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CHAPTER I

PATRONAGE: LIMITS AND DISTINCTIONS

Sometime before November 8, 1782, Philip Freneau received his first government appointment as clerk in the Postmaster-General's office. On July 31, 1909, Edwin Arlington Robinson ended his tenure as special employee of the New York Customhouse. Between these appointments stretch nearly 130 years of development of the political party system and American literature; the appointments of Freneau and Robinson constitute the historical limits of this study. It is a study of how during that time politics have appropriated writers and writers have appropriated politics in such fashion as to make suitable the term "political patronage" with respect to the appointment of a surprising number of American writers as clerks in government bureaus, as secretaries, consuls, and ministers in the foreign service, as officials in customhouses, and as members of Presidents' cabinets. If one uses the term "writer" uncritically to include historians, editors, and journalists, besides writers of belles-lettres, the number under appointment is very large. In this broad sense of the term "writer," a conservative list comprises forty-five names, including such diverse figures as the historians George Bancroft and J. L. Motley, the editors John L. O'Sullivan and Alexander H. and Edward Everett, as well as such peripheral writers as Howells's Ohio friend, John James Piatt, and Whitman's friends, W. D. O'Connor and John Burroughs. If one limits the list to those whose literary significance endures, the count
remains large, at least fifteen names, including Irving, Paulding, Hawthorne, Melville, Howells, Whitman, Lowell, and Robinson.

I set out here to explore the relation between the political appointment of these men and their literary production. What effect had political appointment on the literary production of these writers? In part the question reduced itself to substantive issues which, given sufficient historical record, may be answered with certainty. These real issues include dates of tenure, the official nature of the service, the character of the appointment as a literary sinecure, the effect of the appointment on the writer in terms of subject, technique, or the actual production of manuscripts and books, and the rationales of patron and appointee. Of these, perhaps the most revealing is the latter, that is, the contrast between the patron's view of the writer and the writer's view of himself as appointee. Necessarily, the patron saw the writer as a political appointee subject to the informal laws of political life. The writer wished to see himself as literary appointee subject to another set of rules.

The question of the effect of political appointment also reduced itself to the important issue of the quality of these writers' literary production. Were they better writers for having received appointment? Was the character of their writing made essentially different from what it might otherwise have been? Although their political appointments had a decided impact on their lives, the writers of this study remained unable or chose not to appropriate their official experiences as an imaginative resource. This is a surprising discovery, considering the number of writers who sought appointment and the intensity of their desire. Yet the evidence suggests reasons for their failure to use official experience as
the substance of writing. Many had defined their art in its most mature form and purpose by the time they received appointments; among such writers are Melville and Lowell. Some, like Lew Wallace and Bayard Taylor, accepted formulae of popularity that affected their writing more directly than sinecure; in or out of office they were public literary men, comfortable in their role and their art as limited by their audience. Others, like Howells and Hawthorne, made distinctions between political journalism and imaginative literature that forbade their using imaginative writing as an instrument of party. Thus political appointment did not create the essential character of the works of the writers under consideration here.

This study attempts, then, to contribute a chapter in the broader study of the profession of authorship in the 19th century, with particular reference to the effect of political patronage on authorship and the production of literature. It does not attempt a consistent analysis of political ideology or affiliation among writers, though political indifference, as will be shown, was not a qualification for appointment, and political thought did affect the production of some writers. It attempts no assessment of the effect of writers on our national political life. It makes no effort to assess the value of these men as civil servants. It offers no analysis of the effect of political thought on literary production, which is a related but distinct subject, for the object of this study is to assess the value of political appointment as literary sinecure. All writers, under appointment or indifferent to appointment, were subject to political thought, and I wish not to broaden the scope of this study to that larger dimension. In any case there is little evidence
that political appointment notably changed the nature of the writer's partisan commitment. If the writer was reluctant to engage directly in politics before appointment, he tended to remain passive under appointment, as was true of Irving, Whitman, Melville, and Hawthorne, who wrote the campaign life of Franklin Pierce as much from friendship as a desire to serve party. Committed partisans tended to remain committed under appointment. As I intend to show, the political journalism of such writers as Freneau and Howells remains consistent whether the writer is in or out of office, or indifferent to office.

Rather than these ends, this study attempts to assess the value of political appointment as literary sinecure. The essential question is whether, given the conditions of political appointment, writers were able to make true literary sinecures of their office. Did the only widely available form of literary patronage in the 19th century--political appointment--stimulate the production of literature? Part of the answer depends upon the intention of the patron, for whom encouragement of literature was incidental to his primary end of maintaining party strength. His first principal of selection among men of letters was not literary quality or potential, about which he was not well qualified to judge, and the list of literary appointees includes writers who in their own day were clearly of minor talent. Another part of the answer depends on the writer himself, who faced difficulties that made appointment too often a respite from, rather than encouragement to writing. The failure of political appointment significantly to stimulate the production of literature must be seen in the light of the diminished desire and declining talent of many older literary appointees to write, as well as the common anxiety
of writing for a market that discouraged writing as a means of livelihood. As I shall illustrate, the income that writers received from appointments was almost certain to be superior to the income they could expect to receive from writing, unless they reached a large popular audience. As I shall show, Hawthorne in his lowest-paying appointment received more than he received during his best years as a successful author. Even writers of great talent, like Hawthorne, were understandably reluctant to expend their energies in frustration. It was not, therefore, fault in the system of political patronage itself that failed to stimulate literature, but the condition of the author with respect to his talents, his desire, and the book market. The value of this study lies in the analysis of the relation between political appointment, the writer, and the attitudes he carried with him into office.

Despite the value of this analysis, no major study of the effect of political appointment on the productivity of American writers exists. Some students of Hawthorne, Melville, and Whitman have produced excellent individual studies of these writers' official service. Among studies of Hawthorne's experience as customhouse and consular appointee are Paul Cortissoz's unpublished dissertation, "The Political Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne" (N.Y.U., 1955), and W. S. Nevins's "Nathaniel Hawthorne's Removal from the Salem Custom House." Dixon Wecter's "Walt Whitman as Civil Servant" is an intensive examination of the poet's record as clerk. Other studies treat in part the appointment of certain writers, for example James L. Woodress, Jr.'s Howells & Italy. The existing scholarship is useful in proportion as it considers official documents on file in the National Archives in conjunction with biography and published correspond-
ence; and the above are admirably complete. Other specialized studies are fragmentary or unsatisfactory because they fail to consider significant documents and remain general and impressionistic. Among the poorest in this respect is Lindsay Swift's "Our Literary Diplomats," a collection of adulatory remarks. There is therefore a need for synthesis of the extant scholarship and a systematic examination of the relevant documents and the relation between official tenure and the literary production of these writers.

Critical to this study is an understanding of what is to be meant by the term "writer." One would prefer not to use it in the encyclopedic sense that is equivalent to "man of letter." For the familiar acceptance of the latter term embraces almost all writers who were not scientists. As a descriptive term, "man of letters" designated in the period under consideration writers of humanistic studies, and editors and journalists, as well as writers of imaginative literature. People whose writing was published were men of letters, the term being broadly honorific, and Peter Parley is equal to Geoffrey Crayon. When patrons and friends wrote political endorsements of these men, they made no distinction between scholars, journalists, and belles-lettres; all were equally men of letters. Thus Jared Sparks, then president of Harvard, endorsed George Perkins Marsh as a literary man, although strictly speaking he was a professional linguist. In his letter to Secretary of State John M. Clayton, Sparks wrote of Marsh's "extensive acquirements as a man of letters" which, among other virtues, Sparks thought, qualified him for appointment as Minister to Turkey. With equal assurance George Griggs endorsed his brother-in-law Herman Melville "as a member of the Republic of Letters." Therefore
the stories of all American men of letters who sought and received political appointment in the period under consideration are equally valuable indices to the way they conceived themselves as a class and the way the public conceived of them as a class. This observation justifies the use of evidence from the appointments of George Bancroft, a historian; Mordecai Manuel Noah, a journalist; and Whitman, a poet.

With respect to the effect of political appointment on literary productivity, however, I wish to focus on the histories of imaginative writers. For the question is whether political patronage fostered or inhibited the production of belles-lettres. By the effect of appointment on literature, I mean the effect on imaginative writing: drama, essay, fiction, and poetry. Although I have dealt with a few writers who were not writers of imaginative literature, notably Bancroft, I have dealt primarily with the smaller core of writers whose work represents deliberate creative art and have made use of the experience of other men of letters as it illuminates conclusions regarding the effect of political appointment on imaginative literature.

Equally critical is an understanding of what is to be meant by "patronage." In his Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages Karl Julius Holzknecht defines it as "the employment of favor, protection, and influential support to advance the interests of art . . ." often in the form of economic subsidy, though alternatively in form of public encouragement or interest. Holzknecht questions whether an official appointment, as in the capacity of a court retainer, constitutes true literary patronage; for such appointments require nonliterary duties. He remarks the possibility that an official may be both literary and political patron, it
being "very difficult to determine where one left off and the other began . . . ." A similar ambiguity persists here. If by "patronage" one means appointment for an exclusive literary end, hardly any of the instances in this study so qualify. Yet, among the cluster of motives for appointment, the purpose of literary patronage appears almost uniformly as a subordinate end; the effect was the patronage of writers, and many of the appointments were in fact sinecures. By "patronage" I therefore mean the appointment of writers to official positions.

Beneath the overlay of differing motives for accepting political appointment and differing evaluations of literature and the literary professions, these writers in their experiences tend to reveal certain common assessments of office. In prospect they anticipated security of income that would relieve their anxiety about family and self and release them to their first occupation—writing. They anticipated indispensable leisure, the condition they believed made writing possible. They feared the responsibility of functioning in the practical capacity of a public servant. They anticipated the prestige associated with government service, which afforded them one of their society's few means of public recognition for doing what they best liked and were most able to do. Their capacity for making themselves believe that their appointment was in recognition of literary worth, not political friendship or service, is a significant detail of their story.

In fact they generally discovered that political appointment did relieve their anxiety about income, which, not always handsome, was usually sufficient. In exchange a new anxiety developed over conditions of service which failed to provide sometimes the leisure and often the stimulus
necessary to the production of literature. The appointees found themselves occupied in details of government business, the more so as their positions became higher and more responsible. They discovered in themselves capacity for business and some pleasure in performance, for their official tasks were useful, therefore commendable, acts that identified them directly with the ongoing life of the nation as the literary profession often did not. The evidence suggests that some used the press of business in justification of their failure to write, although they performed duties that could have been deputized.

As for the patron, he seems ever to have accepted the axiom that the price of political patronage is political service. By promoting loyalties through reward, mutual claim and mutual service, the politician builds a power structure that he can manipulate. If rewards are appropriately political, the structure yields and supports at will. For the politician to reward on a basis other than political is the death of power, since he can exercise power only so long as he can claim loyalty. As we shall see, the political patrons of these writers could heartily give appointments within their gift to those who were both literary and political, who wrote campaign biographies and newspaper and magazine articles favorable to party or candidate, who worked within party organizations, who delivered campaign speeches, who commanded alliance with those political figures whose friendship was not to be alienated or whose association enhanced party. Almost without exception the writers treated here qualified in one or many of these ways. It follows also that the patron could not readily forego these conditions, which accounts for the ineligibility of Poe for appointment, the hesitancy
with which John Howard Payne and Herman Melville were treated, and the ease
with which Hawthorne and Howells, both writers of campaign biographies, re-
ceived consular appointments. That political necessity is the first law
of appointment is further suggested by the number of letters of recommen-
dation for writers that attest literary worth coupled with some other more
direct advantage, such as business acumen, political service or friendship,
or national reputation. Predictably, the political patron required the
journalist, not the poet, the caricaturist, not the artist.

As a means of stimulating the production of literature, however, the
patronage of authors was not notably successful, although, for reasons to
be developed further, neither was it a total failure. One cannot speak
finally of true literary patronage, for the patronage was officially po-
litical, and if literature was an effect, it was gratuitous and incidental.
Whether the political patronage became in effect literary patronage de-
pended on the appointee's ability to make it so. Almost all political
appointments examined here were potentially literary sinecures, with leis-
ure, income, and prestige. Yet there is no record of an appointment
with the understanding between patron and writer that the latter had no
duties at all, and, as I have suggested, the patron first satisfied po-
litical before literary requirements.

The patronage was unsuccessful literary patronage because it failed
too frequently to affect literary production in significant ways. In
many instances it came too late. The writing of John Howard Payne, Her-
man Melville, Walt Whitman, Bayard Taylor, George Henry Boker, and James
Russell Lowell, to name a strangely heterogeneous group, had reached
creative peaks prior to the time of their appointments. To the degree
that these appointments recognized literary character, they were given in recognition of an already developed reputation. The writer most urgently needs patronage when he is young and developing, as Howells was in Venice. For some, accession to office was a signal to cease production, either because of the press of duty, their fear of declining talent, what they considered the stultifying effect of office, or their disenchantment with writing as a source of income. These objections helped restrict the production of Joel Barlow, Irving (in his third appointment as Minister to Spain), Hawthorne, Melville, Lowell, and Robinson. Considering direct effect, one can say that American literary history would not be radically changed had there been no political appointment of writers. Quantitatively, the literary production of subject writers during tenure remains limited.

And one must be cautious of claiming too much for patronage or wishing it to do more than it can do, since it does not produce genius, nor produce the writer's urge to write, nor is it likely to change his view of what constitutes his proper object and proper audience, thus making him a more genuine artist. Lew Wallace, having made his decision to exploit the sentimental religiosity of his audience, writes no differently when he is territorial governor and minister to Turkey than when he is a private citizen. One can argue that the logic of these writers' literary careers lay in causes other than whether they held sinecures.

Yet the patronage offered a complex of experiences which some writers appropriated in literature, and some writers made literary sinecures from their appointments. The patronage was most notably effective for Howells, whose Venetian experiences significantly affected his production; for Irving, whose first appointment as vice consul in Madrid led him to
refocus on romantic history; for James Kirke Paulding, who spent most of his life under appointment; and for Bret Harte, who developed his early skill as a writer of California stories during tenure as government clerk in San Francisco. Especially in the case of Howells an organic continuity exists between his appointment and the nature of his early development. In addition political appointment stimulated the writing of a number of travel books by writers in foreign appointments who sought to define the European past and present from a personal and American point of view. The evidence suggests that the particularity of their observations and their criticism were directly influenced by the intimacy of association with England and Europe on more than a casual basis. The result is a body of travel books, from Charles E. Lester's My Consulship (1853) to John Hay's Castilian Days (1871), that command the attention of the student of travel literature.

Finally, the findings of this study hold implications, I believe, for national subsidy of writers. For the first time the national government has taken a step toward direct encouragement of the arts, including writing, by means of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, which has subsidized the young Negro dramatist Le Roi Jones. This study appears to support the conservative dictum that such aid of writers inhibits their productivity, for most writers under appointment wrote considerably more out of office than in office. If the relation between appointment and productivity is an exclusive cause and effect, it follows that a greater favor than subsidy would be enforced poverty, which seems truly to have precipitated literature. Needless to say, other influences than the fact of appointment affected the produc-
tivity of these writers, as I shall point out. The inhibiting effect of appointment had one important exception: the political appointment of novice writers was notably successful; it directly aided in establishing Harte, Howells, and Paulding as writers. This suggests that under national subsidy young writers would receive the greatest benefit.

In the following chapters I wish to illuminate the generalizations I have made here by focusing upon relevant topics and representative examples. My intention is to deal primarily with the core of writers whose work represents serious and consciously literary effort and to make use of the experiences of others as they appear relevant to my purpose.
FOOTNOTES


I do not wish to underestimate the value of other studies, although some rely too exclusively on secondary sources. Neither do I wish to underestimate the value of the good biographies, such as Stanley T. William's The Life of Washington Irving (2 vols., New York, 1935), nor such editions of correspondence as Merrell R. Davis and William H. Gilman's The Letters of Herman Melville (New Haven, 1960). However, since several of these writers elicited general biographies (or none), biography is not a good source of information about the subject of patronage.

2. Lindsay Swift, "Our Literary Diplomats," Book Buyer, XX (June, July, 1900) 364-373, 440-449; XXI (August, September, 1900) 38-49, 90-98.

3. For the purposes of this study the files of the Departments of State and the Treasury in the National Archives have been most useful.

4 Jared Sparks to Secretary of State John M. Clayton, April 27, 1849, Letters of Recommendation, Records of the Department of State, National Archives, Record Group 59. Hereafter records in the National Archives are indicated by the symbol NA, followed by the record group (RG) number.

5 George Griggs to Charles Sumner, March 21, 1861, Letters of Recommendation, NA, RG 59.


7 Irving McKee quotes Lew Wallace's assessment of his role as novelist: "Even then (as a young man) the importance to a writer of first discerning a body of readers possible of capture and then addressing himself to their tastes was a matter of instinct with me." In Irving McKee, "Ben-Hur" Wallace (Berkeley, 1947), pp. 6-7.
In most respects the history of the appointment of writers to positions in the federal government corresponds with the familiar features of the history of political patronage. It is a convenience to divide the history of the patronage into three conventional periods: the pre-Jacksonian, the Jacksonian, and the post-Grant period of reform. Accordingly, one may expect to find literary appointments in the pre-Jacksonian period based on presumably nonpolitical considerations of family, education, or reputation, as were political appointments generally made in the period. In the Jacksonian period one may expect to find the spoils system so crystallized as to make party service the primary basis of appointment. In the post-Grant period one may expect to find appointment based on professional capacity for public service as determined by examination or performance.

This simple pattern is essentially correct in application to appointment of writers. It requires the qualification, however, that in all periods the benefit of party was superior to other purposes. Even in the pre-Jacksonian era, when party lines were fluid and political patrons tended to appoint office-holders on the basis of ability, family, or education, the criterion of political value applies to the appointment of writers. It is true that under the pre-Jacksonian administration of John Quincy Adams, two notable instances of literary appointment occurred for
which no immediate political service was the cost. They are the appointments of James Fenimore Cooper as consul at Lyon and Washington Irving as vice consul at Madrid (both tenures 1826-1829). With Cooper and Irving, record exists of the appointment of eleven writers in the pre-Jacksonian period (1789-1829), including Joel Barlow, Benjamin Franklin, Henry Marie Brackenridge, Alexander Hill Everett, Philip Freneau, David Humphreys, Mordecai Manuel Noah, James Kirke Paulding, and George Wood ("Peter Schlemihl"). As I wish to show further, the appointments of Barlow, Everett, Freneau, Noah, and Paulding first satisfied political requirements and reveal that in even the first period of the patronage, political requirements were dominant in the appointment of writers.

In the second period of the patronage (Jackson through Grant, 1829-1877), the requirements of the spoils system dominated all other considerations in the appointment of writers. In this period record exists of the appointment of thirty-seven men of letters. To be sure, the occupational term is used here in its descriptive sense, and four of the names occur also in other periods, having received additional appointments (John Burroughs, 1877-1885; John Hay, 1879-1881, 1897-1898, 1898-1905; Washington Irving, 1825-1829; and John James Piatt, 1892-1893). Whatever the obscurity of some, the list contains Henry Adams, George Bancroft, George Henry Boker, Orestes A. Brownson, John Burroughs, Richard Henry Dana, Jr., Edward Everett, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Charles Fenno Hoffman, William Dean Howells, Washington Irving, John Pendleton Kennedy, Herman Melville, John Lothrop Motley, John Howard Payne, Richard Henry Stoddard, Walt Whitman, and Nathaniel Parker Willis. Most men of this list combined their careers in such ways as to make impossible rigid distinctions among
them as historians, journalists, and belles-lettrists. While Secretary of Legation under Charles Francis Adams in the London embassy, journalist Henry Adams wrote London letters for the New York Times (1862). As historian he wrote Mont-Saint Michel and Chartres (1904) and The Education of Henry Adams (1907). As novelist he wrote Democracy: An American Novel (1879) and Esther (1884). As former secretary to Lincoln, historian John Hay collaborated with John G. Nicolay on Abraham Lincoln: A History (1890). As versifier he wrote Jim Bludso of the Prairie Belle (1871) and Pike County Ballads (1871). As novelist he wrote The Bread-Winners (1884). Such diverse careers tend to be typical of this group.

In the third period of the patronage (Rutherford B. Hayes to Theodore Roosevelt, 1877-1909), political reform reduced the number of appointments in the President's gift and significantly diminished the number of literary appointments. In this period record exists of the appointment of nine writers: John Burroughs, Bret Harte, John Hay, James Russell Lowell, John James Piatt, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Bayard Taylor, Francis H. Underwood, and Lew Wallace.

Some comparative data from the three periods are suggestive. The periods outlined above are roughly equivalent: 40, 48, and 42 years. The number of appointments for the respective periods are 11, 37, and 9. Recognizing that the period Jackson through Grant encompasses 6-8 more years than the other periods, one is nonetheless struck by the fact that during the heyday of political patronage more literary appointments were made than during all other periods combined (even, to extend the data into our own time, including the period from William Howard Taft through Franklin Roosevelt) and that in the post-Grant period a sharp decline in
appointments occurred. These figures suggest the common fate both of the
appointment of writers and of political patronage in the post-Grant era.
Both suffered as a result of the movement to reduce the amount of patronage
in the President's gift. This reduction was effected through reforms which
saw the development of a professional civil and foreign service. Beginning
with President Hayes, who in his inaugural address had promised reform
"radical and complete," the movement took shape to place formerly appointive
offices under control of a nonpolitical civil service which would select
officers on the basis of competitive examination. The movement was to come
into fruition in the administration of President Arthur (despite his former
control of patronage in the New York Customhouse), when the Pendleton
Act became law on January 16, 1883. Briefly, the Pendleton Act provided
for a three-member Civil Service commission, a chief examiner, state boards
of examiners and minor officers. It called for civil service classifications and competitive examinations, control of nepotism, balanced apportionment of appointments to the states, probationary periods, prohibition of political contributions, and recommendations of character and residence only. It affected the government departments in Washington and customs houses and post offices, but did not affect the diplomatic and consular service. In *The Civil Service and the Patronage* Carl Russell Fish points out that in consequence of the Pendleton Act, both major parties declared
themselves in favor of the Act and adopted the reform cause in the presiden-
tial campaign of 1884.4 Thereafter, civil service reform was
to be a recognized object of legislation, however haltingly it progressed.
The effect of civil service reform is evident here: of the dozen writers
appointed after the Pendleton Act (1883-1945) only E. A. Robinson was in
the civil service. The others were appointed to positions in the Department of State or the Library of Congress which remained within the President's gift.

The effect of the reform movement on appointment of writers is demonstrated in the replacement of Bret Harte by Francis H. Underwood as consul at Glasgow (1885), and the circumstances of the appointment of Edwin Arlington Robinson by President Roosevelt as special agent in the New York customhouse (1905).

An appointee of President Hayes, Harte survived two Republican administrations (Hayes and Garfield-Arthur, 1877-1885) but was removed from office after the accession of President Cleveland brought in a Democratic administration. Though favored by the Hayes administration, Harte's position under Arthur was uncertain. In November, 1882, his alleged misconduct in office was the subject of a State Department inquiry, to which he responded by referring to the evidence of his quarterly reports, properly certifying his absences, and denying anyone's failure to have his signatures on documents. Harte was fortunate at this time, as in the past, to have the friendship of John Hay, Assistant Secretary of State (1879-1881). Hay had previously aided Harte during Hayes's administration by aiding the writer in his request for transfer from the Crefeld to the Glasgow consulate. By March, 1879, Harte was thinking of requesting a change from Crefeld "for my health, for my literary plans, for my comfort, and for my purse." He made the official request later in the year (October 7) in a letter that pleaded his bad health and the good condition of the Crefeld consulate. Having also requested and received leave of absence, he awaited the disposition of his request for transfer.
In the interim Hay joined the Department of State as Assistant Secretary and worked in the consul's behalf. Though the transfer was slow to come, Hay continued into the following spring to encourage Harte. In a letter to his wife Anna, Harte mentioned receipt of warm letters from both Hay and Clarence King, the latter suggesting the indifference of Secretary of State William M. Evarts and remarking the zeal of Hay in favor of Harte. Harte received a private note from Hay on April 2, 1880, which confirmed the news of his appointment to Glasgow. By July 20, he was officially installed in his Glasgow appointment.

Following the election of President Garfield, Harte unfortunately lost the services of Hay, for the new Secretary of State (James G. Blaine) swept the Hayes-Evarts appointees from major offices. Harte received an affectionate letter from Hay on March 21, 1881, in valediction:

I want before my sands run out to say "How?" [sic] to you once more, and to assure you of my eternal love and esteem. I do not know what Heaven meant by creating so few men like Clarence King and you. The scarcity of you is an injury not only to us, but to yourselves. There are not enough of you to go round, and the world pulls and hauls at you till you are completely spoiled.

Meanwhile, Harte had already made liaison with the incoming Garfield administration through Frank Holcomb Mason, consul at Basle, 1880-1884, and a friend of Garfield whose consular service at various posts lasted until 1914. As a fellow Ohioan Mason had served with Garfield during the Civil War and remained on intimate terms with the new President. Harte felt sufficiently confident of his post to report to Mrs. Harte Mason's promise that "if he [Garfield] is elected, I may expect not only to be retained but promoted. Even if the Democrats succeed, it is possible that they will not interfere with me—a literary man and not a political
appointee." To consolidate his position Harte wrote a preface to a brief biography of Garfield by Mason. Although the book bears the mark of a campaign biography, it was not published in the United States and probably had the purpose Harte speaks of: to tell Europeans and the English about Garfield. Harte's preface, dated "London, 4th March.", surely reveals his esteem for Garfield (and Mason). It can have had no effect on the election. The English edition is dated "Basle, March 1881.", and the French edition entitles Garfield President in fact: "Le général James A. Garfield, vingtième président des États-Unis." Yet Harte's gesture of loyalty to Garfield cannot but have helped him, and the consul successfully rode through the accusations of inattendance to office in 1882.

With the accession of President Cleveland, Harte lost his office in the consequent Democratic sweep, as did James Russell Lowell, Lew Wallace, and later in the year, Herman Melville. Visiting England, Hay had advised Harte to wait out the election in hope of retaining office through yet another administration. Harte clearly believed that Hay, though himself out of office, maintained sufficient influence in Washington to be helpful. Despite this, Harte's position was threatened. In the London Times of July 18 he read what he had anticipated, news of his replacement, though he had not yet received official notice. An elaborate Department of State document dated July 16, 1885, notes the suspension of Harte from the office of consul at Glasgow, to be replaced by Francis H. Underwood; it is signed by President Cleveland and Secretary Thomas F. Bayard.

Underwood's replacement of Harte is significant here because the
details of his appointment reveal the new consul's awareness of the animus against literary appointments in a period of reform. The writers of recommendation for Harte in his initial appointment at Crefeld had emphasized his literary reputation and need, subordinating political loyalty and business capacity. Murat Halstead, editor of the Republican newspaper, the Cincinnati Commercial, recommended Harte to President Hayes as a writer of "famous California stories & poems" who wanted to go abroad. Halstead noted that Harte's position as "the most popular of our authors in England, after Longfellow" particularly suited him for the post and that his need was great, being "poor in all but his wit and his wife and children and his friends." Writing to Hayes in response to an inquiry about Harte's alleged indiscretions, Howells emphasized his belief that Harte had reformed and that appointment might lead to personal and literary redemption. Samuel Dickison saw a relation between Harte's uneven artistry and his need of income:

A man distinguished in journalism and politics has just gone out of my room, after having told me of Bret Harte what at once explains to me the mystery heretofore of the inequality of the writing of this admirable genius—and fills me with apprehension that his creative faculty may be crushed and perish utterly. Bret's friends have agreed that if he can be made Consul at Nice that he can be saved to literature. They have applied for the place for him.

I write to you Mr. Evarts, to intervene—and to give this office where I know your interests and tastes will say it should go—to give it to the man of genius instead of the political sucker—to give [it] as an aid to your country's literature.

Other recommendations echo Dickison's tactic, speaking of Harte as "the Thackery (sic) of American Literature" who ought not "be left to languish for want of a like recognition, and aid," or as a writer "whose contributions to our Literature are so highly and universally appre-
Finally, a petition was addressed to President Hayes bearing ninety-two signatures of senators, representatives, and officials. Harte received the appointment.

In contrast Francis H. Underwood chose to take his appointment in Harte's place as consul at Glasgow with the understanding he would disengage from literature and devote himself to consular business. His endorsers could make proper claim for him as a literary man, as Harte's friends had endorsed him as a man of letters. To the time of his appointment Underwood's literary experience included his part in the founding of the Atlantic Monthly, his assistant editorship of it (1857-1859), a volume of short stories, Cloud-Pictures (1872), and such novels as Lord of Himself (1874) and Man Proposes (1885). The recommendations for Underwood include letters from Francis Parkman, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and Oliver Wendell Holmes; most are addressed to Patrick A. Collins, a Boston Congressman (and Democrat) who had agreed to be Underwood's advocate in Washington. Like Harte's friends, Holmes employed the familiar strategy of recommending Underwood as a "man of letters" whose appointment would honor the government.

However, Cleveland came into office on the swell of reform with the support of independents ("mugwumps") who had split from Republican ranks in hope of revision in the patronage. They were especially interested in civil service reform as a means of reducing appointments in the President's gift, and as a principle they opposed appointments on bases other than professional qualifications. For that reason J. Boyle O'Reilly, editor of the Democratic organ The Pilot, foresaw opposition to Underwood and urged the propriety and tradition of the appointment of at least a few
Mr. Underwood is sitting here with me & we have been talking about his chance of getting a decent consulate. The mugwumps will not ask anything, or at least they pretend this; so that the letters in your hands, & Dorsheimer's co-operation are his dependence.

My idea is that Underwood ought to be ranked as one of the literary appointments which all Presidents make. Unquestionably he would be a first rate consul. He has all the qualifications—even the business one. He is urged by the literary Boston—Dr. Holmes, Francis Parkman President of the St. Botolph club; Dr. Green ex Mayor & Lib. of the Mass. Hist. Soc., &c: Col. T. W. Higginson. And so on. Purely as a literary man, not as a Mugwump.

I know that you are interested in his appointment, and though you are between the millstones of political pressure, I am sure you will hearken to the timid voices of the "literary fellows." You will receive our united and unqualified thanks, dear old man, for your earnestness in urging Underwood. I am so personally in this matter that I shall do anything you may suggest that will further it.

Dorsheimer is an old friend of U.'s & has promised all his influence. If you would see him, & act in concert, the thing would be easily done. Some literary men are always appointed; & there couldn't be a better one than Underwood.

Although his friends sought his nomination as a writer, Underwood acted in knowledge of the political circumstances. In his application to Cleveland, he emphasized his professional qualification and denied the intention of using the appointment as a literary sinecure:

If appointed, I shall personally discharge the duties of the office, & shall endeavor to do faithful service to the Government. I am a Democrat,—a tariff reformer, and a believer in honest money.

I do not expect to go abroad to do literary work. I am the author of a number of books (nine) which have been and (many of them) still are successful; but I have no engagements with magazines or newspapers, and do not propose to have any; proposing to devote myself to the duties of the place.

When President Benjamin Harrison succeeded Cleveland, Underwood's friends gathered up testimonials in fear that the incoming Republican administration would do what the natural law of political patronage required. This group of endorsements includes a letter from Lew Wallace, who as a party worker and former appointee lay claim to Harrison's attention.
Wallace insisted that Underwood was really "an old Abolitionist from Kentucky, and a Republican" despite the fact of "his present commission from the late President, Grover Cleveland." A petition to Secretary of State James G. Blaine urged Underwood's retention and carried the signatures of several of the Boston establishment: Whittier, Holmes, James Whitcomb Riley, and the endorsements of the publishing houses of Little, Brown; Lee and Shepard; and Ticknor. Other petitions followed from Glasgow admirers of Underwood. Even so, the claims of literature, service, and his true Republicanism were insufficient. Underwood was a Democratic appointee, and he was ejected from office.

At the end of Harrison's administration, Underwood was once again an applicant. Applying for reappointment in the second term of Cleveland, he solicited letters again from such people as Thomas Bailey Aldrich, Holmes, and Parkman, who urged his record as consul and his contribution to literature as qualifications for office. As in his first appointment Underwood himself underscored his intention not to permit literature to interfere with business. He wrote of having in his first appointment devoted "his time and thought to his duties, delegated nothing which he ought to do himself, and did no literary work beyond writing a few lectures on American Literature," for which he received about $1000 that he in turn donated equally to the Longfellow Memorial fund and to the Consular Benevolent Society for the relief of indigent Americans. He concluded with a brisk catalogue of the official reports he completed while in office. His reappointment as consul at Leith was confirmed by the Senate of September 2, 1893.

Like the case of Underwood the appointment of Robinson reveals the
animus against literary appointments brought on by reform in the patronage. When Robinson was named special agent in the New York customhouse on May 17, 1905, there was no other writer under government appointment. Historical irony exists in the direct participation of President Roosevelt in Robinson's behalf, for Roosevelt had been active in the National Civil Service Reform League and was United States Civil Service Commissioner from 1889 to 1895. He was naturally aware that his aid contradicted his official posture, though he felt no intense qualms, for he conceived of his appointment of Robinson as a true literary sinecure with a true literary end: the aid of a promising poet.

