri write, “in the imperial conception” of the United States, “power finds the logics of its order always renewed and always re-created in expansion.” American imperial identity, according to this definition, relies on the foundation of the United States as a constantly expanding state, and correspondingly on conceptions of America that justify the genocide of peoples in the name of American expansion. “Printing Indians” analyzes the means by which American print culture produces and re-produces the racial logics that mandate expansion and colonialism as an integral aspect of U.S. identity.

These racial logics most often manifest through triangularity. The concept that American identity forms through a triangular structure grounded in representations of Native Americans, the British, and Americans has hovered at the edges of recent scholarly conversations about race and empire in early American literatures. For example, Philip Deloria theorizes that colonial Americans “created a new identity . . . in an intricate three-way system” with their conceptions of British and Native American identity. More recently, Kariann Akemi Yokota has argued for “triangular relations” between creoles, Europeans, and “racially oppressed groups (African Americans and Native Americans).” However, neither of these otherwise illuminating works emphasizes triangularity as their central object of study, nor theorizes how it actually

43 Hardt and Negri, Empire, 167.


works. The most sustained effort to analyze and theorize this kind of triangular identity formation lies in settler post-colonial theory developed by scholars such as Alan Lawson to analyze Australia, and adapted to the North American context by scholars such as Edward Watts. On a structural level, settler-postcolonialism theorizes that American identity is shaped through triangles that locate the American “somewhere in between” the

46 Alan Lawson, “Comparative Studies and Post-Colonial Settler Cultures,” *Australian-Canadian Studies* 10, no. 2 (1992): 157. See also Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Introduction* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassell, 1998). Proponents of early America as a settler postcolonial society have theorized that Americans simultaneously mimic and resist both the Indians that they colonize and the British by whom the settler is colonized. On the adaptation of settler-postcolonial theory to early North America, see Edward Watts, “Settler Postcolonialism as a Reading Strategy,” *American Literary History* 22, no. 2 (2010): 459–70. As Leonard Tennenhouse has pointed out, however, English culture served as a common foundation for both colonists and metropolitans, rather than a set of practices the white colonists mimicked or assimilated, as is the case of third-world colonies of the British Empire. *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and British Diaspora, 1750-1850* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 3. Indeed, while settler postcolonial theory has yielded important insights about the culturally and politically marginalized position of colonists in relation to the British metropole, settler postcolonial theory holds several major flaws that render it inappropriate to the United States. American colonists may have been economically oppressed and exploited in structurally similar ways to the colonies of the second British Empire, but they were not culturally colonized in the same way as Indian and African peoples with their own cultures prior to colonization. See Ralph Bauer and Jose Antontio Mazzotti, “Introduction,” in *Creole Subjects in the Colonial Americas: Empires, Texts, Identities*, Edited by Ralph Bauer and Jose Antonio Mazzotti (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute in Early American Culture, 2009), 7–13. Furthermore, America may be accurately conceived of as a settler colony, but it is one that, and will probably never, decolonize. See Anne McClintock, “The Angel of Progress”: Pitfalls to the Term ‘Postcolonialism,’ ” in *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*, Edited by Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen (New York: Manchester University Press, 1994), 258. Finally, in early America and even to this day the “postcolonial” paradigm remains a highly problematic framework to apply to the state of Native Americans, since the United States has continued to occupy and govern Native territories under the U.S. legal code that considers Native nations to be “domestic dependent nations.” See Eric Cheyfitz, Introduction, *Columbia Guide to American Indian Literatures Since 1945*.
Indian and the European. While this formulation is at times accurate, settler postcolonialism does not adequately account for the diverse uses by which early North Americans employed triangularity to construct their own identities. Rather than only locating themselves between Europeans and Indians, settler colonists used triangularity to shape imperial identity through a variety of racial hierarchies. As I will show in my second chapter, for example, settler colonists adapted the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative to locate the British Empire in between the Indian and the American. And as the frontispiece to the *American Magazine* plainly shows, settler colonists at times located the Indian between themselves and another imperial people.

Rather than adapting postcolonial theory, “Printing Indians” studies such triangular structures of identity formation within settler colonist print culture through a formulation akin to Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s theory of triangulation of homosocial desire. In *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (1985), Sedgwick argues that the figure of the woman in eighteenth-century British romances serves as a conduit for the repressed homosocial desire between two male characters.47 Whereas Sedgwick’s theory of triangulation contemplates the manifestation of redirected desire on the level of gender, “Printing Indians” studies an analogous imperial triangle structured through race. This triangle redirects the often racialized desire of one imperial

47 The bonds of desire between the two male rivals in these romances, attests Sedgwick, are as strong (and in some cases stronger) than those exhibited toward the woman they both desire to possess. In this triangular structure of sexual identity formation, the woman serves as a conduit to redirect a homosocial desire that cannot be directly expressed within the boundaries of eighteenth-century British culture. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), esp. 20-27.
people for another through the representation of Native Americans. Because imperial identity required constructing distinctions between cultures that were relatively racially and culturally similar, members of one white empire often located the figure of the Indian between themselves and other European empires.

The complex interplay of image and text in print culture encourages us to envision this triangulation of imperial desire as driven by dual imperatives of diaspora and creolization. Leonard Tennenhouse has argued that colonists, and later Americans, faced a diasporic existence. Rather than grounding a new American identity in the soil of the continent, writes Tennenhouse, the people of the colonies and later the United States sought to maintain an identity rooted in English culture. Just as Americans sought to replicate English culture, they sought to recreate the empire that spread English culture across the globe, the British Empire. Yet metropolitan Britons sought to exclude Americans from the British Empire and English culture through the discourse of creolization. As formulated by European natural scientists, the concept of creolization held that new-world colonists gradually degenerated from their cultural purity, either through exposure to the North American climate, or contact with Native Americans and Africans, to become more like savages. Despite the fact that a colonist shared the same ancestry, homeland language, religion, and culture as metropolitans, he was, as Benedict

48 Tennenhouse, The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and British Diaspora, 1750-1850.

Anderson put it when he reintroduced the term into scholarship, “irredeemably a creole.”\textsuperscript{50} The racial logics of creolization located the figure of the Indian between the colonial and the European. Internalizing metropolitan discourses of creolization, American writers articulated their diasporic rivalry with Europeans through triangulation with the representation of Native Americans. To paraphrase Sedgwick, in this imperial rivalry the bond that links the two rivals is as intense and potent as the bond that links either of the two empires to the Indian: the bonds of “rivalry” and “love” may be experienced differently but are equally potent and in many cases equivalent.\textsuperscript{51} Whiteness serves as a racial metaphor for a baseline, normative empire that uses the Indian, and the accompanying racial discourse of redness, as a “conduit of a relationship” in which the true partner is the rival white empire.\textsuperscript{52}

Even beyond the cultural production of settler colonists, Africans and Native Americans also employed triangularity to shape their own identities in North America. For example, at the beginning of the French and Indian War, the Seneca Tanaghrisson admonished the French, “both you and the English are white, we live in a country between; therefore the Land belongs to neither the one nor t’other: But the Great Being above allow’d it to be a Place of Residence for Us.”\textsuperscript{53} Tanaghrisson divides peoples into “we”: the indigenous and “whites.” At first glance, Tanaghrisson’s statement appears to

\textsuperscript{50} Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism}, 58.

\textsuperscript{51} Sedgwick, \textit{Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire}, 20.

\textsuperscript{52} I borrow this phrase from Sedgwick. Ibid., 26.

construct binaries between whites and Indians. Yet Tanaghrisson vaguely locates Indians in “a country between” two white empires, rather than outside or opposite them, evoking the triangulation that dominates the print culture of early America. Pontiac’s “Speech at Detroit” affords an additional example of how Native Americans deployed evolving conceptions of redness and whiteness to locate their own identities between two empires. And as I show in my second chapter, the African creole John Marrant would use triangularity to define the British Empire in the years following the American War of Independence. Thus, colonists, Americans, Native Americans, and Africans would all employ the print cultures of early America to structure their conceptions of empire through contrasts with both the representation of Native Americans and another empire. In the chapters that follow, “Printing Indians and the Imperial Contest in North America” traces the development of this image-and-text triangular system, throughout the multi-ethnic cultures of North America, from the colonial era to the U.S. Civil War.

This study begins with King Philip’s War because the colonial narratives of this war, such as Increase Mather’s Brief History of the War with the Indians (1676) and Mary Rowlandson’s The Sovereignty and Goodness of God (1682), constitute a key turning point in the way that English colonists represented Native Americans in print culture. Whereas before King Philip’s War, colonists depicted Native Americans as capable of advancing from their savage state to become civilized Christians, after the war they portrayed Native Americans as irredeemable and unable to adapt to Anglo-American
civilization. The genre of the Indian Captivity narrative that emerged from King Philip’s War set in motion racialized patterns of imperial identity formation that recur at least up until the close of the American antebellum period. Scholars have speculated that Native Americans became less important to shaping American identity after the era of Indian Removal in the 1830s, as the country became embroiled in a national crisis over slavery and blackness that would culminate in the U.S. Civil War. Studies of race in antebellum America have focused largely on racial constructions of blackness in the era following Indian Removal, as if Americans ceased to shape their identity through redness, or Native Americans exited print culture during this period. Quite to the contrary, this dissertation shows that the representation of Native Americans did not diminish after Indian Removal, but instead became submerged in conventions and tropes associated with redness even when Native Americans were not an explicit subject of visual or textual narrative. This project’s focus on how the visual and textual work in tandem in early American print culture and on how redness shapes the historical formation of imperial identities in North America.

Each chapter of “Printing Indians and the Imperial Contest in America” examines how representations of Native Americans function as conduits for difference between European empires in a particular genre of print culture. The first two chapters


55 For example, see Lucy Maddox, Removals: Nineteenth Century American Literature and the Politics of Indian Affairs. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 7.
chronologically overlap in their examination of British political cartoons and the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative, focusing for the most part on the period before the end of the War of American Independence in 1783, when the American colonies still could be considered part of the British Empire. Chapters three and four adopt a more linear chronological approach in order to study how Americans manipulated the patterns of representation studied in the first two chapters to shape their own identity as an empire between the American Revolutionary War and the U.S. Civil War. By examining this representational strategy as it evolved over two centuries through print culture, this project shows that America’s racialized identity as an empire did not take shape through binaries of white and red, but through a triangular structure of red, white, and white.

Chapter One examines how British metropolitans in London introduced a triangular system of racial representation during the eighteenth century in widely circulating prints that employ the allegorical figure of the American Indian to represent the British colonies. I first study prints such as The Deplorable State of America (1765) and The Able Doctor (1774), which use this figure as a means to debate the rights of the colonies during a series of intra-imperial crises over taxation. This symbol of the Indian functions as a pictorial manifestation of the metropolitan theory of creolization that racially reinforces the colonies’ subordinate and inferior status within the empire. This chapter next analyzes colonial iterations of these prints to show how, as diasporic Englishmen, colonists rejected this symbol of the racial colonial impurity by lightening the skin tone of the Indian or altering the figure’s apparel. Finally, I study prints produced at the British metropole that protest the terms of the Treaty of Paris that acknowledged the United States as an independent imperial nation. These prints register Britons’
sustained rejection of Americans as their cultural equals, even as these prints anxiously foreshadow the ascent of the United States as a global imperial power. This chapter demonstrates that the system of identity formation that forms the subject of this dissertation emerged from British metropolitan strategies to racially subjugate the colonies of North America.

The second chapter analyzes how the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative shaped multiple iterations of imperial identity by contrasting white Americans with both Native Americans and another imperial collective, such as the French or British Empire. The first section demonstrates that colonists beginning with Hannah Swarton relied on the representation of Native Americans to construct an English North American empire as morally superior to the French Empire. Captivity narratives written during this period portray the French as having become culturally degraded by this type of imperial structure. At the same time, they attest that a British Empire based on increasingly racialized exclusion would allow creoles to maintain their racially pure Englishness. The second section argues that rebel colonists like John Dodge and Ethan Allen adapted this triangular structure of the Indian Captivity narrative to portray the captivity of American soldiers by the British Army during the War of American Independence. These writers substituted the British Empire for the position held by the French Empire in first generation captivity narratives. In doing so, these revolutionaries relied on the representation of Native Americans to portray the British Empire as degraded through its alliances with Native Americans, and an emerging American empire as the true heirs to pure Englishness in North America. The final section shows that John Marrant’s *Narrative*, which has often been interpreted as articulating African-American identity
through binary contrasts with Native Americans, actually deploys redness through the same triangular structures as early Indian Captivity narratives. Marrant depicts an alternate model of British Empire that can incorporate Native Americans and Africans, in opposition to a savage American Empire based on racial exclusion.

Chapter Three shows how in the early decades of the nineteenth century, the Pequot writer and orator William Apess incorporated text and image in his *Eulogy on King Philip* (1836) to contest this triangular system of identity formation. This chapter expands scholarly understanding of the *Eulogy* by examining its textual content as mediated through its frontispiece, *King Philip Dying for His Country*. I argue that this woodcut engraving, dismissed as an anomaly by previous scholars, inverts and expands the iconology of a nineteenth century visual discourse of Indian Captivity initiated in John Vanderlyn’s painting *The Death of Jane McCrea* (1804), which depicts the purported murder of a colonial woman by Mohawks during the American Revolution. Throughout the nineteenth century this image circulated through print in the form of book illustrations and broadsides, beginning with Joel Barlow’s *The Columbiad* (1807). By establishing that this frontispiece resists an already established discourse of empire, I show that as a composite system of image and text the *Eulogy* advocates for a multicultural America built through cooperation between Native Americans and Anglo-Americans. Apess reconfigures a triangular structure of British, American, and Native American identities originally developed to advance European imperialism against Native Americans into a structure that allows Native sovereignty within North American empires.
The dissertation culminates by analyzing how the writings of Nathaniel Hawthorne and George Catlin employ visual and textual racial tropes to destabilize this transnational triangle in the years immediately preceding and following the U.S. Civil War. In *The Marble Faun* (1859), Hawthorne, through the conventions of neoclassical sculpture, constructs a racial triangle between Native Americans, American empire, and the Roman Empire—the empire conceived of as the archetype of empire itself for many nineteenth-century Americans. In the character of Donatello, Hawthorne creates a permanent indigenous presence that has been colonized by the Roman Empire yet refuses to vanish, even long after the fall of Rome. Hawthorne creates a composite discourse that conflates nineteenth-century vocabularies of sculpture with historical narratives that describe the progress of empire. Recognizing the intertwined language of sculpture and empire in the novel allows us to see that Donatello’s murder of the Model functions as an act of resistance to the narrative of American empire, liberating him from the racially determined extinction demanded by a model of empire predicated on theories of racial difference. Hawthorne thereby posits the possibility that Native Americans can coexist alongside American Empire. Simultaneously, he collapses the triangular structure of identity formation by creating similarity between America’s purported empire of liberty and Rome’s empire of blood and conquest, and between Native Americans and Africans.

Catlin follows Hawthorne’s innovation in his *Last Rambles* (1868) by using illustrations to liken Native Americans to Africans as visually depicted in David Livingstone’s *Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries* (1865). In doing so, Catlin participates in a racial and imperial shift toward the triangulation of red,
white, and black that would stabilize U.S. national identity following the Civil War. At the same time that Catlin’s final printed work re-directs triangularity inward toward the nation, he recalibrates this system to be multidirectional as he continues to face triangularity outward toward the empire through contrasts with Native Americans and the Spanish Empire. “Printing Indians and the Imperial Contest in America” is the story of the triangular system of identity formation in print culture that would sustain a circum-Atlantic contest of empires between Anglo-Americans, Africans, and Native Americans from its colonial origins into the nineteenth century and beyond.
Chapter 2

RED, WHITE, AND WHITE: CONTESTS OF ANGLO-AMERICAN EMPIRES

The first British political print to protest the Stamp Act, the London engraving *The Deplorable State of America, or Sc_h Government* (Fig. 2.1), depicts the British colonies in North America as a dark, half-naked American Indian. This male figure, further identified as an Indian by his feathered headdress, as well as a bow and arrow strung across his back, stands at the center of the print. This engraving was published as a broadside in 1765 on the very same day as the passage of the Act itself. Like most such prints, *The Deplorable State of America* situates the figure of the Indian amid an array of well-known, emblematic figures that date back to the Renaissance. This emblematic tradition made political prints readily accessible to illiterate viewers, as well as those without expertise in political theory.¹ A female figure identified by her shield as Britannia proffers a box labeled "Pandora's Box," which Britannia's speech balloon designates the Stamp Act, to the Indian. The Indian appeals to Minerva, an emblem of wisdom, stands at left with helmet and spear, for aid. The Indian states that he "abhor(s)" the Act "as death." Minerva, goddess of wisdom, urges the Indian to reject the Stamp Act, advising "take it not." Mercury, symbolizing commerce, tells the Indian "it is with reluctance I leave ye,"

while Liberty, on the ground beneath the figures, bemoans "it is all over with me."² Through this blend of textual and visual rhetoric, the print decries the Stamp Act for destroying commerce and liberty throughout the empire. By depicting all of these emblematic figures of values that bind British subjects—both those that we might attribute to national values, such as wisdom, but also those that structure empire, such as liberty and commerce—as vehemently opposed to the Stamp Act, this print rejects the Stamp Act as antithetical to the ideals of British imperial identity.

Figure 2.1. The Deplorable State of the America, or Sc_h Government. Etching. London, 1765. The British Museum. © Trustees of the British Museum.

In popular culture and scholarly studies alike, the Stamp Act of 1765 has long been viewed as the first step in a series of events that led inevitably to the War of American Independence.\(^3\) Between the imposition of the Stamp Act and the Declaration of Independence, British colonists masqueraded as Americans Indians in response to the Tea Act of 1773 and threw the Boston Tea Party. Since at least the 1830’s, the Boston Tea Party has been considered an originary moment in the development of a uniquely American consciousness, where British colonists played Indian to celebrate their distinctness from European ideas.\(^4\) This essay reexamines the trajectory of intra-imperial conflict that began with the Stamp Act through a very different case of colonists dressed as Indians: the allegorical figure of the Indian as America. This racialized, printed symbol

\(^3\) Scholars interpret the Stamp Act as a “prologue” to American Independence that set colonists on a “road to revolution.” Mercy Otis Warren advanced this narrative in her *History of the Rise, Fall, and Termination of the American Revolution* (1805). For one of the earliest iterations of this idea in modern historical thought, see Edmund S. Morgan and Helen M. Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution* (Chapel Hill: Published for The Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia by The University of North Carolina Press, 1953). For a more recent, and one of the most-cited versions, see T.H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).


Philip J. Deloria characterizes the Boston Tea Party as “a catalytic moment” and an “origin story.” “For the next two hundred years,” he writes, white Americans molded similar narratives of national identity around the rejection of an older European consciousness and an almost mystical imperative to become new.” *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 2.
of the colonies rooted colonial identity and, later, national identity for citizens of the United States, in a consciousness that was not uniquely American, but rather grounded in European conceptions of creolization and colonial inferiority.

Primarily disseminated through the work of printers and engravers at the British metropole, the image of the Indian crisscrossed the eighteenth-century British Atlantic world in prints like *The Deplorable State of America* as a means to signify the colonies in popular debate over the proper structure of authority within the British Empire. Within this transatlantic print network the red Indian body served as a vital signifier that tethered the diverse British colonies in North America to the imperial metropole. As a key symbol of the colonies, the figure of the Indian functioned as part of the metropolitan project to justify imperial authority by configuring British imperial identity through racial hierarchies. Benedict Anderson has argued that print culture such as these political prints fostered the emergence of national identities by connecting individuals who might never meet but shared the same language and reading experiences.  

Anderson developed his theories of imagined community in part to explain the emergence of new world nationalism. However, as Ed White has subsequently argued, in the case of the colonies of British North America "the overarching imagined community is the empire, imagined as a complicated community of hierarchies and relations, an encompassing system whose viability hinges on the careful construction, regulation, and maintenance of certain smaller collectivities." This revision to Anderson’s theories raises important questions


6 Ed White, “Early American Nations as Imagined Communities,” *American Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2004): 67, Italics in original. Edward Larkin has shown that “the logic of
about the symbolic role the figure of the Indian played in the construction of British imperial identities in the Atlantic World, as well as the relationship between nation and empire. As numerous scholars, including Anderson, Paul Gilroy, and Linda Colley have argued, collective identities such as those linked to nation and empire typically bind populations through conceptions of racial or ethnic purity.7 In his study of the African Diaspora, Gilroy writes that according to Euro-American conceptions of modernity, the nation-state is founded through the idea of “thinking ‘racial’ self that is encountered . . . within the fortified frontiers of . . . discrete ethnic cultures which also happen to coincide within the contours of the sovereign nation-state which guarantees their continuity.”8 Colley expands formulations such as Gilroy’s when she argues that the expansion of the British Empire, accompanied by inter-imperial wars with France and other European powers, stimulated the unification of Welsh, Celtic, Scottish, and English peoples under a common national identity. Based on these theories of nation and empire, we would expect Britons at the metropole to assert racial and ethnic continuity with their diasporic settlers on the frontiers of the Empire. However, by visually depicting British colonists as Native Americans, illustrators and engravers that created difference between colonial and


metropolitan populations that within the borders of the British nation would otherwise be considered homogenously European and "white." In the act of visualizing the colonial political body through redness, printers and engravers united colony and metropole in a vision of empire grounded in racial difference—not only between Native Americans and Britons, but between white populations within the Empire.

By representing the colonial political body with an Indian, British metropolitans visually marked their colonial kinsmen as creoles—Europeans who, according to metropolitan theories of natural development, inevitably degenerated as a result of exposure to the new world environment.¹ In depicting such degeneration through the figure of the Indian, metropolitans employed the image of a racialized other to picture difference between whites within the empire. Although the concept of the creole originated in the metropole, its impact extended across the Atlantic to the colonies, compelling diasporic colonists to assert their purity through conformity with European culture. At the same time that this depiction served to subordinate colonists within the empire, the use of the Indian to portray the culturally and economically diverse British colonies clustered along the Atlantic rim unintentionally contributed to the colonist’s

growing sense of a shared identity distinct from that of British metabolians. The figure of the Indian thereby functions as a transnational symbol that obstructed the inclusion of British colonists within British national identity. From this perspective, the nascent U.S. Empire would be born of a racialized difference that relied on emerging conceptions of redness as a means to produce hierarchies between populations who both considered themselves white.

**Redness and the Structure of Empire**

British printers employed the pictorial image of the colonies as an Indian with greatest frequency during the empire-wide debates over the limits of metropolitan authority that followed the Stamp Act, and continued through the War of American Independence. From their point of primary production in London political prints carried the image of the American Indian to the colonies, in order to disseminate news about important events in Europe, or debate matters of imperial policy. Colonial printers, for their part, often reproduced and modified the imagery and text of metropolitan prints. Political prints like the *Deplorable State of America* reached a wide population of readers across the British Empire. These illustrations were printed and reprinted in magazines and newspapers such as the *Gentleman’s Magazine* in London and the *Pennsylvania Gazette* in Philadelphia. Most often, though, Britons encountered the figure of the Indian in the form of broadside prints. In this format, political prints could be purchased by individual consumers at print shops to hang in residences or, more frequently, by the

---

owners of coffee houses and taverns for public consumption.\textsuperscript{11} These establishments displayed prints prominently on the walls of the common room, where they could be viewed and discuss by men across class lines, "from aristocracy to laborers."\textsuperscript{12} Through the circulation of political prints the figure of the Indian joined colonial and metropolitan communities in a common readership.

Such prints shaped colonial identity within the empire through a complex interplay of race and gender. In racial terms, engravers consistently visualized the colonies as a half-naked Indian with dark skin attired in feathered headdress and skirt, and often grasping a bow or wielding a tomahawk. This cluster of iconological signifiers portrayed the colonies as red Indians. In terms of gender, at the commencement of the Stamp Act Crisis artists overwhelmingly pictured this Indian as female. Imagined as a daughter of Britannia, this feminine figure dubbed "The Indian Princess" by art historian E. McClung Fleming emphasized consanguinity between inhabitants of colony and metropole. Yet by visualizing the colonies through redness, metropolitan illustrators portrayed British colonists as inferior and subordinate to the white metropolitans.\textsuperscript{13} The


\textsuperscript{13} Olson, \textit{Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology}, 75.
Indian Princess thereby registers a conflicted effort by artists to picture the colonies at once firmly linked to metropolitans within the empire by filial bonds, yet at the same time alien from the British national identity that colonists would otherwise presume share with metropolitans. Although the Indian Princess remained the primary symbol of the colonies following the Stamp Act, artists and engravers began to depict this Indian as male as a part of their protest against what the British public increasingly regarded as an unconstitutional oppression of the colonies. Prints that employ a male Indian like *The Deplorable State of America* portray the colonies as growing stronger and more capable of political resistance, even though dress and skin color continue to mark the colonies as culturally subordinate. Such prints additionally weaken the filial bonds between metropole and colony, since engravers and printers did not conceptualize the male Indian related by blood to Britannia.

The figure of the Indian first emerged as a symbol for the British colonies in North America as a collective political body following the French and Indian War of 1754-1763. During this period metropolitan soldiers were deployed in North America in significant numbers, and conflict with the French Empire disrupted global trade. Since this North American war served as an extension of long-standing European conflicts between France, England, and eventually Spain as emerging global imperial powers, British illustrators and engravers required a symbol for the colonies in political cartoons that communicated news of important events across the Empire. *British Resentment, or the French Fairly Coopt at Louisbourg* (Fig. 2.2), printed in London in 1755, employs

the most common iteration of this figure of the Indian between the French and Indian War and the War of American Independence.

*British Resentment* dramatizes a complex fantasy of a British Empire that has already eclipsed France as the North America’s preeminent imperial power. The etching depicts an impending British capture of the French Fort Louisbourg in New France (although the British would not actually capture the fort until 1758). The print visualizes Britannia as newly enthroned in New France to signify British dominion, while two Indian women—with dark reddish skin, scant clothing, and feathered adornments—kneel at her feet to depict colonial submission to metropolitan power. By representing the colonies as two physically similar and Indian Princesses, the artist’s depicts the British colonies as separate political entities, equally subordinate to metropolitan authority. At right, the French are imprisoned in a cage that is being towed westward to Europe. The print envisions the British Empire forcibly removing the French from North America. Below the border of the illustration, the artist has explained important sections of the image by indexing them with matching numbers and corresponding textual explanations. The first numbered point explains that Britannia is here "attending to the complaints of her injurd Americans," and that she "receives them into her protection." The third number indicates that the British Lion is "keeping his dominions under his paw safe from invaders." *British Resentment* thereby constructs the French Empire as an invader to North America mercilessly attacking vulnerable colonists. The illustration makes colonial dependency on the metropole explicit by pairing the visual image of Indians kneeling with a textual explanation of Britannia’s role as protector of the colonies from the French. The artist thereby guides viewers to understand that Britain is sending thousands of
troops to North America for war in New France primarily to protect helpless colonial subjects. The colonies can only be saved, the print implies, if the French are exiled from North America.\(^\text{15}\)

![Figure 2.2: British Resentment or the French Fairly Coopt at Louisbourg. Etching. Hand-colored. Published by T. Bowles, L. Boitard artist; J. June etcher. London: 1755. © Trustees of the British Museum.](image)

\(^\text{15}\) Timothy J. Shannon analyzes this print as a vehicle to structure the British Empire in *Indians and Colonists and the Crossroads of Empire: The Albany Congress of 1754*, 56–63. Shannon argues that the Indians in this print might with equal facility signify actual Native Americans or colonists. While I agree with Lester Olsen and other scholars who argue that these Indians represent colonists, Shannon’s argument emphasizes the ambiguity of racial boundaries between creoles and Native Americans in the metropolitan imperial imaginary.
By symbolizing the colonial polity with the figure of the Indian in such political prints, metropolitans drew colonists into a visual discourse of racial difference that had been evolving for centuries in two parallel, yet increasingly entangled trajectories. On one hand, an ethnographic pictorial tradition developed in early modern promotional tracts, such as Theodore de Bry’s *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. The images produced by De Bry and other engravers were instrumental to producing European knowledge of the “New World.” 16 The image of Native Americans as primitive savages played a central role in the construction of such knowledge. By depicting the indigenous peoples of the continent as inferior to civilized, technologically-advanced Europeans, such images justified European conquest of the Americas, as well as exploitation and genocide toward Native Americans. On the other hand, in a tradition that began almost concurrently, European engravers used the female Indian as an emblem to symbolize the American continent itself alongside the other established emblems for the three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia.17 Artists depicted this figure, dubbed by art critics “The Indian Queen,” as a Native American "tawny" in skin tone, partly naked and wearing a feathered skirt and headdress, often carrying a bow and arrow.18 In order to convey the exoticism and danger with which Europeans viewed the Americas, The Indian Queen was sometimes depicted riding animals such as an armadillo, an alligator, an armadillo, an alligator,


17 Fleming, “The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783,” 68.

18 Ibid., 67.
or even a stegosaurus, and surrounded by scenes of cannibalism and human sacrifice.\textsuperscript{19} This figure of the Indian as America circulated prominently throughout Western Europe in the multimedia forms of prints, textiles, ceramics, and even theatre.\textsuperscript{20} In these two traditions, then, this depiction of an Indian held divergent significations. The ethnographic figure of the Indian signified Native Americans, while the emblematic figure signified the lands inhabited by Native Americans, and desired by European empires. Because Europeans sought to exploit both the indigenous peoples of the Americas and the land itself for its resources, the logic of imperialism embedded in the figure of the Indian applied equally well to both purposes.

Yet this logic does not explain why metropolitans chose this red figure as a symbol for their white kinsmen who settled North America as part of the British imperial project. Metropolitans strategically chose the figure of the Indian to symbolize the British colonies in their political prints as a means to visually convey the metropolitan belief that colonists were creoles. Even though metropolitans considered colonists to be British, they also believed that exposure to the New World environment, as well as proximity to Native Americans and Africans, left colonists vulnerable to creolization. According to what metropolitans theorized as an inescapable process, Europeans degenerated culturally when they resided or were born in North America. Creoles became less like Britons, and

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{19} For further discussion and examples of such prints see Hugh Honour, \textit{The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time} (London: Allen Lane, 1975), 84–117.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 109.}
more like savages.\textsuperscript{21} Within this context, the figure of the Indian locates colonists outside the boundaries of British national identity. Metropolitans relied on the concept that creoles were culturally degraded to justify limitations on colonial participation in imperial government.\textsuperscript{22} Despite the fact that the colonists in North America shared the same ancestry, homeland language, religion, and culture as metropolitans, each colonist was, as Benedict Anderson has put it, "irredeemably a creole."\textsuperscript{23} Creoles thus occupied a liminal position within the empire. Their British descent theoretically allowed them the full rights of Englishmen, and of course allowed them much greater respect and mobility than would have been allowed to Native Americans. But because the logic of creolization portrayed white colonists as culturally degraded, it reconfigured them as, much like Native Americans, savages within the empire.

British political prints interpellated colonists, now separated by the Atlantic and considered degraded creoles, into a messy, still fluctuating field of increasingly racialized difference only then emerging as a tool to create hierarchies within the British Empire. In representing the colonists as creoles through the body of an Indian, metropolitans employed many of the same discourses of racial difference that both colonists and metropolitans used to justify imperialism toward Native Americans. White creoles were overwritten with red Indians, uniting the two collectives of very different cultures, as well as disparate positions within the structure of empire, under one symbol. However, these

\textsuperscript{21} Bauer and Mazzotti, “Introduction,” 41.


\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism}, 58.
political prints depicted “white” colonists as “red” through the same pictorial strategies that were being more and more often deployed to depict Native Americans, themselves once considered “white,” as different and inferior.

British prints responding to the Stamp Act initiated the use of the figure of the Indian to construct the metropolitan government as unjustly oppressing the colonies. Through these prints, it would be metropolitans, rather than colonists, who first visualized colonial resistance to imperial policy. In the process of stimulating public debate over the structure of empire, the figure of the Indian developed a transatlantic currency among both metropolitans and colonists. *The Deplorable State* was immediately followed by a flurry of prints that similarly utilized the figure of the Indian to decry the Stamp Act as harmful to the empire. London prints like *The Great Financier, or British Economy for the Years 1763, 1764, 1765* and *The State of the Nation: 1765, etc.* rely on the Indian to depict a British economy trending downward toward ruin as a result of its North American colonial policies. Even though these prints were produced at the metropole, they were exported and sold in the colonies, as evidenced by Philadelphia advertisements for *The State of the Nation: 1765, etc.* These political prints acted as part of a public protest so successful that in 1766 parliament repealed the Stamp Act. That year metropolitan prints such as *The Balance, or America's Triumph, The New Country Dance*, and *The Triumph of America* celebrated the repeal. As their titles alone indicate, these prints convey a sense of victory for the colonial political body against the

metropolitan parliament. At the same time, their continued use of the figure of the Indian racially reinforced the cultural inferiority of colony to metropole.

Following the repeal of the Stamp Act, the figure of the Indian temporarily receded as an emblematic figure in British political prints, appearing in only one print, *The Triumvirate, or Britannia in Distress*, published in London in 1769. Rather than focusing on intra-imperial trade or colonial sovereignty, this particular print primarily debated political events at the metropole and protested the exclusion of John Wilkes from parliament that year. The appearance of the Indian in this print demonstrates the figure’s continued currency as a symbol of the colonies, yet the scarcity of the figure during this period suggests that despite the colonial outrage against the acts like the Townsend Acts passed from 1767 to 1768, metropolitans did not feel compelled to depict the colonies as a distinct political body. However, this decline reversed sharply following parliament’s passage of the so-called Coercive Acts in 1774. Parliament passed these four acts (the Boston Port Act, the Massachusetts Government Act, the Administration of Just Act, and the Quartering Act) partly in retaliation for the Boston Tea Party in December of 1773, itself a colonial response to parliament’s passage of the Tea Act earlier that year. 25 By even further tightening imperial authority over colonial self-government, the Coercive acts stimulated a new wave of metropolitan political prints that relied on the use of the Indian, and soon once again reached across the Atlantic Ocean to the colonies.

25 For a summary of the provisions of these acts and the logic behind their passage, see Carp, *Defiance of the Patriots: The Boston Tea Party and the Making of America*, 190–200.
Such prints criticize the Acts through words and images of escalating interracial violence. One of the earliest of these, the engraving *The Able Doctor, or America Swallowing the Bitter Draught* (Fig. 2.3), makes clear to viewers that it refers to the Boston Port Bill through three textual references to Boston. This first of the Acts closed the Port of Boston to trade as retribution for the Tea Party. First published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in London in April of 1774, this print depicts the colonies as an Indian Princess restrained on the ground by members of Parliament. Lord Mansfield holds her arms to the ground, while Lord Sandwich holds her feet, lifts her skirt and leers. Prime Minister Lord North pours liquid, presumably tea by the shape of the pot, down her throat. France and Spain stand at right, amused at the spectacle. Britannia covers her eyes in disgust at the behavior of her ministers. Even though she is restrained, the Indian Princess nonetheless resists by spouting the tea back into Lord North's face.

This engraving metaphorically constructs the Tea Act and the Boston Port Bill, much like colonists felt, as acts of forced colonial consumption of metropolitan goods. In this context, the engraving espouses the cause of the colonists who protested the Tea Act. By depicting the Indian Princess as a sexual victim resisting the advances of parliament, the engraving characterizes this forced consumption as a metropolitan act of economic rape. Like many political prints published following the Coercive Acts, *The Able Doctor* relies on satire to criticize the British Empire. As a visual medium, these prints function

through what one art historian describes as "the deployment of a pictorial negative." As a genre, satirical prints like *The Able Doctor* picture the current state of the British Empire that they ridicule as they seek to stimulate social change. In *The Able Doctor*, Britannia's need to avert her gaze from the rape of her daughter cues viewers to sympathize with metropolitan viewers with the colonists across the Atlantic with whom they were likewise related by blood. constructs parliamentary acts like the Boston Port Bill and the Tea Act as a contradiction to the legitimate structure of empire.

Figure 2.3. *The Able Doctor, or American Swallowing the Bitter Draught*. Engraving. London. Published in *The London Magazine*, v.43, 1774. The British Museum. © Trustees of the British Museum.

Political Prints published in the years preceding the American Revolution, like *The Able Doctor*, are often interpreted to support American independence because they favor the rights of the colonies. In *Playing Indian*, for example, Philip Deloria cites *The Able Doctor* as an example of how "colonial propaganda . . . adapt(ed)" the figure of the Indian "in order to convey revolutionary messages." While this print clearly advocates for colonial rights, viewers would not necessarily perceive its "message" to be "revolutionary." Describing *The Able Doctor* as an instrument of the revolutionary cause elides its complex iconological origins in the metropolitan imagination and obscures the structure of empire that this print advocates. Prints such as *The Able Doctor* would indeed eventually become instruments of revolution, yet as generated by metropolitans these prints focused on terms of colonial inclusion and subordination, not independence. In its composition and iconology, *The Able Doctor* draws on patterns of representation employed in European prints of the early modern period that depicted the American continents through the emblematic figure of the Indian Queen, such as Theodor Galle’s influential print *Vespucci Discovering America* (Fig. 2.4). This 1600 engraving, which would be reproduced throughout the eighteenth century, depicts the Indian Queen as inviting European sexual conquest. Clad in only a feather skirt and headdress, she looks in wonder before the commanding gaze of Vespucci, who stands fully clothed before her.

