

NINETEENTH-CENTURY
AMERICAN LITERATURE
AND THE LONG CIVIL WAR



CODY MARRS

NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICAN LITERATURE AND THE LONG CIVIL WAR

American literature in the nineteenth century is often divided into two halves, neatly separated by the Civil War. In *Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Long Civil War*, Cody Marris argues that the war is a far more elastic boundary for literary history than has frequently been assumed. Focusing on the later writings of Walt Whitman, Frederick Douglass, Herman Melville, and Emily Dickinson, this book shows how the war took imaginative shape across, and even beyond, the nineteenth century, inflecting literary forms and expressions for decades after 1865. These writers, Marris demonstrates, are best understood not as antebellum or postbellum figures but as transbellum authors who cipher their later experiences through their wartime impressions and prewar ideals. This book is a bold, revisionary contribution to debates about temporality, periodization, and the shape of American literary history.

CODY MARRS teaches English at the University of Georgia.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN AMERICAN
LITERATURE AND CULTURE

Editor

Ross Posnock, *Columbia University*

Founding Editor

Albert Gelpi, *Stanford University*

Advisory Board

Alfred Bendixen, *Texas A&M University*

Wai Chee Dimock, *Yale University*

Walter Benn Michaels, *University of Illinois, Chicago*

Kenneth Warren, *University of Chicago*

Branka Arsić, *Columbia University*

RECENT BOOKS IN THIS SERIES

175. CINDY WEINSTEIN
Time, Tense, and American Literature: When Is Now?
174. CODY MARRS
Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Long Civil War
173. STACEY MARGOLIS
Fictions of Mass Democracy in Nineteenth-Century America
172. PAUL DOWNES
Hobbes, Sovereignty, and Early American Literature
171. MARK NOBLE
American Poetic Materialism from Whitman to Stevens
170. JOANNA FREER
Thomas Pynchon and American Counterculture
169. DOMINIC MASTROIANNI
Politics and Skepticism in Antebellum American Literature
168. GAVIN JONES
Failure and the American Writer: A Literary History
167. LENA HILL
Visualizing Blackness and the Creation of the African American Literary Tradition
166. MICHAEL ZISER
Environmental Practice and Early American Literature

(continued following the Index)

NINETEENTH-CENTURY
AMERICAN LITERATURE
AND THE LONG
CIVIL WAR

CODY MARRS

University of Georgia



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107109834

© Cody Marris 2015

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

First published 2015

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Marris, Cody.

Nineteenth-century American literature and the long Civil War /
Cody Marris, University of Georgia.
pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-10983-4 (hardback)

1. American literature – 19th century – History and criticism. 2. United States – History – Civil War, 1861–1865 – Literature and the war. 3. War and literature – United States – History – 19th century. 4. War in literature. I. Title.

PS217.C58M37 2015

810.9'358–dc23 2015003105

ISBN 978-1-107-10983-4 Hardback

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

For Kristin, Harper, and Caleb

Contents

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> x
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
Introduction: Transbellum American Literature	i
1. Walt Whitman's Dialectics	23
2. Frederick Douglass's Revisions	59
3. Herman Melville's Civil Wars	90
4. Emily Dickinson's Erasures	122
Coda: Other Nineteenth Centuries	153
<i>Notes</i>	159
<i>Index</i>	189

Illustrations

1. Title page of <i>Leaves of Grass</i> (1860)	<i>page 46</i>
2. “The Great Strike – The Sixth Maryland Regiment fighting its way through Baltimore” (1877)	53
3. <i>Portrait of William I</i> (1582–1592)	79
4. William T. Sherman, “Statement of Casualties” (1892)	88
5. J. M. W. Turner, <i>The Fighting “Temeraire”</i> (1838)	102
6. James F. Gibson, “Deck and Turret of the U.S.S. <i>Monitor</i> ” (1862)	103
7. Frederic Edwin Church, <i>The Parthenon</i> (1871)	119
8. Page from Richard S. Fisher’s <i>Chronological History of the Civil War in America</i> (1863)	133
9. Emily Dickinson, “Not knowing when the Dawn will come”	149

