American Women Authors and Literary Property, 1822–1869

MELISSA J. HOMESTEAD

CAMBRIDGE

AMERICAN WOMEN AUTHORS AND LITERARY PROPERTY, 1822–1869

MELISSA J. HOMESTEAD
University of Nebraska–Lincoln

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521853828

First published 2005

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

Homestead, Melissa J., 1963–
American women authors and literary property, 1822–1869 / Melissa J. Homestead.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-521-85382-6
1. American literature – Women authors – History and criticism. 2. Women and literature – United States – History – 19th century. 3. American literature – 19th century – History and criticism.
4. Copyright – United States – History – 19th century. I. Title.
PS217.W64H66 2005
810.9'9287'09034 – dc22 2005015907

ISBN-13 978-0-521-85382-8 hardback
ISBN-10 0-521-85382-6 hardback

Preface: "Imperfect Title"

In 1830, a Congressional committee recommended the extension of the term of copyright protection in the United States, and in its report the committee reasons, "If labor and effort in producing what before was not possessed or known will give title, then the literary man has title, perfect and absolute, and should have his reward."[1] To have "perfect title" to property is to have an ownership right that cannot be challenged. This 1830 Congressional report was one of very few during the middle years of the nineteenth century to issue such a ringing endorsement of authorial proprietorship, however. Instead, Congress adopted the logic of copyright opponents, who criticized such natural rights arguments for the expansion of copyright, arguing instead that the primary purpose of the copyright law was to serve the interests of readers and publishers. Following this logic, Congress rebuffed repeated attempts to amend the law so that authors who were not citizens or residents of the United States could claim the protection of the U.S. law for their works. Not until 60 years after the passage of the 1831 Copyright Act (extending the term of protection for American authors) did Congress pass an international copyright law at least partially recognizing by statute what the 1830 Congressional report considered natural and inevitable. Although the American "literary *man*" deserved (according to copyright advocates) a perfect title to his literary productions, his title, not recognized in other countries and devalued on the American market, remained "imperfect."

If the relationship of the claim of the literary *man* to his literary property was imperfect, then what are we to make of the relationship of literary *women* to this regime of property, especially considering the notably successful exploitation of the American literary market by American women authors in the nineteenth century? In legal decisions and in the copyright debates, judges, Congressmen, authors, and publishers drew on the discourses of paternity, commerce, and landed property to define and create the legal rights of authors under copyright, and all of these discourses brought with them their own gendered values and expectations, reinforcing the ambiguous status of women as authors. How could a woman be an author under copyright when copyright advocates claimed for the author status as or equivalent to a father, a farmer working his fields, a professional

1 House Committee on the Judiciary, *Copyright*, 21st Cong., 2nd sess., 10 Dec. 1830, H. Rep. 210, 2.

man selling his services, a tradesman selling his labor, or a businessman trading his goods in the marketplace? Such questions presuppose, however, that nineteenth-century American men who wrote had precisely the same relationship to their literary property as did fathers to their children, farmers to their fields, professional men and tradesmen to their services and labors, and merchants to their goods. Instead, when copyright advocates used these analogies, they inevitably revealed the gap between what they believed the law *should* do for authors and what it *did* do. For most of the century, copyright advocates failed in their attempts to fully invest the author with the legal rights to which they claimed authors as male citizens of the republic were entitled.

Women (and especially married women) also could not claim many of the rights of citizens. Most notably, under the common law doctrine of coverture, married women could not own property. Thus for much of the nineteenth century, both married women under coverture and authors under copyright could possess property and the fruits of their labors imperfectly or not at all. Nineteenth-century copyright advocates argued that the copyright law's failure to grant authors full proprietary status discouraged them from producing, but women authors, doubly distanced from authorial proprietorship, were not discouraged from producing, nor were their works excluded from the market. Instead, I argue, the convergence of literary property laws and married women's property laws, of copyright and coverture, was productive for the women (mostly white and middle class, and mostly married) whose successes transformed the terrain of the American literary marketplace.