---

This sexualization of the Indian Queen metaphorically portrays the Americas, and implicitly its indigenous people, as inviting European conquest. The Able Doctor, with its Indian Princess supine and nearly naked at center, surrounded by standing, fully clothed Europeans, bears remarkable iconographical and compositional similarities with Vespucci Discovering America.

![Image of Vespucci Discovering America]

Figure 2.4. Jon Van Der Straet. *Nova Repurta: Vespucci Discovering America*. Engraving. 1600 Antwerp. Artstor.

29 See Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Carribean, 1492-1797* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 1–2; Gaudio, *Engraving the Savage: The New World and Techniques of Civilization*, xiv-xv. Deloria notes a connection between these two engravings, yet reads the Able Doctor as a contrast, rather than a continuation, of the sexualization and subordination of the colonies in Vespucci Discovering America.
Based on these similarities, we can see that the allegorical imagery of *The Able Doctor* is derived from visual tradition that already depicted imperial identity as already grounded in exploitation. This tradition erased the violence of imperialism by portraying European conquest of the Americas as a consensual sexual act between Europeans and colonists. Analogously, the exploitation of metropole by colony would certainly be permissible. The representation of the colonies as red authorizes such exploitation. *The Able Doctor* does not protest the exploitation of the colonies by the metropole, or the subordination of colonists. The first part of the engraving’s title condones a hierarchical relationship between metropole and colony by comparing Lord North to a doctor and the colonies to a patient. Instead of protesting an inappropriate relationship between doctor and patient, this print protests parliamentary mismanagement by depicting Lord North as a doctor who abuses his patient. *The Able Doctor*, then, does not criticize colonial exploitation, but rather the degree to which the metropole has exploited the colonies. The problem is not exploitation itself, but rather that parliament has driven the colonies to resist by being overly oppressive. As pictured in this illustration, metropolitan oppression exceeds even what is allowable to an Indian. The satirical portion in the title “The Able Doctor” lies in the word “Able”, not “Doctor.” A doctor’s purpose, in the context of this engraving, is to restore the empire to its thriving position before the imposition of the Stamp Act, which included metropolitan extraction of wealth from the colonies. The problem shown in the image is that these members of parliament are not “Able”—instead of acting in the interests of the empire, these doctors abuse their power. Therefore, *The Able Doctor* simply advocates for a recalibration of imperial exploitation to acceptable levels. While *Vespucci* illustrates a solitary emblematic figure of Europe as a consensual
partner, *The Able Doctor* depicts the Indian Princess surrounded with multiple European figures. By depicting emblems of the empires of Spain and France lingering and watching, *The Able Doctor* articulates anxieties that this intra-imperial oppression makes the British colonies, and by extension the British Empire, vulnerable to inter-imperial aggression. The print argues that without changes to the structure of empire, Britain might be forced to share the economic spoils of her once consensual conquest of the colonies. This print relies on the figure of the Indian to advocate the repeal of the Coercive Acts in the hope that in doing so the empire can return to the consensual exploitation of colony by metropole.

As the conflict between colony and metropole escalated, metabolitans used the figure of the Indian to register open colonial rebellion. Metropolitan printmakers continued to represent the colonies primarily as a female Indian, but ceased to depict this Indian as exploited and enslaved. The titles of these prints, such as *Bunker's Hill, or the Bless'd Effects of Family Quarrels* (1775), *When Fell Debate and Civil Wars Shall Cease* (1775), and *The Parricide. A Sketch of Patriotism* (1776) show how even as the American crisis developed into outright civil war, metabolitans invoked familial likeness between Britons on both sides of the Atlantic. Rather than lying prone as in *The Able Doctor*, artists more and more portrayed this Indian as "standing up" to emblematic symbols of the metropole to fight for liberty. *The Female Combatants* (1776), for example, depicts a nearly naked Indian Princess with feathered skirt and headdress and

hair at her shoulders (Fig. 2.5). She is tattooed, and of slightly darker complexion than Britannia, who sports a stylish gown and coiffed hair. This artist has depicted the Indian Princess as engaged in a boxing match with Britannia. Britannia calls the Indian Princess a "slut." The engraver thereby makes a pun to negatively conflate sexual liberty with political liberty and criticize calls for colonial autonomy as licentious and extravagant.  

While the artist has used the clothing, tattoos, and skin tone to emphasize the cultural inferiority of creoles to metropolitans, the two figures' horizontal alignment suggests a measure of equality in terms of their political strength. The artist depicts the Indian Princess with a relatively light skin tone, in contrast to the dark skin of the Indian Princess in prints like British Resentment (Fig. 2.2). The engraver thereby partially mitigates her redness, even though she remains racialized in form of her feathers and tattoos. Kinship is explicitly invoked in the Indian Princess’ reference to Britannia as her "mother." At the same time that this metropolitan artist depicts violence between colonist and metropole, its depiction of the conflict through a sporting boxing match downplays the civil war's bloodshed, and its potential to tear apart the Empire. Prints such as the Female Combatants suggest a longing for a reunion between the family unit of colony and metropole. Indeed, prints of this type have ceased to focus their satirical criticism on parliamentary policy and instead communicate a public yearning for a reconciliation that will draw the colonies back within the fold of the Empire.

Colonial Prints and the Imperatives of Diaspora

The use of the figure of the Indian as a symbol of the colonies originated with metropolitans as a means to racially mark colonists as creoles within the empire. However, between the Stamp Act and the War of American Independence this allegorical figure would become so integral a vehicle for transatlantic debate over imperial policy as to be employed in prints produced by colonists themselves. Such prints remain heavily derivative of metropolitan prototypes. Often these prints directly reproduced their metropolitan models, as in Paul Revere’s 1774 copy of *The Able Doctor*. At other times colonial engravers slightly modified the iconography of London prints as a response to

Figure 2.5. *The Female Combatants, or Who Shall*. Etching, Hand-colored. July 6, 1776. The Lewis Walpole Library, Farmington, CT.
metropolitan thought, as in the case of John Singleton Copley’s iteration of *The Deplorable State of America* (1765). Indeed, the dearth of colonial innovation in these political prints emphasizes the extent to which metropolitans dominated the visual discourses constructed through the figure of the Indian.

The tensions between colonial efforts to copy and to alter these metropolitan originals illustrate the vexed position of creoles within the British Empire. Facing westward from the center of imperial power, metropolitans pictured creoles as alien and inferior by racializing them as red savages. Facing east toward their homeland, however, creoles desperately desired to assert their oneness with the metropole. As members of what Leonard Tennenhouse has called an English diaspora, creoles sought to assert continuity with the metropole in order to reinforce their bonds with their homeland.32 In cultural terms, this desire manifested in the form of literary and visual production that reproduced metropolitan forms. This would be especially true in the case of the political prints that protested the Stamp Act, which required that creoles demonstrate their expertise in the terms of the debate at the metropole. However, participation in this debate demanded that creoles reproduce a cultural form that racially marked themselves as others. Paradoxically, asserting their purity as Englishmen required colonists to picture themselves as savages.

Nonetheless, colonists modified these illustrations in ways that demonstrate their own resistance to the imperial ideologies embedded in this visual signifier. The first colonial print to employ the figure of the Indian was Boston artist John Singleton

Copley's modification of the London print *The Deplorable State of America* (Fig. 2.6). Copley produced his version in November of 1765, eight months after the metropolitan original. Copley's iteration emulates the metropolitan engraver's composition, but reconfigures some of its iconology. Whereas the London original portrays a dark-skinned male Indian standing with bow and arrow mounted on his back, Copley depicts a female Indian with lighter skin lying on the ground, with bow and arrow at her side. Copley's change of the figure to a prone female figure, holding no weapons, reasserts a near-totality of colonial subordination lost to the London original. Copley’s Indian is a defenseless victim of metropolitan policies. However, Copley's choice to lighten the skin tone of the Indian to match that of the other figures in the print erases one of the figure's most prominent bodily markers of racial inferiority. His decision to place the bow and arrow at the Indian's side, rather than on her body, further separates his Indian from objects that symbolically constructed creoles as savages inferior to Europeans. In mitigating the redness of his Indian, Copley proclaims the Stamp Act to be an act of imperial oppression by metropolitans against fellow white Englishmen.

---

33 Copley's version would itself be copied and slightly revised by an artist identified only as Wilkinson. This copy was published in *The Pennsylvania Gazette* in January of 1766. For a detailed discussion of the multiple versions of this print and their symbolism, see Richardson, “Stamp Act Cartoons in the Colonies.” See also Vincent Carretta, *George III and the Satirists from Hogarth to Byron* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990), 105–110.

34 Carretta, *George III and the Satirists from Hogarth to Byron*, 105.
tethered to metropolitan originals. The most frequently reproduced metropolitan print, the 1774 London engraving *The Able Doctor* (Fig. 3), would be republished in several subtly different versions. While these prints continued to criticize the Coercive Acts within imperial frameworks, they advocated divergent responses to imperial oppression. Seven months after its London prototype, Paul Revere engraved a copy of *The Able Doctor* to be published in *The Royal American Magazine; or, Universal Repository for Instruction and Amusement*. Revere's version, like much of the meticulous engraver’s work, is almost an exact copy of the London version, except that Revere adds the word "TEA" to the pot.
Revere's insertion of the word tea in this print demonstrates at least measured support for the Boston Tea Party and for colonial resistance. In response to Revere's print, the Philadelphia broadside iteration that followed just two months later distanced itself from any revolutionary message. The anonymous artist of this engraving also copied the metropolitan original, but retitled the broadside *The Persevering Americans, or the Bitter Draught Return'd*. This title directs reader attention toward the Indian Princess’ metaphoric rejection of the Tea Act and the Coercive Acts. However, by characterizing the Indian Princess as “Persevering,” the print portrays the colonies as laboring to bear imperial oppression until it could be corrected from within the imperial government. In this sense the Philadelphia reproduction tempers any support for insurrection implied in Revere's version.

Not until 1775, following the battles of Bunker Hill and Lexington and Concord, would colonists explicitly adapt the figure of the Indian into calls for breaking the bonds that tethered colony to metropole. Late that year, Timothy Green of New London printed a crude woodcut relief of *The Able Doctor* as frontispiece for his edition of *Freebetter's New England Almanac of the Year 1776* (Fig. 2.7). Green's iteration mirrors his metropolitan prototype by exactly copying and reversing the original. However, Green uses *The Able Doctor* to mediate an anonymous revolutionary poem embedded in stanzas across the top pages of the almanac's interior. By placing the Indian Princess in dialogue with this poem, Green transforms the Indian Princess from a figure that divided the


36 Ibid., 113.
British Empire into two collectives into a symbol for American nationalism. This poem subverts the filial conventions that positioned the Indian Princess as the daughter of Britannia by offering Greece and Rome as an alternative "parent state" to the colonies, which are identified under the umbrella of "America." After first locating America as the heir to ideals of liberty and resistance to tyranny that originate in Greece and Rome, the poem next depicts America's rise to its own imperial status before any mention of Britain. The poem depicts the ascent of America as a moment when the ideals of American liberty can enlighten the world:

"Hail! happy day, while patriotic fire
Glows in the breast of the noble mind t’inspire
Flame’d by this spark America will shine
And lighten distant world with rays benign.

Such lines advocate and celebrate American independence to an extent unrealized in The Able Doctor as an individually circulating illustration. In its glory America emulates Rome, compared to whom "No human granduer e'er appear'd so great; / Spread its vast wings to earth's extreamest point, / And sea and land to pay low homage join'd." Such lines reproduce tropes common among revolutionary-era poems that celebrate "The Rising Glory of America" by poets such as Philip Freneau and Timothy Dwight.39


38 Ibid.

39 For an analysis of such poems within the paradigm of English diaspora, see Tennenhouse, The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and British Diaspora, 1750-1850, 12–18.
Through these stanzas the poem thereby depicts America as reaching prominence as a global empire that will expand across the globe.

Moreover, this poem counteracts *The Able Doctor*'s depiction of Britannia as a maternal force sympathetic to colonial oppression. When Britannia finally appears, she enters as a force of "TYRANNY," who "alarms/ freedom's true son, and forces to arms."

The poet emphasizes the loyalty of the colonists to the mother country, asking
rhetorically "Did we the parent whence we sprung disgrace? And show ourselves a mean
degen'rate race?" This last clause demonstrates the poet's awareness metropolitan
accusations that colonists had degenerated into creole savages, and rhetorically asserts
their falsity. While the engraving *The Able Doctor* pictures Britannia averting her gaze
from the rape of the colonies, this poem describes Britannia as being transformed into a
"tyrant" who, "having taught them to be free and brave, Would her own breast her
offspring enslave!" According to this poet, British tyranny has forced the colonies to fight
for freedom from metropolitan slavery. The figure of the Indian's use as the cover for the
almanac that contains this poem shows that by 1775, at least New England colonists had
begun to redeploy the allegorical figure of the Indian as a symbol for the colonies in
works that advocated American independence. 40 Through this combination of image and
text, this edition of *Freebetter’s Almanac* adapts redness into a marker that racially
differentiates American liberty from British tyranny.

Whether privileging colonial or metropolitan perspectives, political prints that
employ the figure of the Indian invite questions about the structure of the British Empire
through a narrative of racial difference. Engravings that rely on the figure of the Indian to
symbolize the colonies posit differences between whiteness and redness (and
accompanying cultural qualities of civilization and savagery) as baseline beliefs shared
by British subjects on both sides of the Atlantic. Copley, as we have seen, sought to
diminish prominent markers of racial difference between colonists and metropolitans

40 After the 1776, *The Able Doctor* circulated as a transfer print on powder horns carried
by soldiers of the Continental Army. Lester C. Olson, “Pictorial Representations of
British America Resisting Rape: Rhetorical Re-Circulation of a Print Series Portraying
when he lightened the skin of his Indian (as compared to the metropolitan original) in his Stamp Act-era reproduction of *The Deplorable State of America*. At the same time, metropolitan prints such as *The Female Combatants* depicted the colonies as an Indian Princess with fair skin in their effort to portray racial consanguinity between empire and colony. A survey of seventy-seven prints shows that almost sixty percent of metropolitan prints depict the Indian with darker skin than the emblematic figures that accompany them, while only eighteen percent of political prints produced by colonists do so. Analogously, sixty-eight percent of metropolitan prints marked the Indian as other through stereotypical accessories such as feathers or bow and arrows, while just twenty-seven percent of colonial prints conformed to this convention.  

This trend shows that colonists and metropolitans alike agreed redness served as a signifier that could be used to racially mark peoples as culturally inferior to white Europeans, thereby unfit for sovereignty. Most likely it was the very scarcity of signifiers of redness in the metropolitan original of *The Able Doctor* that made this engraving suitable for Timothy Green to appropriate as a call for revolution in his 1775 edition of *Freebetter’s Almanac*.  

In the process of deploying the figure of the Indian to mark creoles as different and inferior, metropolitans contributed to the growing sense among the colonists that they constituted a collective political body, rather than thirteen individual colonies. At the time of the Stamp Act, colonists living in the diverse colonies from Massachusetts to Maryland to Georgia did not think of themselves as possessing a shared colonial identity. While they first and foremost identified themselves as Virginians or Carolinians,

colonists identified themselves primarily with the British metropole and seldom with creoles of neighboring colonies. When the metropolitan Andrew Burnaby noted in his travels that “fire and water are not more heterogeneous than the different colonies of North America,” he articulated this lack of a common identity among colonists. In contrast to the 1755 print *British Resentment* (Fig. 2), which uses the Indian Princess to represent the colonies as physically similar and equally subordinate to Britannia, which signified the colonies through two separate Indian Princesses, the thereby distinct political entities under imperial authority, the political prints that responded to the Stamp Act for the first time visualized the colonies as sharing the same plight from metropolitan aggression, through the single symbol of the figure of the Indian. Perhaps ironically, this signifier of colonial unity originated at the metropole to keep the colonies firmly subordinate to the empire. Creoles considered themselves distinct from their neighbors in other colonies when Burnaby observed them during tour of North America. But the fact that in 1765 and afterward creoles reproduced metropolitan prints that visualized the colonies as one political body suggests that the colonists began to think of themselves as sharing a common identity, even if this was portrayed through a symbol that, despite their diasporic desire for continuity with the metropole, represented colonists as distinct and alien.


43 T.H. Breen has argued that colonial boycotts of metropolitan goods following the Stamp Act contributed to the unity of the American colonies. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence*. 72
1.3 Impossible Indians and the Instability of Empire

Across the Atlantic, the radical transformations in the political relationship between colonists and the European metropolis sown by the Declaration of American Independence posed new challenges for the British artists and engravers. Especially after British General Burgoyne's surrender at the Battle of Saratoga in late 1777 and the formation of American alliances with France and Spain in 1778, the figure of the Indian in British political prints became an increasingly unstable signifier. The visual political discourse of empire that began in *British Resentment* (Fig. 2) in 1755 and continued throughout the crises over the Stamp Act and the Coercive Acts had employed the figure of the Indian, mostly in the form of the Indian Princess, as an instrument to graphically subordinate colonists within the empire. But in the new imperial order, to which metropolitan engravers would increasingly object, the United States fought alongside Britain's imperial enemies as a nascent global power. Although the Indian Princess maintained currency in this new phase, the primary gender of the figure of the Indian in metropolitan prints shifted to male. Metropolitan political prints ranging from *The Bull Over-Drove* and *The English Lion Dismembr'd* in 1780, to *Britannia’s Assassination—Or the Republican Amusement*, published in 1782, most often pictured a male Indian, but sometimes the Indian Princess, successfully contesting British power through violence alongside emblems of French and Spanish Empires.

44 As calculated by Lester Olson, British artists represented the Indian as male in over half of political prints published after 1777. *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, xv.
Following the lead of earlier scholars who coined the terms Indian Queen and Indian Princess, I will refer to this male emblem of the United States as the Indian King. By representing the colonies as a male, artists signaled a metropolitan recognition of the colonies as a potential political and military match for the metropole. As in their depictions of the Indian Princess, illustrators depicted the Indian King with significantly darker skin than his European counterparts, usually wearing only a feathered headdress and skirt. Unlike the Indian Princess, who carried a bow and arrow, weapons that might also be used by Europeans or carried by neoclassical figures such as Cupid, the Indian King usually carried a tomahawk to indicate his savagery. While the Indian Princess was a daughter of Britannia, the Indian King possessed no such designation. These differences detached the Indian King from the kinship to the metropole symbolized by mother and child. Such changes, and the accompanying alterations to the status of the figure of the Indian in these prints, graphically reconfigured the position of the former colonies to stand as a near-equal to white imperial empires within the global order. Yet picturing the

45 This term is particularly apt because, at the same time that the Indian depicted in political prints was culled from a stereotype formed over centuries of colonial discourse, so too the concept of the Indian King is in important ways a European construct. In Native societies different individuals held authority based on cultural situations, such as a war chief, a civil chief, and a spiritual chief. Nonetheless, Europeans translated most Native leaders as "kings." Furthermore, the British often elevated Native Americans who had little or no authority within their own tribes to the level of king in order to legitimize treaties that exchanged land, or with whom they crafted alliance. By the end of the eighteenth century, the term Indian King had come to designate any Native American deemed of importance within the context of empire, regardless of whether that individual held any actual position of leadership or authority within his tribe. The term Indian King then, like the stereotypical feathered, tomahawk wielding image of the Indian that proliferates late eighteenth century British political prints, had become a signifier whose primary purpose was not to represent actual Native Americans but to promulgate English ideologies and agendas. See Eric Hindraker, “The ’Four Indian Kings’ and the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 53, no. 3, Third Series (1996): 487–526; Shoemaker, *A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in North America*, 35–60.

46 Olson, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, 89.
colonies as an Indian continued to mark colonists as culturally degenerate, more like savages than Britons.

Beginning in 1780 with *The Bull Roasted, or the Political Cooks Serving Their Customers*, but more commonly during the peace negotiations to end the war after 1781 in prints like *The Reconciliation Between Britannia and Her Daughter America* (1782), *The State Cooks Making Peace___Porridge* (1782), *The Blessings of Peace* (1783) and *The General P_ss, or Peace* (1783), metropolitans began to represent the United States as an Indian standing or sitting on equal terms with Britain and other empires. Such prints often use the figure of the Indian to satirically protest the peace, and the United States' new independence. In *The Bull Roasted*, the Indian Princess sits at a table at the right, between emblems of France and Spain, with a Dutchman lolling on the floor in front of the table (Fig. 2.8). The figures sit side by side amicably, discussing which parts of the bull they would prefer to consume. These three signifiers of empire dine upon the flesh of the British Bull, which rests on a spit at left, being turned and roasted by King George III.

This symbol of the British public was often used to represent Britannia in prints that criticized government oppression. A large pot hangs above the dancing flames of the fire, symbolically serving as a vessel of destruction and transformation of the British nation. Prime Minister North, at center, carries a fresh bowl to the diners at right, promising to "serve" his "good friends" as quickly as possible. As narrated in the couplets below the illustration, King George III is seen as a conspirator with parliament "tho' he should such an Office disdain." Thus, the print casts both King George and British ministers as

---

complicit in serving the public wealth of Britain up to foreign powers. The couplets at
bottom express further public outcry at the scene with the stanzas: "Behold the poor Bull!
Once Britannia's chief boast / Is kill'd by State Cooks, and laid down for a Roast!" These
couplets, along with the illustration, cast British peace negotiations as enacting a
redistribution of wealth to foreign empires, propagated by the same government meant to
protect it. France, Spain, and the United States are all eager to consume the Bull:
"Monsieur licks his gills at a bit of the Brown/ And the other two wish for to gobble him
down," the print reads. By using words such as "gobble," "lick," and "gills," the author in
fact likens all of these imperial figures to animals, rather than exalted emblems of
civilized empires. Implicitly speaking for the public addressed, the author protests further
with the lines: "But may ill digestion attend on the treat / And the Cooks every one soon
be roasted, & Eat." By wishing all of the figures, both domestic rulers and foreign
leaders, either indigestion or that they be eaten and destroyed themselves, the print
criticizes everyone—Parliament, the King, France, Spain, and the United States--
involved in the approaching dismemberment of the British Empire.
Perhaps most outrageous to the print's audience, *The Bull Roasted* depicts an Indian occupying a position of near-equality with signifiers of European empires. In this case the parity is even more egregious because it is the Indian Princess who, although still marked as culturally inferior, assumes the place of a political equal with the male figures. Indeed, the Indian Princess seems to be included in "the other two" who encourage the Frenchman to eat the bull, leaving the Dutchman, rather than the Indian, excluded from this inter-imperial network. As a satire, this print operates through the principal of the
“pictorial negative” to depict a negative vision of the imperial order which it advocates. The presence of an Indian at the table of empire emphasizes the sense of public outrage at the prospect of an approaching peace that recognizes American sovereignty.

Following the Treaty of Paris, metropolitan artists used such prints to protest the terms of peace even more vehemently by employing the figure of the Indian King as a symbol of a sovereign American empire. *The General P__s, or Peace*, published in London in 1783, uses satire to protest the new global equilibrium in imperial power as reconfigured by the Treaty of Paris (Fig. 2.9). On a purely visual level, *The General P__s* protests the treaty by depicting not only the imperial powers of France, Spain, and Holland standing beside Britain, but also the new United States, in the form of the Indian King, gathered around an enormous chamber pot. Clockwise from left to right, figures representing competing European empires – British (at far left), Dutch (to the immediate right), America (represented by the feathered male Indian), Spanish, and French (in elaborate costume and garish powdered wig), stand in a semi-circle. Swords, war drums, and even national emblems rest in the foreground while these five generals dressed in their finest public ceremonial costumes urinate in the communal pot. They hold their genitals and lean back and sideways to keep their balance. They are ridiculed and reduced from elite to human, even vulgar, status. The angles of the crossed swords in the foreground run parallel to the paths of urine streaming from the generals, referencing phalluses and further mocking the peace between empires.

The United States, although still racially marked as creole through the Indian King, is elevated to an almost equal status by joining in their communal practice. He stands with the same posture, at the same horizontal level, and urinates into the same
basin as the European figures in the print. His feet are slightly behind those of the European figures, indicating that he has only recently joined the circle of empires. This places him slightly farther from the pot, somewhat mitigating his status as a political equal. But he nonetheless stands at the same pot, his right to stand independently in the same space now uncontested. In an instance of the textual punning that this print uses to deride the peace, the Indian King extols his new freedom with "a free and independent piss." The text beneath the image emphasizes the print's caustic disapproval of the scene:

Come all who love friendship, and wonder and see,
The belligerent powers, like good neighbors agree,
A little time past Sirs, who would have thought this,
That they'd soon come to a general P__s?
The wise politicians who differ in thought,
Will fret at this friendship, and call it to nought,
And blades that love war will be storming at this,
But storm they will, it's a general P__s.
A hundred hard millions in war we have spent,
And America lost by all patriots consent,
Yet let us be quiet, nor any one hiss,
But rejoice at this hearty and general P__s.
Tis vain to fret or growl at our lot,
You see they’re determined to fill us a pot,
So now my brave Britons excuse me this,
That I for Peace am obliged to write Piss.
These clever couplets lambast the British government’s agreement to a treaty that allows other European empires to stand as Britain’s equal. To focus its discontent, the text employs a pun on the word “general,” to signify not only the military general in the print, but also the word’s connotations of equality and inclusiveness. Both the print’s title and the interior text conflate the words “piss” and “peace” several times before the artist explicitly uses the word “piss” in the last word of the poem. Instead of a pot of gold, which would symbolize commercial wealth, to replace the “hundred hard millions spent,” the public “we” is rewarded with a pot of “piss.” By stating that these generals have “filled us a pot” the print shows the British Empire, which should be filling the pot with wealth, is now distributing excrement to the public who supported the war. These couplets convey a sense of public betrayal by an elite government and its complicity with the imperial powers with which it has now chosen to stand as equals.
The symbols of the pot, and to a lesser extent the dish and the spoon, play a prominent symbolic role in conveying the protests against peace with the United States and its imperial allies. In *The Bull Roasted*, the solid black pot stands out against the much lighter background of almost diaphanous flames and smoke, drawing the viewer's gaze to the back of the illustration and the Bull being roasted. In *The General P__s* the pot sits at the center of the print, drawing the viewer into the print and acting as the fulcrum of action. I suggest that these prints employ the pot as a symbol of the Atlantic Ocean. We can see this most clearly through the composition of *The General P__s*, which

Figure 2.9. *The General P__s, or Peace*. London, 1783. Etching, Hand-colored. Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
extends its satire by invoking a parallel tradition of late-eighteenth century scatological humor that spatially diminished the bodies of water that separate Europeans. *Poor Old England, Endeavoring to Reclaim His Wicked American Children*, printed in 1777, for example, depicts the War of American Independence as a squabble between an elderly parent and unruly children (Fig. 2.10). England casts ropes across an Atlantic Ocean that literally narrows between the British Isles and North America, while a child representing one of the colonies “moons” his parent empire. While *Poor Old England* uses this bawdy imagery to mock imperial authority, however, *The General P__s* depicts imperial mastery over the Atlantic. The Atlantic Ocean has not only been spatially collapsed, but has been enclosed by empire.

Through the symbol of the pot, *The General P__s* positions the Atlantic Ocean as an object of inter-imperial competition. The English, Dutch, Spanish, and French empires had long engaged in competition to control the Atlantic. Furthermore, these are representatives of not just Atlantic, but global, empire. All the empires depicted participated in colonization across the globe, with the Atlantic Ocean being not a final destination but a gateway to the world—and the resources and peoples whom these empires sought to exploit. In the *General P__s*, the act of sharing the resources of the globe between empires yields not wealth but excrement. In *The Bull Roasted*, the pot which should generate sustenance for the British public instead serves as a cauldron of destruction of the British Empire, with British wealth now apportioned into individual bowls to be consumed by Britain's rivals. The United States, still racialized as the Indian, has assumed its place among the global empires around these communal pots, consuming the world's resources as imperial representatives have gathered as equals in a truce. Prints
such as these register a metropolitan outrage that the great empires of Europe have reduced themselves by sharing the world's resources—which implicitly should be theirs alone—with a savage American empire.48

Figure 2.10 Mathew Darly. *Poor Old England Endeavoring to Reclaim His American Children*. London, 1777. Etching. The Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

**Empire, Nation, and the Common Pot**

48 Sean X. Goudie has argued that the term "empire" does not accurately reflect early U.S. commercial hegemony in North America, and instead uses the term "paracolonialism" to describe the United States as dependent on already-existing structures of European colonialism. *Creole America: The West Indies and the Formation of Literature and Culture in the New Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006). This term may indeed reflect U.S. commercial exploitation of this period in a historical sense. As these prints show, however, British metropolitans depicted the United States as a global empire just as commercially and militarily effective as France or Spain, even if culturally barbaric and creole.
If images of the pot and dish were key images for voicing the British public’s opposition to the peace reached with the United States, these symbols were even more important to the Native Americans on whose stereotyped, red bodies political prints employed as a vehicle to stimulate public debate over empire. Native Americans used the image of the pot and the dish to convey concepts about the relationship between people, and the resources of North America and its surrounding waterways. Indigenous peoples of the Northeast, including the Algonquin language groups such as the Mohican, Pequot, Narragansett, and Arenac, the Iroquois, and even people as far west as the Ojibway, often thought of intertribal relationships in Native space in terms of a kettle, or dish, or spoon. Native use of this symbol dates back to before encounters with Europeans in the oral traditions of the Iroquois and extends into the treaty records recorded by Europeans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The dish or kettle signified a common hunting ground shared between tribes, while the spoon represented the people’s ability to eat freely within that hunting ground. Native Americans continued to invoke the metaphor of the pot and the dish to protest European treaty violations during the nineteenth century. Lisa Brooks has grouped these metaphors under the heading of "The Common Pot," which she defines as "the conceptualization of a cooperative, interdependent Native environment." Brooks theorizes the Common Pot as representative of shared Native space connected through a network of waterways that


carry resources, as well as networks of intertribal relationships built through kinship and adoption. This vision of shared space relied upon the sovereignty of all peoples involved in this network. In this way, the Common Pot represents an ideal based on a shared recognition that both Native space and resources must be shared among peoples in order to sustain communities. With European settlement of North America, the Common Pot would even come to include the Europeans with whom Native peoples increasingly shared the North American continent. Europeans, however, did not hold these same values, and violently disrupted the pot held in common.

Native understandings of the pot and the dish illuminate European assumptions about empire conveyed in The General P_ss and The Bull Roasted, which ridicule and mock a world wherein empires hold a pot in common. In the era following the Treaty of Paris of 1783, these prints protest a new imperial world in which the British Empire must share global wealth and resources with France, Spain, Denmark, and the United States. Political prints of this era depict sharing resources based on horizontal, inter-imperial principles of exchange not an opportunity for a new world order of peace, but an impending disaster. The General P_ss visualizes the resources of the Atlantic Ocean shared by empires as resulting in poisonous waste. The Bull Roasted imagines that sharing resources will result in the destruction of the British people. Tellingly, the artist of the latter print visualizes each imperial figure eating from an individual dish, rather than one shared in common. This combined use of the pot and the dish points to Europeans' inability to conceive of resources as shared between their empires after centuries of inter-imperial warfare across the globe. These satirical prints call for a world where the pot is once again dominated by the British Empire, and not shared with others.
Embedded in these political satires, in fact, lies an imperative renewed inter-imperial warfare. In protesting the new global imperial balance after the War of American Independence, these prints imply the value—which has run through all of the prints analyzed in this chapter—that in order to attain its ideal state the British Empire must dominate the globe and solely possess the earth's resources. Thus, these engravings and etchings insist on competition and warfare between empires.

By depicting the purportedly creole colonists of the newly independent United States as an inferior Indian, such political prints convey the absurdity of the terms of the Treaty of Paris of 1783 as viewed by the British public. According to The General P_ss and The Bull Roasted, the Treaty diminished Britain's imperial power to the extent that even an Indian could stand equal to the British Empire and partake of a common imperial pot. Indeed, from the perspective of British viewers of such prints in parlors and coffee-houses at the metropole, the prospect of an Indian standing on the same terms as the great empires of Europe presented a historical impossibility. Since the sixteenth century, Native Americans had been depicted by Europeans as savages. In this sense, this novel use of the figure of the Indian as a symbol of empire emphasizes one of the main aspects of the new imperial configuration that prints like The Bull Roasted and The General P.ss satirize: the admission of the United States to the circle of imperial powers. On a deeper level, however, this use of the Indian as a signifier for U.S. Empire violates imperial and racial hierarchies vital to Europeans’ sense of themselves. According to the stadialistic model of history, popularized in the late eighteenth-century British Empire by the Scottish philosopher Adam Ferguson, cultures advanced from states of savagery to civilization in an inevitable succession moving from east to west. Metropolitans and
creoles alike conceived of the British Empire as the current pinnacle of civilization. Native Americans, conversely, were believed to epitomize the lowest state of civilization: savagism. The problem was not that Native Americans were incapable of ascending to the civilized state. Indeed, many Europeans believed that Native Americans had degenerated from a prior imperial civilization in North America. But according to this model, Native Americans occupied a state of civilization historically anterior to the European present, and would not be able to again become civilized for centuries. Therefore, depicting the Indian as a symbol of empire both temporally and horizontally equivalent to English, French, Spanish, and Dutch empires, as in *The General P__s* and *The Bull Roasted*, constituted a complete historical anachronism. The British public was by no means prepared to visually recognize indigenous peoples as possessing the same imperial strength as Britons. In fact, the British Empire still retained control over territories that included indigenous peoples, and these same markers of racial inferiority remained essential for justifying the imperial project in North America. By depicting this historically impossible situation, these prints register outrage that Americans have been allowed to stand beside the great powers of Europe.

1.4 Redness and Anglo-American Identities

---

The colonists of British North America at first emulated, and later adopted, the same evolving racialized discourses of redness that metropolitans had developed not only to justify imperialism against Native Americans, but also to subordinate and differentiate white colonists of their transatlantic Empire. Following the Treaty of Paris of 1783, British metropolitans continued to employ redness to portray the newly independent United States as culturally inferior to European empires. This continuity recalls the problem that Gilroy identifies in scholarship about black culture in the transatlantic world. Gilroy apprehends that theorists of black identity tend to reify Euro-American absolutist understandings of the racial purity of the nation by placing a disproportionate importance on blackness as a determinate of national identity among diasporic Africans. Gilroy warns against the tendency among scholars of Black nationalism to conclude “based on overintegrated conceptions of pure and homogenous culture . . . that black political struggles are automatically expressive of the national or ethnic differences with which they are associated.”52 In examining how race structured the eighteenth-century British Empire, scholars have made just the opposite mistake. For decades scholars have studied how Britons, as well as the colonists of what would later become the United States, developed race to construct the transatlantic boundaries that linked populations within the Empire through racial homogeneity and excluded Native Americans through racial difference. This focus has rendered invisible the extent to which metropolitans used this same discourse of redness to racially manage whites at the margins of the Empire. This metropolitan deployment of race as a formulation of racial inclusion became

expressive of racial differences that allowed colonists to conceive of themselves as possessing a shared ethnic identity distinct from that of metropolitans. Yet when white colonists dressed as red Indians at the Boston Tea Party, they did not necessarily do so in celebration of their uniquely American character. Instead, their performance registers the vexed process whereby colonists adopted the figure of the Indian into a symbol of their own emergent imperial nation: a symbol that acted as a racialized marker of their own creole degeneration, expressed through an iconological tradition initially developed by British metropolitans as means to debate the terms of colonial dependence following the Stamp Act of 1765.

On a broader level, these transformations in the use of the figure of the Indian between the French and Indian War and the War of American Independence reveal tensions between the British nation and empire. The formation of national identities depends on the ability of a group of people to imagine themselves as a homogenous cultural community. At the same time, empire is predicated on the expansion of the nation into new geographical territories. In some cases, such an extension of borders stimulates the formation of national identities by placing the nation in conflict with racial or ethnic Others, as Colley argues that imperial conflict with France stimulated the unification of the British nation. But such expansion might also require the empire to incorporate populations formerly outside the boundaries of the nation or, as in the case of the British colonies in North America, disperse national populations across geographies that require innovations in the political and economic structure of the empire. During the colonial era, British metropolitans employed the figure of the Indians as a means to racially subordinate their own diasporic populations within the Empire. In doing so, they
unwittingly reconfigured British national expansion into a transnational movement. In this sense the figure of the Indian registers a rupture in the compatibility of nation and empire.
Chapter 3
CAPTIVITY AND THE RACE OF EMPIRES

During the Thirteenth Remove of Mary Rowlandson's now iconic Indian Captivity narrative The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, one of Rowlandson's Indian captors informs her that her son has been roasted and eaten, and was "very good meat."\(^1\) Rowlandson's son had been taken captive during the initial attack made by Wampanoag, Narrangansetts, and Nipmucs on the Rowlandson family's frontier home in Lancaster, Massachusetts, as part of King Philip's War. Rowlandson refuses to believe the Indian's claim. To her wonder, Rowlandson soon learns from another Indian that her son is indeed alive, and has just been carried to her own camp. Despite the numerous incidents of torture and murder of Englishmen by Indians that she has already described for her readers, Rowlandson writes that, "it might have been worse with him, had he been sold to the French, than it proved to be in his remaining with the Indians" (89). Given that Rowlandson devotes so much of her narrative to demonizing Native Americans as threats to her Protestant soul and English civilization, it seems extraordinary that she would characterize the French—a fellow white, Christian people—as more dangerous to English colonists than the supposedly savage Indians. Moreover, this statement marks a notable

\(^1\) The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, Together with His Promises Displayed, Being a Narrative of the Captivity of Mary Rowlandson, in The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, with Related Documents, Ed. by Neal Salisbury (Boston: Bedford, 1997), 87. All further citations are to this edition.
digression in Rowlandson's story, especially since the French appear nowhere else in her narrative.