Roosevelt's awareness of Robinson's poetry was the result of good fortune. In Groton, Roosevelt's son Kermit was introduced to Robinson's poetry in a literature class and discovered that Robinson was in poverty, working in New York as timekeeper on the subway then building. Kermit communicated his enthusiasm and the poet's need to his father, who read Robinson and was impressed. Roosevelt is reported to have halted cabinet discussions in March, 1905, to ask Secretary of State John Hay if he knew Robinson and, upon receiving a negative reply, to have read from Captain Craig (1902) for the remainder of the session. Later in the month Richard Watson Gilder, editor of the Century magazine, consulted the President about an article; the President said that he had discovered a poet. When Gilder reported his experience to William Vaughn Moody, Moody asked the editor to intercede in Robinson's behalf. Moody reported to Robinson:

It may interest you to know that you have been discovered by the national administration. R. W. Gilder stands in with Teddie, and has promised at my suggestion to tell him you ought to have
a nice lazy berth in the consular service in England. Without Gilder's urging the President had already written an exploratory note to Robinson. In it he asked about the poet's circumstances, expressed a wish for an interview, and told of his pleasure in *The Children of the Night* (1897), which he had apparently taken up after Captain Craig. There followed between the poet and the President a series of communications about possible posts that ended in Robinson's appointment.

In Roosevelt's part in this episode one sees him doubly aware of himself as literary patron and reform politician. At the request of Moody, Gilder asked the President to help Robinson. Roosevelt's response shows that he had been thinking about the potential literary effect of an appointment. He feared that a foreign appointment might remove the poet from the source of his art:

I thank you for your letter and am particularly interested about Robinson. Curiously enough I had just written to him, but evidently had the wrong address. Now I should like to help him, but it seems to me that it is inadvisable for him to go to England. You know I believe that our literary men are always hurt by going abroad. If Bret Harte had stayed in the West, if he had not even come East, he might have gone on doing productive work. To go to England was the worst thing possible for him. In the same way I think Joel Chandler Harris has continued to do good work because he has remained in Atlanta instead of going to New York. I wish you could find out for me how Robinson is getting along. Perhaps I could give him some position in the Government service, just as Walt Whitman and John Burroughs were given Government positions. It seems to me inadvisable to send him abroad.

Roosevelt was therefore interested in finding a genuine literary sinecure for the poet and encouraging his talent. As Robinson informed Gilder, the appointment would have to leave at least two-thirds of the poet's time free: "I have told him (Roosevelt) this, making it clear at
the same time that if I could have more congenial work, with more pay and the same amount of leisure, I should be happy to get it." 33 In May the President informed Robinson that he could be made special agent in the Treasury Department in New York or Boston and that the position "will give you plenty of time to do your outside work." Hermann Hagedorn, Robinson's biographer, reports the President's admonition to the poet after the appointment was settled: "And I want you to understand that I expect you to think poetry first and Treasury second." 34 In August, 1905, after the poet had been in office somewhat more than two months, the President published a review of The Children of the Night. If impressionistic, neither is the review fulsome. Roosevelt modestly urged the encouragement of American poets and made a cautious assessment of Robinson's ability: "Mr. Robinson has written in this little volume not verse but poetry. Whether he has the power of sustained flight remains to be seen." 35 Ten years later, when he sought to find a post for Bliss Carman, he continued to believe that the sinecure had given the poet a push, for Robinson "has done well ever since, though it is perhaps needless to say that Taft promptly turned him out." 36

At the same time Roosevelt knew that his aid was contrary to the principle of reform and that his patronage of Robinson might be used as a political weapon against him. He wrote of it in mock horror, realizing in his humor the uncertain legitimacy of the appointment:

And finally—tell it not in civil-service-reform Gath, nor whisper it in the streets of merit-system Askelon— I hunted him up [Robinson], found he was having a very hard time, and put him in the Treasury Department. I think he will do his work all right, but I am free to say that he was put in less with a view to the good of the government service than with a view to helping American letters. 37
In retrospect he referred to having "cheerfully outraged the feelings of the ultra-Civil-Service reformers" by putting Robinson in the customhouse.38

The appointments of Underwood and Robinson reveal the cause of the decline in appointments of writers toward the end of the century. Though both men received appointments in fact, Underwood received his at the expense of literary production, since he vowed not to write during his tenure, and both appointments were at the expense of an announced political good, reform in the patronage. In place of Harte, recommended warmly for office because he was a writer who needed sinecure, came Underwood, who believed an effective claim for office was the promise not to write. Underwood had a clear sense of the negative value of authorship as qualification for office in 1885 and 1893. Accepting Underwood's intention in taking the post, one sees that it was truly no literary sinecure. His assessment in 1893 of his faithfulness to his intention is correct; he wrote nothing during his initial tenure save the lectures he named and nothing during his second tenure (1893-1894). Roosevelt's aid of Robinson in 1905 is one of the most admirable of the episodes in this study. He neither condescended nor played the haughty patron, and he incurred political risk. Yet he acted with the realization that his patronage of Robinson as a poet was inconsistent with political reform.

The decline of political patronage and of the appointment of writers constitute, therefore, a parallel history. Another way of seeing this is to note the contrast in numbers of literary appointments in the administrations of Lincoln and Johnson, and of McKinley and Roosevelt. In the period 1861-1869, when literary appointments reached their maximum, nineteen writers received appointments. In the arid period 1897-1905, only
Robinson received an appointment.39

Also in their development, as in their decline, the political patronage and the appointment of writers shared a common history. Following the Four-Year Tenure of Office Act of 1820, federal appointive officers were eligible for replacement following each presidential election. Since such offices were held at the President's pleasure, the patronage became the well-known instrument of party discipline. By carefully controlling offices in the President's gift, the patronage manager rewarded the faithful, punished the slothful, and preserved power. With respect to all appointments, the patronage manager had ever to balance the potential effect of the appointment of a writer and some other candidate. He asked himself questions. What service has the writer performed? Will his appointment dignify my party? Ought I to alienate this writer's friends? Ought I to alienate the alternative candidate's friends?

How deeply the patronage penetrated is revealed in the fact that even minor positions were subject to the control of patronage. It is proper to speak of the mere clerical positions held by Wood, Burroughs, Whitman, O'Connor, Harte, Piatt, and Melville, as true political appointments, even when the applicant himself was only mildly political. Although each major department was required to examine clerical applicants after 1853, the nature of the tests was prescribed by individual department heads who were themselves appointees in a higher patronage system. In consequence the tests were sufficiently routine to leave minor positions in the patronage; in his study of the patronage Carl Fish called the examinations a "farce."40 It was not until 1870 that competitive examinations were introduced first (in the Department of the Interior) and not until
the Civil Service (or Pendleton) Act of 1883 that such examinations were made uniform for minor positions in all departments. Since clerkships offered considerably more leisure than higher posts, they were in effect the truest sinecures of the appointments, as I wish to show in "The Writer's Assessment of Political Appointment."

Whitman's application for a clerkship reveals how substantially the minor posts were patronage positions to be gained not through the claims of literature but of proper political endorsement. When he began to consider an appointment, he planned his strategy by asking Emerson for letters to Secretary of State William H. Seward, Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase, and a note of introduction to Senator Charles Sumner. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Sumner could help Whitman secure a foreign post in the Department of State if the poet so chose; as leading Republican in the Senate, he could exert his strength generally. Whitman required the letters, as he told Emerson,

realizing at last that it is necessary for me to fall for the time in the wise old way, to push my fortune, to be brazen, and get employment, and have an income—determined to do it, (at any rate until I get out of horrible sloughs) I write you, asking you as follows:

I design to apply personally direct at headquarters, for some place. I would apply on literary grounds, not political. 41

Just as Emerson had sought to find appointment for Thoreau in 1847, so was he ready to help Whitman. 42 As the poet had asked, Emerson made no political claim but remarked Whitman's good character and unique genius as an American writer:

Will you permit me to say that he is known to me as a man of strong, original genius, combining, with marked eccentricities, great powers & valuable traits of character: a self-relying large-hearted man, much beloved by his friends; entirely patriotic & benevolent in his theory, tastes, & practices. If his writings
are in certain points open to criticism, they show extraordinary power, & are more deeply American, democratic, & in the interest of political liberty, than those of any other poet.43

Emerson concluded with the assurance that Whitman would more than perform well if the government gave him a place.

Although Emerson's letters to Seward and Chase are dated January 10, 1863, Whitman did not in fact use the letter to Chase until late in the year and the letter to Seward, never. Recognizing the characteristic pattern of appointments, he sought instead to enlist the support of Senator Preston King, who represented Whitman's residential state. He sought also to gain the favor of Senator Sumner. Their support gained, he could go to Seward or Chase in a strong position. By February 12 he had seen Sumner three times. Although in an early meeting Sumner had told Whitman that "every thing here moves as part of a great machine" and that he must consign himself to the fate of other office-seekers, Whitman noticed in the meeting of February 12 that Sumner "had life in him" and believed he would help. At a subordinate level other activity was going forward. From New York City, Moses Lane, friend of the Whitmans and Chief Engineer in the Brooklyn Waterworks, wrote in Whitman's favor to E. D. Webster, a clerk in the Department of State on whom Lane had claims of friendship. Whitman's brother Jeff believed that Webster could exert influence, though only a clerk. On February 11 and 13 Whitman had interviews with Senator King, whom he liked for his bluntness and decision. Unfortunately, King could not recall in their first interview Sumner's having spoken about Whitman, though Whitman understood Sumner was to have prepared the way. Meanwhile, Sumner and King conferred about Whitman. In the second interview King gave Whitman general letters for Chase and the Army Quartermaster.
From indecision whether he truly wanted the appointment and the indifference of Sumner, Whitman failed to use the endorsements he had. Sumner was cool to Whitman. In February Whitman wrote of Sumner as "a sort of gelding—no good." By March 19 Whitman believed that Sumner had dropped him: "Sumner promised fair once—but he does not seem to be finally fascinated." In any case Whitman recognized his own indecisiveness in pursuit of office: "I only try in a listless sort of way, and of course do not succeed." Although the details do not suggest that Whitman was quite "listless," he nonetheless held off presenting the endorsements. Possibly he continued to hope for Sumner's endorsement, which would place him in the strongest of positions.

Later in the year Whitman met John Townsend Trowbridge, a minister and writer of juvenile books impressed by Whitman's poetry. He learned of Whitman's desire for an appointment and asked him if he would accept a position in one of the departments. Whitman said he would, though he believed it unlikely he would receive an appointment. Since Trowbridge and Chase were acquainted and Trowbridge had only recently been Chase's houseguest, Trowbridge decided to make a personal claim in behalf of Whitman. That Whitman chose not to give Trowbridge the endorsement written by Senator King suggests that Whitman had determined the letter was too weak or that he had decided to make an exclusive literary claim by presenting Emerson's letter. In December, 1863, Trowbridge had an interview with Chase and gave him Emerson's endorsement. Chase read it and then remarked the notoriety of *Leaves of Grass* and its author. In retrospect Trowbridge remembered that Chase judged the book "by conventional standards of taste and impropriety. He had understood that the writer
was a rowdy." Chase continued his criticism and refused Whitman a place, though he appropriated the letter for Emerson's signature. Whitman's contemporaneous account verifies Trowbridge's story. He records that Chase thought *Leaves of Grass* was an indecent book and could not bring the author into the government service, where he would be in contact with gentlemen. It was, then, the "marked eccentricities" of the artist that Emerson saw as virtue that Chase saw as vice. In absence of political endorsement from King and Sumner, Whitman had no claim on Chase, and his reputation as author was a clear detraction.

When Whitman accepted a place, two years after he first considered the possibility, he received it through the aid of friends who were sufficiently high in office to help. Dixon Wecter, who has examined Whitman's clerkship in detail, shows that the appointment resulted from William Douglas O'Connor's success in his passionate campaign to find Whitman "really a sinecure." As a clerk in the Light-House Bureau O'Connor was in a position to know of vacancies; as a friend he genuinely wished to help. He was able to enlist the aid of Assistant Attorney-General J. Hubley Ashton, who managed to secure Whitman the clerkship in the Department of the Interior, beginning January 1, 1865.

John Burrough's experience offers other evidence that the clerkships held by writers were under the patronage system. Burroughs received work as laborer in the Quartermaster-General's Department in late fall of 1863, but lost his place when slack work made reductions in the department necessary. He sought letters of recommendation from his congressman, James H. Graham, who was unfortunately absent. Meanwhile, he recognized that his chance of appointment was slight. In January,
1864, he achieved his end and took the letters Graham had written for him to the War Department and the Treasury Department. Burroughs spoke with the comptroller of the currency, Hugh McCulloch, showed him Graham's letters, concluded the interview satisfactorily, and began work the next day, to remain in the department as clerk until December 31, 1872. 48

Just as in their appointment the writers in minor positions came under the patronage, so were they subject to the understood conditions of the office. They might be expected to participate in caucuses or contribute to political funds, methods both of showing their faith in the party and of reinforcing its strength. Paulding's failure to give money led to one of the crises of his long government service. As Navy Agent in New York, he was invited by the General Republican Committee (a Jackson organization) to offer money to party coffers. He at first refused, believing the money was to be used for "keeping open house and treating the voters, thereby destroying the purity of our elections." On second thought he contributed what he believed was a proper sum. The committee returned the money indignantly, indicating they could not accept the "small amount" because of Paulding's reluctance and expressed doubts. Paulding had said that he would not hold office under an administration that required contributions, and the committee replied by suggesting he indeed need not. Fearful he might lose his position, he asked Washington Irving to intervene in his favor. 49

Paulding's party allegiance was correct. He was a Jackson man and a Democratic-Republican whose highest office was to be Secretary of the Navy (1838-1841) under President Van Buren (by which time the party had adopted "Democratic" as its name). In his failure to contribute Paulding
made a show of bad faith at an unwise time, for W. L. Marcy had been elected Democratic governor of New York in the election of 1832. With President Jackson reelected, Martin Van Buren as Vice-President, and Marcy as governor, the Democratic-Republicans were in a position to consolidate their gains by purging the unfaithful. As originator of the phrase "To the victor belong the spoils," Marcy was engaged in strengthening the party that was to see him remain in office for three terms until 1838. In his *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York*, Dixon Ryan Fox characterizes the Jackson party in New York politics of 1832 as "better disciplined than ever before or since." Paulding was feeling the sting of the whip.

Fortunately, Paulding had the services of Irving, who was in an excellent position to help. Jackson's Vice-President, Martin Van Buren, had been Secretary of State in Jackson's first term. As Secretary of State, Van Buren had initiated the appointment of Irving as Secretary of Legation in the British embassy (1829-1832). Without consulting President Jackson, Van Buren wrote to Irving's brother John Treade to determine if Irving, then in Spain as attaché, would accept the post. Considering it a graceful sign of his countrymen's respect, Irving had accepted. Van Buren's resignation in 1831 as Secretary of State forced other members of Jackson's cabinet to follow his lead and thus enabled the President to eliminate from his administration the followers of John C. Calhoun. Afterwards, Jackson appointed Van Buren Minister to Great Britain. In London awaiting the Senate confirmation that was to be denied by the Calhoun forces, Van Buren became an intimate of Irving's. He reported Irving's success in office to Jackson:
Washington Irving has been staying some weeks in my house, & will I hope continue to do so through the Winter. An intimate acquaintance with him, has satisfied me, that I was mistaken in supposing that his literary occupation gives his mind a turn unfavorable to practical business pursuits, & as I am not sure that you did not entertain the same impression, I think it but just to correct the error.  

Furthermore, after Irving's decision to leave the legation and return to the United States, Jackson hinted in an interview with Irving that he could have another appointment if he wished it.  

Paulding had therefore asked an appropriate person for aid. With a view to retaining Paulding's position against the devices of the General Republican Committee, Irving corresponded with Vice-President Van Buren on January 2, 1833. Irving invoked Paulding's reputation as a writer, patriot, party faithful, Jackson man, and influential leader. Irving noted that Paulding also wrote "anonymously, and merely for his own gratification, in the newspapers on the administrations (sic) side." Being in Washington at this time, he saw President Jackson the following day about the rumor of Paulding's removal. The President assured Irving that he had heard nothing of the removal and praised Paulding's official conduct so highly that Irving was able to assure Paulding of the safety of his position.  

To his friend Gouverneur Kemble, Irving recounted the interview with Jackson in more detail on January 4. He had discovered that the Republican Committee had gone so far as to name a satisfactory replacement of Paulding, in anticipation of the turnover of office that was to come with Jackson's second administration in March. Toward the end of January Irving discovered that the committee had signed an application against Paulding's reappointment and that the New York City delegation to the state legislature had endorsed it. Irving's awareness of the patronage principle that Paulding
had too lightly dismissed is revealed in his summation of the affair, which fortunately ended in Paulding's favor:

The next time he [Paulding] refuses a benevolence to the sovereign, he must do it with a more gracious and qualifying tone. As it is, I have no idea that the recommendation of the Genl Committee even if sent on here, will have any effect upon old Hickory, after the opinion he has expressed of Pauldings (sic) general character and official conduct. 56

At the level of the minor patronage, as in the appointments of Whitman and Burroughs and the indiscretion of Paulding, the spoils principle discloses its true nature as appointment at higher levels sometimes do not. Certainly, the appointments of writers as clerks and minor officials were made under the political patronage system; they were given with an eye primarily to the healthful effect on party, not literature, though a literary end was an admissible additional effect up to the time of patronage reform. With respect to appointments at higher levels, one sometimes has difficulty penetrating the ceremonial language to discover the true circumstances of the appointment. Clearly, an attractive feature of the appointment of well-known men of letters was the dignity it lent to the national reputation and the party of appointment among the intellectual class, and writers of achieved reputation were most likely to receive high office.

But one need not be uncertain whether the appointment of writers to higher positions were patronage appointments. As a rule rather than exception they were a result of direct political service by the writer or endorsement by political friends who were powerful enough to control the patronage. As I have shown above, the naming of writers to minor positions during the Jacksonian period (1829-1877) constituted true political patronage. That literary occupation alone was insufficient qualification for
office one sees acutely in the failure of Edgar Allan Poe and Herman Melville (in several attempts before success) to secure office. As Harrison Hayford and Merrell Davis point out in their study of Melville's attempts to gain office, he failed because he himself had weak political claims, his supporters had insufficient influence, and claims politically superior overrode his application. Thus in 1853 Melville's application for a consulate at Honolulu or Antwerp was turned down in favor of those of two men who had been immediately engaged in the push to bring Franklin Pierce and a Democratic administration into office. Hayford and Davis attribute Melville's success in receiving appointment as inspector in the New York customhouse (November 30, 1866) to his friendship with Henry A. Smythe, named collector of the port in January, 1866, by President Johnson.

During the Jacksonian period of the patronage, the appointments of writers to higher positions, like those of lower position, were also made with a view to their political expediency or in consequence of political service. As a result of his aid in shaping the Democratic party in Massachusetts and his work in national politics, George Bancroft received four different appointments from grateful friends: Collector, Boston Customhouse (1837-1841); Secretary of the Navy (1845-1846); Minister to Great Britain (1846-1849); and Minister to Germany (1867-1874). In consequence of the campaign Life of Franklin Pierce (1852), Hawthorne received the Liverpool consulship (1853-1857). In consequence of the campaign Lives and Speeches of Abraham Lincoln (1860), Howells received his Venetian consulship (1861-1865). In consequence of his work in the formation of the Union League and loyalty to Republican policy and
politicians, George Henry Boker received his appointments as Minister to Turkey and Minister to Russia (1872-1875; 1875-1878). The list can be extended.

For the purpose of illustrating in greater detail my assertion that the appointment of writers in the maturity of the patronage system resulted from their political service or the endorsement of strong political friends, an examination of Hawthorne's appointments seems appropriate. He held three appointments: Weigher, Boston Customhouse (1839-1841); Surveyor, Salem Customhouse (1846-1849); and Consul at Liverpool (1853-1857). All his appointments were under Democratic administrations, and he lost all his offices in the quadrennial turnover of office. He lost the first and second appointments when Whig administrations came into power; he lost the third appointment when a new Democratic administration (President Buchanan's) came into power. His appointments were to both high and low positions; he received them in consequence of both political friendship and political service. Hawthorne is therefore representative of writers under federal appointment during the middle period of the patronage.

In all of his failure and successes in receiving appointment, Hawthorne had the good fortune to have friends who worked diligently on his behalf for political endorsement. On his own behalf Hawthorne was directly passive, indirectly active. He did not write begging letters or gather sheaves of testimonials, in contrast to the active part F. H. Underwood and John J. Piatt, as well as others, played in their various appointments. Hawthorne did have knowledge of the arrangements on his behalf, acquiesced in them, conferred about them, and accepted the
the deferment of others' hopes for appointment in his favor. No Machiavellian, he nonetheless accepted the patronage system when it worked to his good and was not averse to encouraging a direction proper to his ends. Like many writers under sinecure he preferred to think of his appointment as unsolicited manna. To believe that he, or any of the writers in this study, were innocents in the political world is a view the facts do not support.

Thus in 1837 Hawthorne's friends, Horatio Bridge and Franklin Pierce, set about to find Hawthorne a position. They wanted him named historian on the South Polar Expedition being outfitted by F. N. Reynolds on funds from a reluctant Congress. In his memoir of the episode Bridge reported that while he was in Washington early in the year he cooperated with Pierce in an attempt to exert influence in favor of the writer. Bridge sought to interest Senator Ruel Williams, chairman of the Senate Naval Committee, whom he appealed to as personal friend and fellow resident of Augusta, Maine. From Augusta on March 26 Bridge congratulated Hawthorne on being close to appointment. But as if aware the appointment was in fact uncertain, he asked Hawthorne what other position he wanted in order to "do something with men of influence in this State." He reported to Hawthorne that he was already acquainted with George Bancroft and asked Hawthorne to confer with Pierce about the appointment as historian.

On March 28 Pierce, then United States Senator (1837-1842) from New Hampshire, reported to Hawthorne he had written to Reynolds. Pierce understood that Reynolds would confer with Congressman C. C. Cambreleng, chairman of the Committee on Commerce and Navigation, with whom Reynolds
was organizing the expedition. Cambreleng, in turn, was to confer with President Van Buren. In his letter to Reynolds, Pierce emphasized Hawthorne’s level-headedness: “Mr. Hawthorne is not subject to any of those whims and eccentricities which are supposed to characterize men of genius, and which might disqualify him for any solid and steady business.”

Bridge clearly provided the impetus in this early episode. On April 7 he reported to Hawthorne that he had requested Bancroft, then Collector of the Port of Boston, to urge the writer’s cause with Mahlon Dickerson, the Secretary of the Navy. Bridge must have designed his letter to interest Bancroft; he believed he tickled Bancroft in the right place. He complained that Pierce had not written him and admonished Hawthorne to write Pierce often. A week later, however, the appointment had become blocked. Reynolds and Dickerson were in disagreement. At the end of April Pierce had received no answer to an inquiry of Reynolds. On May 17 Bridge reported that he had been in Washington and understood that the appointment was no longer open, for the position of historian had been filled.60

Although this attempt failed, it brought Hawthorne to the attention of George Bancroft. As Collector of the Port of Boston, Bancroft was patronage manager for the Democratic party in Massachusetts, therefore in position to help Hawthorne if he wished. Bancroft’s biographer, Russel B. Nye, points out that Bancroft responded to Bridge’s urging in April, 1837, by forwarding a recommendation of Hawthorne to Washington in favor of the abortive appointment to the South Polar Expedition. However, Bancroft did not, as Nye suggests, find Hawthorne an appointment “in a short time” thereafter.61 It was more than a year and half, in
January, 1839, that Hawthorne received his appointment as measurer under Bancroft in the Boston customhouse. Bancroft's recommendation to Levi Woodbury, Secretary of the Treasury, shows that Hawthorne took the place of a dismissed official and was endorsed as the biographer of Jonathan Cilley, Member of Congress killed in a duel in 1838. Cilley, Pierce, and Hawthorne had been students at Bowdoin together; Woodbury, Cilley, and Pierce were natives of New Hampshire, Democrats, and in office.

With his reference to Hawthorne as biographer of Cilley, Bancroft made a political justification of the appointment. After Cilley's death Hawthorne had written a biographical memoir published in the September, 1838, Democratic Review. Besides being a literary magazine this was also an instrument of the Democratic party. In his account of the founding of the magazine in October, 1837, John L. O'Sullivan reports that Old General Jackson took a great deal of interest in it, and was its first subscriber. The disasters which everywhere at about that period overthrew our party stimulated us to strenuous efforts to counteract the influences that produced them. The testimony of friends and foes was pretty general that these labors were very influential on public opinion.

O'Sullivan further speaks of himself as political editor and of the magazine's hope of receiving government printing contracts.

Furthermore, Hawthorne's memoir of Cilley is ninth in a series of "Political Portraits with Pen and Pencil" of Democratic politicians, including Levi Woodbury. Although the portrait of Cilley is eulogy, it is also political apology. Hawthorne justified Cilley's political career in opposition to the conservative ("Hunker") Democrats and Whigs of New Hampshire. Hawthorne points out that in 1836 Cilley, after membership
in the New Hampshire legislature (1832-1837), received the nomination of the Democratic party to run for the national congress in the fall elections and won a congressional seat in a formerly Whig district. Presumably, Cilley was a radical ("Locofoco") Democrat who would support the Jackson-Van Buren fiscal policy. Although formerly against the policy, Woodbury aligned himself with the radical Democrats and supported Jackson's demonopolizing of the United States Bank by removing the federal deposits to a number of private banks. One student of the episode points out that Henry Wise, who seconded W. J. Graves in the duel against Cilley, had attacked Secretary Woodbury in Congress, and the cause of the duel, whether political or private, remains uncertain. Nonetheless, a reasonable inference is that Bancroft recommended Hawthorne as partisan biographer of Cilley. In any event Bancroft's endorsement won Hawthorne his first political appointment.

Woodbury responded decisively to Bancroft's endorsement by pencilling the notation "approved: W" at the bottom of the letter. Certainly, by summer of the year of Hawthorne's appointment, Longfellow associated him with the radical Democrats:

The Loco-focos are organizing a new politico-literary system. They shout Hosannas to every loco-foco authoring, and speak coolly of, if they do not abuse, every other. They puff Bryant loud and long; likewise my good friend Hawthorne of "Twice-told Tales"; also a Mr. O'Sullivan, once Editor of the "Democratic Review,"--now Secretary of Legation at Paris.

After he lost his appointment in the Boston customhouse, Hawthorne continued to desire an appointment. His financial need continued to be urgent. In March, 1843, he regretted not having the cash to visit Bridge and sighed "for the regular monthly payments at the custom-house." In July he responded to an invitation from R. W. Griswold to write for
Graham's Magazine by asking if he were interested in offering an exclusive contract for the monopoly of his writing. Hawthorne was ready to do so "on account of the safety of your Magazine in a financial point of view." Meanwhile, Hawthorne and Bridge continued to confer about the Salem postmastership that Hawthorne had been interested in receiving in 1840, in the last year of his Boston appointment. In March, 1843, Hawthorne hoped that the Tyler appointee would not get the postmastership, which he noted with irony might "yet be the reward of my patriotism and public services." In May he recognized that no prospect for the Salem position remained; he remarked the difficulty of supporting himself by writing and expressed the desire for a good office.

With the victory of President Polk in November, 1844, Hawthorne's prospects took a better turn. He was convinced that the new President could help and that the difficulties of the Hawthorne family would "vanish, in the course of a few months." Bridge was in Washington to wait for the opening of Congress. Hawthorne wrote him that the Tyler incumbent in the Salem postmastership, Benjamin Browne, had been in office only two or three months and had not been confirmed by the Senate. Since Browne was not satisfactory to the Polk Democrats in Salem, Hawthorne believed that Bridge's influence might cause rejection of Browne, leaving a desirable vacancy. As Hawthorne put it, "In this way I think I might have a good chance for the office from Polk." Here is a very realistic Hawthorne going about the business of office-seeking.

Bancroft, however, was reluctant to help Hawthorne. As Secretary of the Navy his patronage province was not the Post Office, yet he seems to have been uninterested in finding Hawthorne a place in the Navy Department.
either. On March 21, 1845, O'Sullivan reported to Hawthorne that Bancroft had defended Browne, the incumbent Salem postmaster, as an "excellent and unexceptionable man." Another office-seeker had been appointed in the Boston Naval Yard in a clerkship that Hawthorne had considered and that Bancroft could have held for him. Bancroft weakly suggested as alternative a clerkship in the Smithsonian Library. O'Sullivan suggested consulships at Marseilles, Genoa, Gibraltar, and China that interested Hawthorne. Meanwhile, O'Sullivan intended to ask Every Duyckinck to write an article about Hawthorne in the Democratic Review: "By manufacturing you thus into a personage, I want to raise your mark higher in Polk's appreciation." Although Bridge, O'Sullivan, and Pierce continued to urge Hawthorne's cause with Bancroft, their work ended in nothing from Bancroft save the offer in August of a clerkship in the Charleston Navy Yard at $900 per annum. Hawthorne asked Bridge that O'Sullivan be requested to inform Bancroft he did not want it.

Bridge was perhaps the most faithful, once again, in pursuit of the novelist's end. As purser in the Portsmouth Navy Yard he invited Hawthorne, Sophia, and Una to visit him in late July and early August of 1845. He also invited Franklin Pierce, Senator Charles Atherton, and John Fairfield, Governor of Maine. Since the families were also present, the visit had the character of a vacation. Bridge's object was to interest men of influence in Hawthorne's behalf. Although Pierce was already committed, the help of Atherton and Fairfield would be useful. Their influence would broaden the political base of the appeal in Hawthorne's favor, for they represented Maine (Fairfield), New Hampshire (Pierce), and Massachusetts (Atherton). Additionally, Pierce was esteemed by the
Polk administration. Although he had retired by choice to an appointment as Federal District Attorney for New Hampshire, Pierce had been asked by Polk to serve in his cabinet. As already shown, Bridge’s and O’Sullivan’s plan for Hawthorne’s appointment in the Navy Department was unsuccessful; nonetheless, Bridge introduced the novelist to men who were later to endorse him for the Salem surveyorship. And Bridge was not to be stopped; he also planned to have George W. Greene, Consul at Rome and a literary man, expelled from office in favor of Hawthorne. It was a plan that Hawthorne clearly knew about. He wrote Sophia of having met Greene, “whom, as thou knowest, it was Bridge’s plan to eject from office for thy husband’s benefit.”

The cessation of other plans and the concentration on the plan to appoint Hawthorne to the Salem surveyorship began in the fall of 1845. In the episode one sees the shifting and accommodation that appear typical of the appointment of literary men, as of ordinary politicians. Although some endorsers of Hawthorne speak warmly of his literary reputation, his appointment was clearly not made for the patronage of a writer but for the satisfaction of political demands.

To begin with, the Salem Democrats were badly split. The preceding national administration had left the group in disarray. President Harrison had brought into power a Whig administration with the support of Calhoun Democrats who advocated states rights, strict interpretation of the constitution, and the right of nullification. On Harrison’s death after a month in office, Tyler came to the presidency pledged to carry out Harrison’s patronage appointments. Nominally a Democrat, he thereafter appointed from Whig and Democratic ranks alike. For that reason, when
Polk came into office, Salem Democrats faithful to Polk considered any Tyler appointment a Whig appointment and accordingly called for dismissal, though the incumbents were Democrats. Thus H. L. Conolly and Thomas L. Bowles, Chairman and Secretary of the Democratic Committee for the Second Congressional District, recommended Hawthorne and John Howard as Surveyor and Naval Office in the Salem customhouse.

It is perfectly obvious to the Committee that the continuance of the present incumbents in office is detrimental to the interests of the local democracy. The feelings of a very large number of voters are being alienated from the Party by seeing them retained in office. And though it may not be the perfection of logic, still it is argued, that as these incumbents were placed in office by Whig influence, without the recommendation, sanction or approval of the local Democracy, and anyway continued in office contrary to the wishes of the party, that, therefore the Executive has withdrawn his confidence from the local democracy, & placed it on our opponents the Whigs, & consequently it is useless to adhere to a party which the Administration in effect disowns. In view of these facts, we ask that the shield of the Executive protection may be thrown over the party & confidence restored to our political ranks. A change in these offices we believe to be absolutely essential.

Before the Salem Democrats settled on Hawthorne and Howard, they had already decided that Richard Lindsay and George Mullet should be Surveyor and Naval Officer and had forwarded endorsements to Washington. The reversal meant that Lindsay and Mullet had to be withdrawn. According to Mullet the Salem Democrats asked him to persuade Lindsay to withdraw. Because he knew Lindsay would resist, he at first volunteered to withdraw his candidacy for Naval Officer in favor of Hawthorne, a move that was not satisfactory to Hawthorne's adherents. Mullet persuaded Lindsay to cooperate, and they entered a formal withdrawal of their claim. Interestingly, their letter to Polk emphasizes Hawthorne as a candidate satisfactory to both sides of the split party; they withdrew, "hoping
thereby to promote the interests of the Democratic Party and heal all further differences; and we would most heartily recommend the appointment of Nathaniel Hawthorne Esqr. for Surveyor and John D. Howard Esqr. for the situation of Naval Officer. After Hawthorne's appointment Lindsay and Mullet received appointments as inspectors in the custom-house under Hawthorne. Whatever other claims they had, the inference that they were rewarded also for their cooperation seems inescapable.