Drawing on and contributing to scholarship in literary, legal, cultural, and book history and using a variety of nineteenth-century sources, I reconstruct in this book the engagements of Catharine Maria Sedgwick, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Fanny Fern, Mary Virginia Terhune, and Augusta Jane Evans with the law and with competing visions of the possibilities and limitations of American authorship articulated in the copyright debates. These case studies document women authors' efforts to expand the proprietary reach of both women and authors, but even when their efforts failed to achieve the desired results, they did not stop writing. As nonproprietary subjects, women adapted themselves to a literary market in which unauthorized reprinting was the norm, making the most of their "imperfect" proprietary status of American authorship and working astutely within the constraints imposed by a law that privileged readers' access to literature over authors' property rights.[2]

2 I adapt Meredith McGill's helpful restatement of my argument: "In her dissertation . . . Melissa Homestead argues that as nonproprietary subjects women more easily adapted themselves to unauthorized reprinting." *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 286n.

Acknowledgments

This book began as a dissertation in the English Department at the University of Pennsylvania. Although the book has taken a considerably different shape from the original project, I owe my primary scholarly debt to my dissertation committee, Peter Conn (director), Nancy Bentley, and Christopher Looby, and to my dissertation writing group, Jeannine DeLombard, Leigh Edwards, and Ashley Montague Row.

I am also heavily indebted to the American Antiquarian Society (AAS), where I thrice attended the Summer Seminar in the History of the Book in American Culture (in 1995 under the direction of Robert Gross and Mary Kelley, in 1997 under the direction of Meredith McGill and Joan Shelley Rubin, and in 2003 under the direction of Barbara Hochmann and David Stewart) and where I was twice awarded fellowships (a month-long Petersen Fellowship in 1997 and a year-long Mellon Post-Dissertation Fellowship in 2000–1). At the beginning of my second residence, the AAS arranged for Meredith McGill, Grantland Rice, and Elizabeth Waning Harries to read my unrevised dissertation, and I thank them all for their comments. The AAS also gave me access to a network of scholars who have been essential to many elements of this project, and I cannot praise enough the legendarily helpful staff, past and present, including Nancy Burkett, Joanne Chaison, John Hench, Thomas Knoles, Marie Lamoureux, Philip Lampi, Dennis Lurie, Russell Martin, Caroline Sloat, and Laura Wasowicz. Without the AAS, this book might have been written, but it would have been a much poorer effort and much less fun to write.

Other libraries whose collections and staff have been crucial to the research for this project include Alabama State Department of Archives and History; American Philosophical Society; Beinecke Library at Yale University; Bizzell Memorial Library at the University of Oklahoma; Boston Athenaeum; Boston Public Library; Duke University Library Special Collections; Firestone Library Special Collections at Princeton University; Free Library of Philadelphia; German Society of Pennsylvania Library; Georgetown University Law Center Library; Haverford College Library Special Collections; Harvard Law Library; Historical Society of Pennsylvania; Historic Mobile Preservation Society; Hoole Alabama Collection at the University of Alabama; Houghton Library at Harvard University; Library Company of Philadelphia; Library of Congress; Massachusetts Historical Society; New York Public Library; National

Archives (in DC and the Mid-Atlantic and Great Lakes Regional Branches); Trinity College Library Special Collections; United States Supreme Court Library; University of Massachusetts Library; and Van Pelt Library, Rare Books and Special Collections, and Law Library at the University of Pennsylvania.

A portion of Chapter 4 appeared in the *New England Quarterly* as "'Every Body Sees the Theft': Fanny Fern and Literary Proprietorship in Antebellum America," 74, no. 2 (2001): 210–31, and is reproduced with the permission of the copyright holder, *New England Quartlery*. An earlier version of Chapter 3 appeared in *Prospects: An Annual Journal of American Cultural Studies* as "'When I Can Read My Title Clear': Harriet Beecher Stowe and the *Stowe v. Thomas* Copyright Infringement Case," 27 (2002): 201–45, and is reproduced with the permission of the copyright holder, Cambridge University Press. A small snippet of Chapter 1 appeared as part of "Behind the Veil?: Sedgwick and Anonymous Publication," in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Lucinda L. Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2002), 19–35, and is reproduced with the permission of the copyright holder, Northeastern University Press.

The Nineteenth-Century American Women Writers Study Group has been a crucial resource since I first attended a meeting in 1997. Our reading and discussion of women's texts and the historical and theoretical issues impinging on them have enriched and complicated my approach to this project. Particularly important was a 1999 meeting facilitated by Laura Hanft Korobkin and Elizabeth Maddock Dillon focusing on the topic of "women and property," the secondary readings for which crucially shifted my thinking on gender and property.