As one of earliest print genres to emerge from the contact experiences between European colonists and Native Americans in North America, the Indian Captivity narrative played a key role in shaping early colonial, and later American collective identities.\(^2\) In these narratives Rowlandson and other creoles sought to assert that the purity of their English identity remained intact despite their experiences in the wilderness among Native Americans, who were cast as irredeemable threats to English civilization and Protestantism.\(^3\) Based on this structure, Rowlandson's narrative largely configures


3 Ralph Bauer and Teresa A. Toulouse have recently analyzed Rowlandson and Swarton's as creole texts that played a complex in defining intra-imperial difference between British metropolitans and North American creoles. See Ralph Bauer, *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 118–156; Teresa A. Toulouse, “Female Captivity and ‘Creole’ Male Identity in the Narratives of Mary Rowlandson and Hannah Swarton,” in *Creole Subjects in the Colonial Americas: Empires, Texts, Identities*, Edited by Ralph Bauer and Jose Antonio Mazzotti (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute in Early American Culture, 2009), 313–333. While these scholars share a similar interest with this project, my object of study in this chapter is imperial and inter-imperial relationships, not intra-imperial. I also depart from these studies by focusing on triangulation, rather than allowing Native Americans to into the background. Bauer writes that "what's at stake" in captivity narratives "is not so much the confrontation between European colonists and Native Americans as the geo-political conflict between European imperial states and the Creole elites" (120). This statement is partially true, but this interpretation creates a new binary between creoles and metropolitans that minimizes the imperial and ignores the inter-imperial dimensions of captivity narratives. Benedict Anderson calls Rowlandson's
creole identity in terms of binaries: English against Indian, light against dark, good against evil. Based on its popularity and influence, scholars typically read all Indian captivity narratives through the lens of The Sovereignty and Goodness of God. Consequently, scholars almost uniformly analyze Indian captivity narratives based on the assumption that they structure identity formation in terms of binaries. Our critical questions thereby become framed in terms of whether a given captivity narrative, by either conforming or deviating from this fixed binary structure, reinforces or resists the dominant culture’s values in terms of orthodoxy, gender roles, authority, and colonial and national identity.

---


6 Often scholars following this line of inquiry conclude that the narrative results in ambivalence, arguing that the narrative reinforces dominant cultural values but at the
While this line of inquiry has yielded important insights about the machinery of the imperialist ideologies underlying Indian Captivity narratives, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, as I will show in this chapter, diverges from the structures of identity formation that manifest within the Indian Captivity narrative as a genre in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, this literary-historical emphasis on Rowlandson's narrative as the originator of a genre has rendered invisible the extent to which the racialized representation of Native Americans in this ubiquitous early American narrative form shapes and reshapes imperial identities through triangularity. These narratives produce imperial hierarchies not only through binary contrasts between white colonists and Native Americans, but also through a system of triangularity that relies on the representation of Native Americans to produce inter-imperial difference between rival white empires.

This is not to deny the importance of Rowlandson's captivity narrative as an influence on development of the Indian Captivity narrative. Rowlandson's narrative establishes the basic form of the captivity narrative that begins with abduction by Indians, climaxes with a trial in the wilderness amongst dangerous captors, and concludes with a

same time, through slips in the narrative, the captive subject betrays an affinity to the captor, and thereby an unconscious desire to deviate from the dominant cultural identity. For only a few of the many studies that examine this ambivalence see Mitchell Breitweiser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990); Michelle Burnham, *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997); Castiglia, *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst*. Even Christopher Castiglia, however, whose monograph is dedicated to uncovering feminine resistance to patriarchal imperialist values, concedes that the perpetuation of the narrative form of the Indian Captivity Narrative indicates the successful reproduction of imperialist ideologies (39).
return to the community from which the captive can now recount his or her experiences.\(^7\) The Indian captivity narratives that followed Rowlandson's reproduced these conventions of her text and thereby perpetuated its imperial and racist ideologies. As Kristina Bross has recently written, Rowlandson's narrative "firmly turned American literature and Indian representation in the direction of racist exclusion or extermination."\(^8\) *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* thus initiates a vision of empire that relies on eradication as a response to an impending racially-determined Indian threat to English identity.

However, Rowlandson's captivity occurred as part of King Philip's War, one of the few military conflicts in North America that did not include at least two European imperial powers, and therefore could be presented as solely between Native Americans and Englishmen.\(^9\) Eighteenth-century North America served as the geographic setting for

\(^7\) Rowlandson's narrative establishes the major genre conventions that recur in captivity narratives even written in the present day. For example, see Castiglia, *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst*. Melani McAlister argues that media accounts of the Iran Hostage Crisis appropriated the Indian captivity narrative in *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East Since 1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 198–234.


\(^9\) Even Rowlandson’s presentation of the war as a battle of good Englishmen versus evil Indians, however, is false. Despite the insistence of Rowlandson and other Puritan historians, many Native Americans fought on the side of the colonists during King Philip’s War, and English colonists would not have been the victors without the military assistance from Native Americans. See James D. Drake, *Kin Philip’s War: Civil War in New England, 1675-1676*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999); Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity.*, 2nd edition (New York: Vintage Books, 1999).
not only imperial contests between white colonists and Native Americans, but for inter-imperial competition between the British, French, Spanish, and eventually the U.S. Empire. In the vast majority of Indian captivity narratives, this inter-imperial conflict manifests as a double captivity: Native Americans initiate captivity, only to transfer the captive to another white imperial collective, such as the French Empire. After enduring threats and trials to the purity of his or her cultural identity during this captivity, the captive returns to their community of origin to affirm his or her cultural identity through comparisons with both Indians and this other white collectivity. These redeemed captives construct imperial identity in a triangular fashion through a series of contrasts between the imperial relationships of their own empire to Native Americans, and that of the competing European empire which has held them captive.

This chapter examines the evolution of the Indian Captivity narrative between King Philip's War and the conclusion of the War of 1812. Over this span British creoles, American rebels, and even figures typically marginalized within European empires, such as black loyalists, employed the captivity narrative to promulgate their own visions of imperial identity in North America. I first show that in Indian Captivity narratives produced during the almost one-hundred years of Anglo-French conflict between King William’s War (1689) and the end of the French and Indian War (1763), most notably as those by Hannah Swarton (1697) and Elizabeth Hanson (1728), English colonists reaffirmed their collective identity as English through triangulation with both Native Americans and the French Empire. Next, I study how Americans John Dodge and Ethan Allen adapted the form of the Indian Captivity narrative during the War of American Independence, and redirected this triangular system against the British Empire. Finally, I
show how John Marrant, a creole black writing in post-war London, offered an racially inclusive alternative to all of these structures of imperial identity in his version of the captivity narrative. (1785). In each of these cases, I study multiple editions of captivity narratives to examine how the addition, repetition, and modification of illustration and images work in tandem with textual reproduction to structure triangularity. In North America, mechanisms of racial difference developed not only as tool of imperialism wielded by colonizer against colonized, but as a means to establishing hierarchies between competing European empires.

2.1 The Indian and French Captivity Narrative

Rowlandson's oblique comment that her son might be sold to the French actually represented a likely fate for English colonists taken captive by Native Americans in the late seventeenth century. In addition to Native Americans, the British Empire would vie with France, another preeminent white imperial power, for control of North America until the middle of the next century. As early as 1675, Native Americans began selling or transferring their English captives to their French allies. After the beginning of King William's War (1689-1697), the number of New England captives taken by Native Americans increased dramatically due to French arms, supplies, and instigation. From


King William's War through Queen Anne's War (1702-13), King George I's War (1722-1724), King George II's War (1740-48), and ending with the French and Indian War (1756-1763), the French and British empires would clash in North America constantly.\(^{12}\)

These conflicts served as a North American theatre for almost one hundred years of European-centered war between these two global empires. But in North America, the French and British also fought one another by proxy through their respective Native American allies. From a Native perspective, these imperial conflicts took on the character of "indigenous North American wars" predicated on intertribal conflicts that predated European settlement.\(^{13}\) Although these alliances shifted to some degree over the course of the century, in general the Iroquois and the Algonquin tribes of New England allied themselves with the British, while the Abenaki peoples north of New England, and Great Lakes tribes such as the Huron and Shawnee fought alongside the French. These wars would not cease until the Treaty of Paris of 1763, when, following Montcalm’s defeat to Wolfe, France ceded its North American colonies to the British Empire. In each of the first three major North American wars between Britain and France, New England lost


\(^{13}\) Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*, 155.
over 300 captives to Native American and/or French captivity. By the time of the
French cessation of Canada in 1763, over 1600 English captives had been taken. Of
these, only half returned to New England, many remaining in French Canada after being
assimilated into French or Indian culture.

Captivity played a complex role in these inter-imperial wars between Europeans
and Native Americans. For Native Americans, captivity served two primary purposes. On
one hand, Native Americans captured Europeans and other Native Americans as a means
to adopt them into their tribes, and replace populations lost to epidemics or warfare. On
the other, Native Americans frequently ransomed their English captives back to the
English, or to the French. The French, in turn, sought to convert these English Protestants
to Roman Catholicism. Even though Anglo-American captivity narratives exclusively
depict capture of Englishmen by Indians, all factions in the contest for North American
practiced captivity. The English often captured those they did not slaughter outright,
sometimes selling their captives into slavery, as they did during King Philip’s War.
Indians allied with the English, such as the Iroquois, took French captives for ransom or

14 Ibid.
15 James Axtell, The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America
16 See Richter, Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America,
esp. 63–8.
17 For more on this practice, and on the English hatred of Catholicism, see Fitzpatrick,
“The Figure of Captivity: The Cultural Work of the Puritan Captivity Narrative,” and
Allan Greer, The People of New France (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997),
89–90.
adoption. Indian captivity narratives elide the complexity of inter-imperial war and captivity in North America to configure national/imperial identities.

The narratives that scholars commonly group under the category of the Indian Captivity narrative reflect the historical frequency of dual captivity by Native Americans and the French. From Hannah Swarton's _A Narrative of the Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance_ (1697), to Elizabeth Hanson's _God's Mercy Sürmounting Man's Cruelty_ (1728), to William Fleming's _The Narrative of the Sufferings and Surprizing Deliverance of William and Elizabeth Fleming_, creoles produced captivity narratives recounting dual French and Indian captivities. English creoles thereby asserted the purity of their English identities through contrasts with not only Indians, but also the French. Although there is no shortage of scholarship on the numerous captivity narratives that feature this type of dual captivity, critics analyze these narratives in terms of binaries. In their comprehensive study _The Indian Captivity Narrative 1550-1900_, Katherine Derounian-Stodola and Arthur Levernier, for example, write that in the eighteenth century, captivity narratives functioned to “spread propaganda against those nations and powers that blocked Westerly settlement” and were accordingly “directed against the French, the English, and the

---


20 See Fitzpatrick, “The Figure of Captivity” (1991) 7-9.
Indians, all of whom at different times and in different ways were seen as enemies.”

This interpretation envisions the captivity narrative as utilizing one of these groups, Indian or French, in binary contrasts to reinforce identity.

The kinds of relationships that Europeans sought to establish with Native Americans played a crucial role in the successes and failures of imperial projects. Spiritual, commercial, and imperial aspirations operated in parallel, intertwined structures wherein conquest, trade, and conversion worked hand in hand. The French Catholic and British Protestant Empires competed for land and resources, and at the same time for the very souls of the indigenous population as missionaries from both cultures sought to convert Native peoples to their respective religions. In part because they employed different approaches to empire-building, the French and British developed divergent relationships with the Native Americans. The British Empire relied on a strategy of colonial settlement, whereas the French relied on a commercial network administered from the metropole of Paris. British colonial settlement resulted in almost perpetual disputes over territory and resources wherein the indigenous population "was massacred, marginalized, and exiled from their homelands.”

But because the French possessed only


23 Greer, *The People of New France*, 77.
a sparsely settled empire beyond Montreal and Quebec, these kinds of disputes over land occurred less frequently. Because of their low population of settlers, the French could not attempt the same military domination of Native Americans. Consequently, the French built an imperial structure predicated on extracting North American resources through trade with the indigenous population. This trade, in turn, engendered greater tolerance toward Native American culture, as well as the establishment of stronger alliances. From this perspective, the French and British Empires in North America functioned through antithetical strategies of racial inclusion and exclusion.24

The Indian captivity narratives written by British creoles exhibit a conspicuous awareness of these contrasting imperial models. At the same time that such narratives portray the French as inferior—often through racialized tropes that creoles simultaneously employ to denigrate Native Americans—Indian Captivity narratives subtly express anxieties that the French may be superior empire builders due to their ability to build strong religious and commercial relationships with Native Americans based on racial inclusion. Instead of Rowlandson's narrative, Hannah Swarton's *A Narrative of the Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance* (1697), which emerged from the same New England community, provides the template for the Indian Captivity narrative as an instrument to shape imperial identity.25 On one hand, Swarton's narrative conforms to the genre

24 Ibid., 77–85. See also Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America*.

25 Critics often analyze Swarton's narrative in relation to Rowlandson's in order to examine changing conceptions of Puritan orthodoxy. See Tara Fitzpatrick, “The Figure of
conventions initiated in Rowlandson's. On the other, however, Swarton expands on Rowlandson's binary structure to create the triangular structures prevalent in most captivity narratives of the eighteenth century.

Like Rowlandon’s narrative, Swarton's was published in different editions, on both sides of the Atlantic. Her tale opens with the abduction of Swarton and her children by Indians and continues with an exhausting, painful journey through the wilderness. Swarton's life is constantly threatened by Indian violence, as illustrated by vivid descriptions of her fellow prisoners being executed. Like Rowlandson, Swarton is driven to eating strange foods (turtle, dog flesh, moose liver, roots) to prevent starvation, and forced to wear what she defines as “Indian dress” and “one pair of Indian shoes” to protect her body in the wilderness. While Indian violence and the harsh wilderness threaten Swarton's life, these foods and clothing constitute a forced assimilation that threatens the purity of Swarton's Englishness. English creoles considered European clothing a marker of identity that separated English colonists from savage Indians. Thus when Native Americans strip captives of English clothing and force them to wear Indian


26 Mather first published Swarton’s narrative, along with Hannah Dustan and other narratives, in Humiliations Followed with Deliverances in Boston 1697. He republished Swarton's narrative in Magnalia Christi Americana in London in 1702.

clothing, creole identity is threatened with acculturation. Through these narrative elements, Swarton reproduces conventions established by Rowlandson to construct Indians as a violent threat to English identity.

Swarton reshapes the patterns of identity formation through a new vector, to which Rowlandson only alluded, when she inserts a third cultural collective into the narrative: the French. After a long northward journey, Swarton’s Indian captors camp their wigwams next what Swarton identifies as “French houses.” Like clothing and foods, English colonists viewed houses as facets of their civilized identity as Englishmen. When Indians destroy English property, they not only destroy shelter, but markers of English civilization itself. Houses separated Englishmen from savage Indians, since Indians lived in wigwams. Therefore these "French houses" also denote the French as civilized, and less like Indians. Instead of strange Indian foods, the French give Swarton European style foods such as “beef and pork and bread which (she) had been without nine months.” Rather than equating the French with Indians, then, Swarton's narrative constructs the French as civilized counterparts to Englishmen. Indeed, Swarton


describes the French as “very kind.” She finds the French so preferable that under the advice of another English prisoner, she contrives to be ransomed to the French, among whom Swarton finds “even as kind as I could expect the English.” Europeans considered the treatment of captives "a vital test of civilized qualities," one that separated the civilized from the savage.\textsuperscript{32} This kind treatment of captives, then, further portrays the French as civilized Europeans. In all of these ways, Swarton's narrative characterizes the French as not only different than Indians, but as perhaps even more civilized than the English.

But her narrative sets up that external appearance as a veneer for a different type of degeneration. Swarton soon finds the French to be "a greater snare and trouble to (her) soul and danger to (her) inward man." Throughout the remainder of her narrative, Swarton's French captors attempt to convert her to Catholicism through promises, threats, and scriptural arguments. English colonists viewed conversion to Catholicism as a more severe loss of English identity because this cultural conversion damned Englishmen to hell for all eternity.\textsuperscript{33} Cotton Mather’s introduction to \textit{A Narrative of Hannah Dustan's Notable Deliverance from Captivity}, for instance, which Mather first published in the same collection as Swarton's \textit{Narrative}, likens captivity among the French as "a slavery to devils, to be in their hands, is worse than to be in the hands of the Indians."\textsuperscript{34} When the


\textsuperscript{33} Fitzpatrick, “The Figure of Captivity: The Cultural Work of the Puritan Captivity Narrative,” 16.

\textsuperscript{34} “A Narrative of Hannah Dustan’s Notable Deliverance from Captivity,” in \textit{Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724}, Ed. by Alden T.
French fail to seduce Swarton, they threaten her with an additional remove to France, where she will be burned. This threat of burning recalls the threat of being burned by the Indians that is recounted in many Indian captivity narratives. Nonetheless, Swarton clearly considers this threat separate from her captivity by Indians, as she terms this part of her narrative “her captivity among the papists” (156).

Even though at the end of her narrative Swarton returns to her New England community able to assert that her pure English identity remains intact, she leaves her readers to wonder over the fate of her twenty year-old daughter, who was not included in the exchange, and over the fate of her nineteen-year old son, whom she has not seen since her initial abduction. At the conclusion of Swarton's narrative, then, both the French and the Indians continue to threaten the English political and cultural body. This ever-impending threat necessitates the perpetuation of both imperial and inter-imperial struggle. Yet the French and Indians are not presented as interchangeable threats. In keeping with common European perceptions, the French are depicted as civilized and the Indians as savages, although the lines between the two collectives are sometimes blurred. In effect, Swarton's narrative manifests the dual threat to English identity that Mary Rowlandson, despite her insistence that life in North America constitutes a binary conflict between English and Indians, cannot resist fantasizing in her narrative’s Thirteenth Remove when she expresses her gratitude that her son was not a captive of the French. Rowlandson's comments about the dangers of the French foreshadow the primary structure of the Indian Captivity narrative, but Swarton plays it out for the first time.

This triangular pattern of identity formation is reproduced in the other captivity narratives that emerged from Rowlandson's New England community, such as Quentin Stockwell's *Relation of His Captivity*, Cotton Mather's *A Narrative of Hannah Duston’s Deliverance from Captivity* (1699), John William's *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion* (1707), itself published in multiple editions during the eighteenth century, and John Gyle's *Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, Etc.* (1736). All of these narratives feature the dual French and Indian threat to English culture. This structure would extend into captivity narratives that emerged from neighboring colonies. Elizabeth Hanson’s *God’s Surrounding Man’s Cruelty*, published in Philadelphia in 1728, begins with a raid on Hanson’s home near Dover, New Hampshire in 1724. Hanson's narrative follows genre conventions established in Rowlandson and Swarton's narrative. For instance, Hanson includes a scene wherein her Indian master threatens to burn her child. Before this happens, Hanson and her sons are rescued from the Indians by sale to French traders. At the same time as the French are civilized saviors, they represent a threat to English identity. Hanson’s daughter marries one of the traders, and never returns. And Hanson’s babe is baptized as a Catholic before the family’s release. Hanson’s husband, absent during the initial attack, ultimately dies in the wilderness while seeking to retrieve the daughter who remained among the French. It would be reductive to equate the French with Indians, whom Hanson describes as brutal savages. On the contrary, like Swarton, Hanson describes the French as “very civil.”

35 Elizabeth Hanson, *God’s Mercy Surmounting Man’s Cruelty, : Exemplified in the Captivity and Redemption of Elizabeth Hanson, Wife of John Hanson, of Knoxmarsh at Keacheachy, in Dover Township, Who Was Taken Captive with Her Children, and Maid-
captives present conflicts between the English and both the French and the Indians, the French and the Indians are not the almost interchangeable substitutes that scholars have interpreted them to be. Instead, captives present the French and the Indians as different from one another, even if English conflicts with these groups are interwoven. These patterns of French and Indian representation were reproduced in captivity narratives published at mid-century, such as those written by William Fleming (Boston, 1756), Robert Eastburn (Philadelphia, 1758), Thomas Brown (Boston, 1760), and Isaac Hollister (Hartford, 1767). All of these narratives maintain the representation of their French rivals as largely civilized, yet in terms of religion a savage threat to British Protestant identity.

But the French are subtly portrayed as superior to the British throughout the eighteenth century in one crucial element: the coherence of their empire, as established through religion and conversion In her own narrative, Hannah Swarton relates that before she was sold to the French, her Indian mistress had once lived among the English colonists and adopted English ways, but had now “married a Canadian Indian” and converted to Catholicism. Based on this testimony, Swarton writes that “had the English been as careful to instruct her in our religion as the French were to instruct her in theirs, she might have been of our religion.” Swarton thereby portrays the French as more effective in converting Native Americans to Catholicism than the English were in converting them to Protestantism. Simply in religious terms, Swarton's portrays the

____________________


36 Swarton, “A Narrative of Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance,” 150.
French imperial project as a greater success than the British. Within the plot of her narrative, this directly results in the French alliances with Indians that cause of Swarton's captivity, as well as that of thousands of other colonists during the inter-imperial wars between the French and British Empires in North America. In this way, Swarton's narrative expresses an anxiety that French imperialism may be more successful than British imperialism in creating alliances with the Indians, and that Britain might consequently lose North America to its rival white empire.

Swarton's anxiety over the superiority of French imperial relationships with Native Americans foreshadows Cadwallader Colden's History of the Five Nations, composed by the former governor of the colony of New York, in 1725 and 1727. Writing to advise metropolitan administrators how to best manage the British Empire in North America, Colden begrudgingly commends French efforts to build alliances with Native Americans through communication networks. "This justice must be done to the French," he writes, "that they far succeeded the English in the daring attempts of some of their inhabitants, in traveling very far among unknown Indians . . . and everywhere spreading the Fame of the French name and Grandeur." Like Swarton, Colden fears that stronger cooperative relationships with Native Americans will ultimately result in a superior French Empire in North America. While Swarton fears imperial relationships governed by religious conversion, Colden betrays uneasiness over the French ability to create alliances with Native Americans through trade and more balanced inclusion.

Published in Boston in 1756, William Fleming's *The Narrative of the Sufferings and Surprizing Deliverance of William and Elizabeth Fleming* echoes Colden's anxieties over the strength of a French Empire built on the inclusion of Native Americans.

Fleming's narrative depicts two models of empire: a British model that asserts authority over Native Americans through threats of violence and coercion, and a French model based on communication and promises of continued kinship. Signaling to its readers the book's importance for British identity, the title page of this narrative advertises it as "to be read . . . by every British subject." Midway through the text, which begins as a typical captivity narrative, Fleming's Indian captors tell him that they had initially fought on the side of the British, but that the British general "had not used them well, and had threatened to destroy all the Indians on the continent, after they had conquered the French, and they were informed by French that the Pennsylvanians, and Marylanders, and the Virginians had laid the same plot." Here Fleming relates a model of empire grounded in conquest and genocide. Fleming's captors inform him that the French had asked them to carry all the English captives to Canada, and that as a reward they "would live well, and be as Kindred as our Friends." In common with Swarton and Colden, Fleming depicts a French model of empire based on partnership with Native Americans.

Showing that he is a patriotic creole, Fleming asserts that he does not believe the Indians, and quickly diverts his reader’s attention by relating that he has heard that the French offered a reward for English scalps. Yet at the same time that he denigrates the French by

---

linking them to Indian savagery, Fleming betrays a creole anxiety that French imperial relationships may prove more successful than British imperialism.

By the conclusion of the French and Indian Wars in North America, which established the British Empire as the preeminent European power over much of North America, creoles consistently used Indian captivity narratives to articulate imperial identity through triangulation with Native Americans and the French Empire. On one level, these narratives portray the French and Indians as possessing distinct identities, both of them in their own respects vastly inferior to British culture. Yet these narratives employ triangular structures to depict a British model of empire that maintains the purity of English identity by excluding and conquering Native Americans, contrasted with a French Empire based on a policy of inclusion and assimilation that degrades French civilization. British creoles thereby relied on these narratives to declare a unified English identity firmly linked to the metropole by emphasizing that they, unlike the French, had remained culturally pure by firmly rejecting both Indian savagery and French Catholicism. However, beneath these assertions of the racial purity of their Empire lies an anxiety that a British imperial policy based on racial exclusion may result in the loss of the inter-imperial struggle for mastery of North America, to a French Empire that had mastered inclusive methods of maintaining authority over Native Americans.

2.2 The Narrative of British Captivity

With the French Empire relinquishing its claims to North America after 1763, the British Empire held sway as the primary European empire in North America. This all changed with the escalation of intra-imperial conflict between the British Empire and its North American colonies. The War of American Independence reinvigorated the market
for Indian captivity narratives, beginning with a new Boston edition of Mary Rowlandson's *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* in 1770. This correlation between periods of popularity for Indian Captivity narratives and cycles of inter-imperial warfare in North America suggests that the Indian Captivity narrative served as a vital means to shape and maintain creole identity during these wars between empires. Indeed, the re-emergence of the Indian Captivity narrative as a primary creole publishing genre owed much to the escalations in armed conflict between colonists and metropolitans, as colonists recast their white countrymen as red Indians.39 The decade continued with a spate of republished Indian captivity narratives from earlier in the century, including more editions of Rowlandson’s narrative (1771, 1774), three editions of John William's *The Redeemed Captive* (1773, 1774, 1776), and a new edition of Elizabeth Hanson’s *God’s Mercy Surmounting Man’s Cruelty* (1779).

Publishers of these new editions were remarkably faithful to the textual content of the originals, but in order to market the Indian Captivity narrative to revolutionary readers, publishers introduced new visual content in the form of frontispieces, illustrations, and advertisements to these texts. If the 1790's marked the beginnings of "a proliferation of images in an expansive (American) print culture," as Georgia B. Barnhill has remarked, then the captivity narratives published during the American War of Independence served as the germination period for this proliferation.40 Barnhill


characterizes late-eighteenth-century engravers as dependent on copies of British originals in producing American print culture. Publishers and engravers of revolutionary captivity narratives did not just reprint, but adapted already circulating images to suit the needs of patriotism by incorporating new frontispieces and illustrations into earlier texts. Publishers deployed these paratextual devices to situate the Indian captivity narrative in the context of the American Revolution, and thereby metaphorically depict the American political body as a captive of the British Empire. These republications adapted the Indian Captivity narrative, originally formed to assert the purity of English culture in North America, to turn the genre against the same British imperial identity with which it had been developed to claim continuity.

In tandem with this flurry of graphic adaptation and innovation, revolutionary writers and publishers altered the prototype of the Indian Captivity narrative to create a subgenre that I will call the Narrative of British Captivity. Unlike the narratives produced by creoles earlier in the century that focused on the captivity of British creoles by Indians and the French, these Revolutionary War-era captivity narratives recount the captivity of creoles who now identified themselves as distinct from Britons. Ethan Allen’s 1779 *Narrative of Colonel Ethan Allen’s Captivity*, the most famous of these, sold approximately 20,000 copies its first year, and received at least eight editions in its first

________________________

By Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelley (Chapel Hill: For the American Antiquarian Society by the University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 424.

two years.\textsuperscript{42} John Dodge’s \textit{Narrative of His Sufferings Among the British at Detroit} also exemplifies this type of narrative. Dodge’s narrative was itself quite popular, being published in three American editions (Philadelphia 1779, Danvers 1780, \textit{Connecticut Intelligencer and Gazette} 1780) and at least one British edition (\textit{Almon’s Remembrancer}, London, 1780).\textsuperscript{43}

As recounted in his \textit{Narrative}, the Ohio Valley Indian trader John Dodge is abducted during an attack on his house by both British soldiers and Indians in January of 1776. Dodge claims to be targeted by the British in retaliation for interfering with British attempts to bribe and intimidate Indian tribes into raiding American settlements. In accordance with genre conventions, Dodge endures a long wilderness journey and is threatened with starvation, this time in a British prison. The British pose an additional type of threat to Americans, however, by willfully violating Dodge’s rights as guaranteed by the British Constitution. Dodge is convicted of treason without a trial, and at several points in the narrative his property is either stolen or destroyed by British soldiers. After being held captive for about two years, Dodge escaped in 1778 and fled to Boston. Before writing his narrative, he composed a letter to Congress that decried British atrocities toward American prisoners and advocated renewed invasions of Canada. Scholars have reached the consensus that the Narrative of British Captivity appropriates

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 47. For complete publication history of Allen’s Narrative, see John Pell, \textit{Ethan Allen} (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929), 267–7.

conventions of the Indian Captivity narrative in order to create a collective identity for Americans distinct from that of their British forebears. According to this interpretation, the British in these narratives “replace” the Indians in Indian captivity narratives, and thereby affirm American identity in the same way that Indian captivity narratives do—through a rejection of an alternate identity.\textsuperscript{44} However, analyzing the Narrative of British Captivity in these terms precludes us from recognizing that in this genre the British do not replace Indians in a binary structure. More accurately, the British occupy the position held by the French in the triangular structure that I have traced from Hannah Swarton's narrative to the conclusion of the French and Indian War.

American authors and publishers manipulated this triangular approach not only to reject British imperial identity or religion in the same way that creoles rejected French religion, but just as importantly to preserve Englishness, a cultural identity shared by all Britons but often denied to creoles by metropolitans, so that Englishness may be transferred to an incipient American collective.\textsuperscript{45} We can see this process vividly in the

\textsuperscript{44} Richard Slotkin, \textit{Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860} (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973), 251. More recently Greg Sieminski, who compares Ethan Allen's narrative to Rowlandson's by studying not only textual content but also the visual content of republished editions, has similarly concluded that Allen and Dodge's narratives reenact Rowlandson's narrative through "a British-for-Indian substitution" to create a new binary between savage Britons and civilized Americans. In analyzing both textual and paratextual content, Sieminski pursues a similar methodology to mine. However, triangulation is not the focus of his study. Sieminski, “The Puritan Captivity Narrative and the Politics of the American Revolution.”

\textsuperscript{45} I am using the terms "English identity" and "Englishness" as developed by Leonard Tennenhouse in \textit{The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and British Diaspora, 1750-1850} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007). Tennenhouse uses the term "English" as a kind of ethnic identity that bound the diverse peoples of the British Empire into a collective that shared a sense of national identity. Tennenhouse views "Englishness" as a cultural identity that could travel with diasporic colonists to
way Boston publisher Ezekiel Russell links his 1780 edition of John Dodge’s *Narrative of His Sufferings Among the British at Detroit* to two other captivity narratives that he republished the same year: Elizabeth Hanson’s Indian captivity narrative *God’s Mercy Surmounting Man’s Cruelty*, originally published in 1728; and Ethan Allen’s *Narrative* from 1779. Russell is in many ways typical of late eighteenth-century Boston area printer-publishers. His print production encompasses a wide array of document types, from the staple work common to printers such as sermons, speller, catechisms, and pamphlets, to more specialized items such as poems by Phyllis Wheatley and essays by Cotton Mather. His decision to print these three narratives together in 1780 appears to be less politically motivated than market-driven. Because Russell’s edition of Allen’s *Narrative* followed five other editions published between 1779 and 1780, it appears calculated to capitalize on the *Narrative’s* popularity. His later republication of

North America, one that could be shared by metropolitans and creoles alike (8). Tennenhouse argues that following the War of American Independence, Americans sought not to establish a new cultural identity, but to maintain their English cultural identity. But this English cultural identity was distinct from the Englishness of the metropole, since it had been reproduced under very different conditions in North America. According to this interpretation, Americans after independence often viewed their particular type of Englishness as more purely English than that of Britons themselves.

Russell had supported both sides of the American Revolution prior to these editions. See Benjamin Franklin V, *Boston Printers, 1640-1800* (Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1980), for a detailed record of Russell’s publishing career.

Russell actually published only an excerpt of Allen’s narrative in an almanac, with the promise to publish the remainder later. Perhaps Russell misjudged the influence that the inclusion of Allen’s narrative would have on sales of the almanac, since he never published the rest. Nonetheless, publication of Allen's narrative by eight different printers in Philadelphia, Boston, and Connecticut, all prior to Russell's editions, suggests that Boston readers would be familiar with the content of Allen’s captivity narrative.
Dodge’s *Narrative* was likely intended to cash in on the same craze. And his subsequent republication of Hanson’s Indian captivity narrative is in accord with the republication of other narratives, like those of Rowlandson or John Williams, by New England publishers who sought to capitalize on the patriotic cause earlier in the decade.

When Russell republished these captivity narratives, he diligently reproduced the text of earlier editions, but infused them with new paratextual content in the form of advertisements and illustrations. In some of these cases, Russell reproduced a specific image across different publications. For example, he re-used an illustration that he had added to the text proper of Dodge's narrative as the frontispiece illustration for his edition of Hanson's narrative (Fig. 3.1). And in an advertisement for Dodge’s narrative on second page of Hanson, Russell incorporated an image of an Indian, holding a bow and tomahawk (Fig 3.2.) Russell had already used this woodcut in an advertisement for Ethan Allen’s narrative (Fig. 3.3). It would not be unusual, of course, for a publisher to reuse illustrations from previous publications, given the expense of commissioning original engravings, and the difficulty of finding good engravers in the colonies, especially during a civil war.\(^48\) Convenience and economy surely played a role in Russell’s repeated use of these images. However, Russell is doing more here than strategically recirculating these images. Russell demonstrates a remarkable aptitude for *adapting* already existing images in ways that complicate and modify their original signification.

---

\(^48\) Before independence, the colonies supported only a small number of trained engravers. See Barnhill, “Transformations in Pictorial Printing,” 422–4.
Figure 3.1. Frontispiece,
Elizabeth Hanson,
*God’s Mercy Surmounting Man’s Cruelty*.
Danvers: Ezekiel Russell, 1780.
Early American Imprints, Series I:
Evan, 1639-1800.

Figure 3.2. Advertisement,
Elizabeth Hanson,
*God’s Mercy Surmounting Man’s Cruelty*.
Danvers: Ezekiel Russell, 1780.
Early American Imprints, Series I:
Evan, 1639-1800.
In some cases, Russell employs these images primarily to create intertextuality between his republished narratives. For even the casual consumer in Russell’s shop, these advertisements would index these three narratives in the same category of reading content. Consider, for example, the crude woodcut illustration in Figure 1, which Russell incorporated into both Hanson and Dodge’s captivity narratives. The illustration's visual content is almost illegible. The engraving appears to contain some humanoid figures at right. Yet we cannot ascertain who these figures are meant to represent. They may be wearing feathers or hats, and their bodies might be clothed or naked. One of the figures is carrying what might be a tomahawk or axe. Other shapes could possibly be trees and a pasture, or a smoking house, or something else entirely. Since clothing and buildings played a vital role in depicting identity in eighteenth-century visual culture in general and in captivity narratives in particular, these are crucial details. Regardless of the actors,

49 On the importance of clothing in as a visual method of establishing identity during the eighteenth-century, see Linda Baumgarten, What Clothes Reveal: The Language of
when is the action depicted in the narrative? Has something just happened, is it happening, or about to happen? Some of the most basic elements of narrative are impossible to ascertain in this illustration. Due to either poor execution on the part of the artist, or the degenerate state of the woodblock itself, the image resists stable interpretations.

But this very instability is what allows this image to seamlessly correspond to two different scenes, in different locations, within the texts Dodge and Hanson’s narratives. Indeed, its ambiguity is productive in the context of its intertextuality. In Dodge’s narrative, the illustration is accompanied by the caption, “Representation of an Indian Burning Englishmen.” Indeed the illustration appears at the point in Dodge where Indians, under approval of the British Governor Hamilton, threaten to burn alive a white settler. As the frontispiece for Hanson’s narrative, the illustration is accompanied by the title *The Remarkable Captivity and Surprising Deliverance of Elizabeth Hanson*. Since this title is typical of the genre of the Indian Captivity narratives, viewers could locate Hanson’s narrative within this genre, and surmise that the figures represent Indians. In both publications, then, viewers could identify these figures as Indians. By its co-presence, however, this illustration violates the unity of the individual texts.