The evidence suggests that Hawthorne's endorsers presented him as a candidate whose appointment would heal the division in the Salem party. As already shown, the dissatisfaction of the Polk Democrats with the Tyler appointments had split party ranks. Lindsay and Mullet resigned their claim to office with the desire of healing the wounds. The note of Hawthorne's value as compromise candidate recurs in the letters that began to come in support of Hawthorne. On October 25, Governor Fairfield, whom Hawthorne had met almost three months before, wrote an endorsement of Hawthorne and Howard to President Polk. He denied that the Tyler incumbent had any right to an appointment under a Democratic administration and remarked Hawthorne's reputation as a writer and "a democrat in principles, feeling and action, though never a warm partisan." It was the absence of warm partisanship that made Hawthorne especially suitable, according to Benjamin F. Browne of the Salem Democratic Town Committee. Now that Lindsay and Mullet had stepped down, Browne endorsed Hawthorne and Howard, sure that the appointment of these gentlemen would give general satisfaction to the democracy of this place as they are both gentlemen of unsullied private characters of undoubted capacity and neither of them have been identified with any of our local divisions—
Browne also commends Hawthorne as the man "whose fame as a man of literature is coextensive with the English (sic) language." 80

The claim for Hawthorne as compromise candidate continued. On October 29, Varney and Parsons, publishers of the Democratic Salem Advertiser, addressed Polk in behalf of Hawthorne and Howard. They emphasized the dissatisfaction of the Democrats with "the backwardness exhibited in purging our Custom House of the federal, incompetent, superannuated incumbents."

They pointed out that Lindsay and Mullet had stepped down in favor of Hawthorne and Howard "for the purpose of promoting union and harmony" in the party. The national respect for Hawthorne as a literary man and his identity "in principle" with the party made him a satisfactory candidate.

Significantly, his endorsers made no claim for Hawthorne as an enthusiastic partisan, as they did for Howard. 81 On October 30 a Democratic party caucus forwarded a petition begging Polk to remove the Tyler incumbents and replace them with Hawthorne and Howard, who "would impart, by the high literary characters they sustain, great respectability to the office." 82

On November 17, Pierce forwarded his endorsement to Secretary of the Treasury Robert E. Walker. He emphasized his friendship with Hawthorne and his understanding that the novelist was acceptable to Massachusetts Democrats. The letter bears an additional endorsement by Senator Atherton of Hawthorne as a literary man and pleasing to New England Democrats. It is dated more than a month after Pierce's letter, December 19, and bears the signature of Atherton, whom Hawthorne had met at Bridge's the preceding summer. 83

Although Hawthorne's Salem support had solidified, his appointment pended while superior officers examined the case and their own desires.
On December 18, Marcus Morton endorsed Hawthorne's candidacy; as patronage manager for Massachusetts in his position as collector of the Boston customhouse, his recommendation was most important. He indicated to his superior, Secretary of the Treasury Walker, that he had wished to let the Salem Democrats work out the party division and was now happy to present Hawthorne as fruition of the reconciliation. The letter bears an undated endorsement from Walker to Pierce showing that the Secretary was not convinced the party split had been healed and that he would decline to appoint Hawthorne if conflicting claims were still urged.84

Hawthorne's appointment continued to hang fire while Bancroft interceded in behalf of his own candidate. As Secretary of the Navy, Bancroft had no direct claim over customhouse patronage, but he was a former incumbent of the collectorship and continued to wield great influence as a Massachusetts party leader and a national cabinet member. He had written to Morton in favor of restoring one Stephen Hoyt to an office in the Boston customhouse. Since Morton had removed Hoyt because of incompetence, he had no desire to restore him. He instead suggested to Bancroft that Hoyt be appointed to the Salem surveyorship. As Morton put it, Hoyt was a Salem man, and he understood that the old applicants there "had withdrawn & left an open field. Such an arrangement would relieve me."85 It was, of course, an arrangement that would satisfy Bancroft's requirements, but his understanding that the old applicants (Lindsay and Mullet) had withdrawn, thus leaving vacancies, hardly agrees with his letter to Secretary Walker written five days previously, in which he had endorsed Hawthorne, having "just learned with pleasure, that all the former candidates for the office have withdrawn."
Morton therefore reversed his former position. He wrote again to Secretary Walker, pointed out that the incumbent in the Salem surveyorship was politically objectionable, suggested putting Hoyt in, and concluded by remarking that he had only heard the Salem squabble had subsided. Reinforcing his new stance, he reported to Pierce on January 5 his new belief that the party dispute remained alive in Salem and that

so far from a mutual understanding between the parties, I learn that the proposed appointment was originated with one party, & was most carefully concealed from the other, & is still wholly unknown to them.

But still I have so good an opinion of the integrity & fairness of Mr. Hawthorne, that I think it will be well to appoint him, provided someone will undertake to show him the impropriety of making any of the subordinate appointments in either of the departments of the S.C.H. from either of the factions which distract our party in that town & neighborhood.

As in the past Bancroft was an uncertain agent in Hawthorne's behalf. Although he professed friendship, he was slow to help in 1837, when he was Collector of the Port of Boston and in good position to offer patronage. As Secretary of the Navy he refused to intercede in Hawthorne's behalf for the Salem postmastership. He was also unable to find Hawthorne a suitable position in the Navy Department. Bancroft's reluctance has several sources. No evidence suggests that he was a party to the Democratic split in Salem. He had supported Van Buren in the Democratic convention in 1844 and had gone so far as to write a campaign biography which was in proof when Van Buren's candidacy was deadlocked in convention and the unknown Polk came up as dark horse. Recognizing Van Buren had no chance, Bancroft had turned the Massachusetts delegation to Polk. Although Bancroft had begged off writing a campaign biography for Polk, the relation between them was sound: Polk made Bancroft his Secretary of the Navy and acceded to Ban-
Neither had the structure of the Democratic party in Massachusetts grown insubordinate toward Bancroft, as Morton's desire to please the Secretary reveals. In the immediate instance he may not have known that Hawthorne was a candidate for the surveyorship. Certainly he knew that Hawthorne desired office. As a Democrat who had helped build the party in Massachusetts from a position of weakness to strength, Bancroft certainly knew that patronage enforced party, and Hawthorne was not directly partisan. In 1836 Bancroft could cite Hawthorne's biography of Cilley as political service to justify his appointment to the Boston customhouse, but Hawthorne was reluctant to engage in party activity and had done nothing in the interim. At the close of the Salem surveyorship, the Salem Whigs brought against Hawthorne the false charge of political journalism while in office. Though false, it was the kind of service, I am convinced, that would have made Bancroft readier to help.

In this instance Bancroft probably did not know that Hawthorne was the particular Democratic candidate. Having heard of the novelist's need, on January 9, Charles Sumner wrote one of the most emotional pleas in Hawthorne's favor of all the letters I have seen in favor of literary men. Sumner could make no political claim on the Democratic Party. Not to be senator until 1851, he was to emerge from Free Soil politics, a combination of liberal democrats and anti-Whig forces, as one of the founders of the Republican party. In the period under question he remained within the Whig party, working to cause its adoption of an anti-slavery attitude. It remains doubtful that Sumner knew that Hawthorne had settled on the surveyorship; he made a general plea for "Some post-office, some custom house, something, that will yield daily bread,—anything...." He addressed
the letter to Mrs. Bancroft, importuning through her Bancroft's good-will.

Recognizing he had no patronage claim, he pleaded Hawthorne's poverty and literary character:

"You will think that I never appear, except as a beggar. Very well. I never beg for myself. But I do beg now most earnestly for another; for a friend of mine, & of your husband's; for a man of letters, of gentleness.

I have heard to-day of the poverty of Hawthorne. He is very poor indeed. He has already broken up the humble & inexpensive home which he had established in Concord, because it was too expensive. You know how simply he lives. He lives almost on nothing; but even that nothing has gone...

Some of his savings were lent to Mr. Ripley at Brook Farm; but he is not able to repay them, & poor Hawthorne (that sweet, gentle, true nature) has not wherewithal to live. I need not speak of his genius to you. He is an ornament of the country; nor is there a person of any party who would not hear with delight that the author of such Goldsmithian prose, as he writes, had received honor & office from his country. I plead for him earnestly, & count upon your friendly interference to keep his name present to the mind of your husband, so that it may not be pushed out of sight by the intrusive legion of clamorous office-seekers, or by public cares.

Some post-office, some custom-house, some thing, that will yield daily bread,—anything in the gift of your husband— or that his potent influence might command—will confer great happiness upon Hawthorne; & I believe, dear Mrs. Bancroft, it will confer greater upon you; feeling, as I do, that all true kindness blesses him that bestows it more than it blesses the receiver.

I wish I could have some assurance from your husband that Hawthorne shall be cared for.

Yours sincerely (provided you do not forget Hawthorne)"

Sumner's plea may well have determined Bancroft to help Hawthorne.

Bancroft responded by remarking ironically Sumner's willingness to follow the "good rule of dismissing wicked Whigs and putting in Democrats." He assured Sumner that as soon as business permitted Hawthorne would have an office. On February 2, he "unhesitatingly" endorsed Hawthorne as surveyor and Hoyt as naval officer. Interestingly, he had now decided to negate Howard's claim to the naval office in favor of Hoyt, whom he
had formerly wanted appointed in Hawthorne's position. On February 4, he endorsed an abstract of the recommendations that had been made to that time in favor of Hawthorne and Howard. It reads: "For Surveyor at Salem I advise the appointment of Nathaniel Hawthorne G. Bancroft Feb. 4, '46 For Naval Officer John D. Howard GB. Feb. 4, '46" Bancroft scratched through Hoyt's name and replaced it with Howard's; clearly, he did not surrender easily. Bancroft later reported to Pierce that his personal preference for naval officer had been Hoyt, but that he had conceded to the wishes expressed in Benjamin F. Browne's letter. Browne had emphasized the suitability of Hawthorne and Howard as compromise candidates to heal the party, and Bancroft had no desire to promote rupture.

Accordingly, Bancroft recommended the appointments to President Polk. In response to an inquiry from Salem about the state of the appointments, he explained that Polk would nominate Hawthorne and Howard to the Senate. The records of the Treasury Department reveal that Hawthorne was appointed for four years from April 2, 1846, commissioned on April 3, bonded for $1000 on April 8, and took oath on April 9. He was replaced when President Taylor came into office by Allen Putnam on June 7, 1849. Putnam remained on temporary appointment until confirmed on September 24, 1850, in order to avoid violation of the Four-Year Tenure Act of 1820 by which, strictly speaking, Hawthorne had the right to serve for four years on condition of good behavior.

Unlike his passivity in the Boston and Salem appointments, in his appointment as consul at Liverpool in 1853, Hawthorne played a more direct role than he had in his appointment to the Salem customhouse. With respect to the Salem surveyorship the evidence shows Hawthorne working behind the
scenes in concurrence with the plans of his friends. If not initiator of action, he was certainly adviser, and ready to accept the patronage most suitable to him. But he was not an impersonal manipulator of men and events, for the products of his friendship with Bridge, O'Sullivan, and Pierce was as freely given as gratefully received. He was thoroughly aware of the political nature of his appointment and played the game with a hard-headed awareness of the ground rules. With respect to the Liverpool consulship his long friendship with Pierce and talent as writer conjoined to produce a direct political service for which he received his appointment.

Not the urgency of Hawthorne's political convictions, but his friendship for Pierce led him to write the campaign biography Life of Franklin Pierce (1852). On June 9, 1852, Hawthorne was first to broach the subject after the Democratic convention beginning June 1 had nominated Pierce. He had thought about the obligation to his friend but believed his talents were inappropriate for writing a campaign biography. He reported his awareness that Pierce would ask him to help and offered his qualified services:

Whatever services I can do you, I need not say, would be at your command, but I do not believe that I should succeed in this matter so well as many other men. It needs long thought with me, in order to produce anything good, and after all; my style and qualities, as a writer, are certainly not those of the broadest popularity, such as are requisite for a task of this kind. I should write a better life of you after your term of office and life itself were over, than on the eve of an election. I say this with deepest frankness; and (supposing you have even had the subject in your thoughts) submit my honest opinion to your consideration.97

Hawthorne concluded by suggesting that Mr. Hazewell, editor of the Boston Times, was more properly qualified for the task and offered to help Hazew-
Despite his qualms Hawthorne undertook the task. During June he interviewed friends of Pierce and gathered materials about the presidential candidate's political and military history. Toward the end of July he set to work on the biography, resolved to finish it with diligence. He satisfied his resolve: the author's preface bears the date August 27, and the book was published in early September.

Although Hawthorne was not pleased with the book, he believed it an honest, if somewhat selective, treatment of Pierce. He considered his greatest task the explanation of how Pierce had remained so obscure, given his opportunities for civil and military distinction. By October 18, Hawthorne had decided that he would accept the Liverpool consulship as a reward, though he had made a previous resolution not to accept a beneficence:

He [Pierce] could not do a better thing, either for me or the credit of his administration, than to make the appointment [as consul at Liverpool].... He certainly owes me something; for the biography has cost me hundreds of friends here at the north, who had a purer regard for me than Frank Pierce or any other politician ever gained, and who drop off from me like autumn leaves in consequence of what I say on the slavery question.

Hawthorne's appointment was completed without the flurry of petitions and endorsements that marked his earlier appointment to the surveyorship. There was no need for endorsements; none exists in the National Archives. The succinct notation in the appointments file of the Department of State suggests how completely the appointment was in the hands of President Pierce: "Hawthorne Nathl. Consul. Liverpool. Appointed. April 18, 1853. Consulate—Liverpool Nathaniel Hawthorne Appointed No papers on file at this date. July 14th 1853." On March 28, the Senate con-
firmed the appointment. Having been in Washington during the latter half of April as guest of Pierce, Hawthorne returned to Concord to prepare his family for the voyage to Liverpool. During June, Hawthorne and his family remained in Concord. On July 6 the Hawthorne and Ticknor families sailed from Boston on the Niagara. Because his predecessor wished to remain in office until the end of July, Hawthorne did not begin in office until August 1, when he entered into his duties, his commission, exaquator, and consulate inventory in good order.

Hawthorne's three appointments offer us prototypes of the range and condition of appointment to which writers in the 19th Century of the patronage were elevated. As measurer in the Boston customhouse and surveyor in the Salem customhouse, Hawthorne was subject to the conditions of the political patronage that affected other writers in minor positions, like Paulding, Burroughs, Whitman, and Melville. As consul at Liverpool, Hawthorne received higher office under more dignified and ceremonial conditions, as did Howells, Boker, Lowell, Taylor, and Wallace. Yet the preconditions for appointment at all levels were political, not literary. In his appointment as minor official Hawthorne's political friends managed the patronage machinery that brought him into office. In his appointment as higher official Hawthorne performed a direct political service. These two patterns, political friendship and political service, dominate all others in the appointment of writers to public office.

The political patronage and the appointment of writers share a similar history. Both grew strong as a means of promoting party development in the height of the patronage (1829-1877). Both declined in the post-Grant period of reform (1877-1905). Perhaps the most necessary qualifi-
cation of the common nature of the two systems is the reservation that appointments of writers in the pre-Jacksonian period were almost as uniformly political in origin as appointments of writers in the Jacksonian period. Although federal appointments in the pre-Jacksonian era may have gone to gentlemen of talent and birth regardless of political belief, I have not found those virtues the vital factor in the appointment of writers in the initial period, as I wish to show in "The Political Util-

ity of Writers."
FOOTNOTES

1 See below, Chapter V. and Appendix—Appointees, Offices, and Tenures. I wish to be the first to acknowledge that the findings of this chapter are liable to change with new and fuller information. I have admitted names into all periods under consideration in the catholic sense of the term "literary man." Excluded altogether from this discussion are the tenures of writers who received appointment at the state level, such as Henry Hugh Brackenridge's appointment as Justice of the Supreme Court (Pennsylvania), 1799-1816. Also excluded are the tenures of writers in elective office.

2 This is a conservative figure. I have excluded from the count those appointees who were almost exclusively journalists: David W. Bartlett, John Bigelow, Charles A. Dana, Samuel B. Goodrich, John L. O'Sullivan, and Robert Walsh.

3 In the period Taft through Franklin Roosevelt (1909-1945), record exists of the appointment of ten writers: Sherwood Anderson, Claude Bowers, Robert Frost, Robert Underwood Johnson, James Weldon Johnson, Archibald MacLeish, Meredith Nicholson, Frederick Jesup Stimson, Henry Van Dyke, and Brand Whitlock. Interestingly, all these were Department of State appointments save Frost's and MacLeish's appointments as Librarian of Congress.
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CHAPTER III
THE POLITICAL UTILITY OF WRITERS

Disturbed by a society indifferent to humanistic values, Sherwood Anderson criticized the deterioration of American Life in Poor White (1920). He remarked, as an associated theme, the corruption of writers by politicians and businessmen. As if it dwelled in his mind as one of the evil effects of a system devoted to the exclusive production and consumption of goods, he turned twice in editorial comment to the tendency of men of power to pervert the writer, to make of him a shaper of public opinion, and then to despise him because the writer knows the emptiness of the fabrication. He refers specifically to businessmen who employ writers to make false advertisements and politicians who employ writers to make the lies that keep them in office. The more vehement of the passages spreads over two pages, beginning with an allusion to potential artists occupying themselves "in the making of puffs and creating of myths" in Washington under the employment of politicians and newspapers. It is a bitter passage. Anderson compares writers who permit themselves to be prostitutioned to misled children, to foul animals that befoul the minds of others, and to sheep who lead other sheep to slaughter. His argument implies that writers have creative power only in the absence of such corruptive employment; the support of powerful men turns writers away from art to propaganda.¹

Although Anderson's critical object was the use made of writers, not art patronage, his is one of the characteristic arguments against
the patronage of writers. Recent critics of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, a federally subsidized program, have forwarded an argument similar in part to Anderson's. They believe that the necessary condition of the writer is a stimulating poverty, and they fear characteristically that the subsidized writer will have no impetus to write. Like Anderson they fear that the subsidized writer will become an instrument of party or federal propaganda. Their leading spokesman, Barry Goldwater, believes that such a system would have seriously inhibited nineteenth century writers, who "would have been stifled by the dead hand of bureaucracy." Ignorant of their efforts to achieve appointment, he names Poe and Melville among writers whose art would have been destroyed by "the triplicate forms of a government agency." He asks how subsidized writers are to be restrained from becoming propagandists.2

These views are conventional attitudes toward the patronage of writers. Sherwood Anderson's criticism of the political use of writers reveals the defensive posture of the writer. Barry Goldwater's criticism of state patronage of the writer reflects the modern fear of the totalitarian state. Neither accurately describes the effect of the appointment of writers to public office in the nineteenth century, which constituted in effect a patronage of writers. Whether as an exclusive cause such appointment inhibited the artist is a question I wish to take up elsewhere; I believe it did not. Certainly, the view that the writer is a political neuter whose talents are available at best bid, that he is an innocent who is persuaded by politicians against his own better wishes, these views in application to the writers of this study are false. On the whole our writers believed they were effective participants in power and decision.
When they lent their names or provided services, they did so from numerous motives, not the least being political commitment. Not always fervent partisans, they nonetheless made serious commitments to men, parties, or principles. They recognized and accepted (sometimes ungracefully) the consequences of their political acts and the patronage system. They were not given to shifting party allegiance. They were extremely aware of developing political movements. Although politicians found the ability of writers to influence public opinion their most attractive virtue, writers offered their services freely. They were sometime uncomfortable in the conflict they saw between themselves as writers and partisans. However, if they were partisans and propagandists, they chose the role.

Because of the special usefulness of writers, besides their political commitment, few received appointment on the basis of literary merit alone. As we have seen, in the pre-Jacksonian era a common generalization holds that patronage appointments were nonpolitical. The principle of utility makes necessary a qualification of the generalization as it applies to the appointment of writers. The appointments of Philip Freneau as translating clerk in the Department of State (1791-1793) and Joel Barlow as Minister to France (1811-1812) show that from the beginning, even in the pre-Jacksonian period, the ability to communicate a political point of view and partisan commitment made writers particularly eligible for appointment.

As journalist and political satirist Freneau developed a reputation as an anti-British writer. In his first appointment as clerk in the Post Office Department (1780-1783), Freneau attracted the attention of his department chief for having written a number of patriotic poems dealing
with men and events of the Revolutionary War. Proud to have a talented patriot in his office, Postmaster-General Ebenezer Hazard recommended to a friend especially "The British Prison Ship," as well as "The Voyage to Boston," "Rivington's Reflections," and "Hugh Gaine's Life." Hazard's favorite, "The British Prison Ship," detailed the horrors of the ship on which Freneau was held prisoner after the capture of the American vessel Aurora on May 26, 1870. The four Rivington poems that Freneau wrote in the period February-December, 1782, held up to scurrilous abuse one James Rivington, whom F. L. Pattee identifies as a Tory bookseller and printer in New York from 1761 until the close of the Revolutionary War, when he recovered his patriotism and became a loyal Whig. Hugh Gaine, with a similar history, was another pro-British printer whom Freneau anathematized.

Freneau's ability to stimulate public response interested Jefferson. As a political enemy of Alexander Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, Jefferson saw the need to found a journal to criticize Hamilton's Federalism and build support for his own Democratic-Republican party. He therefore encouraged Freneau to establish at the seat of the national government a newspaper that would be, given Freneau's anti-Federalism, a pro-Jeffersonian instrument. Initially, Jefferson's intention may have been only to bring Freneau to Philadelphia as translating clerk in the Department of State. Before the appointment was completed, it is clear that he also intended to support Freneau as editor of the National Gazette, which became an anti-Federalist, anti-Hamilton newspaper.

On February 28, 1791, Jefferson invited Freneau to assume the clerkship for foreign languages in the Department of State at $250 per annum.
Admitting the modesty of the salary, he indicated the post required so few duties "as not to interfere with any other calling the person may choose" and that he had been told Freneau's services were available, possibly by James Madison and Henry Lee. In response Freneau at first declined the "generous unsolicited (sic) proposal," for he wished to establish a newspaper in Monmouth County, New Jersey. In his immediate response Freneau wrote only of the clerkship, which he refused in favor of his plan for his own newspaper. He probably did not understand that Jefferson would support him in a newspaper venture in Philadelphia, and Jefferson's only interest in Freneau at this time may have been the poet's ability in French, which made him particularly suitable to fill the post made vacant by the resignation of John Pintard upon the government's removal to Philadelphia.

In the congressional recess that extended from March 4 to October 24, 1791, Jefferson and Madison made a tour through the states that found them in New York on May 20 in anticipation of a journey through New England. Preceding Jefferson by several days, Madison conferred with Freneau in New York about the possibility of establishing a newspaper in Philadelphia. There can be no doubt that at this point Jefferson wanted Freneau as editor as well as translating clerk. Madison discovered that Freneau was accustomed to translating the Leiden Gazette, a Dutch paper of republican sympathies that Jefferson wished to present in excerpts in an American newspaper. With respect to the clerkship Freneau had doubted his facility in translating into the French. Reassured of his suitability Freneau appeared ready to accept, as Madison reports,

being made sensible of the advantages of Philadé over N. Jersey
for his private undertaking, his mind is taking another turn; and if the scantiness of his capital should not be a bar, I think he will establish himself in the former. At all events he will give his friends then an opportunity of aiding his decision by their information & counsel. The more I learn of his character talents and principles, the more I should regret his burying himself in the obscurity he had chosen in N. Jersey.®

Jefferson negotiated with Freneau, then, in order to develop a remedy against the Federalist press, especially the United States Gazette, edited in Philadelphia by John Fenno. By May 9 Jefferson believed that Freneau had decided once again not to go to Philadelphia. A few days later he characterized Fenno's United States Gazette as a vendor of "pure Toryism, disseminating the doctrine of monarchy, aristocracy, and the exclusion of the influence of the people." He had hoped to set up another journal to serve as a "whig vehicle of intelligence," but noted his failure to persuade Freneau to establish a rival journal. 9 By July, when it appeared that Freneau was indeed not coming, Jefferson informed Madison of his regret that the poet had declined and indicated that he would have made Freneau the publisher of official documents:

I should have given him the perusal of all my letters of foreign intelligence and all foreign newspapers [for Freneau's journal], the publication of all proclamations and other public notices within my department, and the printing of the laws, which added to his salary would have been a considerable aid. Besides this, Fenno's being the only weekly paper and under general condemnation for its toryism and its incessant efforts to over-turn the government, Freneau would have found that ground as good as unoccupied.®

Fenneau's reluctance had two sources. He had already set in motion plans for a country newspaper in New Jersey and had gone so far as to enlist a number of subscribers who appeared quite ready to support him. On this basis he had first declined Jefferson's offer. Additionally, he had no immediate prospect of capital to aid in establishing a shop in Phil-
Philadelphia. Although Jefferson wished to patronize Freneau's newspaper once established, he had no desire to own it or direct its policy, especially since Freneau's politics were similar to Jefferson's long before the offer came to join the Department of State. In doubt of funds Freneau hesitated. On July 10 Madison reported to Jefferson that Freneau had abandoned the project, although his political principles remained intact. Meanwhile, Madison, Henry Lee, and Freneau conferred about the possible aid of the publishers Francis Childs and John Swaine. On July 25 Freneau promised Madison a decisive answer relative to printing his paper in Philadelphia, contingent upon Childs' support. On August 4 he reported to Jefferson his firm decision to go to Philadelphia, having conferred with Madison and Lee and having reached an agreement with Childs and Swaine to help underwrite the expense of the newspaper. He prepared a prospectus which he wished Jefferson to examine prior to publication. On August 14 Freneau was appointed clerk in the Department of State; on October 31 the first issue of the National Gazette appeared.

Freneau's National Gazette and Fenno's United States Gazette engages in violent exchanges of opinion that led to intensified enmity between Jefferson and Hamilton and charges from both sides that the two Secretaries wrote for the respective journals and exercised unethical control over editorial content. The charge, however, that Freneau was a hireling corrupted by Jefferson does not withstand examination. Before his appointment in the Department of State and the establishment of the National Gazette, Freneau's journalism revealed the anti-Federalist stance that made him an attractive candidate. In his writing for the New York Daily Advertiser, for which he wrote in the year prior to his federal
appointment, one finds several instances of Freneau's criticism of inherited privilege, the aristocracy, and men of wealth, as well as admiration for republican virtues such as universal suffrage, civil liberty, and religious toleration. For example, in a utopian forecast of America in 1940 Freneau noted that rational men will have effected universal suffrage even among former slaves and that the clash of sectarians will have dissolved in the gradual negation of superstitious belief and the adoption of true impartiality toward sects. In a fable called "The OLD SOLDIER and his DOG" he recounted a story designed to show that the model social organization engages people on a free, equalitarian basis, regardless of rank. Derided because he keeps his dog when its sale would bring him wealth, the old soldier responds rhetorically, equating the dog with freedom:

But look at his countenance, and consider it well. Do you see therein a single feature of sycophantism or servility? His services to me are wholly voluntary, and what right have I to make a transfer of him or them to any person whatever?...Sir, I have taken an oath not to part with my dog upon any terms—Instead, therefore, of carrying him off with you to foreign countries, go, and learn to imitate his good qualities; and be not surprised, or angry, when I tell you, that by so doing, you will perhaps have a better claim than ever to what I call the true dignity of a rational being.

In "Rules how to compliment great Men in a proper manner" Freneau made another impassioned plea for free contract in a republican society. He contrasted the flattery Europeans must direct to their great men and the freedom with which citizens of a republic may address their leaders, who are not "man in power," but "fellow-citizens" appointed to execute the laws arrived at by "the common consent of the nation." 14

On founding the National Gazette Freneau as editor was free to expose
his anti-Federalism fully. The most notable change in subject from the period of the Daily Advertiser to that of the National Gazette was Freneau's direct criticism of Hamilton and his fiscal policy as Secretary of the Treasury. Prior to his federal appointment Freneau wrote no direct criticism of the Secretary, possibly because the despised Funding Act of August 4, 1790, was not passed until near the end of Freneau's tenure as contributor to the Daily Advertiser, over which, in any case, he exercised no editorial control. After Freneau became editor of the National Gazette, he frequently attacked Hamilton's Funding Act, which was designed to sell government bonds to relieve the public debts incurred in the Revolutionary War. Critics of the new law considered it an unfair means of reimbursing the wealthy for their contributions to the war effort, for it concentrated wealth in the hands of the few at the expense of a general taxation that deprived especially the poor. Freneau explored this view in such articles as "The Two Parties and Public Debt" and "RULES For changing a limited Republican Government into an unlimited hereditary one." In other respects, however, Freneau's political criticism remained perfectly consistent with that of his earlier journalism: general criticism of aristocratic and monarchical leanings, as in "Sentiments of a Republican" and "to the NOBLESSE AND COURTiers OF THE UNITED STATES," and support of simple republican virtue, as in "The Right of the Poor to Discuss Public Affairs." Freneau was therefore no bought hack. His appointment in the Department of State helped make possible an end he had already conceived and set in motion, the establishment of a newspaper, his own private venture. His political stance made him a suitable choice to Jefferson and Madison, both of whom disclaimed direct control in vindication of their relationship
with Freneau. In retrospect Madison admitted he sought to further Freneau's private interests and to initiate "a free paper, meant for general circulation, and edited by a man of genius, of republican principles, and a friend to the Constitution" as an antidote against monarchy and aristocracy.\(^\text{16}\) In his vindication to President Washington, Jefferson explained that while he had encouraged Freneau to settle in Philadelphia as clerk and editor, he had never dictated editorial policy, for he "took for granted from Freneau's character, which had been marked as that of a good whig, that he would give free place to pieces written against the aristocratical & monarchical principles [other] papers had inculcated."\(^\text{17}\)

The evidence shows Madison and Jefferson were correct in their assertion that Freneau's politics were genuinely his own.

In much the same fashion Jefferson encouraged the Whig bias in the writings of Joel Barlow, who had two different federal appointments as special minister to Algiers (1795-1797) and minister to France (1811-1812), where he died in service. Like Thomas Paine and Philip Freneau, Barlow favored the rationalist humanism that the French Revolution represented.

In 1792 and 1793 Barlow published a two-volume critique of royal and ecclesiastical tyranny called Advice to the Privileged Orders in the Several States of Europe. Coming as it did during his conflict with Hamilton, Jefferson was pleased with it and considered the work a remedy against "the heresies of some people here":

> Be assured that your endeavors to bring the trans-Atlantic world into the road of reason, are not without their effect here. Some here are disposed to move retrograde, and to take their stand in the rear of Europe, now advancing to the high ground of natural right.\(^\text{18}\)

After Jefferson became President in 1801, he continued to encourage
Barlow's republican writings. Following the reactionary movement in the United States against the Jacobin violence of the French Revolution, he believed that the anti-French fervor had ameliorated. He now wished Barlow to return to the United States from France, where he remained following the conclusion of his mission to Algiers in 1797, in order to write a Whig history of the United States. In a letter of May 3, 1802, Jefferson reported to Barlow the favorable dominance of the Democratic-Republican party in the national congress and senate and in several of the state legislatures. He invited Barlow to reside in Washington, for he and Madison could then make available the public archives and their own knowledge. Jefferson clearly had in mind a campaign document; he mentioned that John Marshall, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was writing a Federalist life of Washington intended "to influence the next presidential election." After the publication of Marshall's book, Barlow's history could "point out the perversions of truth necessary to be rectified."

Jefferson miscalculated the speed of Marshall's composition and the immediacy of its purpose. His five-volume *Washington* did not begin to appear until 1804, when the first volume appeared, and was not completed until 1807. It was not, therefore, a campaign document, although it was potentially a Federalist view of the Revolutionary period, and Jefferson remained attentive to its content. By 1809 Barlow was engaged in the history that Jefferson had encouraged him to begin, and the former President was supplying documents. Among them was the fifth volume of Marshall's work, which Jefferson examined with an eye to correcting errors and making annotations to be forwarded to Barlow. Barlow continued to
work intermittently on the history, which seemed to grow grander in
scheme and more difficult to complete with the passage of time. On April
16, 1811, Jefferson congratulated Barlow on his pending appointment as
Minister to France but chided him for having failed to complete a true-
account of "our past revolutionary history" and to offer "antidotes of
truth to the misrepresentations of Marshall."21 After his appointment
Barlow failed to complete the Whig history, and his death in service on
December 24, 1812, negated whatever plans he may have had to complete
the history as a private citizen.