Individual scholars have been generous in sharing resources and expertise, and others have read and responded to portions of the manuscript. In alphabetical order, I acknowledge my indebtedness to Paula Bernat Bennett, Richard Chused, Patricia Cline Cohen, Gayle Harris, Cheri Larsen Hoeckley, Amy Hudock, Rita Keresztesi, Leon Jackson, Barbara Ryan, Francesca Sawaya, Martin Schultz, Robert Shalhope, Jean Silver-Isenstadt, Karen Manners Smith, Naomi Z. Sofer, Amy Thomas, Siva Vaidhyanathan, Joyce Warren, Karen Woods Weierman, and Elizabeth Young. I also thank my Cambridge University Press readers, Sandra Zagarell and Ezra Greenspan, for their comments on and support of my project.

The University of Oklahoma provided research support on several occasions, namely a College of Arts and Sciences Junior Faculty Summer Research grant, a Research Council Junior Faculty Summer Research grant, two College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Enrichment grants, two semesters of graduate research assistant support from the Department of English (funding the labors of Kimberly Martinson and Steven Salaita), and an undergraduate research assistant for a semester funded by the Honors Research

Assistant Program (Clinton Stevens, who assisted with translations from the German for Chapter 3).

When I was hired as a paralegal in the Intellectual Property Group at the Philadelphia law firm of Dechert, Price & Rhoads in 1990, I am sure that partner Glenn A. Gundersen did not intend to train me for a return to my abandoned doctoral study to become a hybrid scholar of law and literature, but he did in spite of himself. I outlasted associate Thomas H. Speranza (now of Kleinbard, Bell & Brecker), but when I began this project with a seminar paper on *Stowe v. Thomas* in 1994, he graciously took phone calls from me about such arcane matters as the distinctions between forms of legal remedies for copyright infringement.

Last, but not least, I thank my parents, John and Carolyn Homestead, for their extraordinary understanding and patience with my long and arduous path to the Ph.D. and then the grueling years of the academic job market. Even though they happily concede that they don't understand a word of what I've written, they have fully supported my endeavors as worthwhile because they want for their daughter whatever their daughter wants for herself. Every junior academic in the humanities should have such parents.

Contents

Introduction: "Lady-Writers" and "Copyright, Authors, and Authorship" in Nineteenth-Century America

Not pay us for our toils of thought!
The struggling of our brains!
By old George Fox, the indignant blood
Is lava in my veins!
Shame on our country and its laws!
Strike, let the Bastile [*sic*] fall!
Down with the tyrant Publishers!
Hurrah for Faneuil Hall!

On October 10, 1847, the *Saturday Evening Post* published on its front page a group of poems, tales, and letters under the title "Copyright, Authors, and Authorship" by one of its regular contributors, Grace Greenwood (pseudonym of Sarah Jane Clarke, later Sarah Jane Lippincott).[1] As the headnote "explains,"

> A short time since a friend of ours, a gentleman connected with the press, being in favor of an International Copyright Law, and feeling an interest in the encouragement of native genius by adequate pecuniary compensation, applied to many of our first authors for their opinions concerning these subjects, leaving them at liberty to embody their sentiments in the form of poems, letters, or sketches. But our friend, being called to the defence of his country, in the midst of his labors of love, left in our hands the important documents. It will be seen that the collection was not complete, several authors of note not having reported themselves; but such as it is, we give it to the public, to read and ponder and inwardly digest.[2]

What follows is actually a group of pieces written by Greenwood in the style of famous American writers of the era, most of them with the "author" identified only by initials that clearly correspond to the name of one those

1 For an overview of her life and career, see Donna Born, "Sarah Jane Clarke Lippincott (Grace Greenwood)," in *American Newspaper Journalists, 1690–1872*, ed. Perry J. Ashley, vol. 43 of *The Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 303–8 (Detroit: Gale, 1985).