Acknowledgments

In almost countless ways, this book is the result of other people's generosity. At UC Berkeley, where this project first took root, Sam Otter guided me with such wisdom and care, I hardly know how to thank him. The following pages owe a great deal to Sam's intellect, wit, and encouragement to write – even in this day and age – about authorial careers. I'm also grateful for the many people at Berkeley who made life as a graduate student there far richer than it had any right to be: Malik Ali, Aaron Bady, Stephen Best, Munia Bhaumik, Natalia Cecire, Paul Hurh, Marisa Palacios Knox, Colleen Lye, Ted Martin, Annie McClanahan, Megan Pugh, Swati Rana, Scott Saul, Randall Smith, and Bryan Wagner.

I wrote most of this book after moving to Athens. At the University of Georgia, I've been fortunate to work with several people who are friends as well as colleagues. Doug Anderson's sagacity and friendship have been utterly crucial to me, and to this book. To Casie LeGette, Brett Szymik, Aaron Santesso, and Esra Santesso: thank you for all the late-night deserts; I don't know what I'd do without you. I'm also grateful for my exceptional colleagues who make Park Hall everything that it is: Nicholas Allen, Michelle Ballif, Cynthia Turner Camp, Nathan Camp, Roxanne Eberle, Miriam Jacobson, Tricia Lootens, John Lowe, Barbara McCaskill, Richard Menke, Ron Miller, Adam Parkes, Ed Pavlic, Christopher Pizzino, Jed Rasula, Channette Romero, Susan Rosenbaum, Hugh Ruppensburg, Chloe Wigston Smith, Andrew Zawacki, and Maggie Zurawski.

This book was supported by fellowships and grants from the Willson Center for the Humanities, the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Newberry Library, and, at an earlier stage, the Townsend Center for the Humanities. Those funds provided me with the time and opportunity to write the following pages. I am also indebted to the editors who allowed me to reprint two earlier essays, and to the anonymous readers who responded to those essays. Parts of [Chapter 1](#) first appeared in *Arizona Quarterly* 67.1 (Spring 2011), pgs. 47–72, under the title “Whitman's

Latencies: Hegel and the Politics of Time in *Leaves of Grass*.” It is reprinted here by permission of the Regents of The University of Arizona. Parts of [Chapter 3](#) first appeared in *American Literature* 82.1 (March 2010), pgs. 91–119, under the title “A Wayward Art: *Battle-Pieces* and Melville’s Poetic Turn.” It is reprinted here by permission of the publisher, Duke University Press.

This book also owes much to my fellow Americanists scattered around the globe, in the intellectual archipelagoes that make up our scholarly world. Philip Barnard and Dorice Williams Elliott first showed me how to read closely and widely. My collaborations with Christopher Hager, both past and present, have shaped this book and enriched my life. *Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Long Civil War* is in many respects but a long-winded “thank you” to Chris. Coleman Hutchison, who was one of my readers, provided a brilliant response that has strengthened and sharpened my arguments; and another reader, whom I don’t know, provided incisive feedback for which I’m grateful. The later parts of [Chapter 3](#) grew out of a talk I gave at Emory University. For that, I owe a hearty thanks to Munia Bhaumik, Michael Elliott, Michael Moon, and Benjamin Reiss. Ian Finseth and Eliza Richards also responded to early, embryonic parts of this book, and their thoughts have anchored my own. I’ve also benefited, in one way or another, from the intelligence, kindness, and camaraderie of scholars far and wide. People like John Bryant, Kathleen Diffley, Betsy Erkkila, Jennifer Greiman, Jeffrey Insko, Michael Jonik, Robert S. Levine, Timothy Marr, Justine Murison, Michelle Neely, Basem Ra’ad, Matthew Reborn, Julia Stern, Ivy Wilson, and Brian Yothers make me feel lucky to be part of this profession. I also want to thank Ray Ryan and Ross Posnock for their enthusiastic support of this project, and Caitlin Gallagher, who has skillfully guided me through the production process.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank my family for all that they have given me, and for all that they continue to give. My parents, Betty and Monte, encouraged me to dream, read, and write, even when it seemed incredibly impractical. My extended family – Jay, Kim, Don, and Lynda – have been unfailingly kind and bighearted. But I owe a special thanks, one that I cannot even begin to put into words, to Kristin, Harper, and Caleb, to whom this book is dedicated. You – each of you – are my world and my cosmos. Anything worth doing must be done with love, and I have that in spectacular abundance, thanks to you.