This account of the relation between Jefferson, Freneau, and Barlow
reveals the pattern in the pre-Jacksonian that was to become dominant in
the Jacksonian period of the patronage. Whatever the nature of their in-
terest in literature, political leaders were aware that power comes only
from office and that the way to achieve power is to influence the electo-
rate favorably. Their natural tendency was to favor writers whose politi-
cal commitment and willingness to help shape public opinion marked them
as partisans. Another pre-Jacksonian figure, John Quincy Adams recogni-
zed this natural law of politics in his diary assessment of Mordecai
Manuel Noah in the entry for September 7, 1820. At the time editor of
the New York Advocate, Nash was also playwright, Consul at Tunis (1813-
1815), and Surveyor in the New York Customhouse (1829-1832):

He is an incorrect, and very ignorant, but sprightly writer, and
as a partisan editor of a newspaper has considerable power. He
urges with great earnestness his merits in supporting the Adminis-
tration, as a title to the President's favor. He is, like all
the editors of newspapers in this country who have any talent,
an author to be let. There is not one of them whose friendship
is worth buying, nor one whose enmity is not formidable. They
are a sort of assassins who sit with loaded blunderbusses at
the corner of streets and fire them off for hire or for sport
at any passenger whom they select.  

Adams's venom is obvious, for the figure of the hired assassin attributes a random indifference to the journalistic object that Freneau, Barlow, and Noah never felt about the objects of their political criticism. Yet Adams's insight into the power of writers reveals an awareness of their utility that showed no diminution among political leaders in the height of the Jacksonian period of the patronage. As I have illustrated in "The Common History of the Political Patronage and Literary Appointment," there was no rigid distinction among writers under appointment in the Jacksonian period between journalists and writers of belles-lettres. Political leaders came more and more to favor or fear (as did Adams) the writer who would engage his talent in political journalism. Thus eighteen years after Adams's analysis of Noah, James Fenimore Cooper offered a similar analysis of the relation between politicians and writers in the Jacksonian period of political patronage. In The American Democrat (1838) Cooper devoted three essays to an examination of Journalism in a democracy. In "On the American Press" he questioned the factual truth of most newspaper accounts, especially with respect to politics. He believed the corruption of the press owed its existence "to the schemes of interested political adventurers" and editors who were partisan in politics. Further, politicians had dependents who built their fortunes by publishing editorial puffs, and "artists, players, and even religionists, are not above having recourse to such expedients to advance their interests and reputations."  

Like Adams, Cooper was essentially wrong when he condemned partisan writers as hypocrites in their political faith, and both offered their
criticism of opposition parties in the national administration. It is true that in the Jacksonian period a substantial number of writers who received appointments engaged as partisan writers. After Paulding's indiscreet failure in 1832 to contribute to party coffers led the New York Republican Committee to demand his expulsion from appointment as Navy Agent, Irving begged Van Buren to intercede in Paulding's behalf. Irving pleaded Paulding's reputation, political faith, family, and especially his anonymous contributions to newspapers in support of President Jackson's administration. In July, 1834, Paulding informed Van Buren of his intention to write a series of articles for the New York Evening Post, a Democratic paper under the editorship of William Cullen Bryant. Paulding indicated he wished Jackson and Van Buren to know of the articles and offered a rationale of editorial anonymity, which he said would give him more freedom of expression and avoid the need to write defensively. After Van Buren became President, Paulding informed him on November 13, 1837, that a new paper was required in New York to combat those against the President's plan for an independent Treasury and offered to write for such a newspaper. In July, 1841, he finished a series of articles critical of the Tyler administration for the Washington Globe, a Democratic organ edited by Francis P. Blair and John Rives. Over the years, then, Paulding offered his services as a partisan writer.

Similarly, George Bancroft's success in receiving appointment as Collector in the Boston Customhouse (1837-1841), Secretary of the Navy (1845-1846), Minister to Great Britain (1846-1849), and Minister to Germany (1867-1874) is directly attributable to his ability as a manipulator of words. In retrospective examination of Bancroft's efficacy
in molding the Democratic party in Massachusetts during the period 1825-1835, Edward Everett Hale noted with irritation that the party was a coterie of a few who kept the party small in order to enjoy federal offices. Of Bancroft he said that

It was very convenient for them to have a scholar and enthusiastic—a real Democrat who could "say the things" for them. Of course the old Federalists were disgusted with this, and poor Bancroft had to share their disapprobations. But he made the Fourth-of-July orations cheerfully, and so in course of time was made collector of customs and secretary of the navy.\(^{26}\)

Hale refers to such orations as those of July 4, 1826, July 4, 1835, August, 1835, and the series of stump speeches that Bancroft delivered in the election of 1834.\(^{27}\)

Besides his speeches he engaged in partisan writing. For the January, 1831, issue of the *North American Review*, he wrote an article strongly supporting President Jackson in his fight against extension of the charters of the United States Bank. According to an editorial note in the next number, Bancroft was to have continued the analysis, but "divergence between the views of our two correspondents Bancroft and Alexander H. Everett\(^{27}\)" made it impossible, and Everett countered Bancroft with a conservative assessment in the April number. From Washington, Bancroft reported that his article was well received in official circles.\(^{28}\) At his accession as Collector of the Port of Boston in 1838, Bancroft founded *The Bay State Democrat*, which functioned as party organ from 1838 until it merged with the *Daily Times* in 1844.\(^{29}\) Correspondence between Bancroft, Van Buren, and W. L. Marcy in the spring of 1844 reveals that Bancroft had completed a campaign biography of Van Buren that was in press when Van Buren's hopes were unfortunately crushed by the Democratic con-
Recognizing Bancroft's political commitment, his contemporaries found political bias also in his historical writing. Reviewing a documentary history of the American Revolution for the *North American Review*, he inserted a puff of President Jackson that angered the editor, J. G. Palfrey. Palfrey first withdrew the reference in half the numbers of the issue, then reinserted it at Bancroft's insistence. Bancroft's major endeavor in history, *A History of the United States* (1834-1875) was also considered to be partisan. After the first volume appeared, W. L. Marcy, then Democratic governor of New York, congratulated Bancroft for having written a history "imbued with the democratic principles of our government," especially since "almost all our scholars competent to such an enterprise have a penchant towards the aristocracy." From his brother-in-law, John Davis, then Senator from Massachusetts, Bancroft received the chastisement of an opposing National-Republican. Pleased with the volume, Davis nonetheless urged Bancroft to remain an objective historian and not to rest his reputation on "the art of Jackson and Van Buren." He entreated Bancroft to avoid partisan bias and cautioned him particularly against insisting on too broad a political suffrage in his history.

Bancroft understood that his ability to use language to seize the imagination and beliefs of men was responsible for his political success and his appointments. It was the assessment that Edward Everett Hale, as hostile witness explicitly offered. It was Bancroft's implicit assessment. Writing from Berlin, where he remained as Minister to Germany in Grant's administration, he attributed his appointment as Minister by President Johnson in 1867 to the eulogy on Lincoln which Congress had asked
him to compose and deliver. He explained that no contradiction existed in his retaining the post, for he had voted for Lincoln in his second term and spoken out "decidedly in favour" of Grant as candidate for President. He might have added that his composition of Andrew Johnson's first annual message to Congress of December 4, 1865, had also made him a likely candidate as Minister to Germany. 33

The example of Bancroft is strong because he was an intensely committed partisan, as much so as Barlow and Freneau in the pre-Jacksonian era and John Pendleton Kennedy and John Hay in the Jacksonian era. Regardless of the intensity of their partisan commitment, patronage chiefs continued to favor the writer who was also partisan journalist, and the pattern continued, as I have suggested, in the Jacksonian era. For example, John L. O'Sullivan founded The Democratic Review in the fall of 1837 in hope of performing services to the Democratic party and receiving contracts for government printing, as had Philip Freneau in the founding of The National Gazette and Blair and Rives in the Congressional Globe. 34 The roll call of writers under appointment thereafter is heavy with those in whose career journalism was also a dominant element. They combined in a variety of combinations careers as belles-letttrists, editors, journalists, and partisan writers. 35

From this point of view William Dean Howells is the most representative example of the writer-journalist under appointment in the Jacksonian period of the patronage. Louis John Budd, a student of Howells's relation with political parties, points out that Howells senior was an influential political mentor. William C. Howells was associated with anti-slavery politics as a member of the first Abolition Society of Ohio, as a Henry
Clay Whig, or constitutional anti-slavery man, and as an anti-Jacksonian. During six months in 1829-1830 he published the Owenite paper, Eclectic Observer and Working People's Intelligencer. Moving to Hamilton, Ohio, in 1840, he edited the Hamilton Intelligencer, a Whig paper. There he served for a time as collector of tolls on the state canal, as William Dean Howells reported, "because he had been such a good Whig, and published the Whig newspaper." The elder Howells bolted to the Free Soil party in 1848. In 1852 the Howells family moved to the Western Reserve, where they published the Ashtabula Sentinel, supporting Free Soil candidates. Prospering with Free Soil and the developing Republican politics, from 1856 to 1859 the elder Howells was rewarded with a clerkship in the House of the Ohio General Assembly.

Howells was therefore prepared in advance to consider a career in journalism and knew by experience the mutual relation between journalism and politics. From the retrospect of age he saw his youth as preparation for a literary, not a journalistic career. Yet in his adolescent imagination and his later rational assessment, he saw that partisan journalism was a means of advancement, and his early journalism distinctly reveals the partisan writer. At age sixteen Howells wrote for the Ashtabula Sentinel a story called "A Tale of Love and Politics," which detailed the rise to happiness of George Wentworth, a printer's boy who won his beloved by secretly composing editorials which swept her father into Congress. It is an Alger fantasy of success about the orphaned Wentworth, who first attracts the attention of Judge S., publisher of the G-Journal in New York, by climbing a flagpole to release the national flag, snarled upon itself by an undignifying breeze. The Judge takes him into his house and
teaches him printing. On rescuing the Judge's daughter Ida from drowning, he is rewarded with $5000 and given a position as editor at $1500 per annum. He is infatuated with Ida, whom he believes unattainable and superior. When Judge S. runs for office, George secretly writes campaign articles that persuade the electorate to endorse George's patron by a large majority. The Judge rewards the anonymous writer, whom he has discovered to be George, with the promise of his daughter in marriage.

The story is an amusing adolescent fantasy that equates success and journalistic ability and predicts the pattern of Howells's early career as newspaperman. In the autumn of 1858 he was offered a subordinate editorship on the Ohio State Journal. He had been recommended for the post by A. P. Russell, Republican Secretary of State for Ohio. Howells was later to designate the Ohio State Journal as the organ of the Republican party. Since January, 1857, he had also been writing a series called "Letters from Columbus" for the Cincinatti Gazette, which reported and interpreted the proceedings of the Ohio Assembly from a Republican point of view, besides other articles of a nonpolitical nature. The "Letter from Columbus" series shows Howells functioning as ironist rather than studious political critic or polemicist. Thus he described a Democratic caucus on January 7, 1858:

By the way, our not-to-be-enough-compassioned Democratic friends were again in caucus and trouble, at the American, last night--partly on Kansas matters, it is thought. One member of the house, I understand, swears he will introduce resolutions endorsing Douglas, in spite of any caucusing to the contrary. I would give his own expressions, but, really, in reporting these sayings of Democrats, I am obliged to adapt the custom of moral novelists, and leave the greater part of the profanity to the imagination of the reader.

For the Ohio State Journal he wrote in mock horror of "a recent Douglas
jellification" where "a man was blown to pieces by the premature discharge of a cannon." Not often dealing with particular issues, Howells's partisan writing in the Ohio State Journal and the Cincinnati Gazette adopts a consistent tone of ironic skepticism that denies virtue to the Democratic party.

That Howells had given thought to the potential relation of politics, journalism, and literature can be further seen in his assessment of the poetry and career of William Wallace Harney. W. T. Coggeshall, editor of the Louisville Daily Democrat, had edited an anthology of Ohio Valley poetry; it was published by the Columbus firm of Follett and Foster, who also published in the same year Poems of Two Friends, by Howells and John James Piatt, and Howells's campaign life, Lives and Speeches of Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin. Howells first reviewed Coggeshall's book, The Poets and Poetry of the West (1860) in the September 1 issue of the Ohio State Journal; thereafter he made certain of the anthologized poets the subjects of more particular examination. In the September 25 issue he came to Harney, whom he saw as an unknown and undeveloped, but promising poet. Howells said that Harney suffered the general fate of the Western poet, who was so engaged in work as well as song as to make all performances "more or less furtive and hurried." The young critic believed that eventually the Western poet would find a recognized place as "the first of American poets." Now they found "that the sweetest grape of Italy soured upon the hill-slopes of Cincinnati". Meanwhile, they could elect the alternative of Harney:

Looking to Mr. Harney's future, we are not sure that he is not
wiser than his friends, in giving himself for a while to politics and journalism. The pool of politics is dirty or not, according as it is a cleanly or uncleanly person immersed in it. We cannot forget that Dante (not to mention lesser names) was a fervid politician. The profession of journalism, too, with its wide opportunities of knowing men and things, may teach the poetic nature, prone to look back and sigh, the poet dreams of yesterday and to-morrow; journalism can teach him to value to-day.

It is a significant association: Dante, politics, and journalism.

Moving from the fantasy of success in "A Tale of Love and Politics" to this cool assessment of Harney, Howells made a pragmatic judgment of Harney's prospects that was equally a judgment of his own prospects and a justification of his immediate course. After he received Lincoln materials from Springfield, Illinois, on June 7, 1860, Howells began work on the campaign life and hastily completed an abbreviated version brought out on June 25 and the full text edition published on July 5. Assuming that Howells considered himself, as he did Harney, an unknown and undeveloped, but promising poet, he was also in effect talking about himself, for his criticism of Harney appeared in the month following the publication of the Lincoln biography, and Howells had surely considered the possibility of an appointment on the strength of the campaign life. The criticism of Harney therefore justified his own literary attempts, his partisan journalism, and the anticipated political appointment. With the election of Lincoln, his hopes were substantially encouraged. As Howells put it: "It seemed to be the universal feeling... that I who had written his life ought to have a consulate, as had happened with Hawthorne, who had written the life of Franklin Pierce."

After Lincoln's inauguration Howells's friends organized a drive in favor of the young writer's appointment as Consul at Munich. They em-
phasized about equally his partisan journalism, the campaign biography, and his potential as an artist. A petition of March 12, 1861, addressed to President Lincoln, bears the signatures of seventeen prominent Ohio Republicans, including Governor William Dennison and James A. Garfield, then state senator. The petition refers particularly to Howells as "a poet and journalist" who wrote the *Life of Lincoln and Hamlin* and was an editor of the *Ohio State Journal* who had "added much to the manly tone and character of that paper, in the last two years." The petition also cited Howells's contributions to the *Atlantic Monthly* and the high esteem for him by James Russell Lowell, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and "other leading authors connected with the Atlantic." It also reminded Lincoln that political appointment had lent mutual dignity to Irving, Hawthorne, and the nation and suggested that the appointment would "aid Mr. Howells in still further promoting the growth and influence of American literature."  

The petitioners calculated their effect to emphasize the past service of Howells as journalist, and even the reference to Lowell and the *Atlantic Monthly* must have recalled to Lincoln the Republican bias of the magazine. Lowell had written two articles favorable to Lincoln and the Republican party entitled "The Election in November" and "E Pluribus Unum." In their endorsements directed to Lincoln others continued to emphasize the partisan services of Howells as journalist. On March 13, Henry D. Cooke, editor of the *Ohio State Journal*, addressed Lincoln in behalf of Howells, who as his assistant editor for "nearly three years past,...in that capacity has done the Republican cause in Ohio essential service." Cooke spoke further of the young writer's literary attainments and hopes of pursuing literary studies abroad.

On the same day...
the company of Follett and Foster, the publishers of the campaign biography, recommended Howells to Lincoln on the basis that "Mr Howells has been for a long time connected with the Republican Press of Ohio, and otherwise associated with our political literature, and is favorably known as one of the promising literary men of the West."50

Of the endorsers only Mencure D. Conway strongly recommended the writer on the basis of literary attainment and promise. He named Howells as writer of the campaign life, which "may possibly show Mr Lincoln the ability of the young applicant."51 The greater part of his letter, however, takes up Howells's literary virtues. As editor of the Cincinnati Dial, a literary magazine to which Howells and Emerson contributed, Conway was predisposed to favor literary ability, and Howells had written a puff of Conway's new magazine in the Ohio State Journal that pleased Conway immensely. Conway was therefore ready to reciprocate: he wrote for the March, 1860, number of the Dial a review lauding Howells and Piatt's Poems of Two Friends and the endorsement of a year later.52 The endorsement refers to Howells as contributor of "exquisite pieces" to the Atlantic Monthly and mentions particularly "The Pilot's Story," a poem published in the September, 1860, issue. Conway pointed out the esteem with which the literary men Lowell, Holmes, and Emerson regarded Howells; Emerson had told Conway "that he held Howells to be a high promise for us." Further, Howells was a student of German language and literature, and the appointment to Munich would give the writer opportunity to perfect his studies. Unlike the other endorsers Conway denigrated the journalism Howells had been writing:

He is now engaged in earning a livelihood by writing the leaders of the Ohio State Journal. It is a position very inferior to so gifted a young man; and in it's (sic)eternal tread-mill circle
he has but little chance to perfect his studies. Howells's friends—of whom I am one—love him very much; and covet for him a chance to pursue more freely the studies which they know may end in giving the West what she has not had—one real poet.

Conway's strong appeal to Howells's literary character, however, was exceptional. While most of the endorsements recognized the writer's value to the world of letters, they were as quick to associate him with partisan journalism. Joshua R. Giddings's letter to Secretary of State Seward struck the tone of most of the recommendations:

William D. Howells is a very worthy young man devoted to Literature (sic). His ability and integrity are undoubted. Indeed he is in all respects meritorious. He desires the appointment of Consul to Munich for the purpose of indulging literary (sic) pursuits. He is the son of an old friend who has long and earnestly labored in our Cause as Editor of the Ashtabula Sentinel and Hamilton Intelligencer. His appointment will give pleasure to a large Circle of devoted friends—

As Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Charles Sumner's blessing of Howells issued from the Senate Chamber of March 28, 1861, when he informed Secretary Seward of his approval. Significantly, Howells had succeeded in gaining the endorsement that Melville and Whitman failed to secure from Sumner. Howells's claims were of course far superior to theirs. Although Melville and Whitman had political friends willing to help them, neither was currently engaged in partisan journalism or had performed political service. As we have seen, their strongest claim to office came from literary reputation and need, which failed to move their would-be patrons. In contrast Howells's partisan journalism pleaded his case in the practical terms of political patronage, and he was rewarded.

He was not rewarded immediately, however, and his claim to Munich fell before the principle of most effective distribution of the patronage. Two months after Sumner's approval he had not received the appoint-
ment, and he renewed his claim in June to John Hay, then serving with John Nicolay as secretaries to Lincoln. Howells reminded Hay courteously that his appointment had not gone through. Since he had seen no public record of another's appointment in his place, he asked Hay to intercede in his behalf with Lincoln. Shortly thereafter he reported to the elder Howells that he had received an appointment as Consul at Rome. Discovering that the income was altogether in fees, not salary, he asked his Columbus friend John James Piatt, then clerk in the Department of the Treasury, to examine the accounts of the Roman consulate in order to determine its annual income. Informed that it was only five-hundred dollars, he decided to ask for the Venetian consulate. On September 7 he reported a conversation with John Nicolay, who told him he would determine if the consulate at Venice were vacant. When Howells saw Nicolay the next day, the secretary reported that the appointment was available and that Lincoln had signed the commission, which Howells accepted gratefully. Dampened by Washington, Howells said office-seekers were like "uneasy ghosts, and refuse to believe themselves hopeless."56

Howells received the appointment as promised and returned to Ohio to await his papers and prepare for the voyage. In several letters to Seward in September and October, he settled details of passport, consular bond, and loyalty oath. On October 14 his predecessor in the Venetian consulate, J. J. Sprenger, expressed his surprise at the discovery that he was to be replaced by Howells. On November 9 Howells sailed from New York on board the Glasgow.57 He was officially nominated to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee on December 23, reported from committee on January 29, 1862, and confirmed by the Senate of February 19.58
This episode reveals Howells as partisan journalist in the attitude most favored by patronage chiefs in the height of the spoils system era. Nothing indicates that Howells was hypocritical in his admiration of Lincoln, but he certainly saw that partisan journalism was a means of personal advancement. Although he considered the task of gathering materials "distasteful," he was attracted by what he called the "wild poetry" of Lincoln's experiences in the West, and he conceived of Lincoln as a representative Western Man. Additionally, his political experience led him to Lincoln, whose primary worth for Howells was his position as an anti-slavery candidate. 59

With no intention of seeking personal reward, Howells later was to exercise his journalistic skill in the presidential campaign of 1876, when he wrote another campaign life, Sketch of the Life and Character of Rutherford B. Hayes. By this time he was editor-in-chief of the Atlantic Monthly (1871-1881) and firmly established as a man of letters, though with the bulk of his work yet before him. As I wish to show in the final chapter of this study, his development owed much to his experiences while consul at Venice. In the instance of the Hayes campaign biography Howells once again had opportunity to join partisan commitment and his skill to aid a cause he believed in. Aware that he was not in fact maker of Presidents, he believed in the propriety and efficacy of his act. He reported to Mark Twain that he was about to begin the life of Hayes and reminded Twain with an irony that suggests at once skeptical detachment and positive belief: "You knew I wrote the life of Lincoln which elected him." 60

Lyon N. Richardson's "Men of Letters and the Hayes Administration"
recounts most of the details of the composition of the Hayes campaign biography. Howells's publisher, H. O. Houghton, first suggested the possibility. In the proposal his motive was profit, for he says nothing of politics but thought the books would boost "the waning fortunes of both of us." Recalling that 70,000 copies of the campaign life of John Charles Fremont had sold, he indicated that Howells should write a biography of Hayes to compete with the Appleton biography of Samuel Tilden. Howells would receive the usual ten percent royalty and continuance of his salary at the Atlantic while he wrote the book, which Houghton wished finished by September 1, 1876. Howells had no desire to offend Hayes; their two families were tied by friendship and the fact that Hayes and Mrs. Howells were cousins. He therefore delicately informed Hayes of the planned biography and offered his services "if you think a biography from my pen would help and not hurt the good cause...." Aware that Hayes intended to present himself as a reform candidate, he mentioned the objection that nepotism might be charged to Hayes in consequence of the commission to write the book.

Hayes responded enthusiastically with much the same attitude as Houghton. Only three days after Howells had dispatched his offer, the candidate conceded that a campaign life would be indeed appropriate, especially if there were "money in it":

Yes, indeed, if the thing is to be done again it would particularly please me to be honored by your doing it. No doubt your work would sell. The only objection, if it is one, that I see is the fact that Robert Clarke & Co. have J. Q. Howard at work on the same. Their little book is three-fourths printed, and will be in market in ten days or so. I will send you a copy and you can judge. No doubt a half barrel of stuff—letters, speeches, memoranda, diaries, etc., etc.—
Glad to have another campaign aid in prospect, Hayes forwarded the "half barrel" of information and otherwise took an active part in the planning of the book. Beginning in early August, Howells wrote hastily, as he had when he wrote the Lincoln life, in an attempt to finish it for publication on September 7. On August 23, he explained to Charles Dudley Warner that he was "reading the immense mass of material, making copy, and correcting proof all at once."63 In his study of Howells and politics Louis John Budd records a letter of instruction dated August 24 that Hayes wished the biographer to follow. It is an amazing document; its ominous and disquieting tone reveals Hayes in extreme awareness of the kind of mask he wished presented to the public and the role of the journalist in effecting that end:

*No quoting of anything on political or semi-political topics capable of being turned to account by the adversary. For instance Mr. Howard mentions (in his biography) that I was a member of the Sons of Temperance. This should have been omitted. That subject is not safe. Prohibitionists and liquor men are alike crotchety and sensitive. Keep all on that...out of the book, or if in strike it out. I am liberal on that subject, but it is not to be blabbered. I am sure you are going through safely and prudently. Don't be disturbed by what I say. Be careful not to commit me on religion, temperance, or free trade. Silence is the only safety.*64

Howells seems to have accepted Hayes's instruction in the spirit of friendship. Whether the instructions privately disturbed him is uncertain.

If he mentioned Hayes's membership in the Sons of Temperance in early drafts, he excised it in the finished book, a modest and cautious presentation that nonetheless shows that each experience of the candidate's life was in some way a test and mark of his natural appropriateness as President, like finding that a miller's son was really a prince of the
realm. Speaking of a wound Hayes had received in the Civil War, Howells commented with the modest understatement characteristic of the book: "It is believed, however, that it will not prevent his ascent to the Capitol steps, on the 4th of March next." He also dwelled on Hayes's military experiences, as had James Hall of William Henry Harrison's and Hawthorne of Franklin Pierce's in their campaign biographies. Although Howells was not altogether candid when he claimed in the preface that he had used materials "without restriction and without instruction," his assertion there of admiration for Hayes appears true. Having made the September 7 deadline, he thanked Charles Eliot Norton for his admiration of the book and privately expressed his continued fondness of Hayes. His comments also reveal Howells testing by Norton's reaction the impression he wished the public to have of Hayes:

I'm exceedingly glad you have read my book with a good opinion of Hayes, who merited a better book that I could make in three weeks. My work does not at all represent the richness and beauty of the material put into my hands; but if I'd had six months for it, I could have given it the color I wanted. However, if you've got from it the notion of a very brave, single-hearted, firm-willed, humorous, unpretentiously self-reliant man, I haven't quite failed.

In consequence of the campaign life and Hayes's successful candidacy, Howells was able to exert influence in favor of Lowell's appointment as Minister to Spain (1877-1880, to be immediately followed by his appointment as Minister to Great Britain, 1880-1885). After Haye's accession to office, movement was also afoot to appoint Howells in the diplomatic service, but he gracefully requested not to be considered. The most tangible political favor which Hayes performed for the Howells family was the transfer of the elder Howells from the consulship he held at
Quebec to the post he desired at Toronto. 68

The appointment of Lowell as Minister to Spain resulted from a complex of motives. Although Howells's influence was perhaps primary, Lowell had entered directly into the election as a Hayes man, and Hayes apparently sought to dignify his administration by appointing men of letters such as Bret Harte, James Russell Lowell, and Bayard Taylor to public office. In his part in the election of Hayes, Lowell reveals another kind of political usefulness that made writers attractive candidates for appointment. So far I have shown that the skills of the partisan writer, as in the examples of Freneau, Noah, Hawthorne, Howells, and others, made writers likely candidates for office in reward of their services. Another kind of political utility that led to the appointment of writers was their engagement in the practical business of getting certain men elected to office or publicly supporting party, policy, or candidate. This group includes such people as George Bancroft, George Henry Boker, Bayard Taylor, and Lew Wallace, some of whom (Bancroft, Boker, Taylor) also engaged as partisan journalists. Of this group Lowell's support of Hayes is a representative sample.

Lowell's politics had matured in the pre-Civil War abolitionist movement, when he was editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard (1848-1852). As editor of the Atlantic Monthly (1857-1861) he mellowed into a Republican in consequence of his fear that radical abolitionism would split the union and because he thought the Republican party could halt the spread of slavery without forcing political disunion. In October, just before the fall elections of 1860, he wrote for the Atlantic a strong endorsement of Lincoln, and approved the Republican party and
criticized the opposition party in a number of other political essays written for the Atlantic and the North American Review in the period 1860-1866. Then, when President Johnson was threatened with impeachment and Republican ranks were in disarray, Lowell wrote an article calling for a reunion of dissidents and an opportunity for Johnson to continue as an effective Republican President.

In the election of 1876 Lowell became interested in Hayes as a reform candidate to serve as remedy against the excesses of Grant and the potential excesses of James G. Blaine, who hoped to gain the party nomination. He therefore directly engaged in reform politics within the framework of the Republican party. Prior to the Massachusetts party convention Lowell agreed to preside over a group of Republicans who sought civil service reform and true reconciliation with the South. At a meeting of the group Lowell advised them to organize committees from each ward to see that the pre-convention caucuses were fairly run. Their efforts were directed against the officials of the Boston Customhouse, who wanted delegates favorable to the nomination of Blaine, then Member of Congress from Maine. One account points out that the caucuses were so strictly observed by the vigilant group that anti-Blaine delegates were chosen in the wards, and the district convention sent Lowell to the national convention in Cincinnati.

The impetus for reform was provided in part by the Liberal Republicans, who had nominated their own presidential candidate in 1872 and in a pre-convention meeting of June 14, 1876, settled on Benjamin Bristow. As Secretary of Treasury (1874-1876) he had successfully brought suit against a group of western distillers who operated illegally in disregard
of federal regulations and tax requirements thus breaking up a notorious group and evoking favorable public response. Believing Bristow sought the Republican nomination for President, Grant had forced him to resign his position. In the eyes of the Liberal Republicans he was therefore a promising reform candidate. In convention Lowell was sympathetic to the nomination of Bristow. E. S. Nadal, later to be Second Secretary of Legation under Lowell in the London Embassy, attended the convention as a New York delegate and Bristow man. Nadal reported that Lowell dropped his "Cambridge manner" and visited the New York delegation in its room. He observed that Lowell "was with us in our opposition to carpet-bag government in the South and in our hope for the reform of Civil Service."73

The convention failed, however, to nominate Bristow, and the result of the first balloting was a deadlock. Recognizing that Blaine was about to receive the convention's approval after the sixth ballot, the Liberal Republicans shifted to Hayes on the seventh ballot. When a spokesman announced Bristow's withdrawal preliminary to the shift, he thanked especially the Massachusetts and Connecticut delegations for their support.74

Shortly after the convention Lowell assessed the selection of Hayes:

I have taken my first practical dip into politics this summer, having been sent by my neighbors first to the State Convention and then to the National at Cincinnati. I am glad I went, for I learned a great deal that may be of service to me hereafter. You are wrong about Hayes; he was neither unknown nor even unexpected as a probable nominee. He was not adopted as a compromise in any true sense of the word, but as an unimpeachably honest man, and the only one on whom we could unite to defeat Blaine, who had all the party machinery at his disposal. The nomination of the latter would have been a national calamity—75

Lowell's further support of Hayes is revealed in an incident following the contested election, which had gone to the Republican candidate by
one electoral vote and was challenged by Samuel Tilden. A series of articles by Charles Francis Adams, Jr., J. N. Pomeroy, and E. L. Godkin in the Nation suggested that one of the Republican electors could properly change his instructions and vote for Tilden in order to place the election in the hands of Congress. Although they did not name him, Lowell understood them to refer to himself. As a Massachusetts elector he felt obligated to vote in reflection of the Hayes majority and wished to do so anyway. In retrospect Howells recalled Lowell's dissatisfaction with Godkin and the Nation. Speaking of his review of a life of Godkin, Howells regretted not having included in the review Lowell's comment upon understanding that Godkin, editor of the Nation, wanted him to cast his electoral vote for Tilden: "Godkin seems to have lost his head." When Hayes was in process of considering Lowell for appointment, Lowell recommended himself as

an Elector who voted for you with both his eyes & ears open & who was the innocent nucleus of a comet with a tremendous tail to it that made a day's sensation in the newspapers. At the time, I thought silence imposed on me by my own self-respect, but I may be allowed to say to you that, if I had ever had any doubt between the candidates, I should have resigned my place at once.

Lowell's refusal to cast his electoral vote for Tilden was thus a public affirmation of Hayes. Had he not so voted, the election could have gone to Congress, contingent upon the yet uncertain status of contested votes in Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina. After the furor subsided in February, 1877, Hayes had won by a single electoral vote. Although Lowell's vote cannot have been any more crucial than any one of the other 184 electoral votes, his failure to vote for Hayes could have meant the frustration of Haye's desire.
After Hayes was firmly in office, Howells, out of respect for his literary mentor, suggested that Lowell be made Minister to Spain. Howells reminded the President that he had hinted before taking office of his willingness to listen to proposals. On April 4, 1877, Howells suggested that Lowell would like to go to Madrid as United States Minister but knew nothing (Howells repeated it) of his intercession with the President. Hayes regretted not having had earlier knowledge of the request, for the Madrid appointment was already promised by Secretary of State William M. Evarts, who probably would not have desired the appointment of Lowell, according to Hayes. Late in April the President asked Howells if Lowell were interested in the missions at St. Petersburg or Vienna. Howells expressed his delight and asked to carry to Lowell the President’s offer, in which Hayes said Lowell need only determine which mission he preferred in order to have an appointment in two or three weeks.

In conversation with Howells, Lowell said he did not desire either mission. On May 20 Howells reported his disappointment to the President and suggested that Lowell might overcome his reluctance in a few days and forward an acceptance. On May 24 he reported the additional information that Lowell had visited him and now positively declined the Austrian mission, which Howells had expected Lowell to accept.

The fact is that Lowell desired the Madrid appointment from the start and made a subtle, if not coy play for it. Although Howells functioned as intermediary between Lowell and Hayes, Lowell also communicated directly with the President. When Hayes made the offer on May 18 of either the St. Petersburg or Vienna mission, Lowell responded on May 21 with two letters, one a formal letter of declination, the other an informal letter of con-
siderable length. In the informal letter Lowell spoke of Godkin's proposal made the previous fall that he change his electoral vote and of his belief before and after the election that Hayes represented honest principles: "I never saw any reason to change my mind, & your course as President has justified me." He remarked the public approval of Hayes and criticized Grant's past failures. In concluding his declination of Hayes's offer, Lowell admitted coyly that "I did say to Mr. Howells that I should be tempted by an offer to go to Spain, but I need not assure you that it was with no intention or expectation that you should hear of it." In his account of Lowell's final refusal Howells recalled that the two talked together at some length. Lowell asked Howells to inform Hayes of his refusal of the Austrian mission. As he rose to leave, Lowell said with a sigh of vague reluctance that he should like to see a play of Calderón, which Howells took as a hint of Lowell's continued desire for the Spanish mission.