2 Grace Greenwood, "Copyright, Authors, and Authorship," in *Greenwood Leaves: A Collection of Sketches and Letters* (Boston: Ticknor, Reed and Fields, 1850), 283. For materials included in the original publication in the *Saturday Evening Post* and added subsequently, I hereinafter cite this edition in the text. The original appearance, including some items not included in *Greenwood Leaves*, is "Copyright, Authors, and Authorship," *Saturday Evening Post*, 9 Oct. 1847, [1].

famous writers. The series leads off with the rousing call to authorial action quoted above by "JGW" (John Greenleaf Whittier), summoning all American authors (or at least all Northeastern authors) to a meeting at Faneuil Hall, the scene of many meetings in support of the American Revolution, to discuss the question of international copyright. "Whittier's" call is relatively inclusive, going out to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow at Harvard, William Cullen Bryant at his editorial desk for the *New York Evening Post*, FitzGreene Halleck at his counting house in New York, Lydia Huntley Sigourney in Connecticut mourning over a dead friend, and even the "Corinnes and Sapphos fair,/In Lowell factories dwelling," who may have published works in the *Lowell Offering*. "Whittier" includes all of these authors because, according to the poem, they have one thing in common – they have not been adequately paid for their "toils of thought" and "struggling of [their] brains," and rather than accept their martyrdom, they should stage a revolutionary overthrow of the law that oppresses them, the copyright law. Although "Whittier's" call is gender inclusive, Greenwood tellingly partitions off "contributions" from women authors under the heading "Lady-Writers" (including her "own" contribution, the last item in the group, a "Letter from the West" signed "Grace Greenwood"). She thus suggests that gender potentially inflected the questions presented by copyright reform and that women writers had a different relationship to the law than did their male peers.

My study of women authors and literary property in the United States from the 1820s through the 1860s aims to answer precisely the question posed by Greenwood's gender segregation of her parodies: what relationship did women authors have to the copyright law and to debates about its reform in the nineteenth century? If international copyright was, as many of the parodies of the male writers suggest, to be justified on the ground that men laboring in the field of letters should be able to provide financially for their wives and children, where did "lady-writers" fit in? More specifically, what are we to make of a seeming paradox at the heart of the relationship between women and the law: if, as nineteenth-century copyright advocates often insisted, the weak copyright law frustrated the development of American literature because it provided inadequate protection for and incentives to authors, how do we account for the spectacular commercial and popular successes of American women in the American literary market at midcentury?

The figure of the writing woman as a successful commercial agent in the literary market troubled and repulsed many nineteenth-century critics and continues to trouble and challenge modern literary historians. Did nineteenth-century women authors wholeheartedly and successfully exploit, and even help invent, the structures of commodity capitalism, or did they maintain a psychological and emotional detachment from the market

in which their texts circulated? That is, should we read nineteenth-century American women's popular authorship through Ann Douglas's *Feminization of American Culture* (and, more recently, Lori Merish's *Sentimental Materialism*) or through Mary Kelley's *Private Woman, Public Stage*?[3]

Recognizing copyright law as a crucial mechanism structuring the literary market and authors' relations to it complicates the question of how women authors engaged the market for literature. Copyright grants literary texts legal status as property – a peculiar kind of property, but property nonetheless. Thus laws regulating the ownership and control of property more broadly applied to copyrights, and under broader property law principles, women (and especially married women) had a profoundly different relationship to property than that enjoyed by their male peers. Whether or not women authors distanced themselves psychologically and emotionally from the market, the law effectively created a distance by refusing to grant most women the legal status of proprietors. One might expect the nonproprietary status of many women to discourage them from producing literary texts, but their productivity in the face of their dispossession belies the logic of copyright advocacy. Their rights to property, their labors, and their very persons often in doubt, women wrote and published anyway, and readers purchased their works in unprecedented numbers.

Concurrently with this burst of women's production and readers' consumption, advocates and opponents of international copyright argued in print over the law's allocation of power between authors and readers, with the anticopyright position and readers' interests effectively holding sway for most of the century. The questions raised by the copyright debates were thus part of every author's "scene of writing," to use Richard Brodhead's useful phrase from *Cultures of Letters*. As Brodhead argues, "A work of writing comes to its particular form of existence in interaction with the network of relations that surround it: in any actual instance, writing orients itself in or against some understanding of what writing is, does, and is good for that is culturally composed and derived."[4] In the copyright debates, American culture attempted to compose just such formulations of what writing is, does, and is good for, and American writers who hoped to reach an audience and succeed would ignore such formulations at their peril. Publishers, who decided which works to circulate and how to circulate them, necessarily

3 Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1977); Lori Merish, *Sentimental Materialism: Gender, Commodity Culture, and Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000); Mary Kelley, *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984; reprinted University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

4 Richard Brodhead, *Cultures of Letters: Scenes of Reading and Writing in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1993), 8.

tried to gauge which works met certain audience expectations and thus would be commercially successful; but publishers also played an important role in setting those expectations by, for most of the century, loudly and publicly arguing *against* the expansion of authorial rights through international copyright. Finally, the copyright debates were as much a part of the various "scenes of reading" in nineteenth-century America, scenes that structured readers' individual experiences of literary texts, as they were part of authors' "scenes of writing." Especially at the dawn of the age of literary celebrity, readers read not just literary texts but authors, too, and the copyright debates contributed to the symbolic construction of American authorship.