Introduction
Transbellum American Literature

The Civil War occupies a rather strange place in the periodic imaginary of American literary studies. On the one hand, it is frequently taken to be the defining event of the nineteenth century – a cataclysm so vast and transformative that it destroys one literary period and spawns another. Much of the field is organized around the idea that because of the war’s annulling force, the century must be separated into two distinct and largely asymmetrical eras: antebellum and postbellum; before and after. This view of the war is reiterated at nearly every level of the discipline: in survey courses, which frequently begin or end at 1865; in monographs, which tend to situate themselves on either side of this grand divide; in numerous anthologies, overviews, and companions; and in the training of graduate students and the hiring of faculty. On the other hand, the Civil War is also routinely marginalized in the very field that so vigorously foregrounds its influence. It often enters the curriculum only on the tail end of courses. It receives far less attention from literary critics than the eras that surround it.¹ And strange as it may seem, the war is deemphasized by the periodizing practices that are specifically designed to acknowledge its impact. Indeed, if the nineteenth century consists in a passage from the antebellum to the postbellum, then the war is essentially an antiperiod, a transition that matters only to the extent that it demarcates what precedes and follows it. The conflict that Robert Penn Warren once called “our only ‘felt’ history” thus functions, oftentimes, as a constitutive absence in American literary history or, at best, as the occasion for a minor literature that emerged between two great eras.²

The Civil War’s paradoxical status – as both the structural pivot and the empty center of the nineteenth century – is part of the genealogical inheritance of our periodic terms. When “ante-bellum” and “post-bellum” entered the American vernacular in the 1860s and 1870s, the words were often hyphenated and italicized because they were linguistic imports from international law. *Ante-bellum* and *post-bellum* initially functioned

as shorthand versions of longer phrases: the *status quo ante bellum* (i.e., “the state before the war”) and the *status quo post bellum* (i.e., “the state after the war”), which, in treaties between warring states, were forms of resolution wherein all the newly acquired property and territory were returned or all prewar claims of ownership were renounced.³ *Antebellum* and *postbellum* treaties thereby promoted fictions of erasure that enabled both sides to pretend either that the war had never really happened, or that history began anew with its completion. We now enlist these terms in radically different ways – as the names for discrete, overarching epochs – but “antebellum” and “postbellum” still depend on a peculiar coupling of retrospection and effacement that enables these eras to be imagined into being only by cutting out the very terminus that makes them historically distinct.

These fraught periodic categories are problematic in other ways, too. By framing literary history as an adjunct, or corollary, of national history, they contravene recent attempts to decouple literature from the state. They also bolster terms like “the antebellum novel” and “postbellum poetry,” which, despite their almost axiomatic status, are remarkably poor descriptors, often functioning as placeholders for other, less epochally-bound frameworks. And as anyone who has taught a survey course knows all too well, the bellum divide also generates a weird set of curricular challenges. If a course is cut off at the war, how does one justify including a book like Frederick Douglass’s *The Life and Times* (1881/1892), which, despite being composed by an “antebellum” author, was written decades after that era concluded? What does one do with intergenerational writers, like Rebecca Harding Davis and Harriet Prescott Spofford, whose careers climaxed in the midst of the war but are not typically considered to be wartime authors? And how does one even begin to properly attend to books such as *Clotel*, which was initially published in 1853 but revised on three different occasions through 1867, or *Leaves of Grass*, which was published in 1855 but significantly rewritten by Whitman, again and again, through 1891?