After Howells told the President of Lowell's wish, the machinery of government meshed into a different gear. On June 5 Lowell confided to a friend that he had refused Hayes's earlier offer out of reluctance to go abroad and quotes himself as having told Howells or Hayes that "I would have gone to Spain." Secretary Evarts requested an interview with Lowell, at which time he told Lowell of the President's disappointment in Lowell's earlier refusal of the Austrian mission and said that an exchange might make Lowell's appointment to Madrid possible. Afterward, John Adam Kasson, whom Evarts had favored earlier for the Spanish mission, agreed to accept the Vienna mission. That obstacle cleared, the President offered and Lowell accepted the appointment as Minister to Spain; he entered
As the evidence of this chapter shows, many writers under appointment in the nineteenth century were favored by virtue of their political usefulness. Several actively helped influence public opinion through partisan writing, as in the instances of Freneau, Noah, Paulding, O'Sullivan, Hawthorne, Howells, and others. Others directed their energy into the practical business of getting their man elected or supporting party policy by making stump speeches and working in caucuses, conventions, and political organizations. Such people include George Bancroft, George Henry Boker, John Hay, John Pendleton Kennedy, James Russell Lowell and Lew Wallace. They were not at the mercy of evil politicians. Indeed, those who speak of the evil of politicians might well speak here of their paid hacks, for these writers sought power in order to realize the policies they believed were right. They elected to offer their services, sometimes with the thought of reward, but also because they believed in the correctness of the position or person they supported, and with the feeling that their actions were effective in the making of decisions.

They therefore engaged their talents with the belief that partisan commitment is a natural adjunct of everyone, including writers. They believed that the various careers they cultivated at one time might in the end make possible the leisure they desired in order to cultivate their true occupations as writers. However, their commitment to abstract ideas of art and the artist led them to see conflicts between their abstract commitment and their commitment to the pragmatic world of politics and what accompanied it, the condition of the writer in his native society. Of this uncomfortable conflict I wish to speak in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER IV
THE WRITER'S ASSESSMENT OF POLITICAL APPOINTMENT

In Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence* (1920) Monsieur Rivière makes an assessment of patronage that suggests the complexities of the attitude toward political appointment held by the writers considered in this study. Wharton invests Rivière with an uncertain status that makes him a haunting image of the 19th century American writer seeking political preferment. Rivière, artist manqué, familiar of Maupassant, Goncourt, and Mérimée, sometime journalist, secretary, diplomat, confronts the new world in the person of Newland Archer and considers once again the possibility of patronage. He tells Archer that intellectual liberty and moral freedom are more valuable than all else; for that reason he had abandoned journalism to become a tutor. He tells the wealthy American that he now enters good talk with no fear of compromising his opinions: "Ah, good conversation—there's nothing like it, is there? The air of ideas is the only air worth breathing. And so I have never regretted giving up either diplomacy or journalism—two different forms of the same self-abdication." But necessity calls him back to himself, and he asks pathetically for a competence:

*Voyez-vous, Monsieur, to be able to look life in the face: that's worth living in a garret for, isn't it? But, after all, one must earn enough to pay for the garret; and I confess that to grow old as a private tutor—or a "private" anything—is almost as chilling to the imagination as a second secretaryship at Bucharest. Sometimes I feel I must take a plunge: an immense plunge. Do you suppose, for instance, there would be an opening for me in America—in New York?*
The opening in America toward which these writers looked was political appointment. About it they revealed the mixed feelings that M. Riviere discloses in his conversation with Newland Archer, at once desire and scorn for the object, the belief that appointment was a salvation bought dearly, perhaps even at the expense of the writer's artistic integrity (but not, as we have seen, of his political integrity), yet with the fear that without the security of income, nothing else, including the writer's true end, is possible. This doubleness, sometimes ambiguity, of feeling is characteristic of the writer's attitude toward political appointment. He recognized clear advantages but balanced them with objections that made the advantages of political appointment finally questionable. As I have shown in the preceding chapters, writers received appointment primarily because of political service or the aid of political friends. Writers were predisposed to believe that appointment recognized, or ought to recognize, literary merit.

For many of the writers here considered, writing was a profession to which they committed themselves with a determination that denied alternatives of occupation or with the sense of having been chosen as an evangelist considers himself called as the instrument of superior will. In either case the decision was irrevocable. If they were dissatisfied with writing as a profession, they also felt they could do nothing else truly. Therefore, any other occupation must be adjunct only to their true profession. In response to an attempt of William and Ebenezer Irving to secure the position of First Clerk for him in the Department of the Navy, Washington Irving struck a note that is recurrent among the writers studied here. In a letter to Ebenezer he spoke of forwarding the first number of *The Sketchbook* as an explanation of "what I am about, as I find my de-
clining the situation at Washington has given you chagrin." The writer explained that he thought the pay insufficient and that office would interfere with his true profession:

My talents are merely literary, and all my habits of thinking, reading, &c., have been in a different direction from that required for the active politician. It is a mistake also to suppose that I would fill an office there, and devote myself at the same time to literature. I require much leisure and a mind entirely abstracted from other cares and occupation, if I should write much or write well.2

He indicated willingness after establishing a stock of copyright property to accept an appointment of a modest sort. Meanwhile, he expected lasting reputation only through authorship. In reference to the appointment he made much the same evaluation in a letter to Henry Brevoort: his education and taste fitted him only for the literary career he was engaged in; only through the literary profession did he expect solid reputation. It is an assessment that Irving repeated as he contemplated the pending appointment to London as Secretary of Legation in 1829.3

The commitment to writing as first occupation recurs in the lives of the writers under consideration in this study. It was sometimes made intense by the writer's awareness that only his literary talent would render him durable fame, as in the instance of Irving. For others the commitment was intensified by a recognition of the need to exhaust literary potency before the spasm remitted, as Whitman felt his need "to devote myself more to the work of my life, which is making poems. I must be continually bringing out poems—now is the hey day. I shall range along the high plateau of my life & capacity for a few years now, & then swiftly descend." Or it was intensified by the sense of calling that Howells recollects as he considers the exclusive purpose of his early years:
This primary engagement with writing made other considerations subordinate, though no less pressing. As Edwin Arlington Robinson put it, he would accept an appointment from President Roosevelt only if it entailed "more pay and the same amount of leisure" he already knew, in order to release him to the work of being a poet.

This commitment led to frustration, for the writer was aware that the profession was not rewarded in proportion to its merit because of unfavorable copyright law and lack of an audience. The democratic patronage in America depended upon an audience who were disinclined toward imaginative literature; defective international copyright law until 1909 made it cheaper for American publishers to pirate English authors and English publishers to pirate American authors, with neither English nor American author realizing benefit in consequence. Additionally, American publishers freely pirated American writers. An early instance of the writer's recognition of the deficiency of audience occurs in the career of Joel Barlow, who recognized that his career as poet was contingent upon his ability to survive from the income of his verse. Establishing a subscription list to underwrite the publication of *The Vision of Columbus* (1787), he found that one subscriber had balked entirely and advised the young poet to go into business for a living, meanwhile making poetry a leisure amusement. Barlow saw that his countrymen were most concerned
with the practical. If he gave himself to their law, he believed that he would never afterward have leisure "to devote the heat of youthful imagination" to his proper business. Elsewhere he spoke of his faith in the ultimate reward of authorship in the United States, where meanwhile "Literary accomplishment will not be much noticed." With pragmatic zeal Barlow suggested the probable consequence: writers will dislike what they are best able to do. For example,

...if I find that writing the Columbiad, with all the moral qualities, literature, and science which that work supposes, will not place me on a footing with John Taylor, who is rich, why, then I'll be rich too; I'll despise my literary labors, which tend to build up our system of free government, and I'll boast of my bank shares, which tend to pull it down, and because these, and not those, procure me the distinction which we all desire.7

In a summation of Barlow's career two years after the poet's death, Gulian C. Verplanck pointed out that the indifference of audience had contributed to Barlow's failure to develop as a poet and the preoccupation of the school of "Connecticut bards" with unsubstantial occasional verse that faded with the relevance of its subject. Faced with "The state of society in this country, which presents a much greater demand for every species of active talent, than for any of the mere elegances of literature." Barlow and his contemporaries became politicians and teachers and devoted their poetic bent to slight occasional verse.7

Other writers from Barlow forward echoed his judgment of the effect of the American audience. Contemplating a future as scholar or writer, Bancroft wrote of the hard fact that "neither money, nor, in the present state of the American public, fame is to be acquired by these pursuits."9 In attempt to accommodate public and private ends, Paulding reported to
Henry Brevoort that he intended his poem *The Backwoodsman* (1818) "As an experiment upon the public taste, of a work composed exclusively of local feelings & manners--" about which he was uncertain of success. Melville saw Hawthorne's success following the publication of *The House of Seven Gables* (1851) as a result of the patronage of the audience that had begun to cultivate Hawthorne. In an attempt to secure the approval of that audience, Melville "calculated" *Pierre* (1852) for popularity beyond anything "yet published of mine--being a regular romance with a mysterious plot to it, & stirring passions at work, and withall, representing a new & elevated aspect of American life--" Speculating on what would go well with the audience, Hawthorne ironically concluded at one point that he should write a series of "Biographies of Eminent American Merchants"; if successful he would follow it with "Eminent Foreign Merchants" designed for the capacity of young clerks and apprentices. With Bitterness toward the audience he did not have, Edwin Arlington Robinson wrote a preface for *The Torrent and the Night Before* (1896) which dedicated the volume "to any man, woman, or critic who will cut the edges of it;" The writer in America has thus had the persistent difficulty of securing an audience and then writing for it without compromising his own aesthetic desires.

This cursory account of the deficiencies in audience and copyright treats neither subject adequately. Yet it suggests the forces that made the nineteenth century writer a man of many talents and explains the readiness of many beyond whatever claim they had as partisans to accept political appointment. The claim they most often made and believed the most appropriate was their claim on the republic as the patron of the arts. In a nation that proposed to honor merit wherever found, all native artists
should receive equitable encouragement, and the sign of greatness in nations was a flourishing of the arts so fostered.

Writers who sought appointment therefore tended to believe that in the absence of a patronizing aristocracy or cultural elite, they had an appropriate claim on the republic as citizens. Additionally, their talents lent mutual distinction to writer and government, for the republic in its patronage dignified writers as they dignified the nation in their attempts to isolate and define the genius of the country in their art. Writers presented this rationale sometimes with the defensive attitude they had learned as authors, sometimes with the assurance that it was truly so. Sixteen years before Irving accepted his first political appointment, he dreamed of a cultural elite who would take "young artists by the hand, and cherish their budding genius!" He believed that such patronage would be "more to the glory and advantage of their country, than building a dozen shingle church steeples, or buying a thousand venal votes at an election." In Irving's case the "nabob" who was to patronize the "budding genius" turned into Martin Van Buren and President Jackson. When Irving returned from his second appointment as Secretary of Legation in the London embassy (1829-1832), Robert Walsh characterized Irving's tenure as an appointment that dignified the nation. It showed the European nations, which had traditional respect for intellect and art, that the American government was not indifferent to literature. Walsh recommended that all literary men should be sent abroad, even if they never return, for "Every American, who, as such, wins honour by authorship, or any kind of superior performance, abroad, acts the part of a true patriot." Walsh was himself to dignify the nation as Consul at Paris (1845-1851).
Other spokesmen for the writer also emphasized the role of the republic as patron, on grounds similar to Walsh's nationalism. When Bridge, Pierce, and O'Sullivan worked together in the administration of President Polk to secure office for Hawthorne, they set their program in action with a public appeal. O'Sullivan asked Evert Duyckinck, editor of the Democratic Review, to write an article calling for Hawthorne's appointment. Duyckinck's enthusiastic response begged for party sponsorship and appointment of Hawthorne on the ground of literary excellence. The law of political life, he asserted, is temporal and fluctuating, yet Hawthorne's work as aesthetic and moral object transcended time, and support of such would lend distinction and, inferentially, lasting fame to the politician who named Hawthorne to office. Duyckinck pointed out that Hawthorne's need was especially great, for the genius of the author was not properly repaid due to the indifference of the reading public to authors. Duyckinck therefore called for the patronage of the American government:

As authors are the immediate ornaments of the State, as the good they confer is general, and their honor and prosperity contributes so largely to the life and enjoyment and complacency expressed in those two words we are charged with using so familiarly, "Our Country," it would seem not unreasonable (though we do not pledge ourselves to the expediency of it) that a well filled purse should be set aside and properly used on occasion, with the label "Literary Pension Fund."16

In an appeal to precedent he pointed out that the principle had already been acknowledged in the appointments of Irving, Alexander and Edward Everett, and Bancroft.

Appointment could also be urged on the basis of political expediency. Charles Edward Lester, Consul at Genoa (1842-1847), summarized his experience as official in a diffuse book called My Consulship (1853). Primarily a
travel book, it is also an account of Lester's consular experiences and his beliefs regarding the obligation of the United States toward its men of letters. Taking as his model the patronage of the arts in European countries, he showed that works of art, libraries, and publication of important books were undertaken there at royal expense. With more zeal than truth he insisted that not a distinguished author on the continent had escaped honor and reward from governments or sovereigns; men of letters were "generally rewarded by titles of nobility and appointments to diplomatic and cabinet stations." Returning to his theme in the second volume, he called for the American government to take the place of the noble patron, and posed as one reason the hard-headed proposition that such action would assure the vote of the intellectual class:

Legislators are mistaken, if they suppose their constituents to be opposed to such a spirit. Every generous act of this kind has been greeted with joy by the country--every public man who has given it his support, and every President who, in his appointments, has been mindful of the services literary and scientific men have rendered to the country, has won golden opinions from all classes. Nor is it unworthy the consideration of our chief men, to remember, that the display of such a spirit wins for them a warm and enthusiastic support, from that powerful class of our citizens, who have withdrawn from the vortex of political struggle, to devote themselves to the elegant pursuits of Art and Literature. This number is small, I am aware, but rapidly increasing. Their influence, however, is not to be measured by their numbers. They are the molding power of the nation--by their writings, addresses, correspondence and conversations, they put forth an influence to which no limits can be assigned in any direction it takes its way. Shall not our Republic receive the services of its best educated men? 17

However deficient his insight into the sympathy of legislators and the people might have been, he correctly assessed the potential influence of the writer. The amusing reminder that politicians imperil their existence not to win the esteem of the intellectual class constitutes a mild threat.
Yet it recalls the politician's awareness of the principle in his readiness to use the talents of writers as partisan journalists or partymen, as discussed in the chapter above.

In his maturity Hawthorne's hope for the active interest of the national government in the patronage of artists summarizes what Irving, Walsh, Duyckinck, and Lester called for. Having left his third political appointment, he resided in Italy, where he was a familiar of Hiram Powers in the summer and fall of 1858. The Work of Powers, an American sculptor living in Italy, attracted Hawthorne, who saw the sculptor as a proto-typical American artist: possessed of genius, living poorly, and forgotten by his government and countrymen. In the September 29 notebook entry he recorded his impression of a female figure Powers had sculpted as an image of America. Hawthorne believed Powers had triumphed in defining thereby the national character, a desirable end for the artist. The sculpture had, he wrote, "great merit, and embodies the ideal of youth, freedom, progress, and whatever we consider as distinctive of our country's character and destiny." Ironically, Hawthorne noted that the statue was prepared for shipment "to our country,—which does not call for it." He entered his wish that the republic would patronize artists. Meanwhile, he noted with the bitterness that appears sometimes in the French and Italian journals, "we have the meanest government and the shabbiest, and—if truly represented by it—we are the meanest and shabbiest people known in history."18

In a variety of modes then—supplication, sweet reason, and anger—writers assigned to the national government the patronage of the arts. What they wanted more particularly was three-fold: recognition, income, and leisure. Considering a tour of Europe, Nathaniel Parker Willis requested
official letters or an appointment from Martin Van Buren, than President
Jackson's Secretary of State. Willis sought them as official recognition
which would enhance his success as literary man:

As I go mainly to observe—my errand being purely literary—
every facility for society & position will be important to me.
I would enquire of you also whether I could not get thro' your
influence (you will think me very impertinent, I fear) some
merely nominal attachment to some one of our foreign ministers,
for the sake of seeing society to more advantage. I have the
first letters from the literary men of this country, but a
collateral introduction from you would of course treble their
value.19

Irving saw a similar advantage when he accepted the position as Secretary
of Legation in the London embassy in 1829. He considered the appointment
"as emanating from my country, and a proof of the good will of my country-
men, and in this light it is most flattering and gratifying to me." Ref-
using an earlier offer of the same post, he had seen, despite his refusal,
that the position would place him in honorable and advantageous society.20
Similarly, Cooper sought an appointment in order to secure a diplomatic
passport offering official protection and recognition to a man of letters.21

The desire for recognition and the belief that political appointment
comprised the national recognition they sought recurs in the lives of
writers under appointment. In several instances one questions whether the
ceremonial statements of this desire and belief reflects any more signi-
ficance than excitement about the event. Yet beneath the gilt of cere-
monial language used by writers and politicians like, one senses the gen-
uine will of writers to believe that their appointments were true signs of
national esteem for literature and men of letters. For example, Howells's
assessment of the appointment of Bayard Taylor as Minister to Germany (1878)
does public honor to patron and author:
It was one of the most graceful things done by President Hayes, who, most of all our Presidents after Lincoln, honored himself in honoring literature by his appointments, to give that place to Bayard Taylor. There was no one more fit for it, and it was peculiarly fit that he should be so distinguished to a people who knew and valued his scholarship and the service he had done German letters.22

If Howells’s ceremonial, public tone leaves room for doubt of the final truth of his assessment, there can be no doubt that Taylor believed his appointment to be a recognition and vindication of himself as a literary man. In a letter to the southern poet Paul Hamilton Hayne after hearing of his appointment, Taylor spoke of the overwhelming good will that had been offered him. He adds:

It is something so amazing for an author to receive, that I am more bewildered and embarrassed than proud of the honors. If you knew how many years I have steadily worked, devoted to a high ideal, which no one seemed to recognize, and sneered at by cheap critics as a mere interloper in Literature, you would understand how incredible this change seems to me. The great comfort is this— I was right in my instinct: the world does appreciate earnest endeavor, in the end. I have always had faith, and I have learned to overlook opposition, disparagement, misconception of my best work, believing that the day of justification would come.23

One hastens to add that the justification writers felt in their appointments was not solely in the recognition they thought they properly received as men of letters. Their appointment was also a justification of their right to exercise a claim on the republic on the ground that their talent as writers peculiarly suited them for diplomatic and official positions. That is, they were generally talented, personable, and acquainted with the etiquette of ceremonial life and the culture of foreign countries. The letters of recommendation of writers on file in the National Archives reflect a recurrent prejudice; it was the fear that men of letters lived too much in the abstract to give proper attention to the concrete details
of official responsibility. Recognizing that fear among political leaders, endorsers of writers employed a characteristic strategy: they made the literary claim in conjunction with a more practical virtue, most frequently service or faithfulness to party, or experience in business. Recognizing his own and the President's fear of Irving's ineptness as Secretary of Legation in London, Martin Van Buren, then Minister to Great Britain, reported to Jackson that "An intimate acquaintance with him [Irving], has satisfied me, that I was mistaken in supposing that his literary occupation gives his mind a turn, unfavorable to practical business pursuits, & as I am not sure that you did not entertain the same impression, I think it but just to correct the error." Paulding saw his tenure as Secretary of the Navy (1838-1841) as a rebuttal against all such criticism. He expressed to Bancroft his hope that the practical success he enjoyed as Secretary would prove the practical ability of writers:

"You don't know how solicitous I am that we should convince the world, that we are good for something else, than mere abstractions, and can deal with men, as well as Ideas. If we give satisfaction to the Nation, it will become the custom here in this great Republic, of the West, as it was in those of the Old World, to elevate Literary men to the highest honours of the State."23

Besides the public recognition that political appointment conferred, writers also sought appointment in order to provide income and leisure to release them to their first occupation. Of course it would be an oversimplification to insist that all the writers who received appointment uniformly sought recognition, income, and leisure. In the absence of studies of authorial income one cannot assess the true need of the writers under consideration, and the facts that are available are relative to the cost of living and the writer's idea of his social class. Certainly, the
need of George Bancroft and John Hay, each of whom married into wealth, was far less than that of Richard Henry Stoddard and Bret Harte, whose genteel poverty makes them typical of the larger group, and those who tried to live solely from the proceeds of imaginative literature fared poorest. The common need of writers under appointment is suggested in two specialized studies of the incomes of Hawthorne and Melville. Studying Hawthorne's will and the correspondence between Mrs. Hawthorne and James T. Fields, Randall Stewart has shown that at the height of Hawthorne's fame following The Scarlet Letter in 1850, the income from his writings averaged perhaps less than $1,000 a year. William Charvat's study of Melville's income shows that in his best years (1846-1851) he averaged $1,600 per annum from his writing, enough to support his family. From 1851 to 1866, however, he averaged a bare $228 per annum, to be rescued in the period 1861-1866 by a trust fund and bequests that made possible a modest annual income of $1000. The fluctuations and uncertainties of such incomes made the regularity of salaries or fees from political positions a welcome adjunct.

These figures, however, require the context of economic history. In The Standard of Living in 1860, Edgar W. Martin analyzes American living standards in the decade prior to the Civil War. He concludes that most industrial workers earned between $250-$400 per annum; skilled workmen, $600-700; lawyers and doctors, $1000-$2000; and successful entrepreneurs, as much as $20,000. According to class structure, the rich received annual incomes of $5,000-$10,000; the middle class, $800-$5,000; and the working class, $200-$800. In terms of the 1957-1958 dollar, when the 100 percent scale of the present cost of living index was es-
tablished, Hawthorne's highest literary income of $1000 equals approximately $5000. The point seems to be that the two writers achieved this modest security by dint of effort they could not expect to keep up indefinitely. In other periods their literary incomes put them in the class of other economically disadvantaged groups.

Beyond salary not the least of the attractions of political appointment was the leisure the appointee believed attended the office. With an appointment that required a minimum of attention to duty and an income that allayed, even circumvented poverty, he could be secure in person and mind and, accordingly, be truly freed to exploit his imaginative designs. With this intention Irving received each of his three appointments. Of his second appointment as Secretary of Legation, he said he intended to use its leisure to complete the development of the materials he gathered during his residence as vice consul at Madrid; if the appointment proved irksome he would resign. He accepted the appointment as Minister to Spain (1842) with the intention to complete his life of Washington and otherwise to "amass a new literary capital." He had used this phrase earlier in his consideration of the first appointment in 1826. With prospect of appointment before him, Poe foresaw the leisure of a position in the Philadelphia customhouse, which would leave him largely free and salaried. With that assurance he could found the magazine for which he recurrently devised prospectuses. Without an appointment Bayard Taylor engaged in multiple jobs. A year before his appointment he recorded the course of his labors: "I am at present working daily in the New York Tribune give a course of 12 lectures on German Literature here, repeating the same in Brooklyn, and writing magazine and review articles." Meanwhile,
he noted, his own literary projects waited. After his appointment he anticipated the satisfaction of his desires; he could begin his *Life of Goethe*, using German archives, and return to his own writing. When Lowell was appointed Minister to Spain, he sought without Henry James's knowledge his appointment as Secretary of Legation in the Spanish embassy. Although Lowell's wish was denied by the Department of State, James later felt that the attractiveness of the post would have made it difficult to decline.

The prospect of recognition, leisure, and income therefore attracted writers to political appointments. The will of appointees to believe that appointment would satisfy these requirements indicates the character of their need as admired but unrewarded members of American society. For whatever the true causes of their appointment, among which were political service, political friendship, political expediency, and literary reputation, writers preferred to believe that their appointment recognized primarily their literary claim. They accordingly wished to be treated in office as if they were not also beneficiaries of a partisan system, although they were rationally aware of the true circumstances of their appointment. One might add that even if the appointment were nonpolitical, as was Roosevelt's appointment of Robinson, the appointment was susceptible to being turned to political advantage, for the appointment of literary men dignified the administration under which they occurred and appealed to the intellectual class. As I have shown above, this was the insight of Charles Edward Lester in *My Consulship*. Thus President Hayes recorded his pleasure in the list of appointments he had made, naming among them Lowell and Taylor, and thought they would "compare well with any previous period in our history." Ironically, the available patronage that grew
naturally from the American experience was not prepared to acknowledge the literary claims of its beneficiaries, which was the claim that Hawthorne, for example, preferred to make despite his concurrence in the political manipulations that brought him into office. If nothing else, the regularity with which writers lost their office in the accession of new national administrations shows that political leaders made of writers no special case.

After the anticipation, what of the experience of office, the recognition, leisure, and income these writers foresaw? One discovery was the unwelcome recognition that literary claims were weak in an essentially partisan system. Perhaps the best illustration of this discovery exists in Hawthorne's removal from the Salem customhouse, an action fraught with political charge and countercharge and Hawthorne's attempt to retain recognition as a man of letters, not a politician.

As shown above, Hawthorne's appointment to the Salem customhouse came about through the persistence of his political friends and his appropriateness as a compromise candidate for the Salem surveyorship. Because of his relative political neutrality, he was acceptable to both Tyler and Polk Democrats in Salem and, with prodding, George Bancroft and the officialdom of the Massachusetts customs service, as we have seen. With the accession of Zachary Taylor to office, the Salem Whigs demanded and received the removal of Hawthorne, to whom notice of the decapitation came on June 8, 1849. Of the dismissals of writers from office, it caused one of the greatest furors, not unlike the recriminations accompanying Secretary James Harlan's removal of Walt Whitman from the Department of the Interior in 1865 and President Johnson's removal of John
Lothrop Motley from the Ministership to Austria in 1867. In "The Political Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne," Paul Cortissoz shows that the controversy erupted into Salem, Boston, and Albany newspapers, which took sides with scurrilous reproaches according to their loyalty to the Democratic or Whig party.36

The Salem Whigs charged Hawthorne with being a grossly partisan official who wrote political articles, engaged in political caucuses, exacted political contributions from Whigs in the customhouse, and dismissed Whig employees on no other grounds than their political affiliation. These charges range through a brief series of letters that Salem Whigs wrote to President Taylor and William P. Meredith, the Secretary of the Treasury, and an especially tedious "Memorial" to the President that explained the Whig position in detail.37 The Whig letters were in response to an equally strong movement after Hawthorne's expulsion urging his retention in office.

Hawthorne and his friends protested the claims made against him. Significantly, Hawthorne insisted on the propriety of his claim to office as a literary man. Anticipating one of the charges to be made against him, he denied having written political articles for the Salem Advertiser and, in anger, reported to Longfellow his intention to "immolate" some of his enemies in satire:

This I will do, not as an act of individual vengeance, but in your behalf as well as mine, because they will have violated the sanctity of the priesthood to which we both, in different degrees, belong. I do not claim to be a poet; and yet I cannot but feel that some of the sacredness of that character adheres to me, and ought to be respected in me, unless I step out of its immunities.

In their unjust call for his expulsion they are indifferent to the claims of literature:
If they will pay no reverence to the imaginative power when it causes herbs of grace and sweet-scented flowers to spring up along their pathway, then they should be taught what it can do in the way of producing nettles, skunk-cabbage, deadly night-shade, wolf's bane, dog-wood. If they will not be grateful for its works of beauty and beneficence, then let them dread it as a pervasive and penetrating mischief, that can reach them at their firesides and in their bedchambers, follow them to far countries, and make their own graves refuse to hide them.

Following Hawthorne's dismissal his friends sought his retention to office in a most skillful manner. Just as they had claimed the political expediency of his appointment on the grounds his inoffensive political history would heal the rupture between Tyler and Polk Democrats, so they now argued political expediency in his retention. President Taylor had come into office promising that removals in the patronage system would not be made on the basis of partisanship. Hawthorne's friends therefore saw his expulsion as a potential cause célèbre, for he remained a passive partisan, and to show that he was unjustly expelled would provide an excellent wedge against the Whigs. Additionally, Hawthorne's advocates sought the aid of Whigs, several of whom were good friends of Hawthorne and might have appealed to the President anyway, in order to make a bipartisan claim. The movement began on June 9, 1849 (the day after Hawthorne first received word of his removal), with a letter to Secretary Meredith from Rufus Choate. Former Congressman and Senator (1830-1934, 1841-1845), he was then one of the leading Massachusetts Whigs. His letter urged Hawthorne's retention on the grounds of the writer's genius and political inoffensiveness.

Choate's letter set the tone of the movement in favor of the novelist. On June 12, Amory Holbrook, a prominent Salem Whig, addressed a plea to Secretary Meredith in which he developed in some detail the expediency of
Hawthorne's retention. He spoke as a faithful Whig concerned with the "honor & Success of the party" and the justice due Hawthorne. He invoked the novelist's education, integrity, and literary reputation, pointing out that he has been

...devoted during his whole life to literary pursuits, he has entirely abstained from all that offensive interference in political disputes which makes the loco-foco office holder, worthy of removal, and it is not less a source of regret to his merely literary friends than to a great majority of the Whigs in Salem, that the fiat has gone forth which removes him from a position which he has never disgraced, and which in his present circumstances, is a necessity to him while his continuance in that station would be honorable to any administration, & especially generous on the part of one, differing from him the political opinions which he is supposed privately to cherish.

Under these circumstances, I beg to be allowed to suggest the expediency & the policy of reappointing Mr. Hawthorne, because I know it will be right—it will reflect much honor & praise upon the administration—it will take away from our opponents, who are not blind to our mistakes, one of the strongest & most dangerous weapons of assault, and cannot operate in any or the slightest respect to our harm or disadvantage.

Holbrook concludes by referring to the desires of David Pingree, Presidential elector; John Chapman, Whig publisher of the Salem Register; and Rufus Choate that Hawthorne be reinstated.

Other Whigs employed Holbrook's strategy. On June 19, the historian George Ticknor informed Meredith that Hawthorne's appointment had been a triumph for men of letters like himself. Considering himself a Whig of the old school who refused to recommend anyone for office, he nonetheless felt the urgency of Hawthorne's poverty:

I feel bound to say, that, from all I have heard from trustworthy sources, I am satisfied that while he is a Democrat, he is a retired, quiet and inoffensive one; rarely voting and never writing political articles for the newspapers or other periodicals of his party; as sensitive in his nature, as any body from his books, might infer him to be; and as little of a practical Democrat as he can be and yet profess the Democratic faith.41
In a lengthy plea addressed to Daniel Webster, then Senator and one of the most powerful Whigs in Washington, George S. Hillard claimed Hawthorne's appropriateness for office as a man of letters, as Holbrook and Ticknor had. Like them he appealed to Hawthorne's inoffensive politics and the effect of the dismissal, which "would be eminently discreditable to the Whig party." Speaking as a friend of Hawthorne, he also wrote as a Whig engaged in state politics and fearful of the consequence of the expulsion on the future life of the party. At some length he warned Webster of the doubtful strength of the Whigs in the coming fall elections in Massachusetts, pointing out that the Whigs most dissatisfied with Hawthorne's expulsion were those most likely to bolt the party to the Free Soil ranks. He concludes: "Therefore I cannot but think that the administration, in gratifying a few zealous partisans in Salem, have deprived themselves of valuable support in every other part of the state."42

Although Choate, Holbrook, Ticknor, and Hillard spoke in terms that Meredith and Webster were prepared to understand, the Salem Whigs felt their party was threatened by such support of Hawthorne. They accordingly reinforced their claims and sought to enforce discipline on Holbrook, the Salem Whig adherent of the novelist. After Holbrook's letter of June 12, Thomas P. Pingree, a member of the Salem Whig committee, visited the wavering Whig and told him of his fear that such aid would weaken the party. In a second letter to Meredith on June 20, Holbrook approached a recantation; he indicated he had not wished his support to be taken as a defense of Loco-Focos, but continued to believe that Hawthorne's removal was bad politics. The next day he forwarded a clipping of Hawthorne's self-defense in a letter to Hillard (June 18) that had been
published in the Boston Daily Advertiser of June 21. Holbrook presented the published defense as representative of Whig opinion and Hillard as an outstanding Whig. In his initial letter Holbrook had also asserted that John Chapman, editor of the Whig Salem Register, believed Hawthorne should be retained. In response Chapman denied to Meredith any such intention and repeated the charges against Hawthorne. He believed that Whigs had a right to expect the removal of obnoxious partisans. Hawthorne was appointed solely on political grounds and had subverted his office to party interests. In particular he charged Hawthorne with having given Democrats extra jobs in the customhouse, with having required political contributions from Whigs, and with having dismissed a Whig who refused to contribute.