For the remainder of this introduction, I continue to tease out the implications of the copyright debates for nineteenth-century scenes of reading and writing. I first continue my analysis of Greenwood's parodies as a concrete and particular interpretation of the gendered implications of the copyright debates. I then use this particular instance to sketch out the broader claims of my project and its relationship to previous scholarship on copyright and literature and on women's authorship in nineteenth-century America. Examining women's authorship through the lens of copyright history and vice versa, I locate a convergence between women's self-fashionings as authors and readers' expectations and desires as both expressed through and shaped by the copyright debates. By locating such a convergence between women authors and a mass readership, I do not simply relocate the supposed easy triumph of popular women's authorship to a slightly different location within the market, nor do I entirely re-distance them from the market, thus preserving them from the contamination of trade. Instead, I seek to recover and revalue the complex and contested nature of their engagements. Although the women I study attempted to exploit literary proprietorship as a mode of authorship, U.S. copyright statutes and their legal status as women sometimes subverted their aims and at times enabled other authorial modes. The recovery of these women's experiences contributes to literary history, but it also can teach us about the present and the future of copyright as a mechanism structuring the relationship between cultural producers and consumers.

"National necessity" versus "sweating wages": Readers and authors at odds in the antebellum copyright debates

For anyone who has not spent time browsing nineteenth-century periodicals, the pervasiveness of the copyright debates across the cultural spectrum can come as a surprise. The *Saturday Evening Post*, for instance, which published Grace Greenwood's parodies, was a widely circulated weekly, published every Saturday night for appropriate reading Sunday in the family

circle.[5] When Greenwood wrote the parodies and when the *Post* accepted them for publication, both author and publisher clearly believed that moderately well informed readers, both men and women, and perhaps even older children, would understand and appreciate them. Not only did the editor assume a basic level of understanding, he assumed a great enough level of interest to devote almost the entire front page to the parodies, a space usually reserved for the fictional tales and novelettes that were the *Post*'s bread and butter. Indeed, nowhere in the parodies, not in the headnote or in the parodies themselves, are the bare facts of the international copyright controversy even explained for readers. The U.S. copyright statute specified that its provisions protected only works authored by citizens of the United States or "residents therein." Rather than leaving the unprotected status of works authored by noncitizens or nonresidents implicit, the law specifically permitted and even encouraged the appropriation of such works by U.S. publishers: "[N]othing in this act shall be construed to extend to prohibit the importation or vending, reprinting or publishing within the United States, of any map, chart, book or books, written, printed, or published by any person not a citizen of the United States, in foreign parts or places without the jurisdiction of the United States."[6] In response to this open invitation, publishers legally could, and did, publish cheap, unauthorized editions of works by English and other European authors (across the Atlantic, the British copyright law did not specifically exclude from protection works authored by persons who were not British subjects or residents, but as a practical matter, most American authors could not secure copyright protection for their works in Britain).[7] According to U.S. copyright advocates, the exclusion of British-authored works from copyright protection caused American-authored works protected by copyright to be sold at much higher prices than "unbought" reprints of British works, and this price disparity made it difficult for American authors to find an audience and receive adequate compensation for their labors. Opponents of international copyright successfully argued that the law and its positive promotion of reprinting should remain undisturbed. The *Post* and Greenwood, however, assumed that average readers knew both these facts and the typical arguments for and against international copyright. By the time the *Post* published the parodies

5 On the history of the *Post* and other "story papers," see Mary Noel, *Villains Galore: The Heyday of the Popular Story Weekly* (New York: Macmillan, 1954). On family reading of weekly literary magazines in newspaper format (focusing on a Southern paper, the *Spirit of the Age*), see Amy M. Thomas, "Literature in Newsprint: Antebellum Family Newspapers and the Uses of Reading," in *Reading Books: Essays on the Material Text and Literature in America*, (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 101–16.