The racial boundaries within Dodge’s “Narrative of His Sufferings Among the British,” which depicts a captivity of a white colonists by white metropolitans, become redrawn as a captivity of white Englishmen by red metropolitans. If a reader had recently purchased Russell’s editions of Dodge or Allen, the first two to be published among these three

narratives, they might very well confuse Hanson’s narrative with the Narrative of British captivity.

In other cases, Russell's paratexts mediate textual content. In doing so, the illustrations mobilize how the triangular structures of identity formation within the text. Dodge's *Narrative* contains an advertisement for his own edition of Ethan Allen’s *Narrative*. This paratext is composed of a textual advertisement for the *Narrative*, visually flanked on the right by an image of an Indian, and on the left with an image of a uniformed white man (Fig. 3). These two images, in turn, function as intertextual links to images that are exterior to Russell’s edition, but were prominent in revolutionary Boston. Russell’s image of an Indian bears a close resemblance to Paul Revere’s engraving of an Indian that circulated on the masthead of the Boston printer Isaiah Thomas’s bi-weekly newspaper the *Massachusetts Spy* between 1771 and 1781 (Fig. 3.4). Revere's Indian is pictured in profile holding a spear and the liberty staff, encircled by the words LIBERTY DEFENDED FROM TYRANNY. As we saw in Chapter One, this figure of the Indian as America holding the liberty staff was commonly used in British revolutionary-era prints to represent the colonies' struggle for liberty.⁵⁰ Revere’s Indian points her spear toward a lion, a standard symbol of the British Empire, to signify this conflict between Britain and

America.\textsuperscript{51} But as we have also seen, by representing the colonies as an Indian, British metropolitans pictured their colonies as culturally and racially inferior within the Empire. Russell’s refurbished image removes Revere’s Indian's liberty pole and replaces it with a tomahawk, a weapon typically used to denote Native American savagery. This visual manipulation symbolically empties the symbol of Indian of its Americanness. In a strange twist, this move signals to colonial readers inured to viewing the Indian as America that this Indian now actually signifies an Indian. On the other hand, the uniformed man in this advertisement can be identified by his cone-shaped hat as a British officer. He faces the reader, holding in one hand a sword, in the other a blank sheet of paper.\textsuperscript{52} Russell had used this image previously in at least two broadsides in 1777; one titled “Great News from New York,” which describes the American victory at Battle of Trenton, and another titled “Great Encouragement for Seamen,” a Naval Recruitment for the war ship “Ranger” commanded by John Paul Jones. Both broadsides display patriotic content. Russell demonstrates a pattern, then, of using this image as a symbol of British oppression. In this advertisement, all three nodes of identity formation that structure the


\textsuperscript{52} We can trace Russell's paratextual chain of even further. Russell had used the Indian icon on a broadside entitled called “Gage’s Folly, or The Tall Fox Outwitted” (1776), which prints a patriotic song of the same name that derides General Thomas Gage as an enemy of liberty. The song has no mention of Indians, but does equate the British with devils. In this case, Russell uses his figure of the Indian to link the British to savage Indians, who are commonly represented as a devil in Puritan captivity narratives.
Narrative of British captivity— Indian and British (in the form of images) and American
(in the textual signifier of Ethan Allen)—are concretely manifest.

Russell’s image of the soldier (Fig. 3.3.) conspicuously resembles the image of a
continental soldier that Paul Revere had engraved for Massachusetts provincial notes for
soldier’s pay in 1775 and 1776 (Fig. 3.5.) The clothing, pose, and props held by these two
figures bear remarkable similarities. As a form of currency, Revere’s image would have
circulated in the Boston area in the years prior to Russell’s edition of Dodge. Rather than
the conical hat of Russell’s British officer, though, Revere’s soldier wears a tri-cornered
hat that designates him as a continental soldier.53 Revere’s soldier carries not only a
sword like Russell’s, but also piece of paper. In Revere’s version, however, the paper
bears the words “Magna Charta.” In his articulation of this figure, we can now see,
Russell has not only transformed Revere’s figure into a British officer, but has excised

53 The AAS Collection: An Illustrated Collection of the Works of Paul Revere. The
American Antiquarian Society.
http://www.americanantiquarian.org/Inventories/Revere/currency.htm, Accessed 2 May
2015.
the words “Magna Charta.” Just as he adapts Revere’s figure, then, Russell simultaneously detaches it from one of the documents that Britons held most sacred, and most associated with their own identity.

Russell’s image holds an intertextual link even more immediately available to his reading audience, this time located in the frontispiece portrait for this same 1780 edition of Dodge (Fig. 3.6). Russell initially purchased the original plate for this portrait, which depicts the Pennsylvania politician John Dickinson, from Revere in 1772 for inclusion in his own publication of *Ames Almanac* (Fig. 3.7). Revere himself had copied this portrait from the frontispiece portrait for 1768 and 1769 editions of Dickinson’s *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania*. Dickinson's extremely popular text protests the taxes imposed on the colonies through the Stamp Act as legally prohibited through the British

Constitution, and warned that further infractions would be "destructive" to "freedom." Based on comparison to the original engraving in the almanac, however, Russell has cleverly refurbished this portrait of Dickinson. The man in Revere's engraving holds a scroll inscribed with the word’s “Farmer’s Letters” to identify him as Dickinson. At the same time that they might at first connect the portrait to Dickinson, Russell’s readers would identify the man in his portrait as Dodge, because this scroll now carries the words “Letters to Congress,” an allusion to the letter Dodge had written soon after his captivity. On the left side of Russell’s portrait, in parallel to the image of the British soldier, hovers a book with a blank cover. Looking at Revere’s version of this engraving, we can see that this book cover originally contained, once again, the words “Magna Charta.” This intricate system of law, liberty, and property would by the eighteenth century be considered, in the words of Jack P. Greene, “the most significant marker of English identity.” In the original versions of the two engravings, then—Revere’s image of an American soldier and his portrait of Dickinson—the words “Magna Charta” would mark both of these figures representing members of the British Empire with English identity.


56 The Magna Charta was often cited in the eighteenth century British and American political debates as a founding document of an “ancient constitution” that guaranteed the civil rights of Englishmen. As such, it held a prominent place in the intra-imperial debates within the British metropole and North American colonies over the validity of the tax acts that would lead to the American Revolution. Jack P. Greene, “Empire and Identity from the Glorious Revolution to the American Revolution,” in The Oxford History of the British Empire, Ed. by P.J. Marshall, vol. 2: The Eighteenth Century (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 213.
But Russell’s iterations evacuate both figures, the first now transformed into a British soldier, the other now an American patriot and captive, of that English identity.

These iconological transformations graphically depict a transfer of Englishness from British to American identity, a transfer that occurs in parallel within the texts of these narratives. Analogous to the way that Russell’s image of the British soldier visually severs the British of an essential feature of English identity, Dodge and Allen textually depict British soldiers as failing to live up to their identity as Englishmen by sharply deviating from British legal and property codes. Dodge complains in his narrative that his British captors do not uphold British law by depriving him of trial and confiscating his property without cause. Ethan Allen similarly emphasizes that his rights
as a British officer are violated during his own captivity. The absence of the words “Magna Charta” in the image of the British soldier underscores this forfeiture of English identity. As a contrast, these Narratives of British Captivity depict American rebels performing an English civilized identity. The preface to John Dodge’s narrative describes the British as “savage adversaries,” yet declares that “it is not in the breast of generous Americans to treat them with equal barbarity.”

Allen similarly characterizes the British of tormenting him with “a barbarous captivity.” In the text of his narrative, Allen demonstrates English civility when he refuses to allow a British soldier, whom he regards as a fellow gentleman, to be murdered in a plot by his fellow American prisoners. From this perspective, these Narratives of British Captivity portray Americans as behaving more English than the British themselves.

Russell’s refurbished frontispiece portrait for Dodge’s narrative (Fig. 6.) symbolically enacts this same process, but expands upon it to make way for an American

57 An Entertaining Narrative of the Cruel and Barbarous Treatment and Extreme Sufferings of Mr. John Dodge during His Captivity among the British, at Detroit. In Which Is Also Contained, a Particular Detail of the Sufferings of a Virginian, Who Died in Their Hands. Written by Himself; and Now Published to Satisfy the Curiosity of Every One throughout the United States., Second edition (Danvers, MA: Ezekiel Russell, 1780), 4.

58 A Narrative of Colonel Ethan Allen’s Captivity, from the Time of His Being Taken by the British, near Montreal, on the 25th Day of September, in the Year 1775, to the Time of His Exchange, on the 6th Day of May, 1778: Containing Voyages and Travels ... Interspersed with Some Political Observations. Written by Himself, and Now Published for the Information of the Curious in All Nations (Philadelphia: Robert Bell, 1779), 28.

59 Leonard Tennenhouse has convincingly argued that following the revolution Americans reproduced and altered British literary forms in an effort to prove that they were more English than the British themselves. I view Dodge and Allen as participating in this process. Tennenhouse, The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and British Diaspora, 1750-1850.
iteration of Englishness. By removing the words Magna Charta from the portrait on his frontispiece, Russell signifies that Americans no longer aspire to live under the British Constitution as they did a decade before, when *Letters from an American Farmer* was first published in response to the Stamp Act. The blank space in the paper comes to represent the void that will be left until an American constitution can be ratified to replace the British constitution. Yet because a desire to live under a constitution is itself a vital facet of English identity, this maneuver paradoxically becomes an American affirmation, rather than a rejection, of Englishness. This iconological strategy emphasizes moments in these narratives wherein Americans absorb positive English aspects of British identity. Far from constructing American identity through a rejection of Englishness, as would be the case if the British acted as mere substitutes for Indians, the Narrative of British Captivity shapes American identity by depicting a transatlantic migration of Englishness from the British metropole to the colonies.

The British have, in turn, become less English through their imperial relationships with Native Americans. Like earlier narratives of French and Indian captivity, these narratives use Indians to generate difference between British and American identity as empires. Both Dodge and Allen present the British Empire as manipulating Native Americans into alliances against the United States, alliances which in turn degrade the British culturally. For example, Dodge begins his narrative by depicting Ohio Valley Indians as inherently neutral trading partners with Americans, who perpetrate violence against Americans only when coerced or beguiled by the British. In one grisly scene, after offering rewards to the Indians for American scalps, British soldiers rush forward with glee to receive these them. The soldiers then rub the bloody scalps over their own
bodies (19). Scenes like this show the British behaving decidedly uncivilized. By rubbing bloody scalps on their bodies, Dodge portrays the British as literally marking themselves as red Indians. Such scenes echo the tropes of earlier captivity narratives, like those of Hannah Swarton and Elizabeth Hanson, which depict the French as becoming degraded through their alliances with Indians. This is, perhaps not coincidentally, an inversion of same accusation that British metropolitans had for centuries made to justify their subordination of creoles.

Creoles, in contrast, who had through the genre of the Indian captivity narrative vehemently denied any deviation from a pure British identity, now appear to be capable of partially absorbing qualities attributed to Native American identity with immunity to this type of degeneracy. John Dodge portrays himself as living prosperously alongside Native Americans, engaging in trade across the Ohio Valley, counseling Native Americans in their own tongue about their own best interests, before Native Americans are corrupted by British deceit. While Ethan Allen only depicts Native Americans at the initial stages of his narrative, and then only as savage foes, Allen partially adopts behaviors attributed to Native Americans in order distance himself from Britishness.60

60 In this way Allen has been likened to Daniel Boone, whose narrative is recounted by John Filson in The Settlement and Discovery of Kentucke (1784). For an example, see Slotkin, 268-312. Boone's narrative is generally interpreted in terms of conflict between Boone and Indians, symbols of civilization and savagery, with Boone emerging from this conflict as a new type of hero able to cross the cultural boundary between civilization and savagery. But like Ethan Allen's narrative, Boone's constructs American imperial identity through triangularity. Although not commonly analyzed from this perspective, two-thirds of Boone's narrative occurs during the War of American Independence. The Native American nations that serve as Boone's primary antagonists during Boone's narrative fought American settlers in the west in part based on their alliance with the British Empire. As Boone's contemporaries would know, Britons and Native Americans fought together during the two primary battles recounted in Boone's narrative, the Battle of Blue Licks and the Battle of Boonesborough. During the captivity narrative embedded in Boone's larger story, Boone is taken by his Shawnee captors to Detroit, the same place as John Dodge. Boone's narrative almost becomes a Narrative of British Captivity except that the British Governor Hamilton, the same governor vilified by Dodge, although unlike Dodge, treats Boone "with great humanity" (64). Hamilton offers to buy Boone from his Shawnee captors, but the Shawnee, according to Boone, had too "great" an "affection" for
Larzer Ziff argues that Allen adopts "an Indian-like fierceness, if not savagery" when he verbally and physically resists his British captors.\(^6\) Yet Allen simultaneously imbues his identity with a racially-inflected purity that he regards as granting him superiority to his British captors by calling himself a "full-blooded Yankee" (16). Dodge and Allen claim an ability to emulate Native Americans without becoming racially degraded like their British captors.

The Narrative of British Captivity relies on this conception of a British Empire degraded through alliances with Native Americans as a negative for shaping American imperial identity. Dodge and Allen use this strategy to construct their own individual and differing versions of American Empire. Dodge depicts an American Empire built on commerce and exchange with Native Americans. Allen completely excludes Native Americans from his vision of empire, erasing the same imperial relationships that Dodge celebrates. These two markedly divergent yet concurrent visions of empire characterize the instability of American imperial identity amid the War of American Independence.\(^6\)

Both of these Narratives of British captivity take imperial difference one step further, him. The British do purchase all of Boone's soldiers from the Shawnee, however, making clear to readers that British captivity posed a real threat. Filson thus shows Britons and Indians working in an imperial alliance that allows them to exist in same physical space, unlike Boone's vision of American empire that relies on exclusion and extinction of Native Americans. In this way, Boone's narrative uses Native Americans to create imperial difference between British and American empires.\(^6\)


Allen's vision of empire based on exclusion, as well as Daniel Boone's would, of course, become the dominant vision of empire in the early republic and well into the nineteenth century. This would perhaps explain why Allen and Boone's narratives experienced such widespread republication, while Dodge's has languished in relative obscurity since its initial waves of popularity.
however, by directly tying conflicts between the American empire and Indians to British imperialism. On the frontispiece to his edition of Dodge's narrative, Russell included a portrait of the author alluding to the Letter to Congress that Dodge wrote shortly after his escape. In this letter, Dodge warns that although as of its writing in 1779 "not one out of a hundred" Indians had "taken up the hatchet against" the United States, Indian invasions were imminent. This is inevitable "unless," he continues, U.S soldiers "march through their Country and take Detroit." According to Dodge's logic, the only way to prevent Indian invasions of the United States is to invade British Canada. Dodge's Letter may have been unfamiliar to some of Russell's readers, but the same cannot be said of Allen's best-selling Narrative. Allen makes his call for invasion of Canada even more explicitly than Dodge. Allen counsels that it is "impossible" for "cruel and bloodthirsty savages" to wage war against America without support of "some civilized nation, which for them would be impracticable, did Canada compose a part of the American empire" (5). As depicted in Dodge’s and Allen's narratives, British imperial alliances with Indians constitute a justification for expansion of the American empire into British Canada. The Indian Captivity narrative has been reconfigured from its original purpose of justifying British imperialism against Native Americans and the French. It has been redirected by creoles to necessitate imperialism toward the British Empire itself.

2.3 John Marrant's Narrative and British Imperial Identity

By the late eighteenth century, Anglo-American writers had firmly established the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative as a primary vehicle for negotiating their own imperial identities through the racialized depictions of Native Americans in relation to competing European empires. However, white creoles publishing in North America did not hold a monopoly on the Indian captivity narrative and its potent mechanisms of identity formation. At the imperial metropole of London, another work that incorporates Indian captivity, authored by the black creole John Marrant, would emerge to challenge the cultural logics of racial exclusion embedded within the imperial vision of the Indian Captivity Narrative. The autobiographical *A Narrative of the Lord's Wonderful Dealings with John Marrant, A Black*, became immediately popular with readers upon its initial publication in 1785. It was published in five London editions in its first year of publication. Eleven more editions within the British Isles followed, all of them prior to the text's first American edition of 1820 a quarter-century later.64 In his *Narrative*, the

---

64 Henry Louis Gates, *The Signifying Monkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 154. Marrant's text has what has been called a "tangled" publication history. Marrant's *Narrative* was first published in edition "ARRANGED, CORRECTED, AND PUBLISHED" by Rev. William Aldridge, Marrant's amanuensis and editor, based on a speech given by Marrant at his ordination by the Huntingdon Connexion, who sponsored Marrant's ordination as well as his mission to New Brunswick to found his own church. Eileen Razzari Elrod, *Piety and Dissent: Race, Gender, and Biblical Rhetoric in Early American Autobiography* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008), 45. The fourth London edition, authorized by Marrant and identified on its title page as "Enlarged by Mr. Marrant, and Printed for his Sole Benefit," is considered the standard scholarly edition. All my references are to this edition unless otherwise noted. Many other editions of Marrant's narrative obscure Marrant's race and/or omit Marrant's comments on American slavery and American treatment of Native Americans. Joanna Brooks and John Saillant speculate that editors "whitewashed" Marrant's narrative to make it a more marketable "captivity and conversion memoir instead of a challenging anti-slavery work." "Introduction," in *Face Zion Forward*, Edited by Joanna Brooks and John Saillant (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2002), 19.
evangelist minister John Marrant describes his trials and conversions during the unstable closing years of the first British Empire. Marrant's tale begins with his birth in the colony of New York in 1755, his Indian captivity, during which he converts the Cherokees to Christianity, and his subsequent emigration to London. Despite its widespread readership in turn of the century Britain, as well as the circum-Atlantic breadth of its plot, scholars interpret Marrant's as a distinctly American text that performs early American and African-American identities by negotiating difference in binary comparisons with Native Americans. However, shifting our perspective toward London, where Marrant's Narrative achieved its initial success, enables us to see that Marrant fashions himself as a loyalist. While the fact that Marrant locates himself within the British Empire need not preclude his Narrative from consideration as an American literary text, the Narrative shapes subjectivity outside the boundaries of American Empire. Marrant’s Narrative articulates an alternative to American imperial identity in North America, one that is inclusive toward Africans and Native Americans, yet ever hierarchical. Marrant delineates this model of empire through contrasts with an American Empire founded on fixed racial categories and interracial violence toward Africans and Native Americans.


To illustrate the strength of his new imperial model, Marrant subverts some of the genre conventions of the Indian Captivity narrative. In first generation captivity narratives, the white captive is dragged into the wilderness against his or her will. But after failing to convert his black community near Charleston to evangelical Christianity, Marrant enters the wilderness of his own accord. Whereas in Indian captivity narratives the captive typically proves the purity of his own cultural identity by resisting assimilation, Marrant willingly assimilates with Cherokee culture in order to reproduce his own cultural identity in the form of a religious conversion. His assimilation soon becomes the means of subverting the cultural identity of his captors. According to his Narrative, Marrant he converts all the Cherokee to Christianity. These experiences among Native Americans in the wilderness empower Marrant as an agent of cultural conversion and authority beyond the Cherokees. When Marrant returns to civilization, he retains the signs of his Indian acculturation. “My dress was purely in the Indian stile;” says Marrant, "the skins of wild beasts composed my garments; my head was set out in the savage manner, with a long pendant down my back, a sash round my middle, without breeches, and a tomahawk by my side" (65). When Marrant first arrives at a white settlement the residents are initially shocked at his Native appearance, but after two days accept him. Marrant soon gathers these families scattered across twenty miles and leads them in prayer for six weeks. Marrant writes that "they expressed much sorrow when I left them" (65). When he reaches his own community, Marrant scolds a host for sitting to supper without prayer. Before his captivity, members of Marrant’s community had met such admonishments with derision. Now, Marrant now concludes that his efforts "ended with a sound conversion. Here is a wild man, says he, come out of the woods, to be a
witness for God, and to reprove our ingratitude and stupefaction” (66). In the passages that follow, Marrant recounts his success at converting the rest of his community to evangelist Christianity, including his own family. Before his captivity, Marrant had failed to religiously reform his black community. Now it is his very acculturation with Native Americans, his “pure Indian stile,” that grants him a new authority among both colonial whites and blacks. Even though as a black creole Marrant already possessed a form of racial otherness for whites, Marrant exploits Indianness to appeal to whites. Where typical Indian captivity narratives reinforce the boundaries of racial and ethnic identities, it is the fluidity of Marrant's identity that affords him authority over both blacks and Native Americans. This fluidity has the additional effect of relocating Marrant outside of these typically marginalized communities him to a position of authority usually denied to blacks within the British Empire.

Marrant contrasts this fluid identity that can spatially coexist with Natives and Africans to that of white creole Americans, who rely on fixed racial boundaries to dominate Native Americans and Africans. Marrant's criticism of American actions toward Native Americans takes the form of a brief statement after his conversion of the Cherokees: “When they recollect that the white people drove them from American shores, they are full of resentment. These nations have often united, and murdered all the white people in the back settlements, men, women, and children” (64). Marrant's depiction of white families slaughtered surely provoked his reader’s sympathy toward white settlers, but Marrant’s statement also tethers Indian violence directly to an American imperialism that relies on displacement and genocide. In a reversal of the strategy of the Indian captivity narrative, which attributes no motivation other than
savagery to Indian attacks, Marrant locates American imperialism as the direct cause of Indian violence toward the American community.\textsuperscript{67} He thereby postulates a fatal flaw in the strategy of American Empire. By rejecting Native Americans as potential allies within the empire and instead pursuing their eradication, American Empire invites violence against its most vulnerable subjects.

Marrant next indicts American slavery as barbaric in order to equate southern slaveholders to heathen savages. Marrant’s discussion of slavery takes place after his return to the settlements, when he gains employment at a plantation outside of Charleston. Shocked at discovering that the enslaved blacks and their children are ignorant of the Christian religion, Marrant becomes their teacher. Upon learning of this, the plantation mistress orders her husband to whip the enslaved blacks to near death. Marrant recounts that “men, women, and children, were strip’d naked and tied, their feet to a stake, their hands to the arm of a tree, and so severely flogged that the blood ran from their backs and sides to the floor . . . and lay upon the ground though as dead” (69). Marrant's graphic description closely parallels his portrayal of his own proposed execution at the hands of the Cherokees prior to their conversion. In both cases, bodies are "stripped naked," followed by almost ritualized torture by penetration with stakes or whips, ending only with death, or near-death. The horrified Marrant is unable to intervene, but assures the mistress that “the blood of those poor negroes . . . would be required by God at his hands.” And it is. Two months later, according to Marrant “it pleased God to lay his hand upon their Mistress, and she was seized with a very violent

\textsuperscript{67}See Elrod, \textit{Piety and Dissent: Race, Gender, and Biblical Rhetoric in Early American Autobiography}, 47–8.
fever, which no medicine that they would procure would remove, and . . . she died in a very dreadful manner” (70). This fever parallels the illness incurred by both Marrant and the Cherokee King’s daughters before their respective conversions, but in this case the plantation mistress perishes rather than converts. Marrant thus not only likens American slave-holders as savages, but goes further and portrays them as irredeemable.

Marrant strategically places this indictment of slavery in his narrative just after the beginning of the American War of Independence. Marrant refers to the war only twice in the narrative, both times calling it "the American troubles" (68). Although this reference to the war may be understated, it would not have been lost on Marrant’s readers at the British metropole still smarting from the loss of thirteen of twenty-six North American colonies. Even though Marrant is a creole, he firmly identifies himself as a loyalist. Shortly leaving the southern plantation Marrant is impressed on a British warship. During the Revolution Marrant shared this experience with many other colonists, both white and black, who were forced to toil on British warships. After the war, several colonists who identified themselves with the rebel cause returned to America and published captivity narratives relating these experiences.68 Marrant’s impressment affords him the opportunity to incorporate an additional captivity within his narrative. Like John Dodge or Ethan Allen, Marrant might very well have employed such a device

68 Because this genre does not reproduce the form of the Indian Captivity narrative, I do not study these works in this chapter. For examples, see John Blatchford, A Narrative of the Remarkable Occurrences, in the Life of John Blatchford (1788) and Ebenezer Fletcher, A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Ebenezer Fletcher, of Newipswich, Who Was . . . Taken Prisoner by the British (1798); collected in Williams, Liberty's Captives, 2006.
to distance himself from the British but rather than declaring himself a captive, Marrant uses his impressment to assert his identity as a British subject.

By announcing his plans to travel to British North America and preach to blacks and Native Americans, Marrant locates himself as the center of Britain’s efforts to unite its fragmented postwar empire through religion. Marrant accomplishes this in part by recounting his successes while living in North America. He writes that while impressed by the British Navy, he landed at South Carolina during the British siege of Charlestown, where he portrays the Cherokee King fighting beside the British General Clinton. Marrant relates that the Cherokee King "rode up to me, and was very glad to see me, and his daughter was very happy" (72). On one hand, Marrant uses this scene to prove that conversion of the Cherokee was a lasting success and thereby affirm his competence as a minister. But this scene also implies that the Cherokee fought as allies to the British in the War of American Independence as a direct result of Marrant's missionary efforts. Marrant thereby suggests to his London readers that by returning to North America to preach to blacks and Native Americans, he can continue to build lasting relationships with both groups, and in this way help manage the British Empire in North America.

Marrant inculcates his own vision for this post-war British Empire by contrasting two distinct models for imperial authority over diverse populations, in particular Native Americans and Africans. One, which he identifies with white Americans, depends on territorial expansion through the dispossession of Native Americans coupled with an economic system built on barbarous African slavery. The other, which Marrant personifies through his own conversion and captivity experiences, relies on the ability to move across boundaries of race, yet maintain one's own cultural authority, in order to
gain consensual cooperation. While Marrant's Narrative incorporates a captivity narrative within its larger structure, his purpose is not to reproduce and insert himself within the logic of empire typical of captivity narratives, but to reconfigure and expand the captivity narrative's triangular system of identity formation. To structure this imperial identity, Marrant contrasts British and American empires through their respective imperial relationships with Africans and Native Americans. Marrant offers a vision of a British empire that is inclusive toward racial others, yet still hierarchical, compared to an American Empire founded on fixed racial categories and interracial violence toward Africans and Native Americans.

Marrant characterizes his success at establishing authority over Natives and Africans through religious conversion as motivated by benevolence. Yet we must be mindful to interrogate such claims, lest we overlook the imperialism and violence underlying his vision of empire. At the conclusion of his narrative, in an allusion to Revelation 7:14, Marrant prays that "strangers may hear of and run to Christ; that Indian tribes may stretch out their hands to God; that the black nations may be made white in the blood of the lamb" (74). Karen A. Weyler argues that through this prayer Marrant "invokes not a color- or race-free world, but a world where Christianity will render race a null category." On the level of skin color, perhaps this is true. In the text of his narrative, Marrant largely avoids affirming racial categories by describing or referring to Native Americans or Africans based on color. In fact, Marrant only marks himself as "a

black" on the title page to his narrative, but nowhere within the narrative himself.

Analogous to the way that the Book of Revelation envisions that the souls of sinners be "made white" or purified through the blood of Christ, Marrant advocates a vision of an empire that will include Native and African collective identities only after religious purification.

Even though Marrant constructs himself as uniting the British Empire through religion, his vision remains imperialist. The religious conversions of missionaries such as Marrant worked "to shatter Indian societies and destroy the cohesiveness of Indian communities."70 As a result, religious conversions in North America were usually followed by cessation of Native territory. In fact, Marrant goes so far as to symbolically enact such imperial expansion in his narrative. His depiction of the Cherokee princess and her kiss participates in an imperial discourse extending back at least as far as John Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia* (1624), wherein Pocahontas' female Indian body symbolizes the land, and her offering of her body to Smith symbolizes the white conquest over the Native territory.71 Therefore, while Marrant's British Empire may not be founded on racial exclusion like the American Empire he depicts to his readers, his


empire demands that Native Americans and Africans sacrifice both their own sovereignty and vital aspects of their own collective identities in order to be eligible for inclusion.

2.4. Race and Identity in Posthumous Editions of Marrant’s *Narrative*.

Marrant's wish that Native Americans and Africans "be made white" within the Empire would be fulfilled, but not in the way that Marrant intended. For John Marrant himself, race was important only insofar as that British imperial identity was not limited by race, but could accommodate multiple racial groups that conformed to a British religious identity. Yet such fluid conceptions of race would prove unacceptable for publishers of posthumous editions of Marrant’s narrative. As a standard practice in the eighteenth-century culture of reprinting, publishers often reprinted previously-published works but added new introductory materials, frontispieces, and illustrations. In posthumous editions of Marrant’s *Narrative*, publishers altered the frontispieces and title pages of earlier editions in ways that diminish or erase Marrant’s racial identity. In doing so, these publishers appropriated Marrant as a symbol for white British identity.

Marrant never identifies himself as “black” within the text of his narrative. In most editions of the text, however, Marrant’s readers could identify him as black based on the book’s title, *A Narrative of the Lord’s Wonderful Dealings with John Marrant, A Black*. Posthumous editions, however, such as the 1813 Halifax edition, remove the words "a black" from the book's title. Such alterations "expunged" Marrant's racial classification for readers.\(^{72}\) Since Marrant never identifies himself as black in the text of

\(^{72}\) Brooks and Saillant, “Introduction,” 59.
his *Narrative*, such editions might have led the *Narrative*’s predominantly white reading audience to identify Marrant as simply a fellow member of the British Empire, rather than a potential racial other. The frontispiece illustration for this same edition of the text goes even further to connect Marrant to British identity (Fig. 3.8). The inscription at bottom right “Vide Page 23” signals to readers that the image depicts Marrant’s initial encounter with a Cherokee Indian on page 23 in the text. This frontispiece matches Marrant’s text to the extent that the image shows a lone Indian hunter leaping from behind a tree to surprise a Marrant who carries a bible, but little else about the image corresponds to the text. Marrant does not describe himself wearing a fine three-piece suit and top hat, as he is shown in this illustration. And as a free black in the colonial south who in his *Narrative* describes himself as being supported by no other means than "by the Lord," it is unlikely Marrant would have owned such attire, much less worn into the wilderness. Instead of identifying Marrant as an African missionary, Marrant’s dress effectively positions him as a representative of civilized British identity. 

Such posthumous alterations that effectively expunge Marrant’s African identity suggest that for publishers and readers of the 1813 British metropole, racial qualities outside the boundaries of whiteness interfered with Marrant’s potential to function as a vessel of British identity.

This frontispiece illustration constructs Marrant as a symbol for a civilized British identity in part through contrasts with Indian savagery. The composition of the image closely parallels popular visual depictions of captivity and conflict circulating in Britain, like the illustration of John Smith’s encounter with Native Americans titled *Smith Taketh the King of the Pamaunkee Prisoner, 1603*. This illustration was first engraved by
William Hole in 1624, and incorporated into seventeenth editions of Smith’s *True Relation of Accidents and Occurrences in Virginia* (Fig. 3.9). Engravings featuring this same visual tradition of ethnographic imagery circulated widely in Britain in the early nineteenth century. By showing Marrant as the captive, the frontispiece image for the 1813 edition of Marrant's *Narrative* reverses the polarity of the captivity in Hole's engraving, which depicts John Smith capturing an Indian. Despite this inversion, the frontispiece bears strong similarities with Hole's engraving. In both images, an only partially dressed Indian towers over a finely clothed Englishman. In each illustration, the captor reaches across the body toward the captive's chest. The curved tree limb that arches over the scene of captivity in the frontispiece to Marrant echoes the topographic curve in the landscape above the heads of Smith and the King of the Pamaunkee in Hole's engraving. Through these repetitions, this frontispiece locates Marrant within a visual discourse that depicts encounters between English imperial agents and Native Americans, thereby constructing Marrant as an active imperialist agent of the British Empire.

Just as this figure of Marrant represents British imperial identity, the Native American in this frontispiece represents much more than the Cherokee Indian depicted in Marrant's *Narrative*; it serves as an allegorical figure of America like those that I explored in the preceding chapter. With his slanted and bulging eyes, sinister grin, and hirsute body this figure portrays Native Americans as bestial and demonic in a manner reminiscent of Mary Rowlandson or Cotton Mather. In the text proper of his narrative, however, Marrant depicts the Cherokee hunter who initially captures him as inquisitive and merely curious about Marrant's survival in the wilderness and prayers to Jesus. After
capturing Marrant, the Cherokee teaches Marrant to hunt and dry animal skins. He does not wish to harm Marrant as in an Indian captivity narrative, but simply to exploit Marrant for labor, or possibly adopt him. And while some of the Cherokees savagely threaten Marrant in his narrative, Marrant's captivity ends with converting the Cherokees to Christianity and redeeming them from savagery. From this perspective, this image of an Indian is incongruous with the text of the narrative. This incongruity stems from the fact that this Indian does not represent the Cherokee nation, but America itself. Published in 1813 at the height of the War of 1812, this frontispiece shows the resurgence of the allegorical figure of the Indian as America in British print culture during times of war. In revolutionary-era political prints, British engravers and artists used the male Indian to symbolize America as a bellicose foe and a threat to British imperial power. Scholars have concluded that the primary visual symbol of America shifted from the figure of the Indian to that of a Greek Goddess at the close of the War of American Independence. However, the figure of the Indian as America continued to circulate in the form of transfer prints in ceramic plates, jugs, and pitchers throughout the British Empire well into the early nineteenth century. It makes sense, then, for a British publisher to return to this imagery amid the first true inter-imperial war for territory within North America between the American and British Empires.

By incorporating this frontispiece, then, the publisher of this 1813 posthumous edition of Marrant’s *Narrative* appropriates Marrant and his narrative in the service of the British Empire, portraying the Empire as an innocent captive of the American empire.

Literary scholars often over-state the agency of the author. Examples such as this one demonstrate the agency of the publisher. By situating these texts and their visual artifacts in a broader context of book production and reprinting we can see how publishers often previously published texts strategically to promote ideological and political agendas that might in fact differ from the author’s. Just as British political prints used the figure of the Indian to picture the British colonies as a creole savage, through which metropolitan citizens of the British Empire could represent themselves as purely British, this frontispiece invites readers to think of the would-be American Empire as a degraded antonym of the British Empire. Moreover, by inverting the strategy of the Narrative of British Captivity, this frontispiece illustration portrays the white British Empire as the captive of a red savage American Empire. After being appropriated and redirected by colonial insurgents during the American Revolution, the triangular system of collective identity formation that originated in creole Indian Captivity narratives of the late seventeenth century, this publisher has reoriented to its original purpose of reinforcing the purity of British imperial identity. With Marrant emptied of his blackness, redness and whiteness serve once again as the contours of empire.

From the narratives written by creoles like Hannah Swarton and Elizabeth Hanson, to American revolutionaries John Dodge and Ethan Allen, to the loyalist John Marrant, the Indian Captivity narrative served as an extraordinarily adaptable mechanism for forming early imperial identities. These narratives shape imperial identity through triangulation, facing on one hand westward toward Native Americans, yet at the same time eastward toward European imperial cultures. Thus far, however, critics have focused
only on the vector of this triangle that contrasts Natives and Americans. The earliest
generation of scholars of early American literature remained blind to the presence of
Native Americans in American literature, instead focusing on such themes as American
desire to settle “an empty, fertile continent.”75 It was not until the 1970’s and 80’s that
scholars such as Brian Dippie, Reginald Horsman, and Richard Slotkin showed that
imperialism toward Native Americans pervades early American cultural production. 76 In
the same way, I suggest, it is only now that scholars are recognizing that American
Empire emerged not as something new from the fertile North American soil through
contrasts with its indigenous peoples, but relied on the cultural representations of these
indigenous peoples to reproduce and modify European conceptions of empire. Even
though recent scholarship has tried to debunk the myth of American exceptionalism, the
myth persists in our understanding of how American identity developed its imperialist
aspirations.77 As a result scholars have privileged Mary Rowlandson’s Indian Captivity
narrative, which obscures the transatlantic scope of imperial identity formation, and

75 Henry Nash Smith, Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth (Cambridge:
criticism, see Amy Kaplan, “‘Left Alone With America’: The Absence of Empire in the
Study of Early American Culture,” in Cultures of U.S. Imperialism, Edited by Amy
Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993); Jane Tompkin,
“‘Indians’: Textualism, Morality, and the Problem of History,” Critical Inquiry 13, no. 1

76 Brian W. Dippie, The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy
(Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1982); Reginald Horsman, Race and Manifest
Destiny (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981); Slotkin, Regeneration Through
Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860.