Hawthorne's Democratic advocates employed the strategy of his Whig friends and additionally set about to disprove the charges against him. John L. O'Sullivan pointed out the potential hurt the expulsion could do the Whig administration and the gracefulness and credit of the novelist's recall. As former editor of the Democratic Review he testified that Hawthorne "never wrote a political line for that work." In the tone of hurt innocence he said, "I should have dreamed of applying to a nightingale to scream like a vulture, as of asking Hawthorne to write politics." On June 29, Zachariah Burchmore informed Hawthorne that the Whigs had always charged himself, not Hawthorne, with party management of the customhouse. Burchmore accused Chapman of attempting to frame Hawthorne. He heatedly claimed that he could

...truly assert as a fact within my own knowledge, that you never had any cognisance of party matters here, of the necessary means of carrying on an election, of any past subscription, of
the amount of money, how, or by whom it was raised, that you never attended any of our party drills or caucuses or allowed your name to be used in any manner by the Party, and that any charge against you on either of these points is false.46

On the same day the Democratic town committee of Salem filed a disclaimer of the charges against Hawthorne, to be followed the next day by a disclaimer of Hawthorne's partisan journalism from Eben N. Walton, Democratic editor of the Salem Advertiser.47 Walton insisted that Hawthorne had contributed only literary notices and that he had never attended party caucuses or conventions. All these disclaimers were forwarded to Meredith under a cover letter from Horace Mann on July 5. Mann, Whig Congressman and brother-in-law of Hawthorne, summarized the charges against the ex-surveyor and presented the testimony of O'Sullivan, Hawthorne, and the four members of the Democratic town committee in proof.48

Significantly, in his public self-defense Hawthorne made no claim as a literary man deserving reappointment. We have seen that his friends invoked his literary reputation, besides political expediency, as the reasons for his reappointment. It was his private conviction that literary men deserved recognition by politicians, as we have seen above in his letter to Longfellow of June 5, before the novelist's expulsion and the ensuing movement to retain him. Hawthorne's self-defense was published in the Boston Daily Advertiser of June 21 and the New York Evening Post of June 22. There, in a public letter to his friend George Hillard, he countered the Whig criticism in a point-for-point defense.49 Consistent with the strategy of his advocates he set out to prove the falsity of the charges against him. Clearly, Hawthorne sought to refute a personal attack. In defending himself, however, he showed that the charges against
him, political in nature, were false, thereby proving himself the politically neutral person his friends claimed him to be and so offering a wedge against the party that had disclaimed the intention of political proscription. Recognizing the final weakness of literary claims in an essentially political system, Hawthorne saw that his most appropriate claim was not that he was a man of letters, but that he was a scandal-free civil servant who had done his job well.

In the Salem Register of June 11, John Chapman had already conceded Hawthorne's ability and political inoffensiveness. Probably on the basis of this editorial Amory Holbrook had listed Chapman as one of the Whig adherents of Hawthorne in his letter of June 12 to Secretary Meredith. But Chapman's attack of Hawthorne in his letter to Meredith of June 30 shows his true desire for Whig dominance in the customhouse, and the editorial of June 11 sought the same calculated effect. Although a gentle treatment of Hawthorne, it called for Whig replacements of Democrats on the basis of spoils. Speaking of the expulsion of Hawthorne, Chapman noted the twenty-year dominance of radical Democrats in the customhouse. He conceded Hawthorne's relative inoffensiveness and suggested that the novelist demeaned himself and his talent in his associations. Quoting Jackson's justification of rotation in office, Chapman said that Hawthorne "is too old a soldier--and too much impregnated with the doctrines of the Democratic Review, which he has contributed so powerfully, by the exercise of his talents, to sustain--to whine at the fortunes of war." Chapman saw Hawthorne's removal as a necessary first movement in the overhaul of the customhouse. In conclusion he remarked the "sudden palpitation of the hearts" of the other Democrats, who would ask, "If the surveyor isn't safe
WHEN AM I TO GO?" Chapman responded: "Wait patiently, gentlemen, and the answer will come."50

The New York Evening Post, edited by William Cullen Bryant, printed Hawthorne's letter to Hillard and offered additional argument against such claims as Chapman's in the Salem Register. The editorial noted that Hawthorne's expulsion was "a flagrant case of political proscription" by a party pledged to follow President Taylor's promise to allow no removals and appointments to be made solely upon partisan grounds. The proscription of Hawthorne, Bryant insisted, undermined confidence in the national administration, especially since Bancroft gave Hawthorne the appointment "as a tribute to his literary position entirely." Following the tack that Hawthorne seemed to be taking in his letter, the editorial admitted that neither the novelist's needs nor his writings themselves entitled him to office, although "they were good reasons for not depriving him of one, the duties of which he discharged[d] with fidelity and efficiency."51 Regardless of Bryant's doubtful logic that literature did not qualify a writer for office but provided good reason to keep him in, the thrust of his defense is clear: Hawthorne's good behavior in office revealed the hypocrisy of President Taylor's words and deeds.

Although the Whig charges bore doubtful truth, Hawthorne was not returned to office. The charge that he had engaged in partisan writing was quite false. Randall Stewart's careful search of the Salem Advertiser supports Hawthorne's assertion that he wrote nothing more than reviews and theater notices.52 A search of the Democratic Review reveals that he wrote nothing of a partisan nature with the exception of his biography of Benjamin Cilley, which Hawthorne acknowledged in his defense to Hillard, and
which in any case had been written ten years before. This hardly supports the Whig charge that Hawthorne was an obnoxious partisan journalist. In his study of the removal from the customhouse, W. S. Nevins was unable to find evidence that Hawthorne had attended caucuses or party conventions, although it was true, as Hawthorne said in his defense, that he had been listed in the Salem Advertiser as a member of the Democratic town committee. As for the charge that he exacted political contributions from Whigs and fired those who refused, the evidence suggests that he probably was not guilty. Nevins insists that Hawthorne was not guilty, basing his judgment on the absence of evidence to the contrary. Nor does any evidence suggest the truth of Robert Cantwell's assertion of Hawthorne's presence in the Customhouse as a Treasury Department spy. I prefer to believe that Hawthorne was probably an acceding member of the machinery that favored Democrats without himself being the source of the motion. The exaction of political contributions is not characteristically recorded for latter-day investigators; whether Hawthorne ever required contributions may never be known. In any case I am unable to believe that Hawthorne was so innocent of knowledge as his friends Buremore and O'Sullivan insisted in their letters above. To believe that goes against the knowledge of his acute political awareness in the movement to appoint him to the customhouse in 1846 and that he later revealed in his biography of Pierce. However, the charges against him were very unsubstantial. He wrote no partisan journalism during his tenure, the alleged Whigs that he dismissed were in fact Democrats, and the job allotment that saw certain Democrats receive more income than Whigs was performed by Hawthorne on order of the Collector of the Port, Ephraim F. Miller, himself a Whig appointed by Democratic President
Polk and therefore unsatisfactory to the Salem Whigs. 54

Hawthorne's guilt or innocence was less important to the Whigs than to the Democrats, who could use his innocence as a tool against their opponents. Behind the Whig verbiage, the charges and the suggestion that Hawthorne was a simple dupe, lay the fear that the doctrine of rotation in office was threatened. From this point of view it made no difference, finally, whether Hawthorne was guilty or innocent, whether he had performed efficiently, whether his literary reputation entitled him to office. He was a Democrat appointed by a Democratic administration; that was sufficient to require his dismissal. Led by Charles Wentworth Upham, a Unitarian minister, the Salem Whigs conceived the expulsion as a test of their right to patronage and of the power of the party to carry out political discipline. In the memorial filed on July 6 with Secretary Meredith, they recounted their faithfulness in the election that brought Taylor to power and asked for Hawthorne's continued dismissal as "no more than our just due." In deference to Taylor's promise not to employ the patronage system, they tried to give the President just cause for removal by detailing Hawthorne's alleged partisanship. Yet their true belief that the expulsion was a test of Whig power recurs throughout:

It was declared in the streets, with triumphant defiance, that the whig party dared not, and could not, remove Nathaniel Hawthorne. It has at last come to this: His continuance or removal should determine whether the conspiracy by which the Custom House was placed beyond the reach of the whig party, or whether the will of that party should prevail.

* * * * * * *

The appointment of Capt. Allen Putnam was the first proof brought home to either democrats or whigs in Salem that Zachary Taylor, and not James K. Polk, is President of the United States. 55

As Chapman remarked in the Salem Register, with Hawthorne removed other re-
movals would surely follow.

This episode is a significant illustration of the natural incapacity
of the patronage system to admit the writing of literature as a qualifying
condition of office. Whatever the belief of the writer and his friends that
literature was an appropriate precondition of office and that office was
an appropriate recognition of literary merit, when battle lines were drawn
the important considerations were political, not literary. In his account
of Hawthorne's expulsion, the publisher James C. Derby recalled a conversation with Bancroft about Hawthorne's retention. Bancroft reported that the historian William Hickling Prescott had written Daniel Webster in favor of
Hawthorne's return to office. In Bancroft's reconstruction of the events,
Prescott wrote, "Here is Hawthorne, a man of the highest merit and letters,
a person whom one must not think of in reference to party." In anger Webster responded, "How can you, a Whig do such a thing, as to recommend the continuance in office, of a man of the politics of Hawthorne?"56

Besides the circumstances of Hawthorne's removal, another instance
of the low priority of literature as qualification for office occurs in
the retired President Jackson's call for Irving's removal from his position
as Minister to Spain (1842-1846). After long association with Jackson,
Van Buren, and the Democratic party, Irving had transferred his loyalty
to Harrison in the campaign between Harrison and Van Buren in 1840.57
Irving therefore received his appointment from a Whig administration.
Realizing that Polk and a Democratic administration were to come into
power in March, 1845, Jackson in retirement asked Amos Kendall what favor
he would like from the new President. As former Treasury official and
Post-Master General in Jackson's cabinet, as well as member of his in-
formal Kitchen Cabinet, Kendall had claims of Jackson's attention. In response he asked for the mission to Spain, which Kendall understood was "held by G. W. Irvine, appointed, I think, By Gen. Harrison, certainly a decided Whig." In a few days Jackson urged Kendall's appointment on Polk, extending the indignity of Kendall's misspelling of the author's name with a more grotesque variation:

I have just received from Mr. Kendall a concise note and noting his wish to be sent to Spain, in such modest & retiring words, & of gratitude that delights me—if this cannot be done consistently than any other that will free him from Washington and from poverty that can be properly bestowed. There can be no delicacy in recalling Erwin—he is only fit to write a Book & secondly that, and has become a good Whigg. 58

Regardless of the recognition that appointment may have bestowed on writers, they cannot but have accepted office with the awareness that their literary reputation was at best attractive to politicians but finally not crucial. Their position as men of letters gave them no special privilege or immunity, as Hawthorne discovered in both his appointment to and expulsion from the customhouse. If they were not aware initially, they became so in time, for most literary appointments did not survive new administrations, and only three survived the accession of a different political party to the national administration. 59 The recognition they received became necessarily tinged with the bitterness of the knowledge that office-holding was an effect of politics, not literature. It was therefore a doubtful pleasure, for it was an effect of the wrong cause.

As for the effect of the income writers received from appointment, one can make only suggestive conclusions, for the need varied with the person. Such factors as family requirements, income from other sources
including family wealth, business, and book publication, and the standard set by the writer's accustomed style of living enter into any such speculations. Final conclusions regarding the effect of official income require a separate study of authorial income, and no general study of the subject exists. Even so, one can say that writers welcomed the salaries from their offices and were able to live from them in modest comfort. Those few experienced genuine hardship who had the misfortune to receive appointments to consulates that were not salaried but feed according to the services the consul provided.Ordinarily, such posts were staffed by natives of the place of the consulate. One of the few writers who received such an unremunerative appointment was George Washington Greene (Consul at Rome, 1837-1845), who, it will be remembered, Horatio Bridge had tried to unseat in favor of Hawthorne in 1845. Greene's consular despatches show that at regular intervals he complained of the poverty of his position. On February 5, 1838, his friend Edmund H. Pendleton solicited the aid of Secretary of State John Forsyth. Pendleton indicated that Greene could not live on the proceeds of his office, which amounted to about $200 a year, and had been able to add only a little by furnishing articles to the North American Review. Pendleton urged that Greene be appointed to a clerkship with an assured salary. Greene received no transfer, however, and his need continued. Hearing of his plight in 1842, Edward Everett, then Minister to Great Britain, addressed Secretary of the State Daniel Webster in Greene's behalf. Everett urged that Greene be upgraded to Consul-General or Diplomatic Agent with a salary of $2000 per annum, equal to that of a Secretary of Legation.61 It will be remembered that this was the consulate that Howells rejected in 1861 when
he learned from Piatt that it remained a feed post worth only $500 per annum.

But Greene's dilemma was not typical, though it would be misleading to assert that writers in minor posts became notably wealthy. The income of writers under appointment was of course proportionate to the rank of office. The lowest salaries belonged to clerks in the Washington bureaus and to consuls in inferior consulates. During the period when Whitman, O'Connor, and Burroughs were clerks in Washington, clerk salaries ranged in two-hundred dollar increments from $1200 per annum for first class clerkships to $1800 per annum for fourth class clerkships. If one's needs were kept simple, this seemed enough to live on. With frugality the Burroughs family in 1865 were able to save fifty dollars each month from a $1200 income; when Burroughs left the Treasury Department in 1872, his income was $1800. Whitman received $1200 per annum from his appointment on January 1, 1865, to May, 1865. He served as second class clerk from June, 1865, to October, 1866, with annual income of $1400. From November, 1866, to the termination of his appointment in June, 1874, he received $1600 per annum as a third class clerk. More meaningful than the bare figures is Whitman's satisfaction with his posts and the attendant salary and (especially) leisure, a theme that recurs in his correspondence during his tenure.

Melville's file in the National Archives shows that as inspector in the New York customhouse (1866-1885) he received four dollars a day or $1250 a year, except for a reduction to $3.60 a day from December 1, 1875, to October 1, 1876. From Freneau's salary of $250 per annum to Burroughs's salary of $1800, writers in clerkships appear to have received about enough not to be in direst poverty, nor yet luxury. Although unattractive, low
salaries could be balanced by the leisure that clerkships afforded or additional income from other sources, as in the case of Freneau's journalism and Melville's income from interest.

Writers holding appointments in the consular service of the Department of State fared better on the whole than writers holding clerkships. As officer in an inferior consulate Howells received a salary of $1500 per annum plus fees during his tenure from 1861-1865. Since commerce between Venice and the United States during the Civil War was at a virtual halt, the extra fees in 1863 and 1864 brought Howells's income to only $1676.25 and $1730.50. On the other extreme was Hawthorne's income from the Liverpool consulate from 1853 to 1857. The busiest and most lucrative consulship during Pierce's administration, the post brought $15,000 annually in fees during Hawthorne's tenure, and Hawthorne left his post with $30,000 in savings. As consul at Crefeld (1878-1880), Bret Harte received after expenses $2500 per annum; as consul at Glasgow (1880-1885), he received $3000 per annum plus another thousand dollars from fees. Writers serving as consuls received salaries ranging from sufficient to attractive.

Holders of diplomatic assignments, however, received the greatest incomes, which ranged from attractive to munificent. As Secretary of Legation in the London embassy (1829-1832), Irving received $2000 per annum; as Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain (1842-1846) he held a highest ranking post, with annual salary of $9000. This was also the salary of George Bancroft, Minister to Great Britain (1846-1849), A. H. Everett, Minister to Spain (1825-1829), and Edward Everett, Minister to Great Britain (1841-1845). By the Diplomatic and Consular Act of March 1, 1855, salaries of diplomats and consuls were fixed at new rates in a system of graded salaries that did not
change until 1946. Under this new system Lowell and Hay received $17,500 per annum as Minister to Great Britain (1880-1885, 1897-1898, respectively). As incumbents of lesser embassies, others received salaries ranging from $10,000 to $12,000 per annum. These included George Henry Boker, John Lathrop Motley, Bayard Taylor, and Lew Wallace during their various tenures. Despite the cost of living in the style expected of the rank, these salaries were very good.

In order to place these salaries into more meaningful perspective, one can draw equivalences between them and their value in terms of the buying power of current dollars. The $1200-$1800 salaries of Whitman, O'Connor, and Burroughs in the 1860's approximate the value of $3600-$5400 in the buying power of current dollars. Hawthorne's saving of $30,000 from office in 1857 equals the buying power of about $103,900 current dollars, or $25,975 per annum. Top diplomatic salaries like Lowell's annual $17,500 from 1880 to 1885 equal about the buying power of $65,700 in current dollars.

This listing of income reveals a few interesting facts. The salaries of writers under appointment ranged from subsistence levels to comfortable wealth. One notes among the higher appointments, however, the tendency toward appointment of men of letters who were not, strictly speaking, writers of imaginative literature: Bancroft, A. H. Everett, Edward Everett, Hay, and Motley. Admittedly, this list is to be balanced by the higher appointments of Barlow, Boker, Hawthorne, Kennedy, Lowell, Paulding, Taylor, and Wallace, who represent a strange mixture of literary merit. Significantly, all the higher appointments were awarded after the writer had reached his prime, achieved a reputation, and perhaps written himself out,
which meant that the effect of the salary was reward for past effort and not necessarily the encouragement of future performance. Young, developing writers, as were Burroughs, Harte, Hawthorne, Paulding, and Robinson in their first appointments, received the poorest incomes from their inferior positions at times when they most needed the support. This was of course a natural deficiency in a system designed to reward partisans and efficient civil servants, not writers.

If writers discovered deficiencies in the recognition and salary they had anticipated, their experience of office also led them to a chastened view of the leisure they expected. This above all else was the desirable feature of office. It made low salaries bearable, for in prospect it allowed the writer freedom to act as a man of letters, that is, to read, think, write. What writers meant by "leisure" was the freedom from duty and insecurity that made unhurried introspection possible and uninterrupted periods of time available. Leisure was to make possible a private standard of productivity not subject to the practical demands of one's own need, family, audience, or the book trade. If practical demands interfered, it was no longer leisure, but time at the service of irrelevant necessity. Thus Melville responded to his cousin Catherine Gansevoort Lansing when she chided him for his use of the term:

So it appears that I used in my letter to you the expression "people of leisure." If I did, it was a faulty expression,—as applied in that case. I doubtless meant people the disposition of whose time is not subject to another. But it amused me—your disclaiming the thing, as if there was any merit in not being a person of leisure. Whoever is not in the possession of leisure can hardly be said to possess independence. They talk of the dignity of work. Bosh. True work is the necessity of poor humanity's earthly condition. The dignity is in leisure. Besides, 99 hundredths of all the work done in the world is either foolish and unnecessary, or harmful and wicked.
In contrast, what politicians meant by "leisure" was the time available to writers after or between the duties of office, and no writer received an appointment with the understanding his office entailed no duties, with exception of Cooper and Irving in his first appointment. From this point of view writers in office received no true literary sinecure, that is, an office without care, the only condition of which was to function as a writer. Some indication that political leaders were as concerned with the execution of duties as with the encouragement of writing is manifest in the appointment of Irving as Secretary of Legation in London (1829-1832) and Robinson as special agent in the New York customhouse (1905-1909). It will be remembered that doubtful of Irving's ability and interest in embassy affairs, Van Buren's and President Jackson's fears were assuaged by Van Buren's discovery that the writer's "literary occupation" did not interfere with practical matters. 73 President Roosevelt appointed Robinson to the customhouse with less political motivation and more genuine interest than probably any other President. Although he assured Robinson in conversation that he was "to think poetry first and Treasury second," he also wished the poet to understand the position required duties. In a letter of May, 1905, he sought the understanding that Robinson would perform his duties in the New York customhouse. 74 Politicians could not do otherwise without fear of a damaging scandal, and in any case they recognised that the offices held by writers were designed for the public service, not literary sinecure.

The evidence suggests that the kind of leisure writers required was not available in the lower positions which, if not well paid, provided leisure and relative freedom from the pressures of responsibility. His
biographer, Clara Barrus, points out that Burroughs had sufficient leisure under his appointment as clerk in the Treasury Department (1865-1872) to write as he wished. He informed a friend in 1869: "I do most of my writing in the office. My work is such that I have two or three hours each day to myself." Whitman expressed recurrent satisfaction in the leisure and flexibility of his clerkships. In 1865 he wrote: "It is easy enough--I take things very easy--the rule is to come at 9 and go at 4--but I don't come at 9, and only stay till 4 when I want." In 1866 he wrote: "I have an agreeable situation here--labor moderate--& plenty of leisure." He offered similar assessments in 1868 and 1872 to A. Bronson Alcott and William Michael Rossetti.

As salary increased with the rank of the appointment, so the leisure declined. Early in his appointment as Secretary to the Board of Navy Commissioners (1815-1824), Paulding reported to Irving his pleasure of office:

It gives me leisure, respect, and independence, which last is peculiarly gratifying from its novelty. All my life I have been fettered by poverty, and my vivacity checked by the hopelessness of the future. Now my spirits are good, my prospects fair, and the treatment I received from all around is marked with respectful consideration.

Paulding remained satisfied with the agreeable relation between his appointment and literary efforts. In 1818 he reported that the leisure of his appointment gave him opportunity to "indulge my scribbling propensities, to which I have now taken a decided vocation, I believe for the remainder of my life." Advanced to Navy Agent (1824-1838), he judged his new post on the basis of the leisure it afforded: "the situation is especially agreeable on account of there being little to do in it, whereby I am
afforded good time for scribbling, which has become a most incurable habit with me." As Secretary of the Navy (1838-1841), however, he noted the heavy duties of office which consumed his time. To Jared Sparks he wrote of his having "abandoned the intention of writing a life of Madison, which I had so long entertained. The Muses and I, have shaken hands, for the present at least, and parted good friends." 77

Like Paulding's, the experience of Irving and Lowell also suggests that writers in higher offices found the amount and quality of their leisure seriously reduced. Before his appointment to London, Irving foresaw the possibility of carrying on at once an official and literary career; he hoped to be able to work up the Spanish materials he had collected during his vice consulship in Madrid. Shortly after he entered into duty in the fall of 1829, he remarked the interruption of his writing by the duties of office, and a few days later complained that he had "been so unsettled and so harried about by various concerns that I have not had a moment to devote to literary matters." In the fall of 1830 Irving noted his wish "to complete some writings of a fanciful nature which I have in hand. I feel my official situation a terrible sacrifice of pleasure, profit and literary reputation, without furnishing any recompense." In the fall of 1831, near the end of his tenure, he complained that "the restlessness and uncertainty in which I have been kept" (he wished to resign his office) had disturbed his "mind and feelings too much for imaginative writing, and I now doubt whether I could get the Alhambra ready in time for Christmas." His present condition, he pointed out, "completely discourages all idea of publication of any kind." 78 Later, Irving expected to use his leisure as Minister to Spain to complete his life of Washington, an expectation
he announced briefly after taking office to a number of correspondents.
In the fall and winter of 1842 he complained of the interference of diplomatic duties, including studying of statutes of trade and the preparation of trade reports, with his wish to finish the life of Washington. His complaint recurs in the many letters of the period and extended to the end of his tenure. Irving's higher appointment required sufficient attention to duty to interfere with his creative efforts.

As a later holder of the Spanish mission Lowell, like Irving, was also oppressed by the official duties of office. Shortly after entry into office he reported the multiplicity of his new responsibilities. After almost a year in office he still felt caught up in its details, about "which I cannot get up a very sincere interest--claims and custom duties, and even, God save the mark! Blandreth's pills. I try to do my duty, but feel surely the responsibility to people three thousand miles away." Settled in his London post, he declined writing an Atlantic article that had been requested by Thomas Bailey Aldrich, then editor. Explaining his inability to Richard Watson Gilder, he blamed embassy work;

If I could, how gladly I would! But I am piecemealed here with so many things to do that I cannot get a moment to brood over anything as it must be brooded over if it is to have wings. It is as if a sitting hen should have to mind the door-bell.

It appears true, then, that higher office brought a burden of duty that hampered creative life. The consular despatches from Liverpool during Hawthorne's tenure reveal that Liverpool was a busy port and that Hawthorne was a conscientious consul. They reveal the writer intimately engaged in witnessing depositions, coroner's inquiries, and shipping manifests, and conducting investigations of shipwreck and crimes aboard American vessels. Yet it is difficult to reconcile the protestations of Pauld-
ing, Irving, and Lowell with the assurance from the latter two that office also afforded great leisure. However busy Irving may have been, he also had great periods of leisure and felt guilty about his failure to produce; his letters toward the end of his Spanish tenure are a litany of remorse. Whatever Lowell's duties were at times, his description of the habitual mode of his day in the summer of 1878 suggests he chose to fill his leisure with pleasant activity:

This is the course of my day: get up at eight, from 9 sometimes till 11 my Spanish professor, at 11 breakfast, at 12 to the Legation, at 3 home again and a cup of chocolate (sic), then read the paper and write Spanish till a quarter to 7, at 7 dinner, and at 8 drive in an open carriage to the Prado till 10, to bed at 12 to 1. In cooler weather we drive in the afternoon. 31

This is hardly the day of a duty-ridden diplomat.

Why many writers could not use the leisure they had under appointment is a complex of various causes different for each person. Yet one cannot discount that for many of them, office came after they had experienced their most fertile period, that is, after the period when their desire to write had been satisfied. As we shall see in the next chapter, the period of appointment was for many writers a barren time, at least in part because they were written out when they received the appointment. Some--Hawthorne, Lowell, Irving--took their duties with extreme seriousness and filed lengthy reports with the Department of State that reveal the necessity and detail of their work, though the ceremonial character of many of Irving's Madrid despatches lead one to suspect their necessity. Business certainly inhibited these. Even so, one senses that their duties may have offered a justification of their dying abilities and desire to write. It was a graceful justification that put public requirements before
private wishes and saved them from the fullest impact of the decline they sensed in their abilities. Thus Lowell could make an exact description of fact and justify himself at once when he protested, "Without unbroken time there can be no consecutive thought, and it is my misfortune that in the midst of a reflection or of a sentence I am liable to be called away by the bell of private or public duty." 82

Besides the persistent awareness of duty, some writers also ascribed to their official surroundings an anti-literary character that inhibited their ability to use leisure productively. This was notably Hawthorne's complaint in his first appointment, when he noted the richness of his experiences but his inability to use them. Addressing his future wife, he noted the color of "salt-vessels and colliers" that he might use in fiction if his fancy were not "rendered so torpid by my ungenial way of life, that I cannot sketch off the scenes and portraits that interest me; and I am forced to trust them to memory, with the hope of recalling them at some more favorable period." 83 In the middle of his second appointment he informed Longfellow that he wished to use his leisure but found that the philistine character of the customhouse deadened his spirit:

I am trying to resume my pen; but the influences of my situation and customary associates are so anti-literary, that I know not whether I shall succeed. Whenever I sit alone or walk alone I find myself dreaming about stories, as of old; but these forenoons in the Custom-house undo all that the afternoons and evenings have done. I should be happier if I could write; also, I should like to add something to my income, which though tolerable, is a tight fit. 84

The preceding speculations regarding the ill-effect of appointment on the production of literature seem to me less certain than the evidence that writers tended to write less under appointment because their need of
income was less. Whatever the modesty of salary, official position offered a security that in the face of the economic uncertainties of authorship made appointment more desirable than writing. The effect of security in some cases reduced the need to write for income, and the consequence was an inhibition of productivity. Out of office and in expectation of another in March, 1843, Hawthorne noted the diligence with which he had been writing for magazines that paid little and slowly. Considering the alternative of office, he admitted that "I might have written more, if it had seemed worth while; but I was content to earn only so much gold as might suffice for our immediate wants, having prospects of official station and emolument, which would do away the necessity of writing for bread." Significantly, Hawthorne's tenures in office were almost barren of literary production. Similarly, as Minister to Spain, Irving noted the decline in income from his investments and literary royalties, which he felt surely would not have supported him and his dependents "if Uncle Sam had not in a critical juncture taken me under his wing and made me a diplomatist!"86

Then the benefits that appointment conferred, namely recognition, income, and leisure, each had its unattractive reverse side that made political appointments doubtful literary sinecures. If he had an undemanding appointment, great desire to write, and a calmness of spirit undisturbed by the trivia of official detail, the writer was able to make his office in effect a literary sinecure. Notably Whitman was so qualified and able. If he did not possess Whitman's ability, the writer's tenure in office tended to be unfruitful. I hope further to support these conclusions in the following chapter's closer examination of the relation between appointment and literary productivity in the experiences of particular writers.
In brief, the experience writers had of their anticipations shows that they were not well able to make use of the potential sinecures they held, an assessment I offer in description, not blame. Those who failed seemed unable to keep their authorship a thing apart from necessity, with superior priority to other considerations. They succumbed to the natural temptations of office that Lowell analyzed after a year in his London appointment in advice to Howells, who considered accepting a professorship at Johns Hopkins University. Lowell's advice suggests the hope of the writer in anticipation of appointment and reveals the tantalizing and enervating effect that appointment too frequently had:

If you are able now, without overworking mind or body, to keep the wolf from the door and to lay by something for a rainy day—and I mean, of course, without being driven to work with your left hand because the better one is tired out—I should refuse the offer [of a professorship], or should hesitate to accept it. If you are a systematic worker, independent of moods, and sure of your genius whenever you want it, there might be no risk in accepting.

Lowell's advice is heavily conditional and he did not encourage Howells to accept. Instead, he contended that in taking other positions the writer released himself from his own proper sphere and necessarily weakened his will and ability through the consequent inactivity as writer. Lowell was, I believe, speaking for himself and men of letters under appointment in the Nineteenth Century.
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CHAPTER V.

POLITICAL APPOINTMENT AND LITERARY PRODUCTIVITY

If one requires a true cause to be exclusive and immediate, then it is true that political appointment had no generally beneficial effect upon literary productivity in the period under consideration. So limited, a true cause would be the conditions of appointment that stimulated notable literary productivity in quantity and quality, and affected the substance of the writing. From this rigid point of view, the effect of political appointment on writers should have been a marked productivity during appointment, resulting in more and better books which reflected the nature of the writer's official experiences. Given a critical temperament, the effect could conceivably have been a body of satire. The economy of political appointment produced no such fruitful effect. Many writers wrote less or not at all under appointment, and few were influenced in substance by the character of their appointment. In most instances, if one did not know the writer were under appointment, he would be unable to determine that fact from the writing itself. Only a handful of sketches and books show that the writer had experience as office-seeker and office-holder, among them Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Custom-House" sketch as preface to The Scarlet Letter (1850), Charles E. Lester's My Consulship (1853), Bret Harte's "The Office-Seeker" in Drift from Two Shores (1878), and Howells's references in Venetian Life (1866), Italian Journeys (1867), A Foregone Conclusion (1875) and A Fearful Responsibility.
(1881). Considering the number of writers under appointment, this is a very minor result and does not significantly affect literary history.

The best generalization that one can make about the influence of appointment on literary productivity reveals how limited its influence was. Under appointment writers tended to write as they had without appointment. That is, they wrote on themes, in a style, and with the frequency they had been accustomed to before their appointment. If the writer had confidence in his ability, an audience, and a desire to publish, his appointment tended to foster his continued success as author, provided the appointment offered leisure to write. If the writer were stale, unsure of his ability or audience, and had little desire to publish, his appointment tended to prove a hiatus in his literary productivity. As literary patronage, many political appointments were unsuccessful because they were given to writers who found themselves in some form of the latter set of conditions. Accordingly, they wrote little or not at all, and the appointment provided more securely the income they formerly received uncertainly as authors. Except for scattered pieces, political appointment failed to encourage the work of Joel Barlow, Philip Freneau, John Howard Payne, Nathaniel Hawthorne, George Henry Boker, Herman Melville, James Russell Lowell, Bayard Taylor, Francis H. Underwood, and Edwin Arlington Robinson. This suggests that whatever the causes of literary production, political appointment was not a direct cause as it affected the lives of these writers, and if the writing of these authors bloomed or was blighted, other causes contributed, perhaps more directly than political appointment. Political appointment could not be expected to provide writers with talent, that is, sensitivity to form, language, and human character, although it could be expected to
encourage literary productivity by providing conditions for growth. What may have had more effect was the inability of writers to live from the proceeds of writing, lack of talent, and the failure of a receptive and critical audience, who seem to have approved Bayard Taylor and Lew Wallace about equally with Hawthorne and Melville.

This is not to suggest that political appointment had no effect on literary productivity. Appointment provided experiences that became the material of a sizable body of travel books, including those of Charles E. Lester, Nathaniel Hawthorne, William Dean Howells, and John Hay. It is possible to trace through them the dissociation of their writers from genteel and conventional analysis and description and the movement toward a realistic and significantly American assessment of Europe and the European past. Among these writers the movement begins with Lester’s *My Consulship* (1853), which calls for a “true” history of Italy, and concludes with John Hay’s nativist account of Spain in *Castilian Days* (1871).