6 Copyright Act of 1790, in Thorvald Solberg, ed., *Copyright Enactments of the United States, 1783–1906* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1906), 32, 34. Although Congress enacted many additions and amendments over the course of the nineteenth century, this section remained in effect.

7 This brief description of the law and trade practices for transatlantic authorship necessarily oversimplifies a very complex topic. See Chapter 5 for a more in-depth discussion.

in 1847, both American and British authors had been petitioning Congress for ten years, urging the passage of an international copyright law that would better protect the "rights" of *all* authors by granting U.S. copyright protection to both resident and nonresident authors, while copyright opponents had mounted and maintained an effective defense against these efforts.

Authors rarely made copyright the direct subject of imaginative literature (which is precisely the source of the parody collection's humor – who writes poems about copyright reform?), but readers of Greenwood's parodies would have encountered more serious discussions of the question in many print media of the day – daily and weekly newspapers, popular monthly magazines like *Graham's*, and high-toned quarterlies like the *North American Review*. Such discussions framed the question of copyright reform not as a specialized issue of concern only to lawyers and to a few interested parties in the publishing industry, but as a question with possible profound and immediate effects for all concerned – for readers, authors, and publishers, and for the American nation. Although some argued that *all* parties would benefit from reciprocal copyright arrangements with England and other countries, most recognized international copyright as a field of struggle between competing interests.[8] Greenwood's parodies frame the struggle as one between authors and publishers (in "Whittier's" poem, authors plan to revolt against "tyrant publishers"), but more often the issue was framed as a struggle between authors and readers. Did copyright law protect absolute property rights of authors, or did the superior right of reader access (and the necessary corollary, the right of publishers to publish) trump authors' rights? Should readers have to pay authors more or less than they were being paid, or did truly great authors not write for money at all?

About six months before it published Greenwood's parodies, the *Post* published a long and vigorous anticopyright editorial tackling just such questions, framing the struggle over copyright as a struggle between authors greedy for more money and power and American readers craving knowledge. Copyright advocates often accused copyright opponents of "literary agrarianism," associating their lack of respect for literary property with contemporary radical critiques of property ownership and attempts to give the poor access to farmland.[9] The *Post* editorial does not deny this characterization but embraces it, claiming that reader "hunger" for books trumped

8 Throughout this study, I adopt and adapt the terminology of Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of literary production, particularly the notion of "the field of cultural production" as structured by conflict. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed," in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. Randall Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 34.

9 See, e.g., Cornelius Mathews's labeling anticopyright "an allowable agrarianism of ideas." *The Better Interests of the Country, in Connexion with International Copy-right* (New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1843), 9. As Martin Buinicki argues in his analysis of James Fenimore Cooper's dual engagements in debates over rights in real property (land) and literary property, land was hardly an unproblematic ground from which to figure the stability of literary property during the "Anti-rent wars" of the 1830s

even the author's property rights in his literary crops: "Now, granting that an author has as much and the same right to his book, as the farmer has to the products of his orchard or his field, it does not follow from this, that his right is absolute and without limitation. As the rights of property in the latter, may justly upon occasion be made to yield to the strong demands of bodily hunger, or national necessity; so may the right of an author in his works, be made to yield before the mental hunger of the masses of society."[10] Although each of Greenwood's parodies takes on the particular style and subject matter of the author parodied, almost all of the pieces focus on the pathos of authorship in a nation that privileged readerly voraciousness over authorial property rights, particularly the pathos of the author and the author's family starving for lack of adequate financial return for his literary labors. That is, whereas the *Post* claimed that the law should first and foremost allow readers to satisfy their mental hunger, the "authors" argued that the law should protect authors and their families from physical starvation.

Of Greenwood's thirteen parodies (including "Whittier's"),[11] the first nine parodies are of male authors, and of those nine, only the Whittier parody reaches beyond the situation of the male author to include women. Instead, the "authors" repeatedly focus on the inability of male authors to support their wives and children through writing. A macabre tale by "EAP" (Edgar Allan Poe) tells of an author immolated in a garret, having abandoned his wife and family. As the ghastly Adolphus Twiggs tells the narrator, "You see before you the victim of the miserable compensation awarded to native genius, and *of the want of a law of International Copyright!*" (p. 290).[12] A narrative poem by "FGH" (FitzGreene Halleck) describes the situation of a poet who awakens from a dream of the glories of the court minstrel's life to the reality of the sheriff banging on his door, the poet's creditors having sent the sheriff to collect debts (pp. 292–3) (a parody ironically appropriate to a man who was lauded as "the American Byron" for his satiric long poem "Fanny," but who also worked in the banking industry for most of his adult life in order to earn a living). While his wife distracts the sheriff, the poet hides in his meal-chest and plans to leave the country on the morning boat. The remaining pieces by the "men" comment on

and 1840s. "Negotiating Copyright: Authorship and the Discourse of Literary Property Rights in Nineteenth-Century America," PhD diss., University of Iowa, 2003, 63–5.