77 On the persistence of American Exceptionalism in thinking about early America, see
Edward Larkin, “Nation and Empire in the Early U.S.,” American Literary History 22,
interpreted John Marrant’s *Narrative* through the lens of American or African-American subjectivities, even though in his *Narrative* Marrant self-identifies as a loyalist of the British Empire. Whereas earlier critics refused to recognize the development of American imperialism at all, we are now coming to recognize that American literature and culture have always been imperial: ever looking back anxiously across the Atlantic, relying on the representation of Native Americans to reproduce, yet simultaneously assert American superiority, to the old imperialisms of Europe.
Chapter 4

IMAGE AND EMPIRE FROM REVOLUTION TO REMOVAL

Jane McCrea was colonist of New Jersey. In 1777, she travelled to upstate New York with her mother to meet with her betrothed David Jones, who was a British officer in General Burgoyne’s Army. She was killed during the Battle of Saratoga. According to popular American accounts, McCrea was brutally murdered by Indians. For example, the American poet Philip Freneau, included an account of McCrea’s death in his 1788 Poem “America Independent—and Her Everlasting Deliverance From the British Tyranny and Oppression.” In Freneau’s account, McCrea is murdered as an unintended consequence of such British alliances with Indians. Freneau writes that the British hoped that “the fierce Indian/ rousing from his rest/ Might these new regions with his flames invest,/ With scalps and tortures aggravate our woe, And to the infernal world dismiss your foe.”

Freneau thereby portrays the British Empire as spurring otherwise peaceful Native Americans to literally create a Hell on Earth for Americans. Calling McCrea by the poetic name ”Lavinia”, Freneau writes: “yonder lies, all breathless, cold, and pale/ Drench’d in her gore, Lavinia of the vale,/ The cruel Indian seiz’d her life away,/ As the next morn began her bridal day!—.” (279) In her 1805 history of the revolution, Mercy Warren would describe McCrea’s murder in remarkably similar terms. Warren writes that

McCrea was “massacred . . . in the cold-blooded ferocity of savage manners.” Warren ends her account with the image of “the helpless maid . . . butchered and scalped, and her bleeding corpse left in the woods” (27). Warren’s and Freneau’s accounts fixate on the threat of Indian violence to the body of a vulnerable, pure, female white American body. Significantly, the authors symbolize Indian violence through a female body dressed in a gore-covered bridal gown that was intended for the marriage to a British military officer. This bloody bridal dress, and the story of McCrea’s death, would be repeated by newspaper printers, history writers, novelists, and poets recounted this story of McCrea’s death with such frequency and consistency over the course of late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as to create on the primary cultural myths of the antebellum period. There are no first-hand accounts of the event. But according to general outlines of the oft-repeated narrative, Jones sent a party of Indians allied with the British Army to meet McCrea escort to Burgoyne’s encampment. In most accounts, the Indians took McCrea, dressed in her bridal gown, toward Burgoyne’s camp. But something went awry along the way. The Indians, who most stories identify as Mohawks, claimed that McCrea was hit by a stray musket ball, and scalped her after her death to recover the reward that Burgoyne had placed on American scalps. According to American accounts, however,


3 For a modern assessment of the event based on recently excavated archeological evidence, see David R. Starbuck, Rangers and Redcoats on the Hudson: Exploring the Past on Rogers Island, the Birthplace of the U.S. Army Rangers (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2004), 103–112. Due to repeated exhumations of McCrea’s corps over the eighteenth and nineteenth century, resulting in a severely
the Mohawks betrayed the British and took McCrea captive. Soon after, they brutally murdered and scalped her. American newspapers immediately sensationalized this latter version of events to incite enthusiasm for the revolutionary cause.\footnote{Jeremy Engels and Greg Goodale, “‘Our Battle Cry Will Be: Remember Jenny McCrea!’: A Precis on Revenge,” \textit{American Quarterly} 61, no. 1 (2009): 95.}

This chapter uses the term “McCrea myth” to refer collectively refer to American versions of McCrea’s murder. Myth, as theorized by Roland Barthes, is a message that purports to be innocent by appearing to relate historical facts but is, at the same time, highly motivated for a specific purpose.\footnote{Roland Barthes, \textit{Mythologies: The Complete Edition, in a New Translation} (New York: Hill & Wang, 1972), 109.} Myths distort reality into systems of signification that carry ideological messages. When a myth is naturalized through repetition, Barthes explains further, “the myth-consumer takes the signification for a system of facts” (131). The story of McCrea’s death would be repeated until it became naturalized as such a motivated system of facts. In addition to Freneau and Warren’s popular accounts, the McCrea myth would be repeated in such works as Joel Barlow’s epic poem \textit{The Columbiad} (1807), Jared Sparks’ “Life and Treason of Benedict Arnold,” (1835) Washington Irving’s \textit{Life of George Washington} (1855-1859), as well as a visual tradition beginning with John Vanderlyn’s painting \textit{The Death of Jane McCrea} (1804). American writers and readers often accepted the McCrea myth as a historical fact. Yet on compromised archeological site, McCrea’s cause of death cannot be determined with any certainty.
the level of myth, Jane McCrea functions as a symbol of the American nation threatened by the often conjoined threat of British Empire and Native Americans.6

Through the tale of a woman captured and murdered by Indians, the McCrea myth employs the genre conventions of the Indian captivity narrative to unify its consumers in a collective identity joined by threat of cultural and racial others.7 Although the McCrea myth follows the conventions of the Indian Captivity narrative, the myth also employs a marriage plot as a frame that imports elements of the sentimental novel. As Jay Fliegelman puts it, the McCrea myth constituted for contemporary readers "sentimental fiction horribly come alive" by mixing the two genres.8 Fliegelman's description implies that the McCrea myth shapes American identity through an innovation in the narrative structure of the Indian Captivity narrative. However, because literary critics have interpreted the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative through binary structures, they have misunderstood the McCrea myth as operating through binary terms.9 If we

6 On McCrea as a symbol for the American nation, see Engels and Goodale, ““Our Battle Cry Will Be: Remember Jenny McCrea!”: A Precis on Revenge.”
7 On the historical and recent use of the Indian Captivity narrative to normalize collective identities in American culture, see Christopher Castiglia, Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
9 One group of scholars has focused on the conflict between McCrea and her Mohawk captors. According to the conventional understanding of the Indian Captivity narrative, they conclude that the McCrea myth creates a binary between vulnerable white Americans and savage red Indians. Renee Bergland argue that the narrative "stirs up fears of the Indians" among Americans. Renee L. Bergland, The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects (New Hampshire: University of Press of New England, 2000), 90. Michelle Burnham argues for a different take on this binary wherein the McCrea myth "conflates" the British and the Indians who threaten to rape and ultimately murder McCrea. Michelle Burnham, Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861 (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997), 73. Within the thwarted marriage plot that culminates in a rape and then a murder, the Indians symbolize the abuses of British authority against the liberty of the American colonists. This
substitute a triangular system for this typical binary one, we can see that by drawing on
the plot conventions of sentimental literature, the McCrea myth infuses the Indian
Captivity narrative with an emergent post-Revolution discourse of inter-imperial desire.

This chapter studies the through McCrea myth to examine the continuing
evolution of U.S. imperial identity between the American Revolution and the era of
Indian Removal in the 1830's. I show that during this period, redness would not only
continue to justify imperialism toward Native Americans and conquest of the British
Empire in North America, but also evolve to accommodate an ambivalent post-
revolutionary inter-imperial desire felt by Americans toward their British imperial
counterparts. In making this argument, the chapter moves the study of how image and
text work in tandem to disseminate racial and imperial ideologies, which has been at the
center of the dissertation so far, toward the foreground of the analysis. I explore the
convergence of visual and textual permutations of the McCrea myth through Joel
Barlow's *Columbiad* and William Apess' *Eulogy on King Philip*, first printed in 1807 and
1836, respectively. *The Columbiad* and the *Eulogy on King Philip*, separated in their
publication dates by thirty years, may at first appear unconnected with one another. Nor,
perhaps due to the differences in these books, have scholars studied the two together. The
former is a 7,350-line epic poem written by an affluent American diplomat during the
interpretation, however, attaches insufficient importance to the romance between Jones and McCrea that, as
Fliegelman notes, sets the tale in motion. A minority of scholars, such as Elisa Tamarkin, have built on
Fliegelman's reading to argue that over the course of the early nineteenth century variations in the McCrea
myth fantasize a "consummation of loyalist affections" and an "imperialist nostalgia" for "lost dependence"
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 156–158, 169. Yet in Tamarkin's astute reading, as in other
readings that focus on the sentimental elements of the tale, the Indians vanish behind an analysis of
revolutionary rhetoric. Neither reading of the McCrea myth accounts for the narrative's dual use of Native
Americans within both Indian captivity narrative and sentimental romance.
early years of American Empire, while the latter is an oration composed, and later printed, by a Pequot Methodist minister and activist at the height of Indian Removal. However, the two printed books are indelibly tethered by their mutual yet incongruous use of the McCrea myth.

Apess placed his *Eulogy* in dialogue with Barlow’s *Columbiad* through the *Eulogy*’s lone illustration, *King Philip Dying for His Country* (Fig. 4.1). As I demonstrate in this chapter, this woodcut engraving, which has long mystified critics, expertly deconstructs and reconfigures the McCrea myth and its imperialist ideologies. *King Philip Dying* manipulates the iconology of *The Murder of Lucinda* (Fig. 4.2), the illustration that Barlow paired with his poetic rendition of the McCrea myth in Book VI of his *Columbiad*. Yet the *The Murder of Lucinda* is itself a modified, unauthorized copy of John Vanderlyn’s 1804 painting *The Death of Jane McCrea* (Fig. 4.3). When studied through the lens of their illustrations, *The Columbiad* and the *Eulogy* reveal divergent visions of early nineteenth-century American Empire. Barlow’s imperial vision updates the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative to express an American imperial desire for cultural reunion with the British Empire. In contrast, Apess collapses the racial hierarchies implicit in the McCrea narrative to advocate for a racially inclusive vision of empire. For both the American and the Pequot, redness and whiteness work through image and text to produce idealized, yet divergent visions of an imperial North America.
Figure 4.1. *King Philip Dying for His Country*. Frontispiece for William Apess’ *Eulogy on King Philip*. Boston: 1836. The American Antiquarian Society, Worchester, MA.
Figure 4.2. *The Murder of Lucinda.*

Figure 4.3. John Vanderlyn. *The Death of Jane McCrea.* Oil on Canvas. 1804. Wadsworth Athenaeum, Hartford, CT. Photo by the author.
Inter-Imperial Desire and the Myth of Jane McCrea

During the early republic, the story of Jane McCrea manifested the desires of Americans sought at once to establish a distinct cultural identity as the ultimate white imperial ethnicity in North America, yet desired to maintain the racial and cultural purity requisite to maintain their Englishness. While the strands of an ambivalent inter-imperial desire lay scattered across early iterations of the McCrea myth like Freneau and Warren’s, it would be Joel Barlow, as writer and book designer, who first fully articulated the tensions of inter-imperial desire through the interplay of image and text in his *Columbiad*.

Barlow aspired to create the ultimate epic of American empire in *The Columbiad*, from Columbus's "discovery" of the Americas, through the American Revolution, to early republican empire. Barlow explains in the poem's introduction that "the real object of the poem" is to inspire his reader’s faith in the "future advancement of human society, until states as well as individuals arrive at universal civilization."\(^{10}\) Barlow modeled his poem on conventions of British epic poetry, themselves adapted from epics written by poets of

the Greek and Roman Empires. Barlow's literary goals for the *Columbiad* position the book as an agent to promote an imperial vision that the statesman first articulated almost twenty years earlier in his *Fourth of July Oration of 1787*. In this speech to the Connecticut Society of the Cincinnatus, Barlow lauded America as an “empire of reason” sustained by “peace.” According to this model of empire, writes Barlow, Americans will spread naturally across the continent bringing with them “the most rapid improvement in all the arts that embellish human nature,” stimulated by “the blessings of rational government” (20). Unlike Britain’s rule by tyranny, or Rome’s bloody expansion, Barlow claimed that after the revolution there was “no territory to acquire by conquest,” but instead an empire established through “permanent principles of sober policy spread through the colonies” (6).

Barlow's idealized vision of an empire of reason expanding peacefully through principles of enlightenment civilization closely parallels that of other prominent Americans, including Thomas Jefferson, who imagined America as an "empire for liberty." Jefferson envisioned an American empire would be structured as "a federal union of self-governing republics" that would expand as new democratic republics formed and sought inclusion in the union. According to the models embraced by Americans like Barlow and Jefferson, Americans would spread peacefully across the

11 On Barlow’s many models of epic form, including both classical and British epics, see Steven Blakemore, *Joel Barlow’s Columbiad: A Bicentennial Reading* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2007), esp. 27–9. Blakemore 27-9. Cite Bauer, Harris

continent, bringing with them that crucial "improvement" of democracy and civilization, which they believed would allow them purportedly allowing to expand westward almost indefinitely without the bloodiness of Rome or the tyranny of Britain.13 Imagined as structured through horizontal political, commercial relationships between the states, this vision of American Empire was silently grounded in hierarchies of power between whites and Native Americans and Africans.14 Native Americans, unless they could somehow adapt to the agricultural way of life that characterized this American Empire, were doomed to extinction.15 In this context, the McCrea myth functions within Barlow's larger work of literary imperialism to simultaneously promote an idealized vision of an American Empire superior to old world empires like the British Empire, and simultaneously erase violence against Native Americans.

But Barlow’s aspirations for his literary epic went beyond textual poetics. Barlow sought to create a printed book that would be lauded as the finest ever crafted in the United States, and could be compared favorably to books printed in Britain. To this effect, Barlow spared no expense on procuring the finest American printing, paper, ink, and book-binding for the project.16 Printed on the finest American paper, bound as a


twelve-inch quarto volume of 476 pages in sumptuous American leather, and adorned with twelve lavish mezzotint engravings copied from original paintings, the publication of *The Columbiad* was “the graphic arts event of the decade,” if not the antebellum era.\textsuperscript{17} Barlow even went so far as to commission an original typeface for his book, fashioned by an American designer, and cast by an American foundry.\textsuperscript{18} By most accounts, Barlow’s efforts in this endeavor would be regarded as a success. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* called the *Columbiad* "the very summit of perfection in the mechanical art of bookmaking."\textsuperscript{19} Even with the considerable advancements in print technology by mid-century, the *Columbiad* still maintained its status as a high art object. As late as 1859, a Brooklyn book agent wrote to his client that "*The Columbiad* is considered the best American book ever published—and in fact the typography of few English books can compare with it."\textsuperscript{20} Barlow’s ambitions included adorning his *Columbiad* with the finest original engravings ever incorporated into an American book.\textsuperscript{21} *The Murder of Lucinda* (Fig. 2), an illustration embedded within the textual portrayal of the McCrea myth in *The


\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 339.


\textsuperscript{20} Even at mid-century the diasporic English population of the United States still anxiously compared their own cultural productions with those of the metropolis from which they had achieved their independence. Letter, T.S. Drowne to unidentified client, January 24, 1859. Winterthur Museum and Library.

\textsuperscript{21} Due to its hefty twenty dollar price tag, Barlow’s first monumental edition of the *Columbiad* did not meet his or his publisher’s sale expectations, or enjoy broad circulation. The *Columbiad* would be republished in more modest, illustrated editions in 1809 and 1812.
Columbiad, would prove the most popular and enduring of these. Before examining the engraving itself, however, we should consider its genealogy within the iconological network of the early nineteenth-century transatlantic world.

The Murder of Lucinda's graphic origins lay in Paris. Like many fine engravings of the time, Barlow’s book illustration originated as a painting created by a master artist. But the path from painting to illustration did not occur as Barlow intended. Barlow first attempted to produce the sketches on which to model illustrations for The Columbiad in collaboration with his close friend Robert Fulton. Fulton had studied with Benjamin West years earlier in London. However, in 1803 Barlow decided to hire John Vanderlyn, a more expert artist, to paint the models for the engravings. As the first of these, Barlow commissioned a painting from Vanderlyn to depict the McCrea myth. Barlow gave very specific instructions for these paintings, leaving, in the words of one scholar of book history, "little to the artist's imagination." Vanderlyn completed his painting, The Death of Jane McCrea (Fig. 3), in Paris in 1804 and displayed it to great international acclaim as the first American painting to ever be accepted at the annual Paris salon.

22 Barlow calls McCrea “Lucinda” in a reference to the fiancé of Major John Andre, the revolutionary officer executed for treason by the order of George Washington, thereby linking Jones to Andre, whom Americans venerated for his gentility and civility. On the cult of Major Andre in antebellum America, see Tamarkin, Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America., 116–149.


24 Bidwell, The Publication of Joel Barlow’s Columbiad, 360.
Vanderlyn’s *The Death of Jane McCrea* immediately arrests the viewer’s attention with the triad of two half-naked, dark-skinned, muscular Indians towering above a crouching, white-skinned Jane McCrea. One Indian grasps McCrea by the arm with one hand, while his other hand holds a tomahawk at the apex of an arc that would end at McCrea’s body. The other Indian grasps McCrea's hair. McCrea herself looks upward at one assailant with an expression that suggests terror and astonishment, clutching one of her captor’s wrists in futile resistance. As a symbol of her impending marriage to the British officer David Jones, she wears a blue version of the bridal dress repeatedly invoked in textual accounts of the massacre. But the dress of this virtuous bride has been torn open, leaving one of her breasts half-exposed to the downward gaze of her Indian attackers. By emphasizing the contrast in skin color between McCrea and her Mohawk attackers, and tantalizing the viewer with the hint of McCrea’s exposed breast, Vanderlyn depicts the attack as a scene of potential interracial rape.25

Like the Indian Captivity narrative, scholars typically read the *Death of Jane McCrea* in binary terms. But unlike readings of Barlow’s poem, which assign equal or primary blame to the British, scholars have focused principally on the contrast between the virtuous white McCrea and her savage assailants. David Bjelajac has perhaps best distilled the standard interpretation that “the helpless Jane McCrea personifies the vulnerability of America . . . to a satanic red menace.”26 According to this interpretation,

25 William H. Truettner calls *The Death of Jane McCrea* “the most brutal and provocative history painting done by an American-born artist in the decades preceding or following the war” of American Independence.

Vanderlyn’s painting utilizes a binary strategy of racial difference to depict Native Americans as a savage threat to an American nation symbolized as a pure white feminine body. However, Vanderlyn’s painting includes an additional signifier of whiteness in the figure of McCrea's betrothed, the British soldier David Jones. After capturing the viewer’s attention with the horrifying scene in the foreground, the painting draws the viewer’s gaze to the brighter, open space at the upper right where Jones appears. Viewers familiar with the McCrea myth would recognize the figure as McCrea’s beloved Jones, a beacon in the darkness rushing forward to rescue his bride from rape and murder. Jones’ diminutive size in the scene's background suggests that Jones is very far away. The visual narrative suspends the viewer’s gaze on Jones’ forever fruitless attempt to rescue his bride from her savage captors, leaving the viewer desperate for to desire McCrea’s rescue.

Scholars have not adequately accounted for the importance of the figure of David Jones. His inclusion in the painting invites a triangular reading. If, as critics have argued, Jane McCrea symbolizes the American community threatened by Indians, this figure of David Jones analogously symbolizes the British Empire with whom diasporic Americans longed for reunion. Long after political independence, as scholars such as Edward Larkin, vulnerable captive.” Stephen F. Eisenman, Nineteenth Century Art: A Critical History, 2nd Edition (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2002), 164. In his classic study, Richard Drinnon wrote that the painting depicted “the epic contrast between dusky innocence, between maddened red cruelty and helpless white virtue.” Richard Drinnon, Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), 101. Truettner perhaps comes closest to noting the presence of the British when he notes that so well-known was the story (of McCrea) at the time that one suspects Vanderlyn was censuring not just the Indians for foul play, but the British—the real villains.” William H. Truettner, Painting Indians and Building Empires in North America, 1710-1840 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 134.

27 Bjelajac, American Art: A Cultural History, 152.
Philip Gould, and Elisa Tamarkin have argued, Americans cherished narratives of reconciliation because they subtly intimated lingering loyalties toward the British Empire, and a longing for British nationalism lost in the revolution. Tamarkin has developed the term “imperial nostalgia,” which she describes as a residual affection for connections to Britain that developed among Americans during the nineteenth century. However, I would suggest that Tamarkin’s imperial nostalgia is not a new development of the nineteenth century. Instead, such longings for cultural and political connection to


29 Tamarkin, Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America. British versions of the McCrea myth absolve the British of responsibility for the actions of their Indians allies by tempering American depictions of Indian savagery and detaching the British from their alliance with Indians. In his Travels Through the States of North America in the Years 1795, 1796, and 1797, the British explorer Isaac Weld uses a decidedly milder portrayal of the Native Americans. According to Weld, Burgoyne engaged “trusty Indians to escort (McCrea) to the camp,” rather than the bloodthirsty savages described in American narratives. When these “trusty” Indians happened to come upon another party of their tribe, a dispute arose over “which should have the honour of conducting’ McCrea to the Burgoyne’s camp. Only to avoid “blood being drawn” among his warriors did one of the chiefs kill McCrea “with a blow of his tomahawk” (279) “The object of contention thus removed,” Weld continues, “the Indians returned quietly to the camp.” Weld’s Indians might be accused of lacking restraint, but are certainly not the “fiends” and “cannibals” that the American accounts construct. Weld disclaims the event as “shocking to humanity” but leaves no gory corpse for his readers to linger over. He explains that this tragedy taught the British “the impolicy of employing such barbarians” and that the British thereafter ceased alliances with Indians. Weld thereby distances the British Empire from the McCrea incident while he uses terms like "trusty" and "honour" to mitigate the savagery of American accounts. McCrea’s death becomes a horrible mistake caused by misunderstandings among Indians and Britons, rather than the unholy result of white alliances with red Indians. To put this another way, Weld transforms the McCrea narrative into a tragedy rooted in political, rather than racial conflict. Isaac Weld, Jr., Travels Through the States of North Americana and the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada During the Years 1795, 1796, and 1797, 2nd Edition, vol. 2, 2 vols. (London: John Stockdale, 1799).
the British Empire articulate the feelings of Americans, not so long ago colonists, as a diasporic English population still yearning to maintain cultural continuity to the homeland.

Vanderlyn positions the Mohawks as a racial collective that perpetually separates the two white empires. In this sense, the Mohawk Indians’ threats of murder and rape both result in the same outcome: the perpetual separation of American and British Empire. McCrea’s death would of course terminate the marriage in the plot of the narrative. McCrea’s rape itself, however, creates obstacles to the reunion of white empires that combine the racial and sentimental strands of the narrative. Within the conventions of the sentimental novel, the rape vividly imperils McCrea by soiling her virginity and rendering her unfit for marriage. But even more importantly, the interracial aspect of this rape would destroy her racial purity by mixing Indian and Anglo-American blood. In this sense the painting registers a diasporic anxiety felt by Americans. As colonists, Americans had been colonized by the metropole with the imperial discourse of creolization. Theories of creolization accused colonists as being degraded into native savages and racially unfit for inclusion in the British Empire. In a strange twist for a narrative of American empire, it is a character who represents the British Empire that attempts to rescue the symbol of the American nation from the racial and sexual defilement that would prevent British-American imperial reunion. Within the narrative of the painting, Americans are absolved of responsibility for their separation from Britain, and instead it is the Mohawks who become culpable for the ruptures of American independence.
Vanderlyn’s narrative of American Empire, despite being based on Barlow’s instructions, would be modified by another American painter, Robert Smirke, before being mass-produced as part of American print culture. Despite being based on Barlow’s instructions, Vanderlyn’s version. Shortly after the painting’s critical success in Paris, Vanderlyn dramatically elevated his price for the painting, and Barlow never purchased it for his *Columbiad*. Instead, the painting would be shipped to the American Academy of Art in New York later that year, where it languished in relative obscurity until 1842.\(^{30}\)

And in an age when most viewers experienced paintings through engraved reproductions, no engravings of *The Death of Jane McCrea* were produced or printed. William H. Truettner has argued that, while the Continental audience at the Paris Salon responded well to the painting’s violence and sexuality, American audiences across the Atlantic were less receptive to such qualities in a work intended as fine art.

Although these aesthetic concerns would have played a role in the painting’s failure to find an American audience, they do not appear to have diminished Barlow’s own desire to incorporate Vanderlyn's style and iconography into his *Columbiad*. After declining to buy *The Death of Jane McCrea*, Barlow circumvented Vanderlyn through his friend Robert Fulton. Fulton viewed the painting when it was on display in Paris and made sketches of it while the canvas was on display at the American Academy of Art. Fulton delivered the sketches to Barlow, who contracted another artist, Robert Smirke, to transform them into paintings. In a remarkably circular turn of events, then, Barlow hired Smirke to create paintings from the sketches Fulton made in New York, themselves

copied by Fulton when he was in Paris and studied Vanderlyn's painting, which Vanderlyn himself had painted from Barlow's explicit instructions. When Barlow published *The Columbiad* in 1807, his poetic depiction of the McCrea myth was accompanied by an engraving entitled *The Murder of Lucinda* based on a painting by Robert Smirke, with no credit to Vanderlyn. Given that Vanderlyn’s painting was displayed only in New York, Americans were more likely to encounter the imagery of Indian violence through Smirke's iteration in Barlow's *Columbiad.*

When scholars consider *The Murder of Lucinda,* they most often presume it to be an exact copy of Vanderlyn’s painting, and interpret it as performing an identical cultural function. But the engraving that would grace Barlow's *Columbiad* bears keys differences, particularly in its depiction of McCrea. In terms of composition, as well as its portrayal of the Mohawks and of David Jones, Smirke and Vanderlyn's renditions are indeed nearly identical. Smirke thereby maintains the importance that the image places on David Jones. But in *Lucinda,* McCrea’s gown now entirely conceals her breasts. Smirke thereby tempers the eroticization of sexual danger conveyed through Vanderlyn's painting. However, one of Smirke's Mohawks now points a knife at McCrea's chest. This knife symbolizes a dual threat in the sense that it both imperils McCrea’s life and acts as a phallic menace of sexual penetration. The most significant difference between *Lucinda* and *The Death of Jane McCrea* lies in the pose of McCrea herself. Vanderlyn depicts McCrea grasping the wrist of one of her assailants, resisting the Indian threat of rape and

---

murder. But in Smirke’s alteration, McCrea no longer struggles. Instead, Smirke poses McCrea with both arms raised and her face pointed upward in an image reminiscent of a saint. Smirke thus sanctifies McCrea as a virtuous colonial woman symbolic of American identity by emphasizing her purity and chastity. On a narrative level, Jane McCrea loses all agency. She has resigned herself to her fate, depending on either God, or on her British lover David Jones who rushes from the background to her rescue. The visual image of the McCrea myth that would circulate in print beginning with the *Columbiad*, and would become most familiar to contemporary viewers, portrays its vessel for American identity as completely vulnerable to a red menace, fully dependent on her white British lover to prevent her racial and sexual oblivion.

Smirke’s image is designed to complement Barlow’s poem in which blame is distributed between the British and Native Americans, both collectives having become degraded through an unholy and unnatural alliance. Even before his description of McCrea’s death, Barlow depicts the British Army as being possessed with “Cold-blooded Cruelty” inspired by the “first fiend of hell.” Barlow connects this cruelty to the British being “here, in this fraternal broil/. . . Far from the nation’s eye, whose nobler soul their wars would humanize.”32 The "here" of Barlow’s poetry is, of course, North America. Barlow thereby portrays British imperial authority according to the geocultural logic of creolization, noble at the metropole but degraded by the environment of the New World. Barlow describes these degraded Britons as masters of their Indian allies, whom he refers to as "kindred cannibals" in relation to the British (317). Barlow thereby reddens the

British and destroys the purity of their white Englishness. Barlow's Indians are subhuman savages. Barlow writes that the Indians at the Battle of Saratoga "Howl thro the night the horrors of the day, / Scalp ever straggler from all parties stray'd"(217). Barlow places "howl" and "scalp" at parallel positions, characterizing the act as more akin to animals than people. Later Barlow makes his analogy even more explicit when he describes Indians as "barking wolves" who "scent the field," and "snuff the walks of men." Here Barlow draws on representational strategies initiated in some of the earliest Indian captivity narratives. In the iconic captivity narrative of Mary Rowlandson, for example, Indian captives are depicted as "sheep torn by wolves, all of them stripped naked by a company of hellhounds, roaring, singing, ranting." Barlow draws on the strategies of the genre of the Indian captivity narrative to position Native Americans as degraded minions of the British Empire, both of whom threaten the sanctity of a feminized America.

Indeed, Barlow perpetuates the element of titillation implicit in Rowlandson's description of captives being "stripped naked," but also links threatened female sexuality with racial overtones. To sexualize Lucinda's whiteness, Barlow writes that, when accosted by the Mohawks, Lucinda “spreads her white hands to heaven” while “her kerchief torn betrays the globes of snow/ That heave responsive to her weight of woe.” Barlow further sexualizes Lucinda when he depicts her hair in "loose tangles round her lovely waist."33 Such imagery puts Lucinda's sexuality clearly in play, unrestrained and

33 Blakemore, Joel Barlow’s Columbiad: A Bicentennial Reading, 176.
vulnerable, exposed like her white breasts that heave dangerously from her gown. Barlow employs this passive, twice-mentioned whiteness as a contrast with an Indian redness signified through savagery. Barlow arms McCrea’s Mohawk captors with “raised axes” and “demon grin(s)” (635). These “yelling fiends” sever Lucinda’s “gory scalp, their horrid prize of blood.” Barlow thus infuses an element of titillation to the threat of interracial sexual violence, one that is less clearly enunciated in previous iterations of the McCrea myth. In fact, more than the Murder of Lucinda that accompanied Barlow’s poem, these stanzas correspond to Vanderlyn’s Death of Jane McCrea, which depicts the bodice of McCrea's bridal dress torn open before the male Indian gaze. This visual image of McCrea, accompanied by a textual image of McCrea and her "heaving globes of snow," allows Barlow to depict McCrea as at once soiled and virgin, racially tainted and pure. Textual narratives of the McCrea myth end with a depiction of McCrea’s bloody corpse and mutilated bridal dress. Within the static field of Murder of Lucinda, the ever-raised tomahawk continually evokes McCrea’s scalping, the open bridal dress her potential rape. Image and text create a narrative that locates Native American violence as the cause of not only McCrea's death, but a symbolic barrier to reunion between British and American affections, on both racial and political levels.

34 On the link between hair and sexuality in the murder of Jane McCrea, see June Namias, White Captives: Gender and Identity on the American Frontier (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 315–317.

35 As Steven Blakemore has suggested, emphasizing Indian savagery and white vulnerability is a critical part of Barlow’s project in the Columbiad. Blakemore, Joel Barlow’s Columbiad: A Bicentennial Reading, 178.
*The Columbiad* relies on the dialogue between image and text to sustain the tension between these two aspects of the McCrea myth. Barlow’s poetic version of McCrea’s murder emphasizes elements of the Indian Captivity narrative that cast Native Americans as minions of the British Empire “by treaties brought from far / to aid [their] master in murderous war” (220). As an Indian Captivity narrative, then, the McCrea myth continues to function through triangularity to diminish Indian agency and to racialize the British Empire through their alliances to Indians. Even though McCrea’s death occurs within an Indian Captivity narrative, the thwarted consummation of ties between these two empires serves as its primary tragedy. The McCrea myth employs a sentimental triangle to express the conflicted longing of the new diasporic American empire for its severed connections to the culture from which these once-British colonists had declared political independence. The idealized marriage between the pure, white, virtuous “American” McCrea and the equally pure, white, gallant British David Jones fantasizes the maintenance of cultural connections that symbolically would allow the reunion of Americans with their British counterparts. Such a reunion would allow Britons and Americans to reproduce the white Englishness with which the two now distinct political entities continued to culturally identify. Thus the visual representation of the event obscures British culpability, and casts Native Americans as independent agents who divide and become an enemy to all whiteness. It is the visual portrayal of events that crystallizes the racial elements of the narrative, maintaining Indian redness yet allowing the British Empire to return to its status as America’s white kindred empire. Through this innovation to the dynamics of the Indian Captivity narrative, the McCrea myth accommodates the longings of a diasporic American population who recognized, and
perhaps even feared, they had now become separated from their cultural and imperial homeland.

3.3 Apess’ *Eulogy on King Philip*, The McCrea Myth, and Native Sovereignty

The actual Native Americans overwritten by the stereotypes of the McCrea myth experienced American Empire from a radically different perspective during the early nineteenth-century. Yet this would not prevent them, as the case of the Pequot minister William Apess, from speaking, writing, and publishing their own divergent visions of empire in North America. When Apess delivered his *Eulogy on King Philip* in 1836, he had already achieved notoriety in New England as a public speaker. He had written and published the first autobiography by a Native American, *A Son of the Forest* in 1829. Soon after, Apess participated in the so-called “Mashpee Revolt” of 1833, where Mashpee Indians asserted their land rights against the depredations of local authorities. In 1835, Apess wrote and published *Indian Nullification*, which appropriated the language of the U.S. “nullification crisis” to defend the Mashpee cause. A year later, Apess delivered the *Eulogy* in at least two oral performances to mixed-race but primarily white audiences in Boston.36 In the *Eulogy*, Apess celebrated the 250th anniversary of the death of the Narragansett war-chief Metacom, who led united Algonquin tribes against the New

36 Following Barry O’Connell’s lead, scholars commonly cite January 8 and 26 at the Boston Odeon as Apess only oral performances of the *Eulogy*. See Barry O’Connell, “Introduction,” in *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, A Pequot*, Edited by Barry O’Connell (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 275; Robert Warrior, *The People and The Word* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 1. Daniel Radus, currently a doctoral student at the Department of English at Cornell, has shown that Apess delivered the *Eulogy* to audiences in Hartford and New Haven.
England colonies between 1676 and 1677 in the conflict that colonists would call King Philip’s War. In the text of the *Eulogy*, Apess demystifies U.S. narratives of imperialism directly by offering an alternative Native account of U.S. history. Apess confronts American racism and denial of Indian civil rights beginning with the landing of the Pilgrims, continuing through King Philip’s War, and ending with an invective against Andrew Jackson and Indian Removal. In December of 1836, and again in 1837, Apess self-published printed editions of his *Eulogy*.

As a work by a Native American author that asserts the rights of Native Americans and undermines the idea of racial difference between white Euro-Americans and red Indians, the *Eulogy* has been recognized as an act of Native American literary nationalism. Critics have largely agreed about how Apess subverts U.S. imperialism to assert Native sovereignty within the text of the *Eulogy*: he repeatedly undermines the white American imperial premises of racial difference and inferiority that serve as the foundation for denial of Native rights. Apess argues that Native Americans—in fact all


“colored peoples,” as he puts it—deserve the same rights as white Americans. Literary scholars have examined the *Eulogy* as one of Apess’ staunchest calls for Indian sovereignty. However, scholars have at times passionately disagreed about what kind of sovereignty Apess envisions for Native Americans. While critics such as Barry O’Connell have argued that Apess’s *Eulogy* envisions Native inclusion within the American nation, Maureen Konkle and Jace Weaver contend that the *Eulogy* constitutes a call for Native separation from the United States.

I will propose, however, that reading the *Eulogy* as a composite system of image and text clarifies Apess’ call for sovereignty, and dramatically widens the possibilities for Native Sovereignty. Apess’ act of resistance to American imperialism against Native Americans in the *Eulogy* implicitly responds to the imperialist ideologies embedded within the McCrea myth. As I will show in the following pages, Apess employs an alternative visual narrative of the McCrea myth through the woodcut engraving *King Philip Dying For His Country*, which he incorporated into his print editions of the *Eulogy*. Apess uses this frontispiece as not only a visual means to subvert the narratives


40 Jace Weaver argues that over the course of Apess publishing career, Apess evolved from a stance of accommodation to one that uses Christian doctrine as a tool of “Native identity and nationalism.” Further, argues Weaver, from his autobiography through *Indian Nullification* and into the *Eulogy*, Apess’ writings “increasingly aim at separatism.” Jace Weaver, *That People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 55–59. Similarly, Maureen Konkle argues that “recognition of their political autonomy is the primary object” of nineteenth-century Native American writers, and that Apess calls for separatism in the *Eulogy*. Maureen Konkle, *Writing Indian Nations: Native Intellectuals and the Politics of Historiography, 1827-1863* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 6. O’Connell agrees that separatism is “Apess’ emphasis” in *Nullification*, but asserts that in the *Eulogy* Apess envisions a future in which “dispossessed peoples are equal citizens in a republic built on their displacement and enslavement.”
of Indian captivity and savagery promulgated through the McCrea myth, but to unravel claims to American exceptionalism that rely on distinctions between America as an empire of peace and reason and European empires built on tyranny and conquest. When read through the lens of its frontispiece, *Eulogy on King Philip* advocates not for Native separatism, but for sovereignty within a multiracial American empire.