Significant in its implications for national subsidy of writers, political appointment had its most healthful effect upon the few writers who were novices or who despite age remained with developing talents. Under appointment Irving turned to a new form, romantic history, to redeem his waning literary reputation; Paulding received twenty-six years of leisure to develop what remained a minor talent; and Whitman secured sufficient leisure to continue his development as major poet. Under appointment as novice writers, Harte in his California appointments and Howells owed their early development in part to the security and leisure of office. Howells’s Venice appointment is a case history of the best possible effect of political appointment, for he received office when he required it, and
he gave it up when he saw it had done all it could for him as author.

Why political appointment frequently failed to encourage literary productivity remains a question best answered through analysis of the particular literary careers that were unmoved by the experience. In each instance the complex of causes is somewhat different. Although Irving intended to use his appointment as Minister to Spain (1842-1845), he failed to do so because of a complex of reasons: interference of official duty, fear of waning literary powers, the alternative security of an attractive income. Francis H. Underwood failed to use his appointment as Consul at Glasgow (1885-1889) and Edinburgh (1893-1894) because he accepted his posts with the understanding he would not write during tenure. The evidence suggests that Melville as Inspector in the New York Customhouse (1866-1885) considered himself temporarily impotent as writer and considered his best course to lie fallow. All conclusions must therefore bear the qualifications of individual cases.

Even so, an examination of the relation between the political appointment and literary productivity of Hawthorne reveals most of the conflicts that made official tenure barren of literature. As in other places in this study, Hawthorne serves as a representative example, for he held appointments that offered him the total possible range of recognition, income, and leisure; he required a sinecure, he held his offices at ages (35, 42, and 49) when one could expect productivity; and he possessed great talent. Although one could properly expect the result to be a literary quickening, the consequence was the writer's almost total sterility under appointment. Hawthorne's bibliography reveals instead a quickening of literature in the
absence of appointment, as do those of the writers named above.

The conditions of Hawthorne's first appointment as Measurer in the Boston Customhouse (1839-1841) made the position a potential literary sinecure. Prior to appointment he had kept his hand in writing through a mixture of literary experiences and had developed a localized reputation. He had published and disavowed a novel, Fanshawe (1828). He had performed hackwork in editing and contributing to The American Magazine of Useful and Entertaining Knowledge (1836) and in co-editing Peter Parley's Universal History (1837). Except in negative reaction neither task could have been conducive to imaginative literature. He had published short fiction and sketches in annuals, the New England Magazine, and the Salem Gazette, which he gathered into Twice-Told Tales (1837) in an edition underwritten by Horatio Bridge's guarantee of two-hundred and fifty dollars. As customhouse employee he received a salary that relieved the necessity of engaging in hackwork and offered, at least potentially, the leisure he required. Although most of the records of the customhouse were destroyed in a fire of 1894, George Edwin Jepson has uncovered a surviving document that shows Hawthorne received $1500 per annum, a sum certainly greater than he had before received and a third more than the thousand dollars a year Randall Stewart shows Hawthorne to have averaged from literary income in the 1850's. Hawthorne anticipated the use of the appointment as a literary sinecure. A few days before his tenure began, he reported to Longfellow his understanding that the job required little time and his intention to write. Although ironic, his remarks revealed his joy of possibilities;
They tell me that a considerable portion of my time will be unoccupied, the which I mean to employ in sketches of my new experiences, under some such titles as follow: "Passages in the Life of a Custom-house Officer," "Scenes in Dock," "Nibblings of a Wharf-Rat," "Trials of a Tide-waiter," "Romance of the Revenue Service"; together with an ethical work, in two volumes, on the subject of Duties... 4

The evidence shows that despite the good prospect Hawthorne was unable to take advantage of the opportunity. His job seems to have required periods of close attention to official details with considerable gaps of time when he was totally free. He recorded on April 2, 1839, the press of business that sent him to East Cambridge for a day of work, and on April 17 having been kept busy until four o'clock. 5 During the spring of 1839, he may have been kept too busy to do much writing. On May 16, he invited Longfellow to visit him, for he wished to talk over publishing another volume of short fiction and desired Longfellow's advice. His literary plans so far had been frustrated by his appointment, possibly by the press of duty: "If I write a preface to the new volume it will be to bid farewell to literature; for, as a literary man, my new occupations entirely break me up." 6 His description of his habitual day in the spring of 1840, however, shows that at least during this period of his tenure he had abundant leisure. He wrote of a day that began with a check of the customhouse to see if his presence were required. Finding no call, he would read the morning paper and at nine-thirty go to the Boston Athenaeum, where he read magazines or reviews until eleven or twelve. Then he returned to the customhouse to determine once again if his services were required. At one o'clock he promenaded in order to stimulate his appetite and, after lunch, returned to the customhouse for a final check. From two until six o'clock he remained in his rooms,
dined at six, and read until ten. Although his morning serenity may have been broken by anticipation of the duty that seemed slow to come, one can properly infer from this description a period of undisturbed afternoon leisure.

Why Hawthorne could not write during this time remains conjectural. His objection in July, 1839, that by evening "my mind has lost its elasticity—my heart, even, is weary. . ." may refer in fact to weariness induced by labor, although it may also have its origin in the courting posture he presented to Sophia Peabody, at once an object to be pitied and desirable to one so capable of pity. However that may be, Hawthorne conceived his appointment as a temporary block to literary productivity. During the same general period when he described the leisure of his habitual day, he reported his wish to Sophia that she might accompany him in his duties in order to keep a record of descriptions and impressions to be used at a future time, when "again busy at the loom of fiction, he would weave in these little pictures." Meanwhile, he complained that his fancy was killed by an uncongenial life that made impossible sketching of experiences as they occurred. Significantly, there is no record of notebooks for this period. Although business may have interfered, Hawthorne seems not to have written because he found his job and its rewards as satisfying as literature and its rewards. During the month he had described his habitual leisure, he confessed that although he wished to function as a writer he found his experiences valuable in extra-literary ways that he might later incorporate in subtle ways into literature. Speaking of himself in the third person, as if the man in the customhouse were some other than his true literary self, he wrote:
It is only once in a while that the image and desire of a better and happier life makes him feel the iron of his chain; for after all, a human spirit may find no insufficiency of food fit for it, even in the Custom-House. [My emphasis] And with materials as these, I do think, and feel and learn things that are worth knowing, and which I should not know unless I had learned them there; so that the present portion of my life shall not be quite left out of the sum of my real existence.

... And when I quit this earthy cavern, where I am now buried, nothing will cling to me that ought to be left behind. Men will not perceive, I trust, by my look, or the tenor of my thoughts and feelings, that I have been a Custom-House Officer.

I believe it is reasonable to conclude from this admission, that beneath the veneer of justification of failure to produce Hawthorne saw his first appointment as a satisfactory substitute for the "better and happier" life that he felt guilt for having left.

Hawthorne's literary production during his first tenure was very slight, comprising republications and juvenile books. Appearing first in the Token (1832), "The Gentle Boy" had already been included in the 1837 Twice-Told Tales; a separate edition bearing quite properly the title The Gentle Boy: A Thrice Told Tale was issued on February 25, 1839. First appearing in the Southern Rose of January 19, 1839, "The Lily's Quest" could of course not have been written and published before Hawthorne's appointment on January 17; it was republished in an ephemera called The Picturesque Pocket Companion, and Visitor's Guide, through Mount Auburn in 1839 and later collected in the Twice-Told Tales of 1842. First appearing in the Democratic Review in May, 1838, "Howe's Masquerade" was republished in The Boston Book, which bears the date 1841 but appeared in November, 1840; this tale was also to be collected in the 1842 Twice-Told Tales.

Hawthorne's only new work of this period was the Grandfather's Chair series of juvenile books, the first two of which he certainly wrote in the
closing months of his tenure but probably not the third and final volume. In a letter to Longfellow of November 20, 1840, he remarked his continuance as a customhouse officer with only nominal duties. For a month past he had been "occupying Grandfather's Chair," which must mean he was engaged in the manuscript of the series from October forward. Publication dates indicate that Hawthorne completed the first two volumes before he resigned his office on January 1, 1841. Grandfather's Chair: A History for Youth was advertised as published on December 3, 1840; Famous Old People: Being the Second Epoch of Grandfather's Chair was advertised in press on January 13, 1841, and advertised as published on January 18. Hawthorne probably did not complete the third volume, Liberty Tree: With the Last Words of Grandfather's Chair while he was in office. Its preface is dated February 27, 1841, and the book appeared in March.

Significantly, after Hawthorne disengaged from the customhouse and Brook Farm, he once again began to function as writer, as his notebooks reveal in the material he had begun to gather at Brook Farm. After he left Brook Farm, he felt perfectly freed to write and probably the need to write for income. His notebook thereafter shows a remarkable increase in entry of brief données "to be wrought out" into fiction. It is clear from the entries that at this point he thought of himself as a writer who needed material, and the entries are often notes to himself about possible fictional treatment. Especially the entries beginning January 23, 1842, and June 1, 1842, are catalogues of moral observations and whimsy that Hawthorne recorded for their value to him as fictionist.

In the somewhat more than five years between his two customhouse appointments, Hawthorne recommitted himself to an uncertain income from
writing short fiction for magazines. In 1843 there were two of his sketches, "The Old Apple Dealer" and "The Antique Ring," in Sargent's New Monthly Magazine. There were six pieces in the Democratic Review: "The New Adam and Eve," "Egotism or the Bosom Serpent," "The Procession of Life," "The Celestial Railroad," "Buds and Bird Voices," and "Fire Worship." "The Birth Mark" and "The Hall of Fantasy" were published in Lowell's Pioneer. "Little Daffydowndilly" appeared in the Boys' and Girls' Magazine. In 1844 there were six pieces in the Democratic Review: "The Christmas Banquet," "The Intelligence Office," "The Artist of the Beautiful," "A Select Party," "A Book of Autographs," and "Rappaccini's Daughter." Graham's published "Earth's Holocaust"; Godey's published "Drowne's Wooden Image"; and the Child's Friend published "A Good Man's Miracle." In the following two years the volume of his writing fell off, and only "P's Correspondence" appeared in the Democratic Review (April, 1845). In the same period Hawthorne sought to reap second fruits with separate editions of the collected tales: the second edition of Twice-Told Tales (1842) and Mosses from an Old Manse (1846), which collected the magazine pieces of 1843-1845, as well as earlier uncollected tales. Other separate editions included Biographical Stories for Children (1842) and The Celestial Railroad (1843). Hawthorne also employed some time in editing Horatio Bridge's Journal of an African Cruiser (1845). This mixture of literary enterprises reveals the ends to which the writer went in order to survive.

Since Hawthorne was out of office, he clearly had to write more. If one considers that five years elapsed between appointments, this body of writing, good as many of the tales are, is not remarkable in quantity. Today one sees as perhaps Hawthorne could not that short fiction was one of
his particular strengths. It is relevant to question why he never attempted long fiction at this time, for it promised the greater income and literary reputation he desired. That he sought both during the period appears certain, for in his 1851 preface to Twice-Told Tales he remarked that his magazine writing to that point, including the previous editions of Tales, had brought him neither. The preface is Hawthorne's indictment of the audience, with which he sought "to open an intercourse," but which remained cool:

Throughout the time above specified, he had no incitement to literary effort in a reasonable prospect of reputation or profit. . . . To this total lack of sympathy [of the public], at the age when his mind would naturally have been most effervescent, the public owe it (and it is certainly an effect not to be regretted on either part) that the Author can show nothing for the thought and industry of that portion of his life, save the forty sketches, or thereabouts, included in these volumes.14

He nonetheless persisted in collecting his magazine and annual writings which, since they had already appeared in print, were naturally less attractive than original material. Also, his magazine writing secured neither income nor fame, owing to the low rates of pay from magazines and the characteristic anonymity or pseudonymity of annual and magazine publication. It was not until Hawthorne began to receive direct credit in the Democratic Review pieces of 1843 and 1844 that his name began to appear with some regularity. One concludes that he wrote no long fiction in the period between custom-house appointments because his experience and strength lay in the short fiction that also frustrated him in the marketplace. Later, fearful that The Scarlet Letter, his first longer fiction, would be too slight, he wrote "The Custom-House" sketch in part to fill out the volume to more impressive and saleable length, and the preface suggests that he had in mind adding
other sketches in the fashion of \textit{Twice-Told Tales} and \textit{Mosses from an Old Manse}. As a writer of short fiction, Hawthorne could continue his frustration, cast out in another direction (as in the later \textit{Scarlet Letter}), or seek other employment.

Hawthorne's option in the middle 1840's was to seek other employment, the second customhouse appointment (1846-1849). A notebook entry midway between appointments reveals that the pace of his writing was designed to satisfy only the Hawthorne family's needs, and office would relieve him from writing for money:

> As to the daily course of our life, I have written with pretty commendable diligence, averaging from two to four hours a day; and the result is seen in various Magazines. I might have written more, if it had seemed worth while; but I was content to earn only so much gold as might suffice for our immediate wants, having prospects of official station and emolument, which would do away the necessity of writing for bread. Those prospects have not yet had their fulfillment... Meantime, the Magazine people do not pay their debts; so that we taste some of the inconveniences of poverty, and the mortification—only temporary, however—of owing money, with empty pockets. It is an annoyance; not a trouble.

With his appointment to the Salem Customhouse on April 9, 1846, the annoyance was relieved. Hawthorne became Surveyor, an office that brought in an annual salary of $1200, less by $300 than the salary in Boston but more by $200 than the average $1000 per annum he earned from his writing in the peak years of the 50's. He anticipated leisure; shortly after his appointment, he wrote to Duyckinck that "my office (the duties of it being chiefly performable by deputy) will allow me as much time for literature as can be profitably applied." Despite the prospect of total leisure, from the time of his appointment to the fall of 1847, Hawthorne wrote nothing. On September 10, Mrs. Hawthorne noted that the writer's
study had been turned into a nursery and his desk unopened for the year past. In a diary entry in November, she noted that Hawthorne had returned to his desk to spend the afternoons in composition. He nonetheless kept his notebook erratically during his second tenure, with entries for March 19, 23, 1848, and January 28, February 1, 5, 1849. A few days after Mrs. Hawthorne noted her husband's return to the writing desk, he assessed his year's infertility and the prospect of productivity. He blamed the inhibiting influence of the customhouse but noted, significantly, the sufficiency of his income, though he sought more. To Longfellow he reported:

I am trying to resume my pen; but the influence of my situation and customary associates are so anti-literary, that I know not whether I shall succeed. Whenever I sit alone or walk alone I find myself dreaming about stories, as of old; but these forenoons in the Custom-house undo all that the afternoons and evenings have done. I should be happier if I could write; also, I should like to add something to my income, which, though tolerable, is a tight fit. If you can suggest any work of pure literary drudgery, I am the man for it.

The assessment he offered Longfellow in 1847 does not correspond exactly with the assessment of "The Custom-House" sketch in 1850, where in retrospect Hawthorne also saw his failure to produce as a defect of purpose. Although business may have occasionally been pressing, Hawthorne probably had most of his afternoons free. In the letter above he noted that only his mornings were committed to the customhouse; in the later "Custom-House" sketch he referred to "the three hours and a half which Uncle Sam claimed as his share of my daily life..." (p. 35). In his notebook entry for February 1, 1849, he entered his return from the customhouse at "1/2 past one P.M." and his meditations on the meaning of the play of Una and Julian. At six o'clock he noted his guilt of having indulged in
playful speculation: "This has been a particularly barren afternoon." In the light of this information, it is fairly certain that Hawthorne had leisure to write, and by the time of the writing of "The Custom-House" sketch in early 1850 he saw that his early condemnation of the customhouse as an anti-literary influence required modification.

The motives of "The Custom-House" sketch are several. Above I have pointed out that Hawthorne wrote the sketch after completing The Scarlet Letter in part to fill up an otherwise slender volume. It also gave him opportunity to indulge his spleen at having been expelled by the Whigs, as I shall illustrate. It is as importantly the apologia of a man of letters in public office, for he spent several paragraphs considering why he had failed to produce under appointment, and the tone of remorse pervades the latter pages of the essay. There he accepted the ghostly charge of Surveyor Pue to embroider the scarlet letter in fiction, a commission that Hawthorne says he could not perform in office because the character of the customhouse had left his imagination "a tarnished mirror." Since he has earlier spoken of the indifference of the customhouse employees to literature and his status as an author, one could assume that Hawthorne means by "atmosphere of a Custom-House" its philistine character. This appears to be the implication of Hawthorne's assessment in his letter to Longfellow of November 11, 1847. If the philistinism of his customhouse associates contributed to his infertility, by 1850 Hawthorne was also blaming himself. Immediately following his reference to the disabling "atmosphere," he blamed his security for having produced the effect:

"The little power you might once have possessed over the tribe of unrealities is gone! You have bartered it for a pitance of
the public gold. Go, then, and earn your wages!" In short, the almost torpid creatures of my own fancy twitted me with imbecility, and not without fair occasion. (pp. 34-35).

Although this self-crimination may be in part the righteous and public pose of a man of letters making his peace after compromise with the world, I believe it is also Hawthorne's genuine and private confession of guilt for having accepted once again a position that left him with no desire to write. Continuing the self-analysis, he remarked the torpor that pursued him from customhouse to the study, where he observed the moonlight filter through the room upon ordinary furniture. The passage is an important reflection of Hawthorne's method; there, he says, the writer sees that objects become representative, universal, and timeless, as they are filtered by imagination and intelligence. Although he used his experience here as metaphor, it is also clear from the passage that Hawthorne enjoyed the leisure and repose that were preconditions for his productivity. Significantly, he recognizes that the preconditions exist and upbraids himself at beginning and end of this passage:

If the imaginative faculty refused to act at such an hour, it might well be deemed a hopeless case. . . .

* * * * * * * * *

Then, at such an hour, and with this scene before him, if a man, sitting all alone, cannot dream strange things, and make them look like truth, he need never try to write romances (pp. 35-36).

Considering alternatives, Hawthorne speculated about what he might have done in fiction with his customhouse experiences. He might have treated in the manner of popular humorists the sea narrative he heard, a style that Hawthorne attempted only twice ("Mr. Higginbotham's Catastrophe" in Twice-Told Tales and "Mrs. Bullfrog" in Mosses from an Old Manse). He might even, he admitted, have written a regular romance with the substance of his experi-
ence by investing real objects with imagination and intelligence and thus
make "a bright transparency" which would "spiritualize the burden that began
to weigh so heavily" and "seek, resolutely, the true and indestructible
value that lay hidden in the petty and wearisome incidents, and ordinary
characters, with which I was now conversant." He confessed that the fault
lay in himself for his failure to use his office as a literary sinecure:

The fault was mine. The page of life that was spread out before
me seemed dull and commonplace, only because I had not fathomed
its deeper import. A better book than I shall ever write was
there; leaf after leaf presenting itself to me, just as it was
written, only because my brain wanted the insight and my hand
the cunning to transcribe it. At some future day, it may be,
I shall remember a few scattered fragments and broken para-
graphs, and write them down, and find the letters turn to gold
upon the page.(p. 37).

As Hawthorne remarked, these perceptions came too late. During his
tenure he was conscious of his inability but not its true source, which
he proceeded in retrospect to analyze. His argument sounds today like
the essence of reactionary criticism of the state. When one leans upon
the resources of the Republic, Hawthorne asserted, he loses his own proper
virtue, the result being a continuing enervation whether in or out of
office:

His [the patronage beneficiary's] pervading and continual hope--
a hallucination, which, in the face of all discouragement, and
making light of impossibilities, haunts him while he lives, and,
I fancy, like the convulsive throes of the cholera, torments him
for a brief space after death--is, that finally, and in no long
time, by some happy concidence of circumstances, he shall be re-
turned to office. This faith, more than anything else, steals
the pith and availability out of whatever enterprise he may dream
of undertaking. (p. 39).

With rhetorical questions and a comparison between "Uncle Sam's gold" and
"the Devil's wages," Hawthorne concluded that one held office at peril of
the soul and manly character.
Hawthorne's analysis is certainly correct in the effect. Although he wrote impersonally here of the office-holder as a type, it is clear that he wrote of himself as well, and the effect of the office on him was not a great spurring of industry. Whether he placed the blame properly upon the system of political patronage remains arguable. Considering the evidence that Hawthorne enjoyed the preconditions of productivity, I am less inclined to accept his indictment of office-holding and more inclined to accept his earlier assertion that "The fault was mine . . . ." It remains true in its effect that so long as the novelist held office he felt insufficient stimulus to write. Although he felt guilty because of his literary idleness, he could not bring himself to resign office and cut himself off from its baneful effects. Despite his anger toward his political enemies, he appears to have been content that his fate fell out as it did. As he put it in "The Custom-House" Sketch, "my fortune somewhat resembled that of a person who should entertain an idea of committing suicide, and, altogether beyond his hopes, meet with the good hap to be murdered." While he was in the "unnatural state" of the customhouse, he had been "withholding myself from toil that would, at least, have stilled an unquiet impulse in me" (p. 42). The dismissal made possible the return to the old confrontation with the blank page that he sought and dreaded. Mrs. Hawthorne reported, with a note of sour-grapes, that "Mr. Hawthorne never liked the office at all, and is rather relieved than otherwise that it is taken out of his hands. . . . "

The most direct literary effect of the novelist's office was the satire of his political enemies that he intended to carry out after expulsion from office. A few days before his dismissal he promised Longfellow he would
"surely immolate one or two" of the Whigs who threatened his appointment. He anathematized his enemies, naming them with a catalogue of poisonous weeds and promising to wreak vengeance in personal satire "If they will pay no reverence to the imaginative power. . . ." Yet his anger remitted, and he softened his hardest intentions. In a letter of June 17, 1850, to his cousin Horace L. Conolly, a Whig minister who had sought his dismissal, he told of his dropped intention of putting him into a book. Writing after the publication of The Scarlet Letter (March 16, 1850), Hawthorne spoke from a new awareness of literary power. With little reservation of his true feelings and with much irony, he thanked Conolly for helping to expel him from the customhouse where, had he remained longer, he "should have rusted utterly away" and not have written The Scarlet Letter. As it was, Hawthorne noted, Conolly was the cause of literature, if not a literary man himself.23

The letters he wrote to George Hillard, Horace Mann, Longfellow, and Conolly vented the bitterest of Hawthorne's spleen. The only unquestionable result of the program of satire was "The Custom-House," although the portrait of Judge Pyncheon in The House of Seven Gables (1851) is also touched by political spleen, and "Feathertop" may be a satirical portrait of one of Hawthorne's persecutors. Yet the satire of these portraiture is subdued and, in the Pyncheon and Feathertop portraits, broadened to include larger classes of evil. "The Custom-House" is marked by a humor and warmth that ameliorates most of Hawthorne's criticism. He made one major critical observation that came from his political affiliation: the employees of the customhouse are ancient Whigs who ought to be dismissed for age and inefficiency (pp. 7, 13). Yet he softened this judgment by sympathizing with
them and by noting his inability to dismiss them (p. 14). Further, the individual sketches of customhouse incumbents reveal admirable characteristics in Hawthorne's former associates. The novelist noted Captain Stephen Burchmore ("a veteran shipmaster"), whose anecdotal skill Hawthorne admired (p. 27). Admittedly, Burchmore was a Democrat. Yet his major portrait, that of the Whig Collector, General James F. Miller revealed some flaw but much glory in the old man. Miller, Hawthorne noted, was "with difficulty moved to change, even when change might have brought unquestionable improvement" (p. 16). The greater part of the sketch of Miller, however, portrayed the Collector's honorable character as a hero of the War of 1812 and first territorial governor of Arkansas (pp. 20-22). The only truly abusive satire in "The Custom-House" is the sketch of the Old Inspector, which pointed out that Inspector Henry Lee was suited for his job because of his simple mindlessness and that his gluttony reflected the animal nature of his existence (pp. 16-19).24

The furor that arose after the publication of "The Custom-House" can be attributed as much to the political circumstances of Hawthorne's removal as to the goad of the sketch itself. In letters to Horatio Bridge he reported his belief that the lightness of the introduction offered a pleasant contrast to the absence of sunshine in the main narrative and that he was surprised by the public reaction to the sketch: "As to the Salem people, I really thought that I had been exceedingly good-natured in my treatment of them."25 Some evidence suggests that Hawthorne had second thoughts about the Old Inspector, the only truly direct attack in the introduction. Hawthorne's publisher, James T. Fields, reported to Evert Duyckinck that the novelist had objected to a plan to publish the Old
Inspector as a prepublication advertisement and wished to substitute the less volatile Collector sketch. As Paul Cortissoz shows in his analysis of the critical reaction to "The Custom-House," critics tended not to see the sketch's ameliorating warmth and to follow a party line, just as newspapers had agreed or disagreed that Hawthorne should have been expelled from office. Although he is less than candid when he disclaims enmity or ill-feeling as the impetus of "The Custom-House," Hawthorne accurately described its tone as being frank and good-humored.

As for Judge Pyncheon of The House of Seven Gables, I think one must accept with caution the idea Hawthorne presented him as a direct satire of Reverend Charles Wentworth Upham, the leader of the Salem Whigs. Randall Stewart points out that notebook entries as early as 1842, and recurring in 1843, 1844, 1845, and 1847, reveal the writer's speculations about much of the material that became The House of Seven Gables. Before his expulsion Hawthorne had already considered as potential literary matter the decline of the family of Sir William Pepperell, especially as the decline manifested itself in destitute descendants and the ruin of the ancestral mansion. Although no prototype of Judge Pyncheon appears in these early speculations, he represents in his history the concluding decay that Hawthorne's early notes forecasted. Since, in the narrative, both the Judge and his son die, the family line is shortly to disappear, and gradual decay and ultimate extinction are the common lot of house and family.

From his anger at expulsion Hawthorne appears to have added only the political dimension that Judge Pyncheon possesses, especially as he is presented in Chapter XVIII, entitled "Governor Pyncheon." Further, Hawthorne presents the Judge primarily as a type of the corrupt man of power,
secondarily as a corrupt politician, subordinately as a Whig, and probably not at all as a figure of Upham, although an intimate of the details of Hawthorne's expulsion might associate Upham with Pyncheon as a likely victim. Hawthorne never says that Pyncheon is a Whig. One infers the Judge's politics from two references: he has spoken at banquets to people who have heard Webster's "mighty organtones," and his inattendance at the current banquet will cause his friends to believe him in the clutches of the Free Soilers (pp. 273, 275). Hawthorne's contemporaries would grasp the implications: Pyncheon must be a Whig to speak to those who have heard the arch-Whig Daniel Webster; and the Free Soilers comprised mainly of disaffected Whigs but also Democrats, were trying especially to woo Whigs into their ranks. These references, however, are subdued, and Hawthorne presents the Judge primarily as a man whom power, whatever its source, corrupts, and secondarily as a corrupt politician.

While the Judge sits dead of the family curse, the author considers the evil acts that death has stopped. As a prosperous businessman Pyncheon can no longer execute his schemes in the insurance office, lend money at heavy interest, or attend uncharitably the meeting of a charitable society whose name he has forgotten. As the domineering family patriarch he can no longer terrify Clifford and Hepzibah. As a poor friend he can no longer remain cruelly indifferent to the plight of the destitute widow and her daughter. As a husband he can no longer be indifferent toward the disgraceful condition of his wife's grave and tombstone (pp. 270-272). Finally, as an evil politician he will no longer be able to manipulate money and loyalties in order to secure the office of governor, although a caucus of skilled politicians were prepared, the author tells us, to
do the people's will (p. 274). Hawthorne emphasized the multiple effects
of the Judge's evil in the diverse relations he has with the world, only
one manifestation of which is his corruption as a politician. This is a
significant and properly chosen object of analysis, for political life
is the essence of human contract, and to corrupt political life is also
to corrupt the contract that forms society. Even so, Hawthorne conceived
Pyncheon first as a bad man, then as a bad politician. He concluded the
chapter with a malediction of the Judge's general evil:

Rise up, thou subtile, worldly, selfish, iron-hearted hypocrite,
and make thy choice, whether still to be subtile, worldly, self-
ish, iron-hearted, and hypocritical, or to tear these sins out
of thy nature, though they bring the life-blood with them! The
Avenger is upon thee! Rise up, before it be too late! (p. 283)

The point is this: although Hawthorne's germinal impulse in "The
Custom-House" was certainly political and in the portrait of Judge Pyncheon
was in part political, his sympathetic engagement with most of his characters
and his awareness of the greater requirement of form forbade his use of
imaginative writing as polemic. However irritating to Whigs "The Custom-
House" may have been, it satirizes less a political party and individuals
than office-holders and impotent writers as a class, of whom, Hawthorne
points out, he was one. As for Judge Pyncheon, no clear link associates
him with Upham except that both were politically ambitious Whigs, character-
istics that fail to distinguish Upham from any number of other Whigs and
politicians. Alfred A. Kerns has suggested that the "R. L. R." attached
to Hawthorne's notebook entry for the idea of "Feathertop" may be a misread-
ing of "R. S. R." as Randall Stewart transcribed Hawthorne's handwriting.
Kerns points out that R. S. R. (the initials of Richard S. Rodgers) took
part in the expulsion of Hawthorne. If a correct identification, this
is another example of how the novelist's method transformed the substance of experience in order to reveal more universal significance, for the scarecrow made a man is first a figure of the fop who mistakes appearance (clothing, manners) for true virtue. Thus the effect of office on the substance of Hawthorne's writing remains limited.

As for his actual production during tenure, he wrote little. One can say with certainty that he had finished and prepared for publication the "Main Street" sketch. In "The Custom-House" he wrote of having prepared "Main Street" as one of the pieces for inclusion in The Scarlet Letter (p. 30). He referred to other pieces to be included that had been "written since my involuntary withdrawal from the toils and honors of public life" and "gleaned from annuals and magazines, of such antique date that they have gone round the circle, and come back to novelty again" (p. 43). Given the truth of this information, it is unlikely Hawthorne completed much else for publication while in office, although he may have finished unsatisfactory drafts or portions of the items that appeared in print in the months after his dismissal. Mark Van Doren says that in office Hawthorne also wrote "The Snow-Image," "The Great Stone Face," "Feathertop," and "Ethan Brand." He certainly did not write "Feathertop" during tenure. In a letter to R. W. Griswold he indicated that he wrote the tale "just before leaving Lenox," a removal that occurred on November 21, 1851. As for the remaining three, the evidence suggests that Hawthorne had finished "Ethan Brand" by December, 1848, and tried to place it twice for publication before its ultimate appearance in the Boston Museum of January 5, 1850. In his study of the early projected works of Hawthorne, Nelson F. Adkins shows that Sophia Hawthorne forwarded it to her mother for inclusion in Aesthetic Papers (1849).
Though she did not name the story, she described it correctly: "It is a tremendous truth, written, as he often writes truth, with characters of fire, upon an infinite gloom,—softened so as not wholly to terrify, by divine touches of beauty,—revealing pictures of nature, and also the tender spirit of a child." Adkins points out that the story did not please the editor, Hawthorne's sister-in-law Elizabeth Peabody, and "Main Street" was substituted. It appears certain that "Ethan Brand" was the story Hawthorne offered to Charles Wilkins Webber on December 14, 1848, for a projected magazine. After Webber's plans collapsed, Hawthorne remembered that Webber asked permission to have "The Unpardonable Sin" (surely "Ethan Brand") published in the Boston Museum. Without giving evidence Adkins also asserts that Hawthorne wrote "The Great Stone Face" during tenure. In the absence of evidence that he had finished either "The Great Stone Face" or "The Snow-Image," it remains doubtful that he wrote more than "Main Street" and "Ethan Brand" during tenure. Hawthorne was placing his work for publication as soon as it was ready, probably because he required money. Only a few days elapsed between the completion of "Ethan Brand" and the first submission for publication, and only a month elapsed between the completion and publication of "Feathertop." Considering these facts, one can infer that Hawthorne wrote and completed "The Great Stone Face" and "The Snow-Image" in the months before their respective first publications in October, 1850, and January 24, 1850, rather than during tenure.

This is a slight production in contrast to the six separate editions of new work that appeared in the interim between 1849 and 1853, including three major novels, The Scarlet Letter (1850), The House of Seven Gables
(1851), and The Blithedale Romance (1852), the lesser trade juveniles, A Wonder-Book for Girls and Boys (1851) and Tanglewood Tales (1853), and the campaign Life of Franklin Pierce (1852). Out of office Hawthorne clearly felt the requirement to write. One could argue that hitherto he had been incapable of writing longer fiction anyway and that Scarlet Letter represents the next likely step from "Ethan Brand," which bore the additional title of "An Abortive Romance." Even so, he did not write it until the expulsion from office forced him to try it, and the tempo of his writing increased measurably as it had following his resignation from the Boston Customhouse.

If doubt remains of Hawthorne's reason for accepting office, the details of his Liverpool consulship (1853-1857) substantiate that the novelist preferred the certainty of official income to the uncertainty of literary income. Several accounts show that Hawthorne was busier in Liverpool than in his previous appointments. Although he could have deputized much of the work, his official despatches show that he witnessed a considerable number of the inquiries that the consulate conducted. In November of the year of his appointment, he reported to Ticknor that he was worn out with hard work and the burden of consular engagements and by December longed to return to authorship. In March, 1854, he reported to Bridge that his official duties were irksome beyond expression. In July, he was annoyed by his obligation to care for "brutal shipmaster, drunken sailors, vagrant Yankees, mad people, sick people, and dead people... . . ." In August, 1855, he was

... sick to death of my office;--brutal captains and brutish sailors;--continual complaints of mutual wrong, which I have no
power to set right, and which, indeed, seem to have no right on either side; calls of idleness or ceremony from my travelling countrymen, who seldom know what they are in search of, at the commencement of their tour, and never have attained any desirable end, at the close of it;—beggars, cheats, simpletons, unfortunates, so mixed up that it is impossible to distinguish one from another, and so, in self-defense, the consul distrusts them all.  