10 "International Copy-Right," *Saturday Evening Post*, 10 Apr. 1847, [2].

11 When the pieces were published in *Greenwood Leaves* in 1850, Greenwood added an additional parody by "OWH, MD" (Oliver Wendell Holmes), changed the byline on one of the lady writers' poems from "Kate Carol" to "FSO" (Frances Sargent Osgood – "Kate Carol" was an identifiable psuedonym and persona of Osgood – thanks to Eliza Richards for explaining this puzzling change), and removed her own "Letter from the West," replacing it with a new "Fable from the Burmese" by "FF" (Fanny Forrester – "Fanny Fern" had not yet begun her pseudonymous career in 1850).

12 For Poe's complex and contradictory relationship to the sort of literary nationalistic rhetoric that Greenwood puts in his mouth, see Meredith McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), chap. 5.

the immense gulf between some ideal of authorial eminence and power and the reality of American authorship. For instance, "The Author of 'Typee'" (Herman Melville) describes the glories of the life of a poet on the island of Typee (the best lodge on the island, food and precious oils supplied through voluntary taxation, the prettiest maiden for a bride, and even the choicest enemy for his cannibalistic pleasure), so that American Christians "might learn a lesson from the savages" about how authors should be treated (p. 294). Although copyright reform was not the direct subject of *Typee*, Melville's book, as well as two volumes of Poe's poems and tales, were published in Wiley & Putnam's "Library of American Books," a series that linked its American literary nationalist project with copyright reform by featuring a quotation from the *Address of the American Copy-Right Club* on the paper cover of each book: "Sundry citizens of this good land, meaning well, and hoping well prompted by a certain something in their nature, have trained them selves to do service in various Essays, Poems, Histories, and books of Art, Fancy, and Truth."[13] By featuring this motto on the covers, George Palmer Putnam, a publisher exceptional during the 1840s for his strong public support of international copyright, meant to frame *Typee* as a service to American readers, but in Greenwood's parody, "the author of 'Typee'" seems more interested in what his countrymen and -women can do for him than in what he can do for his countrymen and -women.

In the small subsection titled "Lady-Writers," Greenwood includes only four authors, and without the same tight unanimity of theme found in the generic, unmarked section of (male) authors. In a "Letter from New York" in the style of her widely read and reprinted columns for the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, "LMC" (Lydia Maria Child) expresses faith that copyright reform is "one of the reforms of the age," as important as the abolition of war and capital punishment (p. 303). In a brief lyric, "Kate Carol" (Frances Sargent Osgood) poetically protests that "precious poetesses" should be protected from "vulgar wants and harsh distresses" of common life, that their clothing should be as pretty and bejeweled as their verses (pp. 304–5). "LHS" (Lydia Huntley Sigourney) poetically laments that she cannot publish a collection of a dead female friend's poetry because a publisher tells her, "It would not pay" (p. 306). Finally, Grace Greenwood, adopting her most typical newspaper genre of the letter, writes a "Letter from the West" addressed to the fictional man who "collected" the pieces, balancing Child's "Letter from New York" geographically and in content. Greenwood begins

13 Herman Melville, *Typee a Peep at Polynesian Life During a Four Months' Residence in a Valley of the Marquesas* (New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1846). Reading Greenwood's parody of Melville out of context, John Evelev suggests she is castigating him for insufficient professionalization in his early career. "'Every One to His Trade': *Mardi*, Literary Form, and Professional Ideology," *American Literature* 75, no. 2 (2003): 305–33. On Putnam's publishing and copyright activities, see Ezra Greenspan, "Evert Duyckinck and the History of Wiley and Putnam's Library of American Books, 1845–1847," *American Literature* 64, no. 4 (1992): 677–93; and Greenspan, *George Palmer Putnam: Representative American Publisher* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).