


*WOMEN  
WRITERS  
and the  
ENGLISH  
NATION  
in the 1790s*

ANGELA KEANE

WOMEN WRITERS AND THE  
ENGLISH NATION IN THE 1790s

*Romantic Belongings*

ANGELA KEANE



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK    www.cup.cam.ac.uk  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA    www.cup.org  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia  
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Angela Keane 2000

This book 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 2000

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Baskerville 11/12.5pt [vN]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Keane, Angela.

Women writers and the English nation in the 1790s: romantic belongings / Angela Keane.

p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in Romanticism)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 77342 3 (hardback)

1. English literature – Women authors – History and criticism.    2. English literature – 18th century – History and criticism.    3. Women and literature – England – History – 18th century.    4. Romanticism – England – History – 18th century.    5. Politics and literature – England – History – 18th century.    6. Nationalism in literature.    I. Title.    II. Series.

PR448.W65 K43 2001

820.9'9287'09033 – dc21    00-028929

ISBN 0 521 77342 3 hardback

Angela Keane addresses the work of five women writers of the 1790s and its problematic relationship with the canon of Romantic literature. Refining arguments that women's writing has been overlooked, Keane examines the more complex underpinnings and exclusionary effects of the English national literary tradition. The book explores the negotiations of literate, middle-class women such as Hannah More, Mary Wollstonecraft, Charlotte Smith, Helen Maria Williams and Ann Radcliffe with emergent ideas of national literary representation. As women were cast into the feminine, maternal role in Romantic national discourse, women like these who defined themselves in other terms found themselves exiled – sometimes literally – from the nation. These wandering women did not rest easily in the family-romance of Romantic nationalism nor could they be reconciled with the models of literary authorship that emerged in the 1790s.

ANGELA KEANE is Lecturer in English Literature at the University of Sheffield. She is co-editor, with Avril Horner of *Body Matters: Feminism, Textuality, Corporeality* (1999) and the author of many articles on women and Romanticism.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN ROMANTICISM 44

WOMEN WRITERS AND THE ENGLISH  
NATION IN THE 1790s

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN ROMANTICISM 44

*General editors*

Professor Marilyn Butler  
*University of Oxford*

Professor James Chandler  
*University of Chicago*

*Editorial board*

John Barrell, *University of York*  
Paul Hamilton, *University of London*  
Mary Jacobus, *Cornell University*  
Kenneth Johnston, *Indiana University*  
Alan Liu, *University of California, Santa Barbara*  
Jerome McGann, *University of Virginia*  
David Simpson, *University of California, Davis*

This series aims to foster the best new work in one of the most challenging fields within English literary studies. From the early 1780s to the early 1830s a formidable array of talented men and women took to literary composition, not just in poetry, which some of them famously transformed, but in many modes of writing. The expansion of publishing created new opportunities for writers, and the political stakes of what they wrote were raised again by what Wordsworth called those 'great national events' that were 'almost daily taking place': the French Revolution, the Napoleonic and American wars, urbanisation, industrialisation, religious revival, an expanded empire abroad and the reform movement at home. This was an enormous ambition, even when it pretended otherwise. The relations between science, philosophy, religion and literature were reworked in texts such as *Frankenstein* and *Biographia Literaria*; gender relations in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* and *Don Juan*; journalism by Cobbett and Hazlitt; poetic form, content and style by the Lake School and the Cockney School. Outside Shakespeare studies, probably no body of writing has produced such a wealth of response or done so much to shape the responses of modern criticism. This indeed is the period that saw the emergence of those notions of 'literature' and of literary history, especially national literary history, on which modern scholarship in English has been founded.

The categories produced by Romanticism have also been challenged by recent historicist arguments. The task of the series is to engage both with a challenging corpus of Romantic writings and with the changing field of criticism they have helped to shape. As with other literary series published by Cambridge, this one will represent the work of both younger and more established scholars, on either side of the Atlantic and elsewhere.

*For a complete list of titles published see end of book.*

*In memory of Katie Keane*

## *Acknowledgements*

I would like to thank Marilyn Butler, Josie Dixon and Paul Hamilton for encouraging me to develop this book from my doctoral thesis. Thanks also to those who helped me through my doctoral studies at Leeds University, including Patricia Badir, Danielle Fuller, John McLeod, Andrew Mousley, Mark Robson, Jenny Rogers, Matthew Pateman and Susan Spearey. At Salford University I had the good fortune to work with a group of colleagues whose sense of humour and generosity exceeds the call of duty, and who all provided me with time and with enthusiasm whenever my own lagged. Particular thanks in the latter respect are due to Peter Buse, Kirsten Daly, Scott McCracken, Antony Rowland and Nuria Triana-Toribio. For guiding me through the final stages, thanks to Sara Adhikari and Linda Bree. For distracting me through the final stages, thanks to Eddie Jones. My extensive and under-appreciated family has been looking forward to this book's completion for a long time and I would like to thank them for bearing with me. My biggest debt is to Vivien Jones and John Whale, who have supported me in innumerable ways since I was an undergraduate student and have always gracefully maintained the illusion that they were learning from me too.