There are a number of ways in which literary history can be remapped without this sharp partitioning. In recent years, scholars have shifted the field’s focus toward a “long nineteenth century,” which jettisons traditional microperiods in favor of an expanded scale of analysis that stretches back to the eighteenth century and into the twentieth. Other critics have eschewed the Civil War almost altogether and recast the struggle not as the defining event of the era but as merely one event among many others – an option favored by many books that focus

on nineteenth-century literature but have little to say about the Civil War. Both approaches have a great deal to recommend them: they draw attention to literary, cultural, and political phenomena that span several generations, and they reveal turning-points that have nothing to do with violence and war (a rare feat when it comes to periodization). Yet reading nineteenth-century literature either solely or primarily in terms of continuity risks overlooking the various ways in which that literature is indeed bound up with the Civil War – not in a linear or sequential fashion, as implied by the ante/postbellum divide, but bound up nonetheless.

This book argues for a different periodization, by looking at the Civil War as a multilinear upheaval. As an event within literary history, the war manifests not as a discrete instance of overturning but as a rupture with a stunning array of trajectories, genealogies, and afterlives. The Civil War's complex periodicity is especially evident when we read authors who not only survived the war but also wrote voluminously for decades after it. I focus on four of these writers: Walt Whitman, Frederick Douglass, Herman Melville, and Emily Dickinson. Although they are usually read as antebellum figures, these authors wrote through the Civil War and through most of the rest of the nineteenth century, often by ciphering their postwar experiences through their wartime impressions and prewar ideals. Their writings are therefore chiefly legible, I shall argue, as part of a *transbellum* literature that stretches (as the etymology implies) across and beyond the war itself.

By “transbellum,” I refer to three different phenomena, which both individually and collectively index the Civil War's periodic fluidity. First, transbellum names the ways in which these writers' careers extend from the “antebellum” period, across the Civil War, and into the “postbellum” era, thereby bridging the very epochs into which American literary history tends to be segmented. It is, in this sense, a marker of this literature's multiperiodicity. Second, transbellum refers to a shared tendency to repeatedly return to the Civil War as a literary, historical, and philosophical subject long after it officially concluded. As such, it draws attention to just how continuous the war's discontinuity was as it unfolded across the century as an unresolved imaginative struggle. And, third, transbellum designates the myriad ways in which these writers recast the historicity of that conflict, often in terms that differ, quite radically, from our tendency to confine it to the period from 1861 to 1865.

Retiming the Civil War

The following pages approach the Civil War as a nonsynchronous upheaval – as a boundary, in short, that is much blurrier, and more heterogeneously constituted, than has often been assumed.⁴ I begin, in [Chapter 1](#), with Walt Whitman, who became enamored with Hegel’s philosophy of history in the wake of the war. After reading Hegel (whom he declared to be the only philosopher “fit for America”), Whitman made substantial changes to *Leaves of Grass* and *Drum-Taps*, experimenting with new syntactic forms and methods of poetic organization.⁵ These changes, I argue, enable Whitman to engage in rich and provocative ways with the defining struggles of the late nineteenth century, especially the conflicts between workers and capitalists in the 1870s and 1880s. [Chapter 2](#) examines the transbellum writings of America’s most famous former slave, Frederick Douglass. According to Douglass, the Abolition War (as he preferred to call it) was but a moment, or phase, in a much longer “irrepressible conflict” between freedom and unfreedom.⁶ To test that idea out, he turns to theories of perpetual motion, histories of revolution, and philosophies of progress. His later speeches, essays, and autobiographies accordingly refer to a broad range of events – from sixteenth-century religious battles to nineteenth-century scientific discoveries – but they all shore up a single supposition, which he wrested from the war: that history, like everything else in this world, is immanently revisable.