When William Apess delivered his *Eulogy on King Philip*, he spoke to an audience well-versed in the scientific and political rhetoric behind Indian Removal, as well as the McCrea myth. Even as Apess spoke, the United States had already begun to forcibly displace Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole nations across the Mississippi River, and would soon enact this genocidal policy against the Cherokee nation, all behind the façade of “advancement” of “universal civilization” idealized by white Americans ranging from Barlow and Jefferson to Andrew Jackson. In calling the period the period between 1815 and 1848 “the Age of Jackson,” historians characterize this era as a departure from Barlow’s early republic. But in terms of empire, America retained close continuity with its early republican imperial ambitions during the Age of Jackson. The logic of Indian Removal justified racial exclusion of Native Americans as a benevolent policy, very much in conformity with Barlow and Jefferson’s empire of peace. In fact, historians have credited Jefferson’s conception of the proper relation between the United States and

Native Americans as unintentionally laying the foundations for Andrew Jackson’s vision of Indian Removal. In his second inaugural address, Andrew Jackson described Indian Removal not as an act of conquest, but as “a benevolent policy.” “No one can indulge a more friendly feeling than myself” toward Native Americans, he claimed, nor more wish “to make them a happy, prosperous people.” Over the early part of the nineteenth century, earlier conceptions of race closely linked to cultural differences became incorporated into developing disciplines of natural science as part of a theory of biological racial difference. Such theories held that Native Americans were biologically inferior to white Europeans, and in fact racially incapable of coexisting with white civilization. As Jackson himself put it, Indian Removal was necessary to not only keep peace between Americans and Indians, but to “retard the progress of Indian decay.” According to this logic, American imperialism protected Native Americans from their own biological deficiencies, since so-called red savages could not exist with white civilization, which only degraded their natural nobility.

The imperial ideologies implicit in the McCrea myth run parallel to Jackson’s logic. As Barlow’s and Freneau's accounts of Jane McCrea’s murder described it, the British Empire had degenerated into cruelty based on its alliances with savage Native

42 Onuf, Jefferson’s Empire: The Language of American Nationhood, 49.


Americans. Such visions of American Empire extrapolated the triangular models of identity formation initiated in the Indian Captivity narrative forward into an imagined, perpetually expanding imperial future of the United States. In contrast to the degeneration and tyranny of a British Empire degraded through its alliances with Native Americans, the United States would reject such imperial strategies of racial inclusion, however tenuous and hierarchical, and maintain its purity as a white empire. This racial purity would, in turn, guarantee American imperial supremacy against both red Native Americans and racially contaminated European empires in North America. Such a vision allowed American empire to expand into the territories of other European empires, such as British Canada or Spanish America. By mid-century, writers like Herman Melville would imagine American Empire expanding even beyond the shores of the continent, past already-occupied Pacific islands like Hawaii, to Japan.45 Such a vision justified American expansion against peoples both red and white while it overwrote imperial conquest and violence toward Native Americans with an empire that grew through benevolence. Native Americans such as the Cherokees, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole were displaced through the policy of Indian Removal, as were those living in the Northeast such as William Apess’ impoverished Pequot; Native Americans also were excluded from the American Empire, and were summarily denied the rights of United States citizens.

Not coincidentally, the McCrea myth’s most concentrated recirculation coincides with the era of Indian Removal. From Barlow’s early republic, through the Age of Jackson, the McCrea myth continued to circulate in both visual and textual forms as one of the most popular variations of the Indian Captivity narrative. The myth sometimes circulated independently of text in visual form, as in “The Tragical Death of Miss McCrea,” an engraving by William Annin published in Boston in 1820, which is almost an exact duplicate of the engraving in Barlow’s *Columbiad* (Fig. 4.4). In textual form, the narrative was frequently included in anthologies that glorified wars between the United States and Native Americans, such Samuel Drake’s series. Books like Jacob K. Neff’s *The Army and Navy of America* (1845) contained heroic accounts of famous wars in American history, and included engravings of the murder of Jane McCrea that closely resembles Annin’s (Fig. 4.5). In the Age of Jackson the McCrea myth could still serve as a reminder of the violent threat that Native Americans posed to Americans when allowed to co-exist with white empires, thereby justifying Indian Removal and preempting any discussion of Native inclusion within the empire. Indeed, for diasporic Americans still feeling imperial nostalgia in the Age of Jackson, the McCrea myth blamed Native Americans for the final separation from the British Empire itself. In this way the red Indian threat served to unify whiteness as a category that could create racial cohesion between white Americans and Europeans. And the myth could serve as perhaps the only unifying issue between an increasingly divided northern and southern United States at a time when sectionalism reflected disagreements over almost every national issue, from slavery, to trade, and in the instance of the Mexican-American War, the morality of imperial expansion itself.
Figure 4.4. “The Tragical Death of Miss McCrea.” Engraving. 1820. New York Public Library, New York.
When he incorporated *King Philip Dying* into his print editions of the *Eulogy*, Apess did more than create a print version of his oral performance. He also added a new sign system, with its own narrative that mediated the printed text of his oral performance. Scholarship of the *Eulogy* has discarded *King Philip Dying* based on the assumption that the frontispiece must depict the specific scene of King Philip’s death described in the text of the *Eulogy*. However, this assumption privileges the textual content of the *Eulogy* over the visual, and forecloses the possibility that *King Philip Dying* introduces new content to the *Eulogy*. When Apess published print editions of the *Eulogy*, he reproduced his oral performance in linear text, printed on paper in ink, from metal typeface. But when he incorporated “King Philip Dying,” an illustration composed of linear figures, he introduced a new independent sign system into the *Eulogy*, transforming his orature into a

---

46 The few critics who have mentioned “King Philip Dying” in their scholarship, such as O’Connell and Jill Lepore, have deemed this illustration unworthy of critical consideration. Between them, O’Connell and Lepore advance two reasons to disregard the engraving. O’Connell observes that the scene depicted in the engraving does not correspond with Apess’ textual description of Philip’s death. Thus, he concludes, the image is “at odds” with Apess’ writing. Indeed, Apess describes Philip as being shot by one of the colonist’s Indian allies, rather than being killed solely by two white Americans as shown in the frontispiece. Lepore notes that Apess included “King Philip Dying” in his Errata Notice on the last page of the *Eulogy*. This Errata Notice includes the statement that “In the frontispiece, the man at the head of Philip, should be an Indian.” Lepore implies that by including mention of “King Philip Dying” in the Errata Notice, Apess is designating its inclusion as a printer’s mistake. While both of these critics pose intriguing questions about how “King Philip Dying” relates to the *Eulogy*’s textual content, neither offers a sufficient reason to discard it from critical study of the *Eulogy* as a nineteenth-century book. Examining both editions of the *Eulogy* shows that Apess did not consider including “King Philip Dying” as frontispiece of the *Eulogy* among the print errata itself. The Errata Notice included in the first edition of the *Eulogy* lists, in addition to the statement regarding the frontispiece, two typographical errors on pages 12 and 23 of the book. When he published the second edition of the *Eulogy* a year later, Apess had these two typographical errors corrected. Yet he still included “King Philip Dying” as frontispiece, and retained his statement regarding the frontispiece in the Errata Notice for that edition. This suggests that the only error Apess considered the illustration to contain was that, as stated, “the man at the head of Philip, should be an Indian.” This statement in itself reorients the frontispiece to obviate O’Connell’s criticism that the illustration does not match Apess’ textual description of Philip’s death.
composite sign system of image and text. Instead of privileging text over image, we can most profitably understand Apess’ *Eulogy* as a nineteenth-century book when we read these sign systems in dialogue, with image and text each making up a distinct facet of Apess’ overall message.

The scene of *King Philip Dying* depicts two groups of men on a path in a dark forest. In the foreground, amid menacing trees, stand two uniformed Euro-American men with their swords and knives raised. They are about to strike a darker-skinned man, whom the engraving’s title designates as Metacom. Based on his position on the forest floor, Philip was probably at rest before being surprised by the two men. He supports his weight with one arm while raising the other defensively. His rifle and pistol lay harmless on his blanket. The white soldiers have pulled back Philip’s head to expose his neck, suggesting that they intend to behead him. In the picture’s background, two other men approach from around a bend in the same path. One appears to be Euro-American, wearing pantaloons, a coat, and a hat. The other could be identified as a Native-American by his clothing, his topknot, and his darker skin. These two figures stand together, as if they have just rounded the bend and apprehended the other group in the foreground. The Euro-American raises his head inquisitively. Both men hold their rifles at their waists in readiness, gazing at the captivity and impending murder of King Philip.

The resemblance between “King Philip Dying for His Country” and the visual discourse of the McCrea myth is striking. This is particularly true, for example, in Robert Annin’s engraving, “The Tragical Death of Miss McCrea” (Fig. 4). Both pictures feature two sets of figures in identical positions on the page: a triad in the right foreground, with approaching figures in the left background. The front triads in these engravings are
depicted in almost identical poses: 1) the attackers on the right side of these triads lean over the head of the captive, and raise daggers at similar angles; 2) both captives lift their faces toward the sky, with their necks exposed to an approaching blade; 3) fabrics with similar billowed curves rest at the feet of each captive; 4) the standing assailants on the left side of each group raise their arms at congruous angles, and have similarly hooked noses and grimacing mouths. Moreover, the shape of the standing white soldier’s hat in *King Philip Dying* echoes the contours of the Mohawk’s headdress in Annin’s engraving.

In terms of composition, each picture first focuses the viewer’s attention on the violent scene in the foreground. They both utilize a path to gradually open the scene and guide the viewer to the background: viewers first come upon the disaster, and only later notice the approaching saviors. This visual narrative technique heightens the viewer’s anxiety over the respective captives’ fates. Unlike the typical Indian captivity narrative that depicts Indians invading white settlements, however, these white soldiers in *King Philip Dying* appear to have intentionally entered the forest to surprise and attack the Indian.

Although the artist of *King Philip Dying* has not yet been identified, all of these correspondences and complex manipulations of the visual discourse of the McCrea myth suggest that the artist had Vanderlyn’s painting or its subsequent iterations in mind when he produced this woodcut engraving, or the sketch from which it would be copied. Apess most likely did not view Vanderlyn’s *Death of Jane McCrea* directly before or during the publishing process; there is no record of Apess traveling to New York in the 1830’s, and Vanderlyn’s painting never circulated beyond the Academy of Art. However, based on his own reading habits, Apess would have encountered the visual tradition of the McCrea myth through Barlow’s *Columbiad*, or any number of contemporary print sources. And
Apess would have been confident that his highly literate audience would easily recognize how *King Philip Dying* manipulates the visual discourse of the McCrea myth.

In his publications previous to the *Eulogy*, Apess demonstrates knowledge of the power of paratextual apparatuses. Apess published and copyrighted five books during his career, some of which he republished in materially and textually different editions that show careful use of paratext. As Phillip Round has demonstrated in his study of early Native American print culture *Removable Type*, Apess acted masterfully as the editor and publisher of his texts.\(^{47}\) For example, Apess added a frontispiece portrait to his second edition of his autobiography *A Son of the Forest* in order to construct his authorial persona for his reading audience according to nineteenth century conventions.\(^{48}\) In *Indian Nullification*, Apess included the frontispiece “Manner of Instructing the Indians” that depicts a Euro-American Christian visiting an Indian village and giving a bottle of alcohol to a trusting Native American. According to Barry O’Connell, this engraving links Christian conversion efforts to “civilize” the Indians with efforts to divest Indians of the forests and “echoes the tone in much of *Indian Nullification*.”\(^{49}\) These two examples show that Apess incorporated visual materials into his self-published works for a clear

---

\(^{47}\) Phillip Round argues that Apess not only understood the profound importance of the social authority that could be established through authorship and copyright, but also that Apess considered “print culture and the physical properties of texts” a vital part of proprietary authorship. Phillip H. Round, *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 163-1880* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 159. Apess, Round concludes, “deployed frontispiece illustrations to influence” how his readers “approached his writings” (201).


purpose. Based on Apess record of self-publication we can conclude that Apess also had a specific purpose in mind about how the frontispiece would mediate the text of the *Eulogy*.

Once we recognize that this frontispiece derives its form and content from racially-charged imagery of captivity circulating in the early nineteenth century, its function comes into focus. Instead of the two racially stereotyped Mohawks glowering above a white virgin woman, *King Philip Dying for His Country* depicts two Euro-American soldiers menacing a Native American. Rather than literally representing the historical King Philip as scholarship has supposed, the titular King Philip represents not only the seventeenth-century Narragansett sachem Metacom, but also becomes a symbol for all Native Americans oppressed by Americans. In terms of constructing collective identity, the “King Philip” of the frontispiece functions similarly to the “Jane McCrea” of the McCrea myth, who symbolizes a feminized American nation. The frontispiece collapses time to utilize the figure of the captive Indian as a symbol for three centuries of British and American imperialism and denial of Native American rights. This engraving inverts the positions of Native Americans and white Americans in the racialized visual discourse of the McCrea myth, thereby reversing the polarity of its narrative.

Apess’s visual strategy here runs parallel to his textual arguments in the *Eulogy*. In the Eulogy’s text, Apess repeatedly undermines the doctrines of racial difference that white colonists and metropolitans of the British Empire, and later the United States, employed to justify subjugation and genocide of Native Americans. Apess often substitutes an Indian for the position of white Americans in prominent nineteenth-century myths of American exceptionalism. In one of his most radical strategies, for example,
Apess compares Metacom to George Washington, and King Philip’s War to the American Revolution. Apess compares Metacom's crossing of the Connecticut River during King Philip’s War to Washington’s venerated crossing of the Delaware. “We may look upon this move,” writes Apess, “of Philip’s to be equal, if not superior, to that of Washington crossing the Delaware” (290). Apess proclaims Metacom to be superior to not only Washington, but all American heroes, when he describes Metacom as “the greatest man who ever lived upon American shores,” and “pronounce(s) him the greatest man that was ever in America” (290, 308). Apess likens Metacom’s fight for Indian rights against colonists and the American struggle for sovereignty against the British Empire when he writes that Metacom died for a cause “though unsuccessful, yet as glorious as the American revolution” (277). He appropriates the language of American revolutionary rhetoric to King Philip's cause, proclaiming: “Let every friend of the Indians seize the mantle of liberty” (307). These rhetorical moves demonstrate but a portion of Apess’ larger project to invert the hierarchies of racial superiority between whiteness and redness that Europeans had developed over the course of colonization.

*King Philip Dying* correspondingly reverses the structures of the Indian Captivity narratives that position Indian savagery as an unending threat to white civilization, instead depicting Native Americans in the United States as the captives of a white empire. To undermine accusations of red Indian savagery, Apess provides numerous examples of cruelties and trespasses committed by the self-professed civilized, Christian, and implicitly superior white Pilgrims against Native Americans. In one strategy, Apess challenges American claims to being more devout Christians. The pilgrims committed, writes Apess, “most barbarous deeds of death” against Native Americans, that were “with
patience and resignation borne, in a manner that would do justice to any Christian nation in the world” (278). Apess likewise claims that the Wampanoag sachem Massasoit “exercised more Christian forbearance than any of the governors of that age or since. It might well be said he was a pattern for the Christians themselves” (300). Apess demonstrates a keen understanding of the ideologies beneath the genre of the Indian Captivity narrative when he writes that during King Philip’s War, Indians were kinder to their captives than Europeans, specifically citing Mary Rowlandson’s seminal narrative as evidence (300). And Apess resists European claims to superior knowledge and science when he calls Europeans “comers from the New World” and implicitly reverses doctrines of “discovery” of North America.”

This visual narrative runs parallel to Apess’s textual claim in the *Eulogy* that King Philip’s War was “sorely provoked by the Pilgrims themselves” (296). This reading also corresponds to Apess’s repeated point that throughout history, “it is always the whites who have been the aggressors, and the wars, cruelties, and blood is the job of their own seeking, and not the Indians” (305). “Who,” Apess Asks, “were more wanting of the name of savages, white, or Indians? Let justice answer” (284). Before he even asks this rhetorical question of his readers, however, Apess has already shown them the answer through the *Eulogy*’s frontispiece, in the form of two white soldiers, standing with their swords viciously raised to behead an Indian.

The key iconological innovation to the McCrea myth, however, resides not in the trio of figures that dominate *King Philip Dying*’s foreground, but in the racial and cultural significations of the duo, who approach the scene of captivity and murder from the

50 Barry O’Connell makes this observation in his notes to Apess, “Eulogy on King Philip,” 294.
background. The Indian and the white man in the background of *King Philip Dying* occupy a position analogous to David Jones in *The Death of Jane McCrea*. *King Philip Dying* depicts not just the captivity and murder of an Indian, then, but also an attempted rescue. But whereas the McCrea myth depicts the unlikely rescue of its white heroine by a lone white man, *King Philip Dying* depicts the potential rescue of an Indian by cooperation between an Indian and a white man. In the visual discourse of the McCrea myth, rescue is delineated by markers of racial difference; both rescuer and captive are white, while the captors are savage red men. In contrast, “King Philip Dying” depicts a multiracial rescue scene: a Euro-American and a Native American seek to rescue a Native American from his white attackers. These rescuers are positioned much closer to the murder scene than David Jones in the visual tradition of the McCrea myth, perhaps close enough to arrive before the Native American is killed. The woodcut depicts the possibility of rescue through cooperation between a white and an Indian.

In this way, the woodcut illuminates aspects of the text of the *Eulogy* that call for interracial cooperation. Apess thus offers a visual analogue to his suggestion that that Indians and whites must “bury the hatchet and those unjust laws and Plymouth Rock together and become friends.” (306). Here Apess asserts that the peace that will follow from granting equal rights to Indians can only be achieved by whites and Indians working *together*. Such a claim is consistent with Apess’ conviction that whites alone do not oppress Indians, but with Indians who are complicit in subjugating other Indians (306). After all, according to Apess’ narrative, it is not a white Englishman, but an Indian allied with the English who deals Metacom a fatal blow (302). Nor does Apess lay sole blame to whites, or claim that racially delineated recriminations can end the metaphorical Indian
captivity depicted in *King Philip Dying*: “You and I have to rejoice that we are not responsible for one another’s crimes,” writes Apess, “neither shall we do right to charge them to one another. We can only regret it . . . and henceforth, let peace and righteousness be written upon our hearts” (310). For Apess, only cooperation between white and Indians can end the cycle of racial oppression and violence initiated with the white settlement of North America, and establish a republic founded on equal rights for Natives and whites.

Whereas white Americans denied Native Americans the rights due to Americans through doctrines of racial difference, Apess argues for native rights through assertions of likeness between white Americans and Native Americans. This is especially true, writes Apess, in the eyes of God. Apess declares to his mostly white audience that Indians are “endeared to God as yourselves, his Son being their Savior as well as yours, and alike to all men” (286). Asserting basic Indian humanity, Apess asks rhetorically, "Do you believe that Indians cannot feel and see, as well as white people?” “Our affections for one another are the same as yours; we think as much of ourselves as you do of yourselves. When our children are sick, we do all we can for them; they lie buried deep in our affections; if they die, we remember it long and mourn in after years.” (309, 285). In response to the claims of racial scientists who asserted that Indians lacked a basic humanity, Apess declares, "my image is of God; I am not a beast." In fact, asserts Apess, all men are equally likely to fall into savagery without God. "All men are governed by animal passions," he writes, "who are void of the true principles of God, whether cultivated, or uncultivated” (287). Apess thereby detaches race from civilization and
Christianity, and tethers cultivation to a godliness that can be attained by all people, white and red.

Such assertions may have been especially provocative to white and Native readers alike at a time when Native Americans across the United States were being forcibly removed westward based on theories that Native Americans could not co-exist with civilization. Apess forces his audience to consider that, despite their basic humanity and potential for civilization, he and his fellow Indians have no rights under the U.S. legal system. Apess links race and Indian rights when he observes that, “when a few red children attempt to defend their rights, they are condemned as savages by those . . . who have indulged in wrongs more cruel than the Indians.” The denial of Indian rights, he argues, began with the first English settlers (288, 291). The same treatment was extended, he writes, at the "first legislature" of the United States. Thereafter, he continues, "every (state) charter . . . has been given with the view of driving the Indian out of the states, or dooming them to become chained under desperate laws” (306). Apess goes so far as to assert that U.S. policy toward Indians is founded on "corrupt and degrading principles that robs one of all rights, merely because he is . . . of a little different color." (306). Apess thereby unveils to his readers the truth behind the façade of U.S. myths such as the McCrea myth and the justifications for Indian Removal: American Empire is founded on a legalized system of racial exclusion, rather than an inclusive republic.

Apess clearly outlines his assessment of Native Sovereignty at the time of King Philip’s War. In the background of his frontispiece, Apess depicts an Indian and a white man in positions of equality. Perhaps startling to his mostly-white reading audience, Apess’s text correspondingly portrays Metacom as a sovereign King with authority equal
to that of the mightiest European imperial authorities. Apess depicts Metacom, Massasoit, and other Native American sachems participating in economic exchange by selling land to English colonists, thereby asserting Native authority over property (290). He depicts Metacom as “an independent chief of a powerful nation” whose sovereignty is repeatedly violated by English governors who demand his fealty (292). In Apess’ history, Metacom objects to such treatment, proclaiming himself an equal to King Charles II. “I shall not treat with a subject,” Metacom tells the governors. "I will treat only with a king, my brother” (294). And while Apess’ contemporary white historians described King Philip's War as a savage uprising, Apess contends on the contrary that Metacom "legally declared" the war as a sovereign King (296). Such language draws a parallel to the Declaration of Independence, and white American claims to sovereignty in defiance of British imperial authority. At the same time that Apess asserts a sovereignty with indigenous authority that supersedes European claims to the land, he often writes of historical Native sovereignty in language that corresponds with European and American conceptions of sovereignty and nationhood.

Combined with the text of the *Eulogy*, *King Philip Dying* advances a multicultural solution to dispossession and genocide toward Native Americans, one that transcends the stark lines of racial difference perpetuated through the visual tradition of the Murder of Jane McCrea. Such a solution clarifies the type of sovereignty that Apess imagines for Native Americans in the *Eulogy*. In the textual narrative that follows *King Philip Dying*, Apess calls for “every Indian to seize the mantle of Liberty” in order to assert Native American rights (307). When isolated from the *Eulogy*’s visual content, this statement might be interpreted as a call for separatism. When read in tandem, the visual and textual
content of the *Eulogy* constitutes a call for structures of cooperation between whites and Indians, rather than the racial exclusion that serves as the foundation of American Empire. Apess advocates the creation of an inclusive America, based on horizontal relationships of interracial equality.

**A Red and White Empire**

The *Eulogy on King Philip* lays bare the contradictions and elisions that allowed white Americans to self-proclaim their empire of liberty. Through the inclusion of *King Philip Dying*, Apess depicts one white empire based on vertical relationships of white violence toward Native Americans, and contrasts it with an empire based on horizontal relationships of mutual interracial inclusion. This illustration carefully manipulates the recurrent iconological tropes used to depict the McCrea myth initiated through Vanderlyn’s *Death of Jane McCrea* and reprinted and recirculated throughout the nineteenth century. “King Philip Dying” recalibrates this narrative to depict whites as savage captors of vulnerable Native Americans, in the process collapsing the triangular structure of imperial identity formation prominent in the myth by which Barlow and other Americans had portrayed America as an empire of liberty and peace. As Apess makes abundantly clear throughout the *Eulogy*, white Americans possessed North America only by "right of conquest," rather than through a peaceful naturally expanding empire that Americans like Barlow and Jefferson invented to cast the United States as superior to the British and other white empires (276). In response to white accusation that Native warfare made them savages, Apess writes that "if we have the common sense to see the difference between the civilized and the uncivilized, we cannot but see that one form of
warfare is as just as the other” (278). Apess thereby shows that white Americans do not spread their empire through democracy and cultivation, but the same violence that Americans used to construct Native Americans as savages. Instead of constructing differences between American and British methods of empire-building, Apess stresses continuity between British colonial Pilgrims and the white Americans whom he designates "the sons of the Pilgrims."

Apess replaces a collapsed empire built on racial oppression with an alternative an alternative ideal of empire built cooperatively between Europeans and indigenous peoples. In depicting its white and Indian rescuers in different forms of dress, *King Philip Dying* suggests that this interracial cooperation need not require assimilation, or the subversion of Indian nationalisms. Yet the illustration has detached race from the body, and relocated race in clothing, and thereby culture. The Indian in the background of the illustration is dressed in a buckskin coat and wears a topknot on his head. Based on his clothing, this figure represents an Indian who has maintained his cultural autonomy. Since cultural integrity of a people functions as a crucial component of nationalism, this autonomy designates the cultural integrity requisite to preserve Indian nationalism.\(^{51}\) Although the white man sports a hat instead of a topknot, his clothing appears very similar to the Indians. The likeness in the duo’s clothing stands in stark contrast to that of the trio in the foreground, where whites wear formal uniforms and the Indian a rustic tunic. Relocated in clothing and culture, race becomes a chasm that can be bridged by whites and Indians, rather than the unresolvable alienation between whites and Indians.

underlying biological theories that locate race in the body, and most visibly the skin. In fact, the illustration’s formulation of race turns the concept of race away from white nineteenth-century racial theories, back to the eighteenth-century concept of race. This conception of race was very close to that of the nation, rather than a biological collection, and held currency at a time when Europeans and Indians both often referred to one another as white, when Europeans commonly referred to Indians as peoples of nations.\textsuperscript{52} The Indian in the background stands very close to the white man, in an almost identical pose, so close that in the gaze of the viewer the two figure's bodies almost overlap. While Indian and white are not equivalent, their likenesses outweigh their differences.

The illustration suggests a union, rather than a separation, of white and Indian political bodies. Scott Richard Lyons has argued that “the nation doesn’t need to have absolute sovereignty or an independent state but it should have enough ‘statehood’ to move away from culture toward more discourse on rights, duties, and responsibilities . . . in order to care for the citizens who make up the nation.”\textsuperscript{53} According to this precept, Native American nationalism need not constitute separation from the United States. Such an interpretation emphasizes Apess’ advice near the end of the \textit{Eulogy} that “all men must operate under one law,” and that this is what is necessary “to make (them) . . . good and equal citizens” (310). The \textit{Eulogy} thereby advocates a Native nation that exists within the overall structure of an integrated, interracial North American empire composed of equally sovereign red and white peoples.

\textsuperscript{52} See Nancy Shoemaker, \textit{A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in North America} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), esp. 6-8, 125-140.

\textsuperscript{53} Lyons, \textit{X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent}, 146.
Understood in this way, Apess presents a hybrid vision of red and white conceptions of sovereignty. In his advocacy for a sovereign red people strong enough to maintain their cultural heritage amidst the expansion of white imperialism in North America, Apess hearkens back to the speeches of eighteenth-century leaders such as the Ottowa Pontiac and the Senaca Red Jacket. As Drew Lopenzina has recently shown, Apess subtly incorporated Haudenosaunee myths into the fabric of the *Eulogy*, as well. At the same time, Apess’ vision of sovereignty runs very much in accord with Jefferson and Barlow’s empires of “liberty” and “peace,” at least in their most idealized forms. Jefferson advocated an imperial republic composed of sovereign states, joined together as a federal political system that could accommodate diverse cultures of New England, the mid-Atlantic, the South, and later the western states. Jeffersonian republicans, as well as later Jacksonian Democrats would, in fact, frame many of the sectional disputes of antebellum America in terms of state sovereignty versus federal oppression.  

54 On the surface, at least, the early American Empire allowed for great diversity among the states. However, this republican empire silently excluded both Native Americans as it brutally enslaved Africans, often in the name of state sovereignty. Under Apess’ imperial vision, red and white coexist as sovereign peoples, together seeking the solutions to the interracial violence that serves as the foundations of Jefferson’s empire, and lie embedded within the visual and textual permutations of the murder of Jane McCrea. 

Indeed, Apess red and white empire becomes visible once we recognize the interplay of the *Eulogy*’s text with its frontispiece illustration, and how the *Eulogy* in turn

responds to the dialogue between image and text in the McCrea myth. Scholars have plumbed the text of the *Eulogy* for the sources from which Apess borrowed and appropriated from the multi-ethnic cultures of New England in composing his *Eulogy*, from the speeches of politicians such as Edward Everett and Daniel Webster, to the rhetoric of the abolitionist movement. But until now, we have neglected to study with equal scrutiny into the iconological depths of *King Philip Dying for his Country*. Yet readers encountered this illustration, itself a complex visual sign system that readers encountered before even reaching the text. In assuming that *King Philip Dying* constitutes a failed mimetic representation of a scene from Apess’ text, we have unconsciously privileged the textual over the visual. Scholars have unconsciously created a hierarchy between text and image that parallels nineteenth-century hierarchies between white Americans and Native Americans. At the same critical moment in literary studies when we celebrate the depth and diversity of Native American technologies of literacy, we have denied Apess’ visual literacy. Acknowledging Apess’ mastery of the book as a print technology that functions through the very copresence of image and text, on the other hand, enables us to comprehend Apess radical vision of Native sovereignty as part of a North American imperial system founded correspondingly on the copresence of peoples both red and white.

Chapter 5

RACE AND TRIANGULARITY IN HAWTHORNE AND CATLIN

George Catlin’s final work, *Last Rambles Amongst the Indians of the Rocky Mountains and the Andes* (1867), chronicles the American painter and ethnologist’s 1854-1860 expedition across South America, from the Amazon basin in Brazil to the Strait of Magellan. Despite his oft-professed compassion for Native Americans, Catlin reproduces American tropes of imperialism common to nineteenth-century American culture, including the myth of the vanishing Indian.  

James Fenimore Cooper had most famously employed this myth in his 1824 novel *The Last of the Mohicans*. In his preface to the 1851 edition of the novel, Cooper waxed poetically that the Mohicans represent the seemingly inevitable fate of all these people, who disappear before the advances . . . of civilization, as the verdure of native forests falls before the nipping frost.” This pervasive elegiac trope functions as a type of extinction discourse, as Patrick Brantlinger has termed it—a discursive structure functioning across media and disciplines that, by explaining extinction as racially determined, merges ideologies of

---


race and empire. Americans thus solved the problem of the indigenous by portraying Native Americans as a people with no future, opening the continent to the peaceful expansion of American civilization. Echoing Cooper, Catlin wrote that Indians are “going . . . to the setting sun” before “the irresistible wave of civilization.” “Somewhere in the Western horizon,” Catlin opines, “their race will soon be extinguished.”

Catlin’s extinction discourse operates through the binary structures of savagism and civilization that scholars identify as the dominant cultural mode of American Empire.

But if Catlin employs a conventional imperial poetics, his vision of empire extends in geographic scope well beyond that of many antebellum Americans. Catlin describes the Indians of South America in terms that mirror those used to portray North American Indians. For example, Catlin writes that the Payaguas of South America are “representatives of a tribe nearly extinct, and whose bodies were purely primitive” (211), and that the Botocudos are “reduced to a few hundred by those universal pests of the American Indians—rum, and whiskey, and the small-pox” (212). Thus, Catlin portrays the indigenous peoples of South America, just as much as North American


243 George Catlin, Last Rambles Amongst the Indians of the Rocky Mountains (London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston, 1868), 335.
Indians, as racially incapable of coexisting with the progress of civilization. Despite being “different in appearance and language” than the Payaguas, however, the Botocudos have one material link to the Payaguas: both vanishing peoples “wear the block of wood in the under-lip as an ornament.” According to Catlin, these lip-blocks are exactly the same as those worn by “the Nayas Indians of Queen Charlotte’s, in North America,” whom Catlin had visited earlier. “How surprising this fact!” exclaims Catlin, that these Indians should share the same customs, even though they reside in the “north-west” and “south-east” of the Americas, “almost exact antipodes of each other” (215). Catlin thereby utilizes “lip-blocks” as objects that collapse the geographic space of the Americas, uniting North and South American indigenous peoples through one small racialized signifier. These shared lip-blocks visually denote the shared racially-determined fate of the indigenous peoples of the hemisphere. Catlin considered these lip blocks such a definitive feature of these Indians that he sketched a portrait of Indians who wore with them, which would be reproduced as an engraving in *Last Rambles* (Fig. 5.1).

Catlin’s imperial fantasy does not end at the edges of the American continents. “Imagine my surprise at finding,” continues Catlin, “that the Rev. Dr. Livingstone should have found a native tribe in the centre of Africa wearing blocks exactly similar in shape and dimensions in the upper-lip” (216). Here Catlin ingeniously employs lip-blocks to unite indigenous Americans and Africans, extending his chain of racial signification beyond the American continents, to central Africa. Despite his exclamation of “surprise,” Catlin did much more than “find” an extant custom shared among
American and African indigenes. He visually constructed it. To paraphrase Catlin himself, his sketch is exactly similar in shape and dimensions to an engraving (Fig. 5.2.) in Livingstone’s 1865 *Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries*, which chronicled the British missionary and explorer’s 1858-1864 expedition to sub-Saharan Africa. This likeness is particularly true of Catlin’s central Indian, which faces right in profile. Most strikingly similar is the disk itself, which protrudes from the face at an up-turned angle, allowing the viewer to behold its top surface and the elongated lips that surround it. But Catlin’s Indian echoes Livingstone’s African in numerous other respects, such as the distance between nose and mouth, the slightly down-turned angle of the head, and the line of the chin. While the bust of Livingstone’s African disappears at the slope of her bare breasts, the bust of Catlin’s Indian vanishes at a similar point in a strangely distended chest. Looking even more closely, the wrinkles at forehead, cheek, and around the mouth of Catlin’s Indian correspond to striated branding marks in Livingstone’s African. The close similarity between these figures strongly suggests that Catlin composed his sketches with reference to the engraving in Livingstone’s book long after his journey to South America. In this way, Catlin employs image and text as mutually reinforcing sign systems that join American Indians and Africans under one set of racial markers.
In using visual and literary representation to blur the lines of difference between African and Native peoples, Catlin’s racial logic epitomizes the tangled racial
discourses of the nineteenth century. Traditionally, scholars have viewed African and Native Americans as manifesting separately in American cultural production. According to this narrative, literary depictions of Native Americans materialized in the 1820’s as an expression of anxieties over Indian Removal, but gave way to the Slave novel at mid-century as the nation became embroiled in the crises that would lead to the U.S. Civil War. However, the racial issues surrounding Native Americans and Africans were not so easily separable for antebellum Americans. In fact, the conflicts over African slave emancipation that served as the locus of scholarly inquiry on antebellum literature were tethered inextricably to continental imperialism, and thereby Native Americans. As Amy Kaplan has put it, “the conquest of Indian and Mexican lands in the antebellum period cannot be understood separately from the expansion of slavery and the struggle for freedom.” Because expansion required the removal or extinction of Native Americans in order to make way for settlers, railroads, and livestock, not to mention enslaved Africans, westward settlement perpetuated warfare.

244 For one example of this view, see Lucy Maddox, *Removals: Nineteenth Century American Literature and the Politics of Indian Affairs.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 35.

245 As Ezra Tawil has argued in *The Making of Racial Sentiment*, “the nineteenth-century discourse on race cannot be comprehended as a simple supercession between the ‘white/red’ dyad by the ‘white/black’ one.” This chapter builds on Tawil’s understanding that white American discourses of racial supremacy toward Africans and Native Americans became increasingly tangled over the nineteenth century.

between the United States and Indian nations. Moreover, because of the fervent controversies over whether new states admitted to the Union should be "Free" or "Slave" states, westward expansion contributed to the sectionalism that would lead to the U.S. Civil War. Many Americans of mid-nineteenth century plainly perceived the U.S. Policy of Indian Removal itself to be motivated by the expansion of slavery. As Catlin opined in *Last Rambles*, Indian Removal was stimulated by the desire “of removing all the southern tribes of Indians west of the Mississippi River, that their two hundred and fifty millions of rich cotton lands might be covered with slaver laborours” (51). As a product of the continuity between problems of race at mid-century, white American visual and literary strategies of racialization toward African and Native Americans became increasingly inter-reliant.

This chapter analyzes the changing shape of American identity in the years leading up to and following the U.S. Civil War. Previous chapters have established triangularity between racialized representation of Native Americans with two white empires as the primary shape of American identity formation in the colonial and antebellum periods. In this chapter I study a literary and visual movement toward the binaries that major literary critics of the postbellum period, such as Amy Kaplan and Anne Stoler, tend to employ even when exploring the messiness and gaps between

I focus on these changes to racial and imperial formation through Nathaniel Hawthorne’s last completed novel, *The Marble Faun*. This novel, I argue, employs sculpture as a literary means to construct racial visual similarities—between not only Africans and Native Americans, but also Anglo-Americans. In this way *The Marble Faun* collapses triangular structures of race into binary ones. Yet as I show by next returning to Catlin’s *Last Rambles* and its debt to Livingstone’s *Expedition to the Zambesi*, triangles lurk at the edges of identity when we shift our focus beyond literatures white/subaltern binaries.

**Hawthorne’s Empire: Sculpture and the Indigenous in *The Marble Faun***

Throughout *The Marble Faun*, Nathaniel Hawthorne’s depiction of Donatello’s racial and ethnic identity remains cryptic. Donatello, the novel’s titular character, is described as a member of an ancient race that is indigenous to the Italian peninsula colonized by the Roman Empire. But Hawthorne also characterizes him through a combination of racialized tropes frequently applied to Native Americans, to Africans, or to both groups, in antebellum American culture. Hawthorne’s pairing of indigeneity with this vexed racial categorization has seldom been explored by critics of *The Marble Faun*, yet both are integral to the novel’s commentary on race. Donatello’s racially

ambiguous indigeneity is particularly evident at the beginning of The Marble Faun’s second volume, when an old butler informs the expatriate American sculptor Kenyon that Donatello’s family descends from a member of a faun-like race “not altogether human.” This race originated in pre-historical Italy, long before the novel’s antebellum present. Donatello’s family line, according to this legend, began with the union of one of these fauns and a “mortal maiden” “while Italy was yet guiltless of Rome.”