Earlier versions of Chapter Two and Chapter Four appeared as 'Resisting Arrest'. The National Constitution of Gothic and Picturesque in Radcliffe's Romances', *News from Nowhere: Theory and Politics of Romanticism*, eds. Tony Pinkney, Keith Hanley and Fred Botting (1995), 96–120 and 'Helen Maria Williams's *Letters From France*: A National Romance', *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism* (December 1992), 271–294.



## *Contents*

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i> ix
1. Introduction: Romantic belongings	i
2. Domesticating the sublime: Ann Radcliffe and Gothic dissent	18
3. Forgotten sentiments: Helen Maria Williams's ' <i>Letters from France</i> '	48
4. Exiles and émigrés: the wanderings of Charlotte Smith	81
5. Mary Wollstonecraft and the national body	108
6. Patrician, populist and patriot: Hannah More's counter-revolutionary nationalism	133
Afterword	159
<i>Notes</i>	163
<i>Bibliography</i>	186
<i>Index</i>	195

*Introduction: Romantic belongings*

The subjects of this book, five English women writers of the 1790s, are no longer the unrepresented underside of the English Romantic canon, as they undoubtedly were even ten years ago. Critical studies of Ann Radcliffe and Mary Wollstonecraft, in particular, have proliferated in the last decade. The poetry of Charlotte Smith, if not her prose fiction, is now relatively well known due to the services of Stuart Curran and others who have seen fit to edit and analyse the work which was barely noticed for two hundred years.<sup>1</sup> The prose of Helen Maria Williams and Hannah More has been less researched, although these writers too are coming into focus: the former principally for her poetry, the latter to illustrate that not all women writers of the period were feminists, or that not all women writers who have been appropriated by feminism were republicans or even democrats.

If they are no longer unrepresented, they have not by any means been deemed 'representative': neither of the literary movement we now nervously call Romanticism, nor of the 'Romantic Englishness' which until the late 1970s was largely associated, in the academy as well as popularly, with Wordsworth and Nature. Since then, contributions by cultural historians, postcolonialists and feminists have ensured that to study 'English' anywhere in the world in the 1990s is to be confronted with difference and contestation, not unity and coherence. This book emerges from that contested disciplinary context, and as such embodies its own contradictions (for only some of which I can account). It is in part a work of feminist historical recovery, building on the 'archaeology' of predecessors and peers.<sup>2</sup> I have willingly succumbed to two of the 'new English' axioms: that reading women's writing is an inherently valuable activity, and that literary canons have cultural meaning that is best understood by the recovery of marginal, 'excluded' texts. While I have a reflexive sympathy for both of these positions, the rationale of this study needs a more nuanced explication, so the remainder of this introduction

and the chapters that follow will map out the connection between Romanticism, women writers and the English nation in the 1790s that underpins the subsequent readings.

The book is not simply a case for inclusivity, nor a history of exclusion, although my readings do raise questions, as others have, about the relative literary historical fates of, say, Helen Maria Williams and William Wordsworth, or Ann Radcliffe and Walter Scott, and look closely at the exclusionary effects of Romantic nationalism and the organicist metaphors on which it is founded. The exclusions are largely the symptom of nineteenth-century literary and imperial history that is beyond the scope of this book.<sup>3</sup> Rather, it looks at the 'proliferation' of meanings of Englishness and national belonging in the 1790s, aiming to fracture rather than complete the historical map of a literary period.

I have used the term *belongings* to signal, in three principal ways, the economic and affective underpinnings of the imagined community of the English nation, and women's relation to it in the 1790s. In the most literal sense, belongings are owned goods, the property that defines the individual in modern, contractual society. In the light of feminist critiques of the gendered bases of Lockean contract theory and the material effects of eighteenth-century contract law on women's status as property-owners, it goes without saying that women were more often belongings than proprietors.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, the present participle, *belonging*, evokes a metaphorical form of ownership: having property in common, sharing in the interests of other people. The idea of belonging to a nation holds out the promise of full and equal participation for all nationals. This is a deliberately tautological statement, as one of the things this book addresses is the historical, contested and discursive character of the nation, and how it is shaped in the interest of different groupings competing for hegemony. In the 1790s, radicals, reformers and loyalists all claimed ownership of the sign of English nationhood. Although, as I shall argue, the ascendant model was the Burkean organic nation-state, we should not be blind to the other forms of belonging that preceded it and co-existed with it, and their implications for women's national status.