[Chapter 3](#) focuses on Herman Melville, who construes the war as part of a long cycle of internecine conflict. As Melville represents it in *Battle-Pieces* (1866), *Clarel* (1876), and *Timoleon* (1891), the Civil War repeats events that have already been repeated many times before in Europe and the Holy Land. *Battle-Pieces* elucidates this historical pattern by connecting the Civil War’s defining moments – such as the draft riots of 1863 and the fights between ironclads – to ancient Roman rebellions, medieval French revolts, and other analogous instances of civil strife; while *Clarel* and *Timoleon* loosen and expand this pattern by locating similar civil wars in the earth, in the world’s religions, and in the very structure of the cosmos. The war’s historicity then recedes almost entirely in [Chapter 4](#), which considers the poems that Emily Dickinson wrote from the 1860s through the 1880s. Dickinson represents the conflict as a vast undoing that is unmoored from chronology itself. Many of her poems are shot through with moments of erasure because, for her, such fading away is the Civil War’s defining temporality. Unlike these other transbellum

writers, Dickinson figures the conflict as a repealing of history – as an annulment that can certainly be felt, but never adequately remembered because it exceeds all of our earthly chronometrics.

As we will discover, the Civil War was an ongoing imaginative conflict across much of the nineteenth century. Or more accurately: it was a struggle that had to be continuously *reimagined*, and that is precisely what these authors did by folding the war into a raucous variety of literary timescapes. Despite the patent heterogeneity of these transbellum works – from Douglass’s lectures about William of Orange to Dickinson’s later poems about “Dimpled War[s]” and “finished Faces” – they each attempt to do the impossible: to secure a cogent temporality for this long, chaotic upheaval.⁷ This book thereby extends the work of such scholars as Faith Barrett, Kathleen Diffley, Randall Fuller, Coleman Hutchison, Shirley Samuels, and Julia Stern, who have made a strong case for reading Civil War literature as an essential part of, rather than a violent departure from, the development of nineteenth-century United States culture.⁸ In the following pages, I make that same argument from a different perspective by looking at the Civil War’s transbellum influence on these purportedly antebellum writers, who try to track the war’s almost untrackable history long after the fall of Richmond. And by doing so, these authors provide us with a number of rich, alternative timelines through which the war itself can be reread and replotted.

These writers’ sustained efforts to figure the war underscore one of the foremost insights of recent Americanist scholarship: that literature’s irregular temporalities tend to disrupt the timeframes of the clock and the nation. As several critics have demonstrated, the standardization of time in the nineteenth century – which made temporality increasingly homogeneous and measurable – was accompanied by a literature that, instead of merely archiving that transformation, actively troubled it. To account for literature’s nonstandard temporalities, scholars have fashioned a robust set of interpretive models. Wai Chee Dimock has argued for a hermeneutic of deep time that is attuned to literature’s “irregular duration[s] and extension[s].” Elizabeth Freeman has shown us how queer time emerged, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as a kind of “arrhythmia” between “sacred, static ‘women’s’ time and [the] secularized, progressive, nominally male national-historical time.” Still other critics have examined the pluridimensionality of literature’s “vehement passions”; the material and textual creation of “heterogeneous temporal cultures”; and the feeling body’s ability to provide an “alternative mechanism for the collection of time.”⁹

The following pages both expand on and depart from this scholarship on temporality. On the one hand, *Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Long Civil War* extends many of the principal claims that have emerged out of this work: that time was a crucial modality of nineteenth-century political struggles; that literature played an important role in the imaginative construction of this chronopolitics; and that the temporalities enacted in literature tend to be remarkably diverse in their composition and movement. These writers' responses to the Long Civil War, we shall see, are both fueled by and structured around an abiding interest in the politics of time. They each figure that struggle in very different ways – as a revolution, or counterrevolution, or historical erasure – but they all present the war as an event that outstrips the discrete, four-year span with which it is often associated. And to understand how the war eclipses its official chronology, I turn to a different and frequently overlooked archive for thinking about time, politics, and periodicity in the nineteenth century: the less canonical works of highly canonical writers.