Hawthorne thereby positions Donatello as a descendant of an indigenous people colonized by settler-invaders who conquered Italy, and would become the Roman Empire. As critics have noted, Hawthorne set his last-completed novel in mid-century Rome in order to spatially displace racial and cultural issues confronting the United States. In this context, Donatello’s history might suggest for readers an analogy to the position of Native Americans. But Hawthorne confounds definitive classification by then comparing Kenyon’s investigation of Donatello’s ancestry to a search for the origin of the Nile, thereby linking Donatello to African origins (231). The dominant


strain of criticism of the novel pursues this second point of reference, and interprets Donatello, along with the character Miriam, to represent the enslaved Africans who endured forced transatlantic migrations to North America. That body of work largely neglects the novel’s use of indigeneity. In what follows I pursue the implications of both Donatello’s clear association with indigeneity and his racial ambiguity, which in turn leads to a reassessment of the novel’s inquiry into the foundations of American Empire.

The current consensus surrounding The Marble Faun’s treatment of race has played a major part Hawthorne’s reputation as an apologist for slavery and tacit endorser of American imperialism. As one of the first critics to illuminate the discourses of race embedded in the novel, Nancy Bentley argued in her 1990 article “Slaves and Fauns” that while Donatello encapsulates many qualities representative of Africans in antebellum America, he also embodies characteristics ascribed to Native Americans as noble savages. Thus, writes, Bentley, the novel “captures a complex

constellation of beliefs about race, culture, and American progress.” In The Ethnography of Manners (1995), Bentley would expand the scope of her argument to contend that Hawthorne attempts to maintain the purity of advanced moral, political, cultural, and aesthetic values in the face of primitive “transgressive energies” represented by Donatello and Miriam. In both cases, Bentley’s thesis relies on Donatello and Miriam’s racial indeterminacy. But subsequent literary critics such as Evan Carton and Blythe-Anne Tellefsen, as well as art historians such as Charmaine Nelson, have focused on the aspects of Bentley’s argument that understand Miriam and Donatello as representative of enslaved blacks. According to this interpretation, Hilda and Kenyon represent a pure white American nation divided by growing sectionalism.

---


253 The Ethnography of Manners: Hawthorne, James, Wharton, 62.

between Northern and Southern states, threatened by the looming challenge of integrating racially different, emancipated slaves whom Donatello and Miriam represent. Following this line of inquiry, scholars such as Tellefson, Eric Cheyfitz and Mark Kemp have concluded that the novel rejects the idea that emancipated blacks might safely become American citizens and thus represents a call for the perpetual segregation of whites and blacks to sustain the American nation. Each of these studies has illuminated important facets of The Marble Faun’s racial logic. However, in focusing on only one strand of the novel’s complex treatment of race, these critics have been unable to see that, with its blending of both African-American and Native American racial images, Hawthorne’s project is committed to a wider interrogation of race and empire.

The Marble Faun’s racial narrative is informed not simply by Hawthorne’s own interpretations and observations about sculpture, but the very language of nineteenth-century marble neoclassical sculpture. Beginning in the 1830’s with the work of Horatio Greenough, America’s first prominent sculptor, this medium seized the imagination of the American public. Rome, where Hawthorne composed The Marble Faun, grew into a

focal point for American sculpture as sculptors flocked to the city to learn from European masters, to employ expert carvers, and to gain access to the purest white marble. Many of these sculptors with whom Hawthorne interacted worked under contract for the U.S. government. As Fryd has argued, the sculpture commissioned at mid-century “forms a remarkably coherent program of the early course of American Empire, from the discovery and settlement to the national development and westward expansion that necessitated the subjugation of indigenous peoples.”

I suggest that Hawthorne's profound experience of American neoclassical sculpture during his 1858-1859 visit to Naples and Rome altered his thinking about race and American Empire, and prompted him to explore alternate futures for America and its racial others. Over the course of *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne intertwines narratives of sculptural creation with the novel’s plot to lay bare the inherent self-destructiveness of western empires founded on racial difference.

From this perspective, Hawthorne’s novel constitutes itself as an interrogation of the concept of a great American Empire sculpted from the model of the Roman Empire. *The Marble Faun* begins as a typical nineteenth-century narrative of American Empire that justifies the extirpation of racial others from white U.S. imperial space. But beginning with the murder of the Model who, as I will show, represents the Roman model of empire, the novel effectively rejects the U.S. policy of Indian Removal.

---

poeticized through the myth of the vanishing Indian. By using sculpture to depict
Donatello’s subsequent transformation from Faun to man, *The Marble Faun* implicitly
discards the policy of assimilation that the United States would implement to sustain the
empire throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century. Ultimately, Hawthorne
proves incapable of crystallizing a coherent vision for the coexistence of empire and the
indigenous within the plot of the novel. But the effort to do so demands our attention. In
its fictional attempt to negotiate a future for Africans and Native Americans in imperial
space, Hawthorne’s novel demonstrates how deeply in the American imaginary the
racial logics of civilization and empire had become entwined with sculptural aesthetics.

**Racial Others and the American Imperial Future**

In *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne essentially reopens a question often foreclosed
in American culture and politics: must the empire’s others vanish? For many proponents
of antebellum American Empire, the very existence of Native Americans and Africans
posed a formidable problem. American intellectuals, including presidents from Thomas
Jefferson to Andrew Jackson, historians like George Bancroft and Francis Parkman, and
novelists like James Fenimore Cooper, believed themselves to be members of a great
imperial civilization modeled on the Roman Empire. According to the stadialist model
of history that supported this belief in the continuity of empire across time, all
civilizations pass through the same defined stages of advancement as they rise and
fall. Americans often coupled the stadialist model with the *translatio imperii*, the theory that civilization travelled naturally from east to west, beginning with the Romans who perfected the Greek model, extending its glory across the Atlantic Ocean to the nascent American empire. According to these theories American westward expansion became the ultimate chapter in grander story of imperial progression. In reality, however, Europeans expanded their civilizations into North America by displacing and exterminating Native Americans through deceit and conquest, and through economies grounded in the labor of enslaved Africans, that contradicted many of the defining qualities of their supposedly civilized empires. Thus the model of empire, according to which America had been predestined to rise as inheritors of Roman glory, caused many Americans both pride and anxiety: pride at their national ideals and imperial ascendancy, but anxiety over a national institution of African slavery and a policy of national expansion based on dispossession of Native Americans.

American politicians, artists, and writers attempted to solve this contradiction through race.

---


Native Americans, according to American theories of empire, were racially capable of neither becoming civilized, nor of co-existing with civilized Americans in their reputedly savage state. Such theories were commonly articulated as a natural fact in American culture through the myth of the vanishing Indian, an elegiac trope commonly employed in antebellum writing, painting, sculpture, theatre, and politics. The trope functions as a type of extinction discourse, as Patrick Brantlinger has termed it—a discursive structure functioning across media and disciplines that, by explaining extinction as racially determined, merges ideologies of race and empire. Cooper most famously employed the myth of the vanishing Indian in *The Last of the Mohicans*. In this 1824 novel the Mohican Indian Chingachgook voices the myth himself when he repines: “Where are the blossoms of those summers!—fallen, one by one: so all my family departed, each in his turn, to the land of spirits.” In his preface to the 1851 edition of the novel, Cooper waxed poetically that the Mohicans represent "the


seemingly inevitable fate of all these people, who disappear before the advances . . . of civilization, as the verdure of native forests falls before the nipping frost.”

Through this elegiac mode Americans solved the problem of the indigenous by portraying Native Americans as a people with no future.

Hawthorne consistently depicts Donatello according to the conventions that white Americans had developed to overwrite Native Americans with vanishing Indians. Like Cooper’s Chingachgook, Hawthorne’s Donatello voices the myth of the vanishing Indian when he tells Kenyon that he is “the last” of his race, and that his kin “have all vanished” (221). Hawthorne’s frequent use of the words “hereditary,” “type,” and “character” in association with Donatello locate him within the same field of racial science that postulated the extinction of Native Americans as biologically inevitable. Donatello’s race has vanished, moreover, because his people are considered racially incompatible with the march of civilization. According to the narrator of the novel, the world has grown “too wise and sad” based on the “complicated scheme of progress. No life wanders now like an unfettered stream,” he explains; “there is a mill wheel for the tiniest rivulet to turn” (238-239). The world has grown sad, then, because of the technological innovations that bring more advanced states of civilization, until simpler, primitive creatures like Donatello and Native Americans cannot survive.

Kenyon

264 Ibid., 457.

265 This association between sadness and civilization reproduces what George Dekker has identified as a central feature of this genre: a tension between a nostalgia for a
reinforces this concept when he speculates to Hilda that perhaps “beings, of Donatello’s character . . . have no longer any business on this earth, or elsewhere. Life has grown so sadly serious, that such men must change their nature, or else perish” (459). Kenyon not only denies that Donatello could adapt to this more “serious” and complicated world, but links Donatello with an antiquated past, just as American extinction discourse positioned Native Americans as relics of the past. On the matter of racial discourse, I am suggesting that in The Marble Faun Hawthorne has essentially rewritten novels of American Empire like Cooper’s The Last of the Mohicans, but drastically shifted the position of this narrative within the cyclical model of empire. Whereas Mohicans takes place during the ascent of American Empire, The Marble Faun takes place on this continuum at empire’s nadir amid a ruined, degraded post-imperial United States where a descendant of the indigenous Chingachgook still roams the countryside, with empire’s promise of indigenous extinction unfulfilled.266

However, Hawthorne’s strategic use of the myth of the vanishing Indian allows him to embody the oppression of Native Americans and Africans in one character. While enslaved, Africans were rarely depicted through extinction discourse. In fact, advocates of slavery justified the “peculiar institution” based on a humanitarian claim

prelapsarian past and an enthusiasm for the technological progress. See Dekker, The American Historical Romance, 74.

266 Kristie Hamilton explores some of these similarities between The Marble Faun and The Last of the Mohicans “Fauns and Mohicans: Narratives of Extinction and Hawthorne’s Aesthetic of Modernity.”
that only under the auspices of slavery could Africans advance from their savage state. 

This logic allowed pro-slavery whites to argue that naturally inferior Africans would become extinct if emancipated because they would not be able to compete economically with whites in the United States. The northern clergymen Horace Bushnell, for example, argued in 1839 that slave emancipation would result in “a process of premature extinction; as we know to be the case with another barbarous people, now fast yielding to the infection of death.” The “other barbarous people” with whom Bushnell equates Africans are, of course, Native Americans. Thus, extinction discourse circulated in antebellum U.S. culture as a means to racially justify colonization and oppression of both Native Americans and Africans.

On the eve of the U.S. Civil War, as Hawthorne wrote *The Marble Faun*, such theories would be especially relevant to the approaching possibility of slave emancipation. Critics of the novel interpret Miriam, like Donatello, as representative of Africans. Yet this does not necessarily exclude her from the category of the


270 Nelson discusses the racial implications of the connection between this sculpture and Africans in the context of antebellum slavery in *The Color of Stone: Sculpting the Female Subject in Nineteenth-Century America*. 

214
indigenous. Hawthorne makes his most explicit link between Miriam and Africa through a marble bust that Kenyon sculptures of Miriam, which the author notes in his “Preface” to the novel as inspired by American sculptor William Wetmore Story’s *Cleopatra*. Hawthorne studied this neoclassical bust of the African queen in Rome, where Wetmore was still modelling the sculpture in clay. As *Cleopatra*, however, Miriam specifically represents the indigenous African colonized by imperial Rome, and later colonized by the British and French Empires in the nineteenth century. Thus, *The Marble Faun*’s use of extinction discourse and indigeneity encompasses antebellum anxieties over both Africans and Native Americans, and locates both Africans and Native Americans within his interrogation of empire. By casting the novel’s indigenous presence through tropes commonly applied to Native Americans, Hawthorne draws a parallel between the United States’ oppression of racial others with Rome’s conquest of Donatello’s indigenous race.

Rather than celebrating Rome’s glory, however, *The Marble Faun* fixates on Rome’s post-imperial ruin. After all of its glory and imperial expansion, Rome “lies like the dead corpse of a giant, decaying for centuries, with no survivor mighty enough to bury it” (110). “Rome,” continues Hawthorne, “seems like nothing but a heap of broken rubbish, thrown into the great chasm between our own days and empire” (110). Miriam declares that “it was the guilt of Rome” which caused this chasm to swallow up the empire, “as the evil of Rome is far more than its good, the whole commonwealth sank into it” (162). Miriam’s phrase “guilt of Rome” recalls the legend that Donatello’s race flourished at a time when “Italy was yet guiltless of Rome” (232). Through this
correspondence the novel links the “evil of Rome” in this scene with Rome’s conquest of indigenous peoples. Yet in stark contrast to the extinction discourse that undergirds theories of American Empire, the indigenous persists in the form of Donatello, as “the original type” of the indigenous before the advent of empire. Rather than doomed to vanish, the indigenous of Hawthorne’s novel is enduring as the marble *Faun of Praxiteles* with which the novel identifies him. In essence, *The Marble Faun* rejects the belief that indigenous peoples are doomed to perish. The remainder of the novel encourages antebellum readers to consider whether the United States can pursue a different imperial trajectory than that which has resulted in Rome’s decaying corpse of an empire built on bloody conquest and slavery.

**Empire, Sculpture, and Racial Difference**

*The Marble Faun* adapts the language of marble sculpture as a hermeneutic for interrogating the question of whether the indigenous can co-exist with American Empire. The novel announces its strategy to revisit the subject of race and empire through sculpture from the novel’s opening scene, when three of the novel’s major characters—Hilda, Kenyon, and Miriam—stand in the sculpture gallery in Rome and identify Donatello with the ancient Grecian marble sculpture the *Faun of Praxiteles* (Fig. 5.3). “Our friend Donatello,” asserts Miriam, “is the very Faun of Praxiteles.” Gazing at the *Faun*, Miriam laments that “it is a pity there are no longer any of this race of rustic creatures” for Donatello to consort with (13). Kenyon echoes her sentiment, calling it “a pity” that the *Faun* “has vanished forever from the hard and dusty paths of
life” (13). Hawthorne repeats this strategy throughout the novel, identifying Donatello with the Faun of Praxiteles and describing them both in terms of the myth of the vanishing Indian. Through this technique Hawthorne effectively intertwines sculpture, race, and empire as mutually constitutive within the novel’s logic.

The Rome of the mid-nineteenth century where Hawthorne conceived and wrote The Marble Faun served as the center of an artistic movement that recast the narrative of American empire and native extinction anew through the life-sized, three-dimensional, monochromatic medium of sculpture. In the nineteenth century sculptures, especially sculptural monuments, were considered ideal objects for inculcating American patriotism. Horatio Greenough, one of America’s first nationally recognized sculptors, theorized that monuments could “impersonate” the nation by literally embodying and personifying national values. The U.S. government turned to sculpture to unite the nation through neoclassical aesthetics in an effort to simultaneously reproduce narratives of American Empire and connect the new American Empire to the glory of the Roman Empire. Thus, the American imperial project and the world of marble sculpture were closely intertwined.


Hawthorne immersed himself in this world of imperial sculpture while he wrote *The Marble Faun*. Throughout the *French and Italian Notebooks*, Hawthorne chronicles his growing fascination with marble sculptures, the process of their creation, and his evolving friendships with American expatriate sculptors working in Rome. He writes of afternoons and evenings spent in the company of almost every prominent American sculptor working in Italy, including Harriet Hosmer and William Wetmore Story, both mentioned in the Preface to *The Marble Faun*; Joseph Mozier, a longtime friend had sculpted a statue of *Pocahontas* (1854), and would soon cast a sculpture called *Wept of Wish-ton Wish* (1862) based on

![Statue of Resting Satyr, after Praxiteles](image)

Figure 5.3. *Statue of Resting Satyr, after Praxiteles*. Roman 2nd century CE copy of a Greek original of c. 340-330 BCE. The Capitoline Museum, Rome. Photo by the author.
Cooper’s 1829 novel of the same title; and the most famous American sculptor of the century, Hiram Powers. While developing one of his own sculptural portrayals of an Indian, *Last of the Tribes* (Fig. 5.4), Powers would explain, “Cooper wrote *The Last of the Mohicans*, but I am writing in marble. The last of them all. It is an Indian girl . . . fleeing before civilization.”273 With this statement Powers plainly articulates the link between marble neoclassical sculpture and the myth of the vanishing Indian embedded in the sculptural representations of Native Americans produced in Rome.

![Figure 5.4. Hiram Powers. *Last of the Tribes*. Marble. 1873. The Smithsonian, Washington, D.C. Artstor SAAM.1968.155. 125.](image)

Hawthorne’s relationships with these artists afforded him the opportunity to
directly study numerous sculptural narratives of empire, most significantly Thomas
Crawford’s *The Progress of American Civilization*, commissioned by the U.S. Congress
for the pediment to the Senate extension of the U.S. Capitol building (Fig. 5.5).
Hawthorne’s *Notebooks* record his visit to the studio of the deceased Crawford, where
Hawthorne studied the plastic casts for this multi-figure work.\(^\text{274}\) Montgomery C.
Miegs, supervisor of the Capitol extension project, instructed Crawford to illustrate “the
history of the struggle between the civilized man and the savage, between the cultivated
and wild nature” as his subject for the pediment.\(^\text{275}\) Crawford fulfilled his commission
by designing a visual progression of North American settlement that premised the rise
of American Empire on the necessity of Native extinction.\(^\text{276}\) Crawford would describe
the iconology of this sculpture as “emblematic of the extinction of the Indian race.”\(^\text{277}\)

\(^{274}\) Hawthorne also discussed the commissioning process for *Progress* with Powers, who
out of pride had declined to compete with Crawford for the commission. Nathaniel
Centenary Edition of the Complete Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne (Columbus: Ohio

Sculptors in Nineteenth Century Italy* (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1972),
359.

\(^{276}\) Fryd provides a detailed analysis of this monument in Fryd, *Art and Empire: The Politics of Ethnicity

\(^{277}\) Ibid., 116.
Such graphic narratives were ubiquitous in nineteenth-century neoclassical sculpture.\footnote{278} Hawthorne inserts Donatello into exactly this type of narrative when he merges his indigenous figure with sculpture in the novel’s opening scene.

![Image of sculptural depiction](image)


Just as *The Marble Faun* links sculpture and the indigenous through the character Donatello, the novel symbolically merges sculpture and empire through the character of the Model. Hawthorne uses the word “model” for two primary purposes in *The Marble Faun*. One of these refers to the character of the Model, the mysterious specter who almost persistently haunts Miriam, and consequently infuriates Donatello, during the novel’s first volume. Not coincidentally, the novel also frequently employs

this term to depict the process of crafting marble sculpture. Hawthorne describes the three-step process used in the nineteenth-century to craft sculptures in the chapter “A Sculptor’s Studio.” This process originates with a “clay-model” that is the “intimate production” of the sculptor himself. The clay model is then reproduced into a plaster cast, and finally chiseled from marble by trained artisans whose work he describes as “merely mechanical” (115-6). Hawthorne’s description, as well as his evaluation of the creativity required at successive stages of the process, is consistent with contemporary writing about sculpture. In 1850 Dodge Pickering wrote in his treatise _Sculpture and the Plastic Art_ that “the genius of the artist is displayed altogether in the model; for the process of afterward copying it in stone is chiefly mechanical.”

In his _Notebooks_, moreover, Hawthorne describes the process of replication from model to marble as one of unswerving fidelity. Observing laborers chiseling marble in Rome, Hawthorne writes that “the model is sure to be accurately repeated in the marble.” The shape of the completed marble sculpture, then, is predetermined by the shape of the clay model from which it is copied.

Hawthorne subtly manipulates the language used to describe sculptural creation with vocabularies developed by theorists of empire to describe historical progress.

---

279 Pickering Dodge, _Sculpture and the Plastic Art_ (J.P. Jewett, 1850), 2.

Indeed, the terms employed to celebrate the stadialist model of empire closely parallel the sculptural use of the terms “model” and “copy.” Adam Ferguson, the Scottish philosopher who helped popularize the historical narrative of progress in the late eighteenth century, wrote in his famous Essay on the History of Civil Society (1767): “The Greek was a copy of the Egyptian, and even the Egyptian was an imitation, although we have lost the model in which he was formed.” In The Marble Faun Hawthorne conflates this narrative of empire with the process of creating sculpture when he refers to the individual phases in the process of creating a sculpture as “stages of advancement” (115). Rome, which was in the minds of many Americans the ultimate empire, becomes analogous to the clay model, with succeeding empires like the British, and later American Empire, analogous to finished marble sculpture. In this sense, the novel’s character “the Model” is metaphorically “the model” of empire. In the same way that Donatello represents the “original type” of the indigenous, the Model represents the original type of empire that, according to the narrative of historical progress, emerged in the form of the Roman Empire and spread westward to Britain, and then America, in more advanced manifestations. As the model of empire, the character of the Model stalks Miriam and Donatello, the novel’s racial others, as a harbinger of oppression and extinction.

However, while sculptors in Rome represented indigenous North Americans in marble to promulgate racially-justified narratives of American Empire and indigenous extinction, *The Marble Faun* fuses sculpture and empire to undermine racial difference. Sculpture served as an ideal medium for Hawthorne’s project because racial theorists had already transformed sculpture into a site of racial discourse. In the late eighteenth century, racial scientists such as Johann Blumenbach, Petrus Camper, and Georges Cuvier justified their claims that white Europeans were superior to Native Americans, Africans, and other groups through aesthetics of Roman and Greek sculpture. Theorists of race used sculpture as evidence of racial difference by measuring the extent to which Native and African bodies varied from classical ideals. But whereas American sculptors and racial theorists manipulated sculpture to inscribe racial difference, Hawthorne uses sculpture to bring difference into question. At several points in the novel, Kenyon, Hilda, and Miriam wonder if Donatello is actually descended from the marble *Faun of Praxiteles*, and whether Donatello truly has the pointed ears of the *Faun* that would prove his racial difference. Hawthorne never answers this question for his readers. In the novel’s epilogue, Hawthorne chides readers who “wonder how Cuvier would have classified Donatello” (463). Two pages later, asked by the narrator if Donatello truly has furry, pointed ears, Kenyon replies that he knows, but “on that point there shall not be one word of explanation” (467). By posing the possibility of

Donatello’s racial difference, yet refusing to give a clear answer, *The Marble Faun* offers only an uneasy ambivalence, rather than a reification of racial theory for American readers obsessed with biological justifications for doctrines of empire.\(^{283}\) The novel’s uncertainty over questions of race and the inability of its characters, especially the white Americans Hilda and Kenyon, to identify race in the absence of clear physical markers indicates empire’s failure to successfully categorize and reinforce racial difference. At its core, *The Marble Faun* is an exploration of what happens to empire when its racially-justified foundations dissolve.

**Indigeneity, Extinction, Assimilation**

Understanding Donatello as a vessel for the indigenous in an imperial world of sculpture, and, as the title literally instructs us to do, a “Marble Faun,” allows us to see how Hawthorne’s novel rejects both extinction and assimilation, each of which in their own way result in the vanishing of the racial others from U.S. space and the fulfillment of nineteenth-century American Empire.\(^{284}\) In the decades preceding the Civil War, the

---

\(^{283}\) Kenyon and Hilda similarly debate Miriam’s race and origin. The narrator of the novel introduces four different possible national and racial backgrounds for Miriam, including not only being the mulatto offspring of a Southern planter and his slave, but also Jewish, German, and English. Ultimately, Miriam reveals that she is of “mixed race”- an amalgamation of English, Jewish, and Italian bloodlines. Hawthorne, *The Marble Faun, Or the Romance of Monte Beni*, 4:430.

\(^{284}\) On assimilation and extinction of Native Americans as conjoined goals of nineteenth-century American Empire, see James H. Cox, *Muting White Noise: Native
reform spirit of the nineteenth century, combined with the realization that with the settlement of the West repeated Indian Removal was no longer possible, led to a renewed belief that the Indians could be Christianized, civilized, and assimilated into American society. As early as the 1840’s, and continuing through the Civil War, Commissioners of the Bureau of Indian Affairs publicly stated their belief that Native Americans could be civilized. Among those were George W. Manypenny, who served under Hawthorne’s friend President Franklin Pierce. Although assimilation contradicted racial theories of innate Native inferiority, this new course demanded complete adoption of white American culture, lifestyle, and religion, with a corresponding rejection of indigenous identities. Essentially, assimilation solved the problem of the indigenous by transforming Indians into Europeans. The Marble Faun experiments with a new structure of empire that can be sustained through neither racially-determined extinction, nor an assimilation that transformed indigenes into white Americans.

When Donatello throws the model over a precipice near the end of the first volume, the novel sets in motion a series of events that defy the two main options that readers would have found available to indigenous characters in American fiction. First, this act defies a frequently-employed plot convention of American novels that conjoin

______________


indigenous extinction and the growth of American Empire: whether they are pushed by white characters or fall inadvertently, Indian characters in antebellum American novels plummet to their deaths from a “precipice” with startling regularity when their actions threaten the limitations established by racial stereotypes. For instance, in Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans*, the Huron Maqua dies after failing to leap across a “precipice.” In a variation of this theme, the vengeful Pequot Mononotto’s severed arm “drops” over a “precipice” in Catherine Maria Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie* (1827). Hawthorne inverts this plot structure when Donatello hurls the Model from a “precipice” (172). When Donatello murders the Model with Miriam’s implicit approval, he symbolically breaks the cycle of empire that the Model represents, as well as the oppression it imposes on racial others.

Secondly, in defying extinction discourse Hawthorne’s novel reopens possibilities for growth foreclosed to Native Americans and Africans in antebellum culture. In his influential *Regeneration Through Violence*, Richard Slotkin theorized that in American literature the cyclical renewal of white literary characters, grounded in the continued destruction of the indigenous as dark other, functions as “a metaphor of
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287 Cooper, *The Last of the Mohicans; A Narrative of 1757*, 867. Romero cites this source as an example to illustrate how the trope functions to limit the potential of Native Americans in “Vanishing Americans: Gender, Empire, and the New Historicism,” 121.
the American experience.” In direct contrast to this plot convention, in *The Marble Faun* the indigenous racial other destroys the model of empire, which in turn activates his own rebirth. Following Donatello’s murder of the model and subsequent rebirth, the novel charts Donatello’s transformation from a faun-like creature to a complete, civilized human being characterized by moral awareness, intellectual capacity, and restraint. Kenyon theorizes to Hilda that Donatello’s “great crime” has “awakened” his “soul” into “developing a thousand high capabilities, moral and intellectual, which we never should have dreamed of, within the scanty compass of the Donatello we knew” (460). In demonstrating one of these “capabilities,” Donatello becomes preoccupied with knowledge of his sin of murder. Hawthorne thereby characterizes one aspect of Donatello’s growth as the development of a Christian moral intelligence. As Bentley argued in *The Ethnography of Manners*, “the allegorical plot points us toward his redemptive transformation through a fortunate fall.” When combined with the novels’ defiance of extinction discourse, this transformation constitutes a range of possibilities that include growth toward both Christian moral sensibilities and civilized characteristics such as restraint. Thus, Donatello’s rebirth symbolizes potential for change among the supposedly inferior Native Americans and emancipated Africans
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who, according to the dominant racial theories could never develop from their purportedly primitive states and coexist Christian Western civilization.

On the surface, *The Marble Faun* offers ambiguous assessments of Donatello’s progress toward civilization. Immediately after Donatello throws the model from the precipice, Hawthorne writes that the act “had kindled him into a man. It had developed in him an intelligence that was no native characteristic” of his former self (172). This statement appears to characterize Donatello as having already become fully human, and no longer half-faun. Later, Kenyon wonders if his friend’s progress was only “half-imagined” and laments Donatello’s “antique healthfulness that had vanished from the earth” (393). Throughout the second volume, Kenyon and Hilda offer contradictory assessments of Donatello’s progress toward civilization. At the end of the novel, Kenyon muses to Hilda that perhaps the moral of Donatello’s story, after all, is that “such men must change their nature, or else perish” (459). For antebellum readers familiar with the myth of the vanishing Indian, Kenyon’s words would suggest that the indigenous must assimilate with American Empire as a precondition for survival. Critics have viewed these ambiguous assessments of Donatello’s transformation as part of Hawthorne’s rejection of the possibility that racial others can ever be safely integrated into the United States.290 This interpretation, however, overstates the weight of Hilda’s

and Kenyon’s respective observations, which in turn rely on the same imperialist narratives of extinction and assimilation that the novel symbolically rejects through Donatello’s murder of the Model. Instead, the novel explores options for integrating racial others within an American imperial system.

With his main characters’ views of indigenous change locked in a narrow, white supremacist view of progress, Hawthorne relies on sculpture to depict alternatives to assimilation. Kenyon sculpts two busts of Donatello in *The Marble Faun*. He sculpts the first of these at Donatello’s ancestral home shortly after learning of his indigenous heritage. Following the standard process of crafting sculpture, Kenyon begins a clay-model that he intends to later replicate as a marble bust. Kenyon requests permission to create this model by telling Donatello: “your head in marble would be a treasure to me” (228). As in previous instances in the novel where Hawthorne conflates Donatello and the marble *Faun of Praxiteles*, Hawthorne blurs the distinction between Donatello as a sculptural object, and Donatello’s actual body. By merging Donatello and this bust, Hawthorne aligns Kenyon, who, along with Hilda, critics have agreed symbolizes the white American nation, with American efforts to assimilate Native Americans with Western civilization. Kenyon struggles to complete Donatello’s transformation in clay. Yet with his “last accidental touches,” Kenyon creates a bust that indeed resembles the actual Donatello before him. Hawthorne writes that this bust retains “the features of the antique Faun, but now illuminated with a higher meaning, such as the old marble never bore” (273). The narrator characterizes this last model as “a success.” Hawthorne’s description of this bust evokes a mixture of indigenous and white American qualities.
The bust contains the features that retain the indigeneity of the “antique Faun,” yet possess “a higher meaning” that nonetheless evidences change in Donatello.

Near the end of the novel Kenyon shows Hilda a second bust of Donatello. Kenyon has diverged from the usual process that begins in a clay-model and chiseled this bust directly into white marble based on his memory of Donatello. Hawthorne writes that this bust has “a more recognizable expression than Kenyon had succeeded in putting into the clay-model” (379). Hilda recognizes this bust by its likeness to the Faun of Praxiteles, but “with a soul breathed into him. It is the Faun,” she continues, “advancing toward a state of higher development” (381). Kenyon and Hilda both agree that this last bust succeeds “not by any skill or purpose on the sculptor’s part” but by “the chance-result” of ending his sculpting process when it matched Donatello’s development. As in the example of Kenyon’s earlier clay model, this “chance-result” raises skepticism that American efforts to civilize and assimilate Native Americans can affect the cultural advancement of indigenous peoples. Meanwhile Kenyon, by working only with chisel in marble, has participated only the final phase of sculptural creation that the novel judges to be “merely mechanical.” These busts, therefore, stress indigenous agency and resistance to the sculpting hands of the colonizer.

Unfortunately, Hawthorne never grants readers the opportunity to see the conclusion of Donatello’s transformation. When Kenyon shows this marble bust to Hilda, it is only partly complete. Kenyon and Hilda agree that this bust should never be completed for fear of ruining it. This marble bust, the narrator relates, “has ever since remained in an unfinished state” (381). Since Hawthorne has strongly linked Donatello
to sculpture over the course of the novel, this implies that Donatello’s own transformation remains unfinished. However, Donatello's transformation is not the failure that critics have concluded it to be. Instead, the novel employs marble busts to offer an alternative that allows Donatello to retain indigeneity, yet exhibit positive adaptation toward co-existence with American Empire. Hawthorne describes each successful bust as “illuminated,” yet still resembling the *Faun of Praxiteles*. The *Marble Faun* thereby visualizes indigenous change as an addition to, rather than an abandonment of, indigenous culture. As Miriam approvingly describes the process, Donatello has “travelled in a circle . . . back to his original self, with an inestimable treasure of improvement won” (434). Hawthorne even goes so far as to characterize Donatello’s voluntary imprisonment as a kind of growth. Miriam tells Kenyon that Donatello is “haunted by a strange remorse” for his murder of the Model, and an “unmitigable resolve to obtain what he deems justice upon himself” (433). By characterizing Donatello’s remorse as “strange,” and his sense of justice as “what he deems . . . upon himself,” the novel suggests that Donatello’s growth is observable, yet still incomprehensible to and developing independently of, European intellectual and Christian moral sensibilities. Moreover, this description of Donatello contrasts starkly with the description of Donatello’s ancestors, whom he resembled almost perfectly at the novel’s beginning, as “never quite restrainable within the trammels of social law” (233). The novel uses these sculptures, then, to indicate types of change for racial others outside of the linear progress toward civilization demanded by proponents of assimilation.
Hawthorne has been excoriated for separating his white American and racial others at the novel’s conclusion. At the conclusion of *The Marble Faun*, Hilda and Kenyon leave the ruins of Rome and return to the promise of America. Both Miriam and Donatello, however, remain in Rome. Donatello ends the novel in an Italian prison, while Miriam’s whereabouts are unknown. According to current critical consensus, this ending returns Hilda and Kenyon to the pure white space of America to protect them from the threat of racial contamination. Combined with what has been interpreted as a failed transformation that symbolically portrays emancipated slaves as too racially different to assimilate as American citizens, this ending constitutes a “final segregation” between blacks and whites. But since Donatello is indigenous to an Italy colonized by the Roman Empire, an alternate ending in which Donatello travelled to America with Hilda and Kenyon would represent a removal echoing the American Empire’s ongoing Indian Removals and encouragement of African Colonization. Donatello’s remaining in Italy allows him to continue to occupy his ancestral territory, even as it has been colonized by a Roman Empire that has already followed its complete stadialistic lifecycle, from savage state to decadence. Combined with Hawthorne’s use of sculpture, this ending leaves open the possibility of co-existence between the indigenous and empire in the indeterminate future.
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Hawthorne’s Empire

Hawthorne’s experiences while travelling outside the United States, I have been suggesting, transformed his understanding of the imperial world. When he wrote *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne’s own United States stretched from Atlantic to Pacific after the recently-concluded Mexican-American War. American writers like Hawthorne’s friend Herman Melville had even imagined the American Empire expanding even beyond the shores of the continent, past already-occupied Pacific islands such as Hawaii, to Japan.\(^{292}\) As he was inspired to write the novel in Rome, surrounded by American imperial sculpture, amid the ruined architecture of the civilization that had served as the model of Western Empire, Hawthorne drew new connections between America’s empire and a Roman Empire that at its height had expanded not only north west across Europe, but south into Africa and east into Asia. And Hawthorne completed writing his novel in England, the seat of one of the nineteenth century’s preeminent global empires, which held territories in North America, Asia and Australia, dominated the Indian subcontinent, and would soon significantly expand its dominions in Africa.\(^{293}\)

---


Writing from these metropolitan centers, afford Hawthorne the opportunity to develop a transnational, global, and multi-racial perspective on empire.

All of these empires—Roman, British, and American, thrived through the enslavement and oppression of peoples indigenous to the lands that they conquered. From Hawthorne’s renewed imperial perspective, American expansion could not credibly be characterized as the exceptional encounter between a rising civilization and disappearing savage races poeticized through the myth of the vanishing Indian. Nor could antebellum instabilities be identified as the result of sectional disagreements over peculiar conflicts between white Americans and racially distinct Native Americans and enslaved Africans. Indeed, if the westward expansion envisioned by Americans as an inevitable aspect of the progress of civilization was instead but a phase in a process of duplication akin to the repetition of marble sculptures from a common clay model, then the American Empire was identical to its Roman and British predecessors with whom it shared the mutual oppression of multitudes of indigenous peoples. The Africans and Native Americans whom advocates of nineteenth-century Western empires represented as distinct but unilaterally inferior races were both members of indigenous races. The Marble Faun delineates a moral interrelationship among Western empires through Donatello and Miriam’s racially indistinct indigeneity. Hawthorne describes Donatello as indigenous to the Italy colonized through the “guilt” of Rome, yet also through tropes applied both Native Americans and Africans in antebellum culture. And the novel portrays Miriam as racially African, yet in terms that simultaneously locate her in a position of enslavement perpetrated by American empire, and the position of
indigeneity held by Africans colonized by the Roman and British Empires. Hawthorne’s empire is both transnational and, at least in its portrayal of the colonized other, transracial.