There is a third term embedded in belongings that is a corollary of the idea of the nation as a discursive event: the participle 'longing' neatly captures the dynamic of desire that, I would argue, is endemic to national discourse. The nation is constituted by longing for community, and for a place of origin and stability. This pastoral fantasy of plenitude and local sustenance is symptomatic of the alienating condition we

define as 'modernity' and of the enforced mobility of populations under the burgeoning capitalism of the eighteenth century. It is all the more potent, however, in a decade of radical upheaval such as the 1790s, when, due first to revolution and then to war, European subjects were displaced within and between national boundaries and when those boundaries were being redrawn.

As an object of desire, a longed-for place for mobile populations, the nation is gendered feminine: the *heimlich*, a familiar place. The feminised home is a concept that appears frequently in the texts I address here. It figures not only in the predictable spaces of Ann Radcliffe's and Charlotte Smith's Gothic fictions, whose wandering protagonists dream of home, but in the letters and travel narratives of Helen Maria Williams and Mary Wollstonecraft, and in the more prosaic, but equally compelling didactic tracts by Hannah More. More's work in particular, like that of other counter-revolutionary writers, places much emphasis on the nurturing place as the source of national security.

The interpellation of the woman into the feminine, maternal subject position in national discourse, and its exclusionary effects, is apparent across the range of women's texts I have analysed for the purposes of this book. Of these five only Hannah More, resolutely single and childless, explicitly sanctions the logic of the national family romance, despite the compromise to her own subjectivity. Smith and Wollstonecraft to varying degrees critique the suffocating effects of a symbolic order that destines most women to lives of material and psychic impoverishment, whilst Ann Radcliffe and Helen Maria Williams fantasise about the power of femininity (but not necessarily maternity), and of national affection to effect a transformation in the institutions of state. It is obvious from the work of these writers that the feminised space of the nation does not provide equal rights of access to male and female travellers. The masculine subject is intelligible both inside and outside of this domain, free to define nation/home/woman as object of his desire or his possession; as a national subject he can literally come and go, long and belong at the same time. This mobile condition perhaps accounts for the 'representative' national status of male writers as peripatetic as Shelley and Byron and for the paradoxical elevation of the male traveller/adventurer in the Romantic national tradition. In the Romantic national imaginary, the woman who wanders, who defines herself beyond the home and as a subject whose desires exceed or preclude maternity, divests herself of femininity and erases herself from the familial, heterosexual structure of the nation. Her belonging depends on

her belonging to another, desired not desiring, and her romantic attachment to person and place is sanctioned only by her literal and symbolic reproduction of the national family. However, as the work of Mary Wollstonecraft in particular testifies, whilst the archetypal feminine subject of the Romantic nation is the mother, the emerging structures of capitalism that coincide with modern nationhood institutionally misrecognise the mother's status as citizen of the state.<sup>5</sup> As I shall suggest, the tensions between the cultural centrality of the mother and the downgraded position that mothers occupy in the political economy of nations inflects women's relation to the symbolic reproduction of the nation, not least their relation to literary production.

To claim that the nation is a gendered space is to read against the grain of hegemonic analyses that have addressed issues of nationhood as continuous with a 'neutered' political, public sphere.<sup>6</sup> The 'public sphere' is the term coined by Jürgen Habermas to describe the civic space of political participation, debate, and opinion formation. For Habermas, the public sphere mediates between the economic exchanges of modern civil society and the family (which together constitute the private sphere) and the state. It specialises in socialisation and cultural formation, but its critical debates serve an economic function, protecting commercial economy from the incursions of state.<sup>7</sup> Feminist critics have rehearsed the tensions of the universalist rhetoric and the gender blind-spots of Habermas's model of the public sphere, drawing attention to the inadequacy of eighteenth-century public debate to treat subjects deemed as private and particular, and the material exclusion of unpropertied subjects from its domains.<sup>8</sup> Further, as Carole Pateman has shown us, the social contract that organises the relationships of the eighteenth-century civil society is a sexual contract; the public sphere not only mediates between civil society, the family and the state, but reproduces one in the image of the other.<sup>9</sup> Gender is central to the economic language of the civil domain: first, because there are contractual differences in women's and men's relation to material goods, land and capital; second, again in Pateman's terms, because social contracts are underpinned by sexual contracts, the subject of which is 'the property that individuals are held to own in their own persons' (p. 5). The property that subjects hold in their own persons – their sense of belonging – is determined as much by gender as by social rank.