This author-centered focus, however, also distinguishes this book from many of its temporally-oriented companions. In studies of nineteenth-century time and literature, the analytical object is almost always a material culture, social practice, or literary genre, the defining temporalities of which point toward broader epistemic shifts in national or subnational identity. In studies of periodization (and its limits), critics often scale out, as it were, in order to reveal vast new swaths of historical time and loosened hermeneutic frameworks. These approaches have reorganized the field and yielded a stunning array of insights. Nonetheless, construing literature's temporalities primarily as evidence of discursive formations that have little to do with individual writers risks losing sight of the temporalities that hinge on the idea of authorship: the patterns that emerge across a writer's works; the timescapes that an author actively – and sometimes quite self-reflexively – assembles out of a culture's materials; and the transformations to a writer's worldview that can begin with something as simple as reading a book, or as complicated as witnessing a war. These more authorial temporalities do not require a full-scale retrieval of biography, but they do oblige us to think more rigorously about the applicability of some of this criticism's key terms – such as scaling and timing – to considerations of individual writers, and about the resources that disciplinary forms of inquiry might, in turn, bring to bear on areas of scholarship that are frequently framed as interdisciplinary, or even antidisdisciplinary. These chapters are designed to address these concerns by looking afresh at the later works of these four transbellum authors.

Canons and Periods

Many other writers, texts, and movements could easily be described as transbellum. Harriet Beecher Stowe, whose novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) became such a cultural sensation before the Civil War, wrote for more than 30 years after the conflict, producing seven more novels, a book of poems, and a study of women in "sacred history." Those lions of prewar literature, the Transcendentalists, also wrote prolifically after 1865. In the wake of the war, Amos Bronson Alcott penned two books of philosophy, two volumes of poetry, and a biography; Ralph Waldo Emerson issued two more essay collections and a book of poems; and Emerson's former-associate-turned-apostate, Orestes Brownson, published so widely that when his articles were anthologized in the 1880s, it required twenty volumes to contain them.

One finds that same unyielding production among many African American writers. After the fall of the Confederacy, Martin Delany followed up his earlier antislavery writings with pamphlets for the newly freed slaves, a work of antiracist ethnography, and essays on Reconstruction. William Wells Brown not only continued to revise *Clotel*; he also wrote three books on African American history and a series of sketches about late-nineteenth-century Southern society. And slave narratives, despite their longstanding status as an antebellum genre, continued to be composed and revised into the twentieth century. In fact, more than ninety slave narratives were printed after emancipation.¹⁰

There is also a markedly transbellum trajectory for other types of Civil War literature. From the 1860s onward, journals and magazines throughout the United States published hundreds of fictional stories about the Civil War – more than 300 by Kathleen Diffley's count – by writers both well known (such as Louisa May Alcott and Silas Weir Mitchell) and obscure (such as Ellen Leonard and J.O. Culver). Many of the songs sung by soldiers and civilians alike continued to be sung for decades afterwards, at once shaping and preserving the conflict in Americans' cultural memory. Many Union and Confederate veterans also penned accounts of their experiences in the late nineteenth century. Memoirists included well-known generals such as Ulysses S. Grant and James Longstreet, as well as infamous captains (John Singleton Mosby), blockade runners (William Watson), bushwackers (Samuel S. Hildebrand), reefers (James Morris Morgan), spies (Allan Pinkerton), and confused privates (Mark Twain).¹¹ That collective attempt to create a usable and readable past for the struggle also generated a stunning array of other texts, including – though hardly