We can most clearly see Hawthorne’s visions of empire through sculpture. Hawthorne weaves the language of sculpture – its materials, its stages of production, and its life cycle, into the fabric of *The Marble Faun*. In doing so, he uses the form and plot of the novel to unveil the multiple and entangled meanings of sculpture in antebellum American culture. Indeed, it is through these entanglements that Hawthorne interrogates the irresolvable tensions within America’s narratives of empire. As the novel illustrates through the cycle of Roman expansion and degeneration, continuing the course of empire cast and recast in imperial narratives like Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans* or Crawford’s *The Progress of American Civilization* indelibly damages the very fabric of the United States, and has the potential to cause the fall of American civilization. White marble—the medium that had become in the American imperial imagination the very measure of difference between white American civilization and its dark racial others, becomes an enduring medium of the similarity and compatibility between the indigenous other and the empire. Marble is the material manifestation of both Rome’s glory and the index of empire’s collapse. *The Marble Faun* thus suggests that Hawthorne recognized that contrary to the myths embedded in American cultural production, Native Americans and Africans would persist in American space. They could not be removed from North America, as many nineteenth-century
“humanitarians” hoped. As a man of marble sculpture, the indigenous Donatello is mutable, permanent, and breakable, but not vanishing.

**Hawthorne, Catlin, and the Imperial Other**

The foremost theorists of late nineteenth and twentieth century American empire employ binary models to study empire. This is true even of scholars who emphasize their focus on the on the messiness of imperial structures. For example, despite her concentration on the vexed and tangled tensions between the ideologies of empire and the practical realities of colonial desire “that could blur the distinctions between color and culture,” Anne Stoler firmly locates this tension in the “relations between the colonizer and the colonial.” Stoler’s terms clearly indicate her reliance on postcolonial, binary models of identity formation developed by scholars such as Edward Said. Amy Kaplan belies her own reliance on binary structures when she declares herself to be “interested in tracing not only the ways in which imperial relations abroad were rendered through the lens of black/white relations at home, but the ways these two arenas were meshed.” At the same time that Kaplan troubles the borders between “abroad” and “at home,” she reinscribes a binary structure of “black/white relations.”

In this section, I study the movement from the triangular structures dominant in antebellum literature toward the binaries most prominent during the postbellum era,

which in turn serve as the foundation of current empire of studies. *The Marble Faun* manipulates a triangular structure of comparison between antebellum American Empire, the classical Roman Empire, and a composite Native American-African other in order to undermine the racial classifications and imperatives that justified antebellum American Empire. In this sense, the novel resists conventional structures of antebellum empire. However, in the ways that the novel constructs similarity between the contemporary empires of Hawthorne’s time, *The Marble Faun* foreshadows binary structures of imperial identity formation more typical of those described by scholars to dominate the era following the U.S. Civil War. Catlin’s *Last Rambles* and Livingstone’s *Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi* serve as potent examples of how postbellum works by American and Europeans collapse the world into a binary between colonizers and colonized, while at the same time maintaining triangulation at the outskirts of empire.

In *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne replaces the two white empires which typically vie for domination of the same temporal and geographical space with two empires—the Roman and American Empires—which share neither space nor time. In order to initiate this structure, *The Marble Faun* erodes the differences between white empires, and the former global imperial rivals of England, France, and America now intermingle without conflict. Hawthorne scatters brief depictions of this imperial brotherhood across the novel. On the grounds of the Villa Borghese, “3 French Soldiers, A Modern Roman, 3 German Artists, Pope’s Swiss Guardsmen, Two English Tourists” join in a cosmopolitan dance (87). On the Pincian Hill, French soldiers, “griseled Veterans with
medals of Algiers or Crimea,” “are always to be seen” with “the peaceful duty” of watching over English and American children (100). Here Hawthorne allows French veterans of imperial wars, who served as foils to the British Empire in Indian Captivity narratives, to be responsible for maintaining the reproduction of the Anglo-Saxon race. At the Coliseum, Hawthorne depicts “a party of English or American, paying the inevitable visit by moonlight” (155). Here, the difference between English and American appears inconsequential to the narrative. In another scene Hawthorne depicts “an assemblage, composed almost entirely of Anglo-“breeding,” but emphasizes the “Anglo-Saxon blood” shared by the two imperial peoples. Formerly divided by degrees of redness, it is now the shared blood between the English and American people that is emphasized even in their difference.

The novel foregrounds an analogous similarity between Native Americans and Africans through the characters of Donatello and Miriam. Hawthorne depicts the relationship between the Model and Miriam, as critics have observed, in a way that is reminiscent of that between master and slave. In one scene, the Model holds an “iron chain” round her “feminine waist” in his “ruthless hand” (93). Critics of the novel who align Miriam specifically with enslaved Africans have yet to note, however, that Hawthorne describes her slavery as a result of imperial conquest: Hawthorne writes Miriam is “shackled” to the Model like a “captive queen” following an “Emperour’s triumph” (108). Thus, Hawthorne mingles the means of domination typically associated with Africans and Native Americans. Hawthorne similarly blurs tropes often used to describe Native Americans and Africans when he links Donatello to Egypt with
attempts to determine Donatello’s ancestry to a search for the origin of the Nile (231). In conjunction with Hawthorne’s construction of an imperial brotherhood between the French, British, and American Empires, the novel’s amalgamation of Africans and Native Americans presages the binary of whiteness and black/red discourses that scholarly consensus has regarded as typical of postbellum imperial discourse.

The Shifting Triangles of Global Empire

By the time he wrote Last Rambles, Catlin had travelled extensively through territories formerly colonized by the British and French Empires. Yet Catlin makes relatively little mention of these once-preeminent conquerors, affording him ample opportunities to opine on the results of French and British imperialism in the Americas. But Catlin seizes such moments to naturalize colonialism. Catlin notes that ethnologists can expect to meet “on the United States frontier . . . Indians occasionally using French and English words, and now and then meets a half white Indian, with a French face and a French Beard.” Catlin continues that “there is no evidence that these tribes are Frenchmen or Englishmen, but proves only that Frenchmen and Englishmen have been there a hundred years before him” (309). Instead of condemning the French in this passage for mixing with Indians, and accusing both collectives of degenerating as a result, as we might expect of a writer like John Dodge or Joel Barlow, Catlin writes as if white settlers have always occupied the frontier, with French and British Empires yielding to the United States.
Indeed, instead of employing Indians to construct triangular oppositions between empires, Catlin appears to construct a binary between the savage and the civilized. Catlin employs the myth of the vanishing Indian in this endeavor to build a hierarchy between primitive Indians and civilized settler colonists. Amid the savage squalor of the jungle, Rio is “a beautiful city,” according to Catlin. Despite this admiration, Catlin expresses no desire to linger. “But what of all of this, why should we stop here?” asks Catlin. “We travel to see the perishable, not the eternal” (207). Here applied to one of the grandest and oldest colonial cities of the Americas, the word “eternal”—employed by Hawthorne and numerous other writers of the nineteenth century as “the eternal city”—conjures comparisons to Rome. Catlin thereby equates the civilization originally founded by the Portuguese empire with the Roman Empire regarded in the west as the preeminent imperial civilization the world has known. American, British, French, Roman, and even Portuguese Empires ascend together to approximately equal footing in comparison to the savage. Although Catlin praises the eternal in the grand scheme of progress and empire, for the purpose of his voyage he favors the disappearing and the savage: “we travel to see the perishable and the perishing,” so “let us see them before they fall” (208). For Catlin, both as an ethnographer and more importantly a painter, Indians must not only be written about, and read about, but seen so that they may be documented in the form of image and text, preserved as a justification for the genocide that is a requisite of empire in the Americas.

In addition to uniting white empires in relation to indigenous Americans, Last Rambles extends The Marble Faun’s strategy of racially amalgamating Native
Americans and Africans. In doing so, Catlin transforms empire to conquer the indigenous other on a global level. As we saw in the beginning of this chapter, Catlin relied on the wood-blocks that the Payaguas and Botocudos wore in their lower lips to equate indigenous Americans with Livingstone’s Africans, who wore an “exactly similar” wood-block. Catlin builds on this strategy to equate British and American empires. “Now if,” wrote Catlin, “in my eccentric peregrinations, I should stumble on to a tribe . . . ingenious enough to have united the two—wearing a block in both the upper and the under-lip—what a beautiful and useful improvement it would be, and a wonderful addition to the honorable discoveries of my roving life” (217). Catlin’s hope to find a “wonderful” indigene who, through the use of the lip-block, combines racialized features of indigenous Native Americans and Africans functions as an imperial fantasy because in doing so, Catlin draws equivalence to American and British colonizers. In Catlin’s figuration, the dominion of white empire is not just an American conquest of Native Americans, nor the British conquest of Africans, but a global conquest against the dark indigenous other.

What appears at first glance to be a binary scheme becomes a triangular one when we shift our focus from the British, French, and American Empires to the Spanish Empire. Just as remnants of French and British colonization linger in Catlin’s description of North American Indians, the Spanish linger in his depiction of South America. Throughout Last Rambles, Indians wear clothing of “Spanish manufacture,” speak Spanish, or congregate about settlements that retain their Spanish names, like Santé Fe. But Catlin does not refrain from condemning Spanish imperialism. He
explicitly blames the Spanish Empire for the last “genius” of Native American civilization in South America. Catlin writes that the Indian’s last hopes for developing civilization was lost “when the inhuman onslaughts of civilized men, stimulated by the thirst for gold, set honesty . . . and Heaven itself at defiance, in extinguishing the last lights that were lifting these poor nations from savage darkness and ignorance” (306).

Catlin employs the myth of the vanishing Indian as a node in a triangle that creates difference between Spanish and American Empires. According to the myth of the vanishing Indian, which Catlin invokes in both Last Rambles and his previously published works, American Empire expands with the progress of civilization, replacing the Indians doomed to vanish due to their racial incompatibility with civilization. Spain, on the other hand, has committed “inhuman onslaughts” to prevent racially-capable Indians from the blessings of civilization. Catlin’s implication is simple: American is an empire of peace, Spain an empire of bloody conquest. Although the Spanish Empire had already lost its significant holdings in the Americas when Catlin wrote his memoir, it is perhaps significant that Spain retained dominion over the island of Cuba. James K. Polk had attempted to purchase the island as recently as 1848, and American imperialists would continue to covet the island long after the island achieved independence from Spain in 1898.

In this facet of his imperial logic, Catlin shares with David Livingstone more than just the inspiration for his sketches of Indian lip-blocks. Catlin and Livingstone used identical triangles to construct the identities of their respective white empires. But while Catlin traversed the Americas to preserve a record of an Indian race he believed
doomed to vanish, Livingstone travelled Africa as a Christian missionary to save the African race from savagism and slavery.\footnote{Livingstone’s travels in Africa and his influence on Victorian ideas of empire are well-chronicled in Andrew C. Ross, \textit{David Livingstone: Mission and Empire} (A&C Black, 2006). On British missionaries and the imperial project in Africa, see Andrew Porter, “Religion, Missionary Enthusiasm, and Empire,” in \textit{The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III: The Nineteenth Century} (London: OUP Oxford, 1999), 222–46.} As a staunch British imperialist, Livingstone employs binary structures of barbarism and civilization to produce hierarchies between white Britons and black Africans. Livingstone distinctly links savagism and civilization to white and Africans in racial terms. Writing on the causes of the recently-concluded U.S. Civil War, Livingstone opines that “the introduction of an inferior race from a barbarous country was a great mistake” (595). Livingstone justifies British imperialism through the benefits that it affords savage Africans. As he states in the preface of his \textit{Narrative}, Livingstone made his second expedition to Africa, supported by the British government and the Royal Geographical Society, not simply to explore the region, but to undertake “another attempt to open up Africa to civilizing influences” (v). Livingstone here portrays Africans as redeemable and who can advance from their savage state to coexist with civilization. Indeed, Livingstone declares he does not “believe in any incapacity of the African in mind or heart” (596). In this sense, Livingstone’s Africans bear a greater resemblance to Catlin’s South American Indians, since Catlin describes North American Indians as racially doomed to extinction.
Where Catlin triangulates his at-first-glance binary opposition through the Spanish Empire, Livingstone triangulates imperial difference through the Portuguese Empire. While the slave-trading Portuguese Empire often operates in the background of Livingstone’s *Narrative* as an implicit opposite to Britain’s beneficent Christian empire, Livingstone plainly addresses the Portuguese threat to Africans in his preface. Livingstone explains that he returned to East African not only to uplift the African race, but because he could not bear “abandon . . . Africa to the Portuguese and slave-trading” – which Livingstone designates “the curse of Africa” (iv). Livingstone rightly excoriates the Portuguese for their cruelty toward Africans. Yet other facets of his criticism focus on their failure as imperial administrators. For example, Livingstone writes that the “Portuguese pretence to dominion is the curse of the negro race” (x). In this statement, Livingstone does not even mention the slave-trade. Instead, he laments how the lack of effective Portuguese imperial authority damages the African race. “The main object of the Portuguese government is not geographical,” writes Livingstone, “It is to bolter up that pretence to power . . . that has been the only obstacle to the establishment of lawful commerce and friendly nations with the native inhabitants of Africa.” In another instance, Livingstone complains that “the Portuguese have little real authority—which perpetuates the barbarism of the inhabitants” (viii). In Livingstone’s estimation, even without their cruel slave-trade the Portuguese would denigrate the African race. Ineffective Portuguese imperial authority interferes with British imperial efforts to civilize and Christianize Africans. Thus, while Catlin justified American imperialism through triangulation with Native Americans and a bloody Spanish Empire,
Livingstone justifies British imperialism in Africa through contrasts to the damaging effects of Portuguese imperialism on the African race.

**The Persistent U.S. Empire**

Reading Hawthorne’s *The Marble Faun* and Catlin’s *Last Rambles* with an attention to their visual as well as textual representation emphasizes the continuity in the structures of U.S. identity between the colonial era and the mid-nineteenth century. Most studies of the representation of the Native Americans end either in the 1830’s, reasoning that with the beginning of Indian Removal, Native Americans posed a less immediate threat to Americans, or with the mid-1850’s, offering the assumption that at this time Americans turned their attention to issues over slavery and sectionalism. Based on this assumption, we might expect the U.S. Civil War to mark a dramatic shift in shape of U.S. Empire. However, the Civil War does not mark a change in structure, but a change of the triangular direction of U.S. racial discourse. The *Marble Faun* anticipates postbellum racial constructions by depicting likeness, rather than difference, between contemporary white European empires. Concurrently, the novel blurs the racial conventions typically employed by Americans in representing Africans and Native Americans as distinct races, and implicitly representing distinct racial problems for U.S. Empire. Nonetheless, Hawthorne maintains the triangular structures of colonial

---

antebellum empire by employing Rome as the imperial other of his contemporary white empires. Catlin builds on Hawthorne’s depiction of similarity between European and American Empires, and he constructs similarity between Native Americans and Africans through visual culture. Yet like Hawthorne, Catlin also relies on triangularity, this time through the Spanish Empire. In Catlin’s imperial formula, while the U.S. expanded into North American native space justified through the myth of the vanishing Indian, the Spanish built a South American empire by violently extinguishing an Indian race that could have been otherwise saved and raised from savagism to civilization.

On a structural level, then, Hawthorne, Catlin, and even Livingstone deploy racial/imperial triangles consistent with the representational schemes of Americans writing at the turn of the nineteenth-century. In 1813, for example, Thomas Jefferson complained in a letter to the Prussian naturalist and geographer Alexander Von Humbolt that the British imperial presence in North America thwarted American attempts to peacefully coexist with Native Americans. Much like Livingstone claimed that the British Empire could uplift Africans for their state of barbarism without Portuguese interference, or Catlin stated that South American Indians could have achieved civilization except for Spanish imperialism, Jefferson recalled to Humbolt the “benevolent plan” of U.S. Empire: “We spared nothing,” wrote Jefferson, “to teach them agriculture and the rudiments of the most necessary arts, and to encourage industry by establishing among them separate property” (1312). Yet, Jefferson continued
the interested and unprincipled policy of England has defeated all our labors for the salvation of these unfortunate people. They have seduced the greater part of the tribes within our neighborhood, to take up the hatchet against us, and the cruel massacres they have committed on the women and children of our frontiers taken by surprise, and will oblige us to now pursue their extermination, or drive them to new seats beyond our reach. (1313)

Jefferson claims to Humboldt that the U.S. Empire sought and would have been able to save Indians. But “now,” as a result of British imperial interference “will oblige” the U.S. to enact a genocidal policy.” Jefferson thereby blames the British Empire for American genocide toward Native Americans.

Once we have become attuned to their often subtle clues, we can see triangularity at times in textual representations, as in Jefferson’s letter to Van Humbolt. But increasingly throughout the nineteenth century, scholarly attention to purely textual representation too often results in an understanding of race and empire as operating through binary terms. As I have shown in this chapter, both Hawthorne and Catlin rely on the interplay of visual and textual representation to construct the racial triangularities that underlie their respective views on the sustainability of U.S. Empire. While Hawthorne employs the Roman Empire as a foil to question the ideals of American imperialism, Catlin’s Spanish Empire serves as the dark opposite that justifies U.S. Empire. Both British and American writers based their racial constructions on figures that blurred the difference between Native and African Americans as the dominant white national culture turned inward to maintain its identity through difference with Africans and Native Americans who were now geographically included within national boundaries, yet politically and culturally excluded as equal citizens with white
Americans. This innovation occurred at the same time that the United States established itself as the undisputed imperial power in North America.
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Hanson, Elizabeth. God’s Mercy Surmounting Man’s Cruelty, : Exemplified in the Captivity and Redemption of Elizabeth Hanson, Wife of John Hanson, of Knoxmarsh at Keacheachy, in Dover Township, Who Was Taken Captive with Her Children, and Maid-Servant, by the Indians in New-England, in the Year 1724. Philadelphia: Samuel Keimer and W. Heurtin, 1728.
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Thank you for ordering the image AN12379001 from the British Museum free image service, which is attached to this email.

Please note:

The image file size sent from this service may be up to 5 MB, which may cause problems if you are using dial-up internet access or if your email service has a limited attachment size or storage capacity.

Our original 'master' digital images vary in size and quality. If the image you have received is less than 2,500 pixels along the longest edge, by 1775 pixels along the shortest edge, it is because:

a) The original picture was smaller than 2,500 pixels (881mm) along the longest edge;

b) The original picture could not be scaled to the correct size without distortion;

If the image is not of high enough quality, we recommend you commission new photography, which will be of a guaranteed high quality. You can find out more about commissioning new photography here: http://www.britishmuseum.org/join_in/using_digital_images/commission_photography-1.aspx or contact sales@bmimages.com for more information.

If you have not received your image(s) within two working days, or if you receive the wrong image, or have any other enquiries, please contact the non-commercial image service, by emailing web@britishmuseum.org, with as much information about your order as possible.
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Order number FI-000820960

Thank you for ordering the image AN360952001 from the British Museum free image service, which is attached to this email.

Please note:

The image file size sent from this service may be up to 5 MB, which may cause problems if you are using dial-up internet access or if your email service has a limited attachment size or storage capacity.

Our original 'master' digital images vary in size and quality. If the image you have received is less than 2,500 pixels along the longest edge, by 1775 pixels along the shortest edge, it is because:

a) The original picture was smaller than 2,500 pixels (881mm) along the longest edge;

b) The original picture could not be scaled to the correct size without distortion;

If the image is not of high enough quality, we recommend you commission new photography, which will be of a guaranteed high quality. You can find out more about commissioning new photography here: http://www.britishmuseum.org/join_in/using_digital_images/commission_photography-1.aspx or contact sales@bmimages.com for more information.

If you have not received your image(s) within two working days, or if you receive the wrong image, or have any other enquiries, please contact the non-commercial image service, by emailing web@britishmuseum.org, with as much information about your order as possible.
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Thank you for ordering the image AN367118001 from the British Museum free image service, which is attached to this email.
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The image file size sent from this service may be up to 5 MB, which may cause problems if you are using dial-up internet access or if your email service has a limited attachment size or storage capacity.

Our original 'master' digital images vary in size and quality. If the image you have received is less than 2,500 pixels along the longest edge, by 1775 pixels along the shortest edge, it is because:

a) The original picture was smaller than 2,500 pixels (881mm) along the longest edge;

b) The original picture could not be scaled to the correct size without distortion;

If the image is not of high enough quality, we recommend you commission new photography, which will be of a guaranteed high quality. You can find out more about commissioning new photography here: http://www.britishmuseum.org/join_in/using_digital_images/commission_photography-1.aspx or contact sales@bmimages.com for more information.
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Thank you for ordering the image AN74503001 from the British Museum free image service, which is attached to this email.
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The image file size sent from this service may be up to 5 MB, which may cause problems if you are using dial-up internet access or if your email service has a limited attachment size or storage capacity.

Our original 'master' digital images vary in size and quality. If the image you have received is less than 2,500 pixels along the longest edge, by 1775 pixels along the shortest edge, it is because:

a) The original picture was smaller than 2,500 pixels (881mm) along the longest edge;

b) The original picture could not be scaled to the correct size without distortion;

If the image is not of high enough quality, we recommend you commission new photography, which will be of a guaranteed high quality. You can find out more about commissioning new photography here: http://www.britishmuseum.org/join_in/using_digital_images/commission_photography-1.aspx or contact sales@bmimages.com for more information.
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Terms and conditions

The attached image is released to you under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) license.

This license allows you to:

- **BY (Attribution):** copy, distribute, display and perform our copyrighted work – and derivative works based upon it – but only if you give us credit in the way we request: ©Trustees of the British Museum.

- **NC (NonCommercial):** copy, distribute, display, and perform our work – and derivative works based upon it – but for noncommercial purposes only.

- **SA (ShareAlike):** distribute derivative works only under a license identical to the license that governs our work.

Creative Commons defines commercial use as “reproducing a work in any manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or monetary compensation”.

For the avoidance of doubt, the British Museum considers the following to be commercial activities (this list is not exhaustive):

- anything that is in itself charged for, including textbooks and academic books or journals;

- an individual’s website or blog that is used as a platform to promote or conduct commercial activities (for example, to sell products created by or services provided by such individual);

- a commercial organization’s website or blog, including trading arms of charities;

- freely distributed leaflets or merchandise that promote goods or services;

- corporate stationary or any business communications such as annual reviews;

- free-entry events, presentations or lectures promoting a product or a service;

- displays in public places offering or promoting a product or service, such as use in a shop, restaurant, hotel, public bar or property show room.
Creative Commons defines commercial use as “reproducing a work in any manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or monetary compensation”.

The British Museum considers the following to be non-commercial activities (this list is not exhaustive):

- use in free-entry, educational lectures (or in activities promoting free-entry lectures);
- promotion of any non-commercial activity, such as a poster advertising a bursary;
- one-off classroom use;
- reproduction within a thesis document submitted by a student at an educational establishment (an electronic version of the thesis may be stored online by the educational establishment as long as it is made available at no cost of the end user);
- use in websites as long as they are informational, academic or research-oriented and not linked to any commercial activity;
- display within a free-entry public space (including museums and galleries), as long as the use is not promoting a product or a service.

In the event of any identified breach of our Standard terms of use we may take any appropriate action to constrain further use and/or seek financial recompense.

Read more about the British Museum and Creative Commons

Please note

The British Museum has made every effort to identify copyright holders of objects and to obtain permission to include images on the website. Any omissions are unintentional and we will endeavour to rectify these as soon as possible, once we are notified.

You are reminded that if a work of art, sculpture or work of artistic craftsmanship is still in the artist’s copyright (where for example the artist is still alive or has died within the last 70 years) you will need to obtain the additional permission of the artist or his or her estate or successor in title in order to reproduce the work. We are not able to help you in tracing artists or their successors in title. Some may be registered with DACS (www.dacs.org.uk).
Use of photograph of Crawford's _Progress of Civilization_

1 message

Paff, Eric <epaff@aoc.gov>  Wed, Apr 13, 2016 at 2:03 PM
To: "clayzuba@udel.edu" <clayzuba@udel.edu>

Dear Mr. Zuba:

If I understand your message correctly, you are seeking permission to publish a photograph that you, yourself, took.

The Architect of the Capitol has no control over the use of photographs that are not part of our agency's records, and the work of art is not copyrighted, so our permission is not necessary for the use that you describe--nor for any other.

I hope that this will be useful to you. Best wishes for the success of your dissertation and publication!

Eric Paff
Office of the Curator
Architect of the Capitol

-----Original Message-----

Submitted on Wednesday, April 13, 2016 - 13:31

First Name: Clay
Last Name: Zuba
Email: clayzuba@udel.edu
Phone Number: 512-431-7251
Subject Type: Research
Message:
Hello. I have taken a photograph of Thomas Crawford's Progress of Civilization while visiting the Capitol. I have been using the photograph for research for my dissertation in the department of English at the University of Delaware. I also have submitted the photograph as part of an article that has been accepted at the academic journal Studies in American Fiction.

My I have permission to publish a photograph of this sculpture as part of the filing requirements for my dissertation, as well as my research publication?

Thank you,

Clay Zuba
Hello,

I have been studying this print (image ID lwpr04040) as part of my dissertation.

The dissertation is now complete. May I have permission to publish in the dissertation as part of my filing requirements?

Thank you,

Clay Zuba
Doctoral Candidate
Department of English
University of Delaware

Dear Mr. Zuba,

Thank you for your inquiry about using an image from the Library's collection in your forthcoming dissertation. The images on the digital collection online are intended for study use only. We can supply a high resolution tiff which we will send electronically via a server, with a separate email providing a link to click on to download the image.

Because there is an existing publication-quality digital master, there is no cost for the image, and we do not charge a fee for use. Details of the Library's photoduplication policy and price list are available at: http://www.library.yale.edu/walpole/research/rights_reproductions.html.

The Library's statement on permission is as follows:

Permission to Publish. Provision of a photoduplicate is not an authorization to publish. The Library cannot grant or deny permission to publish texts or images unless Yale University is identified as the copyright holder. If the text or image in question is under copyright, permission to publish should be sought from the owners of the rights, typically the creator or the heirs to his or her estate. The Lewis Walpole Library should, however, be cited as the source with the following credit line: "Courtesy of
Because we do not hold the rights to the image, we cannot grant or deny permission to publish it. We leave it to you to determine its copyright status and who, if anyone by now, holds the rights. You may decide it is in the public domain by now, but we cannot make that assertion for you. Once you have the image we provide for publication, you should need nothing further from us.

I will post the image to the server. You can expect a separate email with a link to the image. Click on the link to download the tiff.

It will ask for a password, which is: lwl.

You will need to download and save the image locally as it remains on the server a limited time, typically ten days.

Please let me know when you have successfully retrieved the image, if you have any difficulties, or if you have further questions.

Best,

Kristen McDonald

Public Services
Lewis Walpole Library
Yale University
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I have been studying this print (image ID lwpr04040) as part of my dissertation.

The dissertation is now complete. May I have permission to publish in the dissertation as part of my filing requirements?
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Clay Zuba

Doctoral Candidate
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PUBLICATION PERMISSION CONTRACT

Please read the following terms and conditions before completing this form. Return complete form to the attention of Rights and Reproduction. Please remember to include payment.

Terms and Conditions

1. Credit Line shall read: The Library Company of Philadelphia. A credit line must appear next to each reproduction. **Failure to credit properly may result in refusal to grant future permissions.**

2. Permission is granted for **one-time use only.** The Library Company considers one-time use to be: the use of an item within a project where the format has not been altered and the original purpose for giving permission has not been changed. **Material may not be reused without the written permission of the Library Company.**

3. If images are used online, image size on Web site shall not exceed a maximum size of 1200 pixels width and/or height and should include the above credit line along with a hyperlink to the Library Company's Web site (www.librarycompany.org).

4. The fees for this order are listed on the next page as well as on the accompanying invoice. Payment in advance is required. Permission to publish is contingent on the receipt of these fees.

5. The Library Company requires 1 reference copy of the publication containing the item(s) reproduced. It is **not** necessary to provide a copy of the publication if the following space has been initialed.

6. This completed form will serve as official permission to reproduce Library Company materials. The Library Company does not, however, claim to own the rights of reproduction for all materials in its collections. The publishing party assumes all responsibility for clearing reproduction rights and for any infringement of the U.S. Copyright Code.
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The general p--s, or peace

Print shows five men, an Englishman, a Dutchman, a Native representing America, a Spaniard, and a Frenchman urinating into a pot. The Englishman says, "Say what they will, I call this an honourable P--", the Native says, "I call this a free and Independent P--", and the Frenchman says, "Jack English we confess your exceeding good nature, tho' we have wrangled you out of America you freely make P-- with us." Five swords, two drums, and the flags of the respective nations rest on the ground before the pot. Includes sixteen line of verse.

Created / Published
### Subject Headings
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- Peace–1780-1790
- International relations–1780-1790
- United States–History–Revolution, 1775-1783–Peace

### Format Headings
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### Notes
- Title from item.
- Forms part of: British Cartoon Prints Collection (Library of Congress).

### Medium
1 print : etching, hand-colored.

### Call Number/Physical Location
PC 3 - 1783–General P–s, or Peace (A size) [P&P]

### Repository
Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA

### Digital Id
- ppmsca 10740 [http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/ppmsca.10740](http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/ppmsca.10740)
- cph 3a05339 [http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/cph.3a05339](http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/cph.3a05339)

### Library of Congress Control Number
2004673512

### Reproduction Number
- LC-DIG-ppmsca-10740 (digital file from original)
- LC-USZ62-1548 (b&w film copy neg.)

### Rights Advisory
No known restrictions on publication.

### LCCN Permalink
[https://lccn.loc.gov/2004673512](https://lccn.loc.gov/2004673512)

### Library of Congress Online Catalog
[https://catalog.loc.gov/vwebv/search?searchCode=STNO&searchArg=2004673512&searchType=1&recCount=10](https://catalog.loc.gov/vwebv/search?searchCode=STNO&searchArg=2004673512&searchType=1&recCount=10)

### Additional Metadata Formats
- MARCXML Record
- MODS Record
- Dublin Core Record

### Rights & Access

### Cite This Item

### More photos, prints, drawings like this

- Peace porridge all hot - the best to be got
- A petitioning, remonstrating, reforming, republican
- The Englishman in Paris
  - 1 print : etching. | Print shows an Englishman, only recently
- The belligerent plenipo's
  - 1 print : etching, hand-colored ; 25.7 x 36.2 cm (sheet) | Cartoon shows America, on the right,
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**By the United States in Congress assembled, a proclamation:** Whereas definitive articles of peace and ... Signed: Given under the seal of the United States, witness His Excellency Thomas Mifflin, our president, at Annapolis, this fourteenth day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven ... **The United States in Congress assembled, to all who shall these presents greeting:** Whereas in ... Includes the text of the treaty. Signed: In testimony whereof, we have caused our seal to be hereunto affixed. Witness His Excellency Elias Boudinot, president, this fifteenth day of April, one thousand ... **Today in history. January 14** Catalog Record - Electronic Resource Available Provides information on the ratification of the Treaty of Paris on January 14, 1784, officially establishing the United States as an independent and sovereign nation. **Today in history. April 15** Catalog Record - Electronic Resource Available Brief discussion of the ratification of preliminary articles of peace on April 15, 1783 by the U.S. Continental Congress, ending the Revolutionary War with Great Britain. Additional discussion of events leading up ...
Poor old England endeavoring to reclaim his wicked American children

Title: Poor old England endeavoring to reclaim his wicked American children
Creator(s): Darly, Matthew, active 1741-1780, publisher
Date Created/Published: [London] : Pub. by M. Darly 39 Strand, 1777 Apr.
Medium: 1 print : etching ; plate 24.6 x 35.2 cm, on sheet 27.6 x 38.3 cm.
Summary: Print shows England as an old man with wooden leg and crutch tugging on strings hooked onto the noses of five American men across a divide labeled "The Atlantic Ocean"; the men resist, shoot pellets at, and taunt old England. Includes a quote attributed to Shakespeare, "And therefore is England maimed & forc'd to go with a staff".
Reproduction Number: LC-DIG-ppmsca-40235 (digital file from original print) LC-USZ62-34862 (b&w film copy neg.)
Rights Advisory: No known restrictions on publication.
Call Number: PC 1 - 5397 (A size) [P&P]
Repository: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA
http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/pp.print
Notes:
- Title from item.
- Catalogue of prints and drawings in the British Museum. Division I, political and personal satires, v. 5, no. 5397
- Forms part of: British Cartoon Prints Collection (Library of Congress).
Subjects:
- United States--History--Revolution, 1775-1783.
- Politics & government--England--1770-1780.
- Interpersonal relations--1770-1780.
- Fathers & children--1770-1780.
Format:
- Cartoons (Commentary)--British--1770-1780.
- Etchings--British--1770-1780.
Collections:
- Cartoon Prints, British
Bookmark This Record:
http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/2004673329/

View the MARC Record for this item.

Rights assessment is your responsibility.
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The tragical death of Miss McCrea in the year 1777, near Fort Edward in Washington County, N.Y.
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RIGHTS STATEMENT

We believe that this item has no known US copyright restrictions. The item may be subject to rights of privacy, rights of publicity and other restrictions. Though not required, if you want to credit us as the source, please use the following statement, "From The New York Public Library," and provide a link back to the item on our Digital Collections site. Doing so helps us track how our collection is used and helps justify freely releasing even more content in the future.
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Hello Clay Zuba

The information below should answer all of your questions, if not, please don't hesitate to email me for clarification.

Best regards,

Jamie Roberts
Rare Books and Special Collections Division
Library of Congress

RIGHT OF REPRODUCTION FEE
We do not charge for a 'right of reproduction fee' or 'permission fee' as it is sometimes called. If you would like to reproduce an image that you received from us, there is no charge.

PERMISSIONS
If you already have an image of ours, or you can get it elsewhere, you will not need to notify us when using the image.
You do not need permission from the Library of Congress to publish.
The Library does not give or deny permission to publish or otherwise distribute material in its collections.

CREDIT LINE
We do ask, if you have not manipulated the image beyond recognition, that you include a credit line. If the intent is to use the image for reasons beyond personal research and/or school projects, we would request that the Library of Congress be credited as the source.

Please credit us as:
Rare Books and Special Collections Division of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

[If the item is part of a special collection please name the special collection]
Rosenwald Collection, Rare Books and Special Collections Division of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

COPYRIGHT
Works first published in the United States before 1923, and foreign works before 1909, are in the public domain and are outside of copyright. You can publish these works without investigating further. To learn more about copyright or request the copyright status of a piece (fee based search associated for items before 1980) please see this page:
http://www.copyright.gov

Library of Congress guides, timelines and other educational material available on our websites is in the public domain.

DUPLICATION SERVICES
If you need to obtain an image from the library, film or digital, there will be a reproduction fee. Please know the exact information that you would like reproduced and send your request to Duplication Services http://www.loc.gov/preserv/pds; here you can also find a summary of their services.

If a satisfactory image is available on our website please feel free to download this at no cost.

Please take a moment to fill out a survey at: http://www.questionpoint.org/crs/servlet/org.oclc.ask.PatronSurveyForm?&language=1&type=ask&qid=11322844

Question History:

Patron: Some time ago I took a photograph of the frontispiece illustration to AP2.A2 The American Magazine and Monthly Chronicle
For purposes of research for my doctoral dissertation in the department of English and the University of Delaware

I am now ready to file the dissertation. May I have permission to reproduce the photograph for publishing in my dissertation?

Librarian 1: The information below should answer all of your questions, if not, please don't hesitate to email me for clarification.

Best regards,

Jamie Roberts
Rare Books and Special Collections Division
Library of Congress

RIGHT OF REPRODUCTION FEE
We do not charge for a 'right of reproduction fee' or 'permission fee' as it is sometimes called. If you would like to reproduce an image that you received from us, there is no charge.

PERMISSIONS
If you already have an image of ours, or you can get it elsewhere, you will not need to notify us when using the image.
You do not need permission from the Library of Congress to publish.
The Library does not give or deny permission to publish or otherwise distribute material in its collections.

CREDIT LINE
We do ask, if you have not manipulated the image beyond recognition, that you include a credit line. If the intent is to use the image for reasons beyond personal research and/or school projects, we would request that the Library of Congress be credited as the source.

Please credit us as:
Rare Books and Special Collections Division of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

[If the item is part of a special collection please name the special collection]
Rosenwald Collection, Rare Books and Special Collections Division of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

COPYRIGHT
Works first published in the United States before 1923, and foreign works before 1909, are in the public domain and are outside of copyright. You can publish these works without investigating further. To learn more about copyright or request the copyright status of a piece (fee based search associated for items before 1980) please see this page:
http://www.copyright.gov
Library of Congress guides, timelines and other educational material available on our websites is in the public domain.

DUPLICATION SERVICES
If you need to obtain an image from the library, film or digital, there will be a reproduction fee. Please know the exact information that you would like reproduced and send your request to Duplication Services http://www.loc.gov/preserv/pds; here you can also find a summary of their services.

If a satisfactory image is available on our website please feel free to download this at no cost.
To whom it may concern,

Several years ago I took a photograph of Vanderlyn's Death of Jane Mccrea while at the Wadsworth Atheneum, as part of research for my doctoral dissertation.

May I have permission to publish a photograph of this painting as part of the requirements for filing my dissertation?

Thank you,

Clay Zuba
Doctoral Candidate
Department of English
University of Delaware.

It is approved.

Stacey Stachow
Manager of the Museum Shop
Rights and Reproductions Coordinator
From: Clayton Zuba [mailto:clayzuba@udel.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 10:43 AM
To: Rights Repro
Subject: death of Jane McCrea
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