Despite the frequent elision of 'national' and 'public' life in critical commentary, it is impossible to simply map on 'the nation' to 'the public sphere'. Although the interests of the English public sphere may have

been presented as the interests of the nation, the matters of the nation are both too particular (non-universal) and too general (explicitly incorporating public and private life, in its civil and domestic forms) to be accommodated by the public sphere. Models of national belonging are premised on a more expansive and amorphous kind of contract that is not, even in its ideal sense, open to rational enquiry. As I have suggested, the affective, organic and often biological discourse that characterises nationalism – particularly Romantic nationalism – has particular repercussions for women, by restricting female subjectivity to maternal reproduction.

Familial and gendered metaphors are of course etymologically embedded in the term 'nation', which, in Romance languages, has its origin in the notion of 'naissance, extraction', whilst its Germanic equivalent – *natie* – refers to a birth and descent group. Romantic nationalism foregrounds these organicist associations, as it cross-breeds Renaissance and Enlightenment ideas of national development and merges the notion of territorial acquisition with historical progress. As Marlon Ross has argued, the Romantic nationalist grafts these ideas on to the notion of 'the folk as an organic unity with a natural relation to the nurturing place, the motherland, or the place of dissemination, the fatherland'.<sup>10</sup>

One of the most significant texts in the canon of Romantic nationalism, Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, brings together these images of the land and the constitution in the familial unity of the nation-state.<sup>11</sup> In Burke's text, metaphors of birth, maternity, paternity, generation, nurturing, origin and progress in Britain jostle with images of French social engineering, unnatural graftings, geometrical carving up of community, matricide, patricide, the eating of children and monstrous women marching on Paris. That the sight of women on the streets are, for Burke, a sign of a crisis in public order and of a lost civilisation, demonstrates the extent to which the discourse of citizenship and social contract had become 'biologised', absorbed into the Romantic national idea, by the 1790s. In the middle of the eighteenth century, when for good or ill, citizenship was associated with the temporarily feminised realms of commerce and the performative domain of clubs, coffee-houses and associations (the public sphere), it was, at least rhetorically, available to women. The work of Adam Smith, David Hume and Adam Ferguson, or the Scottish 'feelsophers' as Thomas Paine called them, was instrumental in forging the ideal citizen of the eighteenth-century public sphere. In a range of texts dedicated to

redesigning the economic and moral infrastructure of Britain, they effectively deconstructed the classic language and ideals of civic morality, which limited the citizen's expression of virtue and moral autonomy to political life in a legalistic or martial sense.<sup>12</sup> Their investigations led them to consider as citizens, women and men who did not have the means to participate in the political process, but who displayed their moral autonomy in economic, social and intellectual activity. The Scottish Enlightenment imagined a republic in which conversation, friendship but, most importantly, exchange became public virtues. The citizen of this republic – the commercial humanist – could take up a pen, read a newspaper, or make a purchase to fulfil his or her public duty and participate in national life.<sup>13</sup> These Scottish writers and their nervous philosophical enquiries made conceptually possible a balance between subjective will and the greater good, sentiment and sociability, individual desire and consensus in the mobile, historical environment of commercial society. They made a public virtue of private interest, and in the process took the patriotic sting out of antagonism to marketplace citizenship, helping to naturalise the image of the nation and state – the English nation and the British state – as a consensual community. The most visible expressions of this expanded definition of citizenship were the provincial clubs and societies which, as Kathleen Wilson has argued, '[w]hether devoted to philosophical inquiry, politics, or competitive gardening . . . endowed their memberships with the identity of decision-making subjects capable of associating for the public good'.<sup>14</sup> As Wilson also notes, whilst the values of these clubs were indeed homosocial, 'associational life per se was not a male preserve'.

The rationalist discourse of the public sphere, although in practice largely homosocial, is potentially more flexible in terms of gender identity than the affective discourse of nationhood. In the public sphere, gender is constituted performatively, not biologically, and its modes of address are, hypothetically, appropriate to men or women. Rudimentary historicisation problematises this Utopian image of the public sphere, which I am aware echoes Habermas's own optimistic vision of the transformative power of a rational bourgeoisie. In the course of the eighteenth century, the material spaces of the public sphere became less receptive to women's participation, as they reproduced the divided economy of capitalism and were inflected by masculinist models of citizenship. However, as is evident in the life and works of Charlotte Smith, Mary Wollstonecraft, Helen Maria Williams, Hannah More and Ann Radcliffe, all of them at some time 'wandering women', it is the

discourse of the public sphere, not of the nation, which allows them to imagine themselves as participating citizens. It is the discourse of nationality not rationality that turns them into exiles, by naturalising a patriarchal social contract and putting it beyond rational enquiry.

Not everyone, however, invested sympathetically in the construction of the nation-state as a public sphere or a consensual community of 'associates', especially a construction which was imported from across the Scottish border and which included women. Patriotism as the language of opposition to the Hanoverian state, intent on exposing corruption, persisted throughout the century, and remained masculinist and xenophobic, perhaps increasingly so in the aftermath of the Seven Years War and the subsequent battle with American 'rebels'.<sup>15</sup> Radical English patriots in the later part of the century rejected the image of commerce as conversation, and reinvented it as a form of military enterprise. Epitomised by the campaigns of John Wilkes in the 1770s and 1780s, radical patriotism revived the image of the ancient constitution and portrayed a variety of alien, corrupting and miscegenating forces, which threatened the liberty and masculinity of the freeborn Englishman.<sup>16</sup>

In debates about public life and citizenship in the 1790s, one does not find a simple opposition between feminised, commercial models of citizenship and a xenophobic, masculine patriotism. The Revolution debate threw light on the figure of the cosmopolitan patriot, exemplified by Richard Price, whose political and intellectual roots were in Enlightenment philosophy and Dissenting traditions. Price had famously called for a new attitude towards France, asking in his *Discourse on the Love of Our Country* for his congregation to lend their patriotic service to the battle for French liberty. In the 1790s, then, the discourse of patriotism itself fragmented, divided between an inward-looking loyalism and an internationalism, as radical dissenters championed universal civil liberties and embraced the intellectual strand of Enlightenment cosmopolitanism.<sup>17</sup> These various languages of citizenship – commercial humanism, loyalist patriotism and cosmopolitan patriotism – depend on different conceptualisations of the origins, progress and wealth of nations. They inflect the work of the women I focus on here, in ways which often compromise their own political agendas and more often their gendered, authorial identities. Mary Wollstonecraft, for instance, betrayed her femininity when she issued a hasty riposte to Burke's *Reflections* (which she caricatures as an extended sentimental apostrophe on the French queen) in her 1790 polemic *A Vindication of the Rights of Men*.<sup>18</sup>



Wollstonecraft's rhetoric draws on an ideal commonwealth of manly, autonomous, independent, rational citizens and old-style patriots. In this vein, she portrays Burke as a corrupt, effeminate, state-ventriloquist, trying to seduce the nation away from the fulfilment of their rights in an enlightened republican future. In later texts, most significantly, her *Letters Written During a Short Residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (1796),<sup>19</sup> Wollstonecraft explicitly turned against the image of the commercial citizen, portraying the deadening effects of trade on the imagination, which she regarded as a vital faculty for social sympathy. The imagination, she suggests, has been appropriated by capitalism. In a similar vein, she demonstrates the degrading impact of capitalism on the nation's most valued asset, the maternal body. As though to illustrate the extent of this public degradation, Wollstonecraft succumbs in her own rhetoric to the downgrading of maternity.

Helen Maria Williams, the poet and *salonnier*, who, like Wollstonecraft, found a public and political voice in the early years of the Revolution, with her *Letters From France*,<sup>20</sup> departed from her contemporary's view on commerce. She attempted to describe French revolutionary patriotism in terms that were commensurate with myths of English constitutional liberty and commercial humanism. Her descriptions of the sublime spectacles of the early French republic, significantly in epistolary 'exchanges' with an unknown recipient, incorporate the familial, the domestic, the beautiful and the feminine. She called herself a citizen of the world, *une patriote universelle*, and embraced the icon of French liberty as though she were a younger sister of the matronly English spirit. When Marianne became the sign of French republic under the rule of Robespierre, however, Williams held on to a sense of liberty that she saw as distinctly English, albeit formulated in the public sphere rather than by the nation. Her faith in universal citizenship turned to fear of French imperial zeal and a newly masculinised French public sphere, and, with the unsolicited help of the republican régime, she exiled herself from her adopted *patrie*. Significantly, she did not return to England, which was even less hospitable than France to her cosmopolitan ideals.

In her 1790s fiction, Charlotte Smith undertook a critique of 'things as they are' in English society, and allied herself tentatively with the radical ideals of cosmopolitan patriots. Never quite a 'Jacobin', however, she represented the internationalism of Godwinian radical philosophy with scepticism, portraying it as little more than a romantic ideal, which is pursued by her ingenuous protagonists at the expense of more quotidian