Mrs. Hawthorne complained that because the novelist was busy from nine to five with the duties of office he "could no more write a syllable than he could build a cathedral."

Hawthorne was very clear about what kept him in office and away from his writing desk. In the letters cited above and elsewhere he explicitly stated his intention to write only in case of need. He was saving almost eight times as much as he made in his best earning years as an author; and if he had a sense of declining power, the fear of failure made the post that much more attractive. As in the Salem Customhouse he felt guilty for having quit the pen, but his guilt was insufficient to return him to it. In the December, 1853, letter to Ticknor, he acknowledged his readiness to abandon office if the 300 pounds he had recently deposited with Baring Brothers had been 3000 pounds. In his letter to Bridge he acknowledged his distaste for office but confessed, "Nevertheless, the emoluments will be a sufficient inducement to keep me here. . . ." In the July letter to Ticknor he complained of the office and confessed wryly he had nothing to comfort himself with but the emoluments. In the fall of 1854, when Ticknor suggested that he prepare another book, Hawthorne responded: "You speak of another book from me. There is no prospect of that, so long as I continue in office; but if the consular bill should pass at the next session [of Congress], I shall be an author again." From 1854 forward the pending Consular and Diplomatic Act of March 1, 1855, threatened to reduce
Hawthorne to a salaried position at $7500 per annum, rather less than the $10,000 per annum the position brought in as a feed post. Although its passage did not finally affect the consul in tenure, Hawthorne feared its impact. On March 23, 1855, he admitted that he might be forced to return to authorship:

It would seem to be a desirable thing enough that I should have had a sufficient income to live comfortably upon for the rest of my life, without the necessity of labor; but, on the other hand, I might have sunk prematurely into intellectual sluggishness—which now there will be no danger of my doing...when I contrast my present situation with what it was five years ago, I see a vast deal to be thankful for; and I still hope to thrive by my legitimate instrument—the pen.44

The threat of the Consular Act subsided; Hawthorne continued to have satisfaction in his income. He began to think of his notebooks, which he kept much fuller than his American journals, as the substance of a future book and source of income. In August, 1855, he told Ticknor that his notebooks were already full enough to enable him to write a book, though he had no intention yet of publishing one. Letters to Ticknor in the following spring show that Hawthorne was considering a travel book. In April, 1856, he assured Ticknor that he then had enough money not to fear the eventual loss of the consulship. If he should find it necessary, he could "write a book or two that will set it all right." In May he reported keeping a journal of his excursion into Scotland, which could make up two volumes that would scandalize the Scotch and English. In June, when Ticknor was considering a trip to Great Britain, Hawthorne offered a reading of his notes on London, "which would be worth a mint of money to you and me, if I could let you publish it."45 Hawthorne held off preparation of his journals in book form because he feared, as expressed here, the English
reaction and because he wished to have literary capital to fall back on in the future. Near the end of his tenure he was pleased with the income from the consulship and his books but feared his contemplated further stay in Europe would reduce his savings. The notebooks could make one of the "one or two books, that shall make up for my over-expeditures." 46

The consequence of four years in office was the English journals, which became the substance of Our Old Home (1863), easily the best of the travel books that men of letters wrote as a literary consequence of political appointment. The journals show Hawthorne, as ever, recording his experiences with an eye to their future literary use. I count at least seventeen entries in the journal which show Hawthorne explicitly considering separate données as literary germs to be developed in fiction, and much of the travel description was of course potential material for Our Old Home. The fictional données recall those of the American notebooks. Each is a dramatic rendering of a significance Hawthorne senses the experience shadows forth; each has something of the shock of epiphanic revelation. Thus he recorded his impression of a crippled woman in a wagon who is moved about the city by volunteers. He commented: "There is something in this (I don't yet well know what) that has impressed me, as if I could make a romance out of the idea of a woman living this manner a public life, and moving about by such means." Elsewhere he entered his impressions of a city inspector who described at length a decaying corpse. Hawthorne commented: "A very racy, and peculiarly English character might be made out of a man like this, having his life-concern wholly with the disagreeables of a great city." 47 These entries show that during his third tenure in office Hawthorne continued to think as a man of letters.
His entry of these fictional germs occurred at regular intervals during the period 1853-1857. Yet he was to make no fictional use of them, save the notes for the incomplete *Dolliver Romance* and made no use of the travel accounts until *Our Old Home*, published serially in the *Atlantic Monthly* (October, 1862-August, 1863) and separately on September 1, 1863.

It would be misleading to suggest that the causes of Hawthorne's failure to produce under political appointment are also the causes of the failure of all other writers who were infertile in office. Differences in age, talent, desire, and prior success or failure of the writer, and the character of the appointment affected writers under tenure in varying ways. The fact remains that in office many ceased production, as Hawthorne ceased production, because the ease of official income was preferable to the hardships of seeking literary income. Joel Barlow, George Henry Boker, Joseph C. Hart, Nathaniel Hawthorne, John Pendleton Kennedy, James Russell Lowell, Herman Melville, John Howard Payne, Bayard Taylor, and Francis H. Underwood wrote nothing or very little in office. One notes that several received appointment after they had already developed a literary reputation, and age and literary fatigue had set in. For example, Kennedy was 57 and his novels lay behind him when he was appointed; Lowell was 56; Payne was 51; Taylor was 53. For Barlow, Boker, Hart, Kennedy, Payne, and Underwood, tenure in office proved an absolute hiatus in literary productivity. For others, like Hawthorne, Lowell, Melville, and Taylor, it was a period of severely limited productivity. Lowell wrote and delivered the addresses that became *Democracy and Other Addresses* (1867). Melville wrote and published, at the expense of his uncle, *Clarel* (1876). One can plausibly argue that in or out of office some of
these writers had insufficient talent to write anyway. Yet Bayard Taylor's talent, certainly minor, inhibited him not at all. The quantity of his serial publications can only be guessed at, since no one has ever had the interest or resources to establish such a bibliography. His bibliography of separate first editions reveals a remarkable production of thirty-six items. Of these only one was written under tenure, Hannah Thurston: A Story of American Life (1863). Taylor shows about the same productivity in office as Hawthorne. With respect to these writers, political appointment helped avoid the anxieties of literary reputation and literary income. The effect was the inhibition of productivity.

Although it was the effect of most appointments, it was not the effect of all. For another somewhat sizable group political appointment offered opportunities to develop as a writer or to continue a development already begun. Significantly, all these appointments were to posts that required few duties, made small demand on the emotions, and thus offered the kind of leisure writers required. Two men of letters—Washington Irving and Walt Whitman—continued to develop after having already been established. Others—John Burroughs, Bret Harte, William Dean Howells, and James Kirke Paulding—received offices when they especially required aid as novice writers. Although their unequal talents led them to different ends, their early development was favorably influenced by the conditions and experiences of office and in the case of Howells significantly influenced his early work.

The details of Irving's appointment as viceconsul at Madrid from January, 1826, to September, 1829, reveal one of the few instances of an established writer whose career was aided by his public office. It was avail-
able at an appropriate time; although Irving was in one of his periods of despondency over his choice of the literary profession, events beyond his immediate knowledge operated favorably. He had long been aware of the possibility of appointment. His nephew Pierre Irving documents five different occasions in the period 1809-1818 when steps were taken to secure the writer an appointment. His appointment as Secretary of Legation in Paris under Joel Barlow in 1811, as Secretary of Legation in London in 1817, or as First Clerk in the Navy Department in 1818 would have been invaluable, in the opinion of Irving's brothers Ebenezer and William, who emphasized the salary, position, and leisure that the posts afforded. Irving's refusals during this period came from his sense that the political nature and responsibilities of appointment conflicted with his own personality and his commitment to literature as a profession and a source of income. His opinion crystallized in letters to Ebenezer Irving and Henry Brevoort in 1819, when Irving wrote of his passive, contemplative bent that unfitted him for the active affairs of office, and of his desire to support himself by developing "a stock of copyright property, that may be a little capital for me hereafter." He insisted that he must build his reputation by the pen but did not disregard the possibility, after developing literary property, of "some official situation of a moderate, unpretending kind. . . ."

Even as he wrote Brevoort, Irving was placing his literary program into effect. The Sketch Book appeared first in America, printed by C. S. Van Winkle in seven parts from June 23, 1819, to September 13, 1820. The English edition appeared in two volumes, the first published by John Miller in February, 1820, the second by John Murray in July, 1820, after Miller's
bankruptcy. This was followed by American and English editions of Bracebridge Hall in May, 1822, with a second American edition later in the year. In the fall of 1824 Tales of a Traveller appeared in English, French and American editions, the latter in four parts, August 24 through October 9, followed by a second American edition the following year. At about two year intervals, then, Irving was introducing new literary property into his expanding stock and attempting to realize a maximum from it, as testified by the American publication of The Sketch Book and Tales of a Traveller in parts, with Sketch Book selling at an expensive seventy-five cents the part.52

Although the critical reception of Sketch Book and Bracebridge Hall assured him, in the period from August, 1823, until his Madrid appointment in January, 1826, Irving fell into a sterile period of hack writing, experimentation with drama, and procrastination punctuated by Tales of a Traveller, a critical failure. Reviewing this period of his life and the critical reception of the book, Stanley T. Williams suggests that Irving was in despair of producing another Sketch Book and aware of the urgency of shrinking capital.53 He had tried dramatic writing in collaboration with John Howard Payne but found the income from Charles II disappointing, and in a letter of January 31, 1824, he informed Payne of his decision to discontinue writing drama because of his realization of "the market price my productions will command in other departments of literature."54 By December 7, 1824, he was disgusted with authorship. He could offer no recommendation of the profession to his nephew Pierre Paris Irving:

There is no life more precarious in its profits and fallacious in its enjoyments than that of an author. I speak from an ex-
perience which may be considered a favorable and prosperous one; and I would earnestly dissuade all those with whom my voice has any effect from trusting their fortunes to the pen.

In a letter the following day to C. R. Leslie, he lamented his isolation in English literature and the hostility of the "scribblers of the press" who had censured Tales of a Traveller. He concluded both letters with an almost identical statement of hope for a "moderate competency," now thoroughly convinced of the need for sinecure.55

The competency came about as planets fall into harmonious patterns. Irving recorded in his journal a pleasant weekend with Alexander Hill Everett and his family in August, 1823, in Paris.56 He met Everett again in Paris in the summer of 1825, when Everett was preparing to journey to his post in Madrid as Minister to Spain, an appointment made by President John Quincy Adams. During their summer visit Everett offered Irving the courtesy of a diplomatic passport for travel in Spain. From Bordeaux early the next year, Irving reminded Everett of his promise and expressed his desire additionally to be made attaché to the embassy. Irving noted receipt on January 30, 1826, of a letter from Everett that enclosed the passport, made him officially a vice-consul, and proposed a translation of Voyages of Columbus. According to Pierre Irving, Everett suggested the possibility of receiving 1,000 to 1,500 English pounds for the translation. The project fired Irving's enthusiasm, for the next day he communicated to Everett his acceptance of the appointment and the literary commission and his plans to contact his English publisher (Murray) about possible publication, although he doubted receiving so much for a strict translation.57

Irving's request of Everett came at an opportune time. The Spanish
historian Martín Fernández de Navarrete was preparing for press under Spanish patronage a massive edition of Columbus documents, and Everett recognized their significance as American subject. Only three days after Irving wrote his acceptance of the commission (February 3, 1826), Everett enclosed with his regular despatch to Secretary of State Henry Clay a copy of a report to the Spanish Secretary of State, the Duke del Infantado. The report was an official instrument written by Everett to urge the independence of Spanish colonies in Central and South America. Significantly, it concluded by extolling the "glorious actions" of Columbus under the "patronage of the Sovereign of Spain" and noted consequent Spanish influence in the new world. Everett, therefore, considered the Columbus documents an important collection relevant to American history. In his despatch of March 25, 1826, Everett indicated purchase of two copies of Navarrete's Voyages of Columbus in two volumes for "the National Library" and promised to forward additional volumes as they appeared. He transmitted a third volume of Voyages on June 23, 1829. Furthermore, Everett particularly "wished to have it [the translation] done by an American." Thus Irving's elation as he assesses his prospects:

I am on the wing for Madrid! A letter from our Minister Mr. Everett has determined me to go on without delay; for the purpose of translating into English a very interesting work printing there. The Voyage of Columbus compiled from his own papers. It is the best thing that could present in the form of a job, and just now I absolutely want money...

Irving was fortunate also to have the friendship of Obadiah Rich, the American Consul, who had moved his consulate to Madrid from Valencia in July, 1823. Rich was a remarkable collector of Spanish manuscripts and books who dreamed of functioning as book agent for the republic. In a
personal letter to John Quincy Adams (then President Monroe's Secretary of State), Rich had written from Valencia on July 24, 1819, of his interest in purchasing from a nobleman's collection a quantity of manuscripts and rare books for the Library of Congress and the proposed national university. He desired permanent appointment as library agent in order to "procure a maintenance and enable me to follow my favorite pursuits, and, what is the extent of my ambition be usefull (sic) to my country."61 Though he did not receive the appointment, he had built a large private collection which Irving used heavily and characterized as containing "the most valuable works in print and manuscript of the Spanish writers."62 The collection was later to aid W. H. Prescott, Jared Sparks, and George Ticknor, whose names Rich invoked when he resigned his consulate at Port Mahon and requested to be named book agent for the Smithsonian Library, his hope of twenty-six years earlier not yet forgotten.63

Before Irving began the Voyages he had decided to make something more of it than a translation, perhaps because of his awareness that a translation would not be profitable, as he had explained in his otherwise enthusiastic letter of acceptance to Everett, and perhaps because of the wealth of Rich's holdings. He was also drawn to the work because of its scholarly nature and the national character of the subject. Irving had felt the sting of American scorn for his expatriation and had suspected, because of a break in Brevoort's letters, that his friend might be the source of some of it.64 He therefore conceived of Voyages, in retrospect, as a potential redemption of his literary reputation. He set to work in order "to produce something that will give satisfaction to the American public" and make "a little money," which he needed.66
With the wealth of Navarrete's volumes and Rich's library before him and his desire to recover what he believed to be a damaged literary and national reputation, he decided to make of the translation instead a major work, a biography proper. By March 25, 1826, Irving had turned to new researches for the purpose of writing "a regular Life." He entered one of his most strenuous periods of productivity, which culminated in a rough draft by June 23. It did not please Irving, who foreseeing a long period of revision and correction in order to perfect this "trial of skill in an entirely new line" began in August a fair copy. With interruptions because of interests in other projects based on Spanish materials, he completed *A History of the Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus* by July 29, 1827, when he proposed publication to John Murray. It was published in February, 1828. There followed in April and May, 1829, American and English editions of *Conquest of Granada*, the work that interrupted Columbus.

By the end of his first appointment, Irving had written and published two new books. When he went to London in September, 1829, as Secretary of Legation to the American Embassy, he carried with him manuscripts from his Spanish residence that were ultimately to realize publication in four different books: *Voyages and Discoveries of the Companions of Columbus* (1831), *The Alhambra* (1832), *Legends of the Conquest of Spain* (1835), and *Mohamet and His Successors* (1850). It will be remembered that Irving complained of the restrictions his second appointment as Secretary of Legation placed on literary activity. *Companions of Columbus*, published during his tenure in 1831, appears to have received little revision from first draft. The book reveals few graces and remains a dreary recital of
events with few digressions on the meaning of the events the writer narrates. He worked on revision of the manuscript of The Alhambra in January and February, 1832, and arranged while yet in London for its American publication in May, 1832. During his tenure he also prepared the manuscript for Mahomet and His Successors, which seems to have been refused by John Murray, to await publication in 1850. Finally, Legends of the Conquest of Spain (1835) brought together most of the remainder of the Spanish manuscripts. When it reappeared as Spanish Papers in 1866, Irving added "The Legend of Pelaye," Abderahaman," "Chronicle of Ferman Gonzalez," and "Chronicle of Fernando the Saint." Of these additions, "Abderahaman" was certainly written in rough draft in Spain, and the remainder may have been.

Irving's first appointment thus introduced him to a body of Spanish material and the new field of romantic history and biography that he was to exploit thereafter. The impetus from the success of Columbus led him to The Crayon Miscellany (A Tour on the Prairies, Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey), 1835; Astoria, 1836; The Rocky Mountain, 1837; The Life of Oliver Goldsmith, 1840; the maudlin Biography and Poetical Remains of the Late Margaret Miller Davidson, 1841; and The Life of George Washington, 1855. His Spanish appointment provided Irving with a new body of material that made possible an interesting compromise between readers, who required the truth of history and biography, and Irving, who required material on which to exercise a romantic imagination. About his treatment of history I wish to comment further as part of the discussion of the travel books written by authors under political appointment.

Walt Whitman's tenure as clerk from 1865 to 1874 offers the only other
example of an established writer whose productivity was not severely limited by political appointment. It will be remembered that under appointment he continued to feel the urgency to write poetry and that he enjoyed considerable leisure. He experienced his greatest burst of literary energy when he was not yet in office; it brought about the 1860 edition of *Leaves of Grass*, which added 124 new poems to the 1856 edition of 22. The 1867 edition of *Leaves of Grass* added 80 new poems; the 1871 added only 9. However *Passage to India* (1871) had 20 new poems of its 74. He therefore continued to produce under appointment, and some of the production is of major significance. *Drum-Taps* (1865) contains poetry written altogether before Whitman's appointment, except for the stop-press insertion of the Lincoln poem, "Hush'd Be the Camps Today." *Sequel to Drum-Taps* (1865-1866) contains poetry written after Whitman's appointment, among them the major poems "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd," "Chanting the Square Deific," and "As I sat Alone by Blue Ontario's Shore." Besides permitting the conditions that helped make this production possible, Whitman's appointment also offered income that he used to facilitate publication of *Drum-Taps* and *Sequel*, which he published himself. Other major poems were "Passage to India," in the 1871 volume of the same name; "Song of the Exposition," in *After All, Not to Create Only*, (1871); "Song of the Universal," written for the Tufts College commencement of June 17, 1874; and "Thou Mother with Thy Equal Brood," written for the Dartmouth College commencement of June 26, 1872.

Besides poetry Whitman also published prose works completed during tenure. These included *Democratic Vistas* (1871), comprised in part of the essay "Democracy," published in the *Galaxy* in December, 1867, and
"Personalism," published in the *Galaxy* in May, 1868. Memoranda During the War (1875) incorporated several excerpts from a series of articles entitled "'Tis But Ten Years Since," published in 1874 in the *New York Weekly Graphic* from January 17 to March 7. Considering his continued productivity under appointment, one sees that Whitman was another exception to the general truth that established writers of imaginative literature ceased production under political appointment.

Was the literary productivity of other writers favorably affected? One of the significant findings of this study supports what students of literature have always suspected: patronage has its most productive influence on young novice writers. It gave four of the writers considered here the opportunity to develop whatever talents they possessed as writers, and their early literary careers were fertile, if their production was not always profound. These were James Kirke Paulding, William Dean Howells, Bret Harte, and John Burroughs. They received their first appointments respectively at ages 37, 24, 25, and 27, much younger men on first appointment than most other writers under appointment. They had duties that offered great leisure and required little of their emotional energies, with exception of Paulding in his third appointment, as Secretary of Navy (1838-1841), when it will be remembered he bade farewell to writing. Additionally, they had long tenures in office: Paulding, 26 continuous years; Harte, 16 years interrupted; and Burroughs 21 continuous years. Untypically, Howells remained only four years in office.

Their appointments therefore permitted them to use their energies to write. We have seen Paulding's pleasure in his appointments as Secretary to the Board of Navy Commissioners (1815-1824) and Navy Agent (1824-1838).
His letters to Irving reveal his commitment to writing. Of the twenty-two separate editions in Paulding's bibliography, sixteen were written and published during his tenure in office. Of these sixteen, three are novels major to Paulding's work: *Koningsmarke: The Long Finne*, *A Story of the New World* (1823), *The Dutchman's Fireside* (1831), and *Westward Ho!* As clerk in the San Francisco Surveyor-General's Office and U. S. Branch Mint (1861-1869), Harte developed the western story that won him literary fame and critical condemnation when he became fixed in the form. The *Last Galleon and Other Poems* (1867) contains verse written during this period in the *Golden Era* and *San Francisco Daily Evening Bulletin*. *Condensed Novels* (1867) collects parodies of novels written for *The Californian* from July 1, 1865, to June 23, 1866. *The Luck of Roaring Camp* (1870) collects the title story and "The Outcasts of Poker Flat," written for the *Overland Monthly* of August, 1868, and January, 1869; these are representative of the form toward which Harte's writing developed by the end of his official tenure.

This remains a catalogue that offers a limited sense of the favorable effect of political appointment on young writers. It is difficult to speculate whether these writers transcended their natural talent because of political appointment. Yet is is certain that their desire to write and the conditions of appointment combined favorably in their early careers. The most significant of these cases is William Dean Howells's appointment as Consul at Venice (1861-1865), for it shows how a young writer with literary ambitions and talent accepted the experiences of his tenure and the conventions of travel writing to shape out of them the writing that was to establish his literary career. Except for appointment he would not
otherwise have had the Italian travel and official experiences that affected the substance of his travel writing, criticism, and fiction, thereafter. His exposure to a foreign culture gave him exotic materials to exploit before an audience interested in Europe and the European past. His official and foreign experiences introduced him to analysis by contrast, a characteristic means of fictional analysis, as in *A Foregone Conclusion* (1875). In discernible stages the form of the early fiction grew naturally from the form of the early travel books. The young Howells therefore shaped the substance of his foreign experiences, afforded by his political appointment, into the material of a literary career.

Prior to appointment Howells had written the verse that was collected, along with that of John James Piatt, in *Poems of Two Friends* (1860). He had also written the campaign life of Lincoln and edited without credit *Three Years in Chili* (1861), by Mrs. C. B. Merwin. As journalist he had written for the Ashtabula *Sentinel*, the Cincinnati *Gazette*, and the Columbus *Ohio State Journal*. At ages sixteen and seventeen he essayed fiction for the Ashtabula *Sentinel*; in 1860 he wrote a sketch for a novel, *Geoffrey Winter*, that was never published. Anticipating a literary career as a poet, he had written much less fiction than verse. Except whatever reputation publication of verse in the *Atlantic Monthly* offered in 1860, Howells before appointment possessed mainly a local reputation, although the *Atlantic* poems introduced him to an important contact with its editor, James Russell Lowell. Like the campaign life of Lincoln, *Poems of Two Friends* was published by Follett and Foster, Columbus, Ohio. In its fourth year of existence, it of course could not bring to bear the techniques of the larger, established eastern publishers. Howells was therefore an
ambitious but largely unknown writer prior to appointment, except for the Lincoln biography.

The Venetian consulship made an attractive literary sinecure. For the duration of the Civil War the normal salary of $750 was raised to $1000, then $1500 per annum. At the conclusion of his office Howells left Venice in part because the salary was to be returned to $1000. James L. Woodress, Jr., who has made a special study of Howells's Italian experiences, points out that in the writer's first year in office only four American ships called at Venice. Venetian-American commerce had halted because of the fear of the ravages of Confederate privateers and the shift of Italian commerce to Ancona and Ravenna in consequence of Austrian control of Venice. The result was "the measureless leisure" that Howells acknowledged led him to his development as a writer: "Till then I had no real leisure, but was yet far from the days when anything less than a day seems too small a space to attempt anything in." In Literary Friends and Acquaintance (1900) he was to recall that during his tenure he felt constantly the urgency of "the literary intention." The conditions of development appear to have been present.

Howells continued to prefer thinking of himself as a poet and to seek reputation as a poet, not as a literary journalist or novelist. In his first year in Venice he continued to write poetry and forward it to magazines, choosing to forget in his recollection of the period the travel letters that were also published in the Ohio State Journal, the Ashtabula Sentinel, and the Commonwealth in 1862 and early 1863. Of the poetry he wrote, little reached immediate publication, though some of it was to be collected in the 1873 Poems. "Louis Lebeau's Conversion" appeared in the Atlantic in November,
1862; "Saint Christopher" was to appear in the Harper's Monthly of December, 1863. In retrospect Howells saw the early months of his appointment as a test of his potential as a poet, with the conclusion enforced by experience that the "more practical muse [of literary journalism] persuaded me my work belonged to her, and. . . I began to do the various things in prose which I have mostly been doing ever since, for fifty years past." Elsewhere he explicitly stated that his defeat as a poet threw him upon the prose studies that became Venetian Life.

The coolness of the Atlantic and other potential publishers toward his verse contributed to the decision to turn to prose. In 1860 Howells had succeeded in placing five poems with the magazine. With James T. Fields's accession to the Atlantic editorship in June, 1861, the young poet lost the services of Lowell as advocate and adviser. Before his acceptance of the Venice post, he succeeded in placing two more poems in the Atlantic of February and April, 1861, when Lowell was still editor. With great hope he had finished by January 18, 1862, a first draft of "Louis Lebeau's Conversion," a poem not to be published until November. Although in the spring of 1862 he continued to write verse with enthusiasm, the Atlantic accepted no other contribution beyond "Louis Lebeau," and the only other poem published during his tenure was the "Saint Christopher" poem of the following year in Harper's Monthly. That Howells had thought to build a reputation through the Atlantic is clear. In April, 1862, he announced from Venice his hope that the magazine would accept an unnamed poem that he had submitted, "for the reason that I don't want the Atlantic public to forget me. . . ." Although his failure with the Atlantic turned him to prose, he again sought unsuccessfully in the spring of 1864
to find a publisher for "Disillusion" (*No Love Lost* [1867]) and a collection of his verse. Frank Foster, Howells's Columbus publisher, refused the former; from London Howells's friend Moncure Conway wrote of his failure to place the latter. 92

In consequence of the depression from failure to place verse for publication, the young consul fell into a period of literary idleness in 1862. Although he later felt shame for his failure to produce during this year of "homesick despair," he was less guilty than he had cause to be. 93 In the first half of the year five of his travel letters appeared in Ohio newspapers. He had also kept a journal of his impressions of Venice from the day of his arrival, and he began to put them into publishable form in the summer and fall of the year. 94 He forwarded these sketches to the *Atlantic* (one of the "more aesthetic periodicals," as he wrote ironically of the incident), which continued indifferent. 95 Late in the following year W. D. Ticknor was to write a politely vague explanation of the disinterest of the *Atlantic* in Howells's travel sketches: "not one of the MSS you have sent us swims our sea. . . . I don't believe that you are more disappointed at this than I am." 96 Howells therefore had accepted an offer from the *Boston Daily Advertiser* (at five dollars a column,) to write a series of travel letters which ran from March 27, 1863, to May 3, 1865. 97

His placing the travel sketches gave him a confidence that fed on itself. By summer of 1863 he decided that he had not been idle after all, although "The Novel is not written; the Great Poem is hardly dreamed of. . . ." To Edmund Clarence Stedman he expressed joy at the recent successful course of his writing, which included placing the travel sketches and the poem "Saint Christopher" with *Harper's Monthly*. 98 He also undoubtedly
referred to the writing of *No Love Lost*, the verse romance that Moncure Conway noted listening to in the summer of 1863 during its composition by Howells.

In the following year Howells continued to exploit his Italian experiences in the *Daily Advertiser* series. He began also to plan use of his materials for separate book publication. To his benefit Lowell became coeditor of the *North American Review* in January, 1864, with Charles E. Norton. In March Howells toured the Lombard cities with an eye to adapting his impressions for a series of lectures that he intended to work up along with his book on Venice. His notion was to prepare several talks on such cities as Padua, Verona, Modena, and Parma. This material was instead to become part of the substance of *Italian Journeys* (1867). In June he was busy compiling notes on Mantua and working in St. Mark's Library. This material was to become "Ducal Mantua," later to be published in the *North American Review* (January, 1866) and the second edition of *Italian Journeys* (1872). During the same period he forwarded to Lowell the article "Recent Italian Comedy," an examination of the dramatists Paolo Ferrari, Paolo Giacommetti, Teobalde Cecconi, and Francesco Dall'Ongare. It possessed the graceful scholarship the *North American* required, and Lowell accepted it with the encouraging request for more. It was also to provide the germinal impulse for *Modern Italian Poets* (1887), which, as Howells put it, grew "out of studies begun twenty years ago in Italy, and continued fitfully, as I found the mood and time for them..." Howells clearly benefitted from Lowell's help and advice during the year which saw the young writer's development of these germinal materials. Lowell's acceptance of "Modern Italian Comedy" gave Howells great support.
Entry into the North American, especially at invitation of Lowell, representative Boston man of letters, offered the distinction Howells sought. Although the Daily Advertiser series had brought recognition from the historian John Lothrop Motley, then Howells's chief as Minister to Austria, it was an ephemeral and journalistic mode of publication that failed to confer the status of what he was later to call "my admission to the North American."

In addition, Lowell appears gently to have advised Howells that his best literary prospects lay in prose composition. In his acceptance of "Modern Italian Comedy" he asked the writer to work up another article on modern Italian literature and expressed his belief in the consul's ability, although as a poet he must "sweat the Heine out...as men do mercury." Significantly, he concluded his letter with warm praise of the Venetian sketches appearing in the Advertiser: "They are admirable, and fill a gap. They make the most careful and picturesque study I have ever seen on any part of Italy. They are the thing itself."

On receipt of Lowell's acceptance Howells responded with a letter which summarized his literary program for the remainder of his tenure. It is a communication between disciple and master which expresses without sycophancy appreciation for the master's help and admiration of his place in letters. Howells reported his intention of shaping a book from the Advertiser series, which would require little editing and only the addition of chapters on Venetian art, the national character and customs, and Austrian political domination. He would resign his office in December, 1864, or March, 1865, since he was beginning to feel that he had expatriated himself. He would offer the book to a London publisher because first appearance in England would brighten his literary prospects in America. Before quitting Venice
he would prepare additional notes on Italian subjects for later literary exploitation. In allusion to Lowell's veiled criticism of his verse, he indicated his belief that he had overcome Heine and wished Lowell would examine a ballad, "The Faithful of the Gonzaga," which awaited refusal at the *Atlantic*. In addition to this program he reported to his father the intention of remaining in the Eastern publishing centers on return to the United States, in order to profit by the claims to European residence and foreign travel that he could make.

Howells carried out his literary program as he intended, if not with the speed he desired. Although "The Faithful of the Gonzaga" was not published, he found a reluctant English publisher for *Venetian Life*, which he completed in October and November, 1864. In April, 1865, Howells received word from the London firm of Truebner and Company that they would accept *Venetian Life* if he could persuade an American publisher to assume risk for half of the edition of one thousand. Howells left Venice on July 3 for England, where armed with a letter to Anthony Trollope he sought to interest other publishers in issuing the book under a better contract. Toward the end of July, however, he sailed for Boston with no better offer than Truebner's. At home he received the aid of his brother Joseph, in business as newspaper publisher with Howells senior, who agreed to publish the half edition. The brothers went so far as to solicit an agreement with James T. Fields to act as agents for binding and distributing Truebner's sheets. As in the past Lowell helped by endorsing the offer to Fields. In September Howells lunched with M. M. Hurd, whom he had providentially met aboard ship during the voyage to the United States in July. To the house of Hurd and Houghton he successfully proposed public-
cation of Venetian Life, which appeared in English and American editions in 1866.

This was the publication which according to Howells established his literary position. In twenty chapters it collected, with the addition of new material in most cases, twenty-eight of the Advertiser series; of the twenty chapters only two comprised totally new matter. In the second edition, published in January, 1867, the writer added the chapter "Commerce"; it is a very slightly revised form of his consular "Commercial Report for the Year 1863," which in absence of genuine transactions to report he made an ambitious "Sketch of Venetian Commerce from the Earliest Times." Also in 1867 appeared Italian Journeys, which collected magazine sketches Howells wrote from notes of a trip through northern Italy to Naples and Capri in 1864. Working from these notes in New York, he composed the travel articles which became Italian Journeys, most of them appearing first in the Nation and Atlantic in 1865, 1866, and 1867. Italian Journeys contained only five chapters not previously published.

Clearly, Howells's appointment gave him a large body of subject matter to exploit and stimulated interests that continued to shape his literary career. It provided materials for the Advertiser series of 1863 and 1864, the Nation series of 1865 and 1866, and articles published in the Atlantic and North American. These led him to see travel writing as a valid literary form. Venetian Life and Italian Journeys were to be followed by American travel books like Their Wedding Journey (1872) and Their Silver Wedding Journey (1899). He was to make another journey through Italy that initiated Tuscan Cities (1886). These early publications also led him to see the value of criticism as another exploitable form, for "Recent Italian Comedy" was
followed by intermittent studies, published in the Atlantic and North American between 1864 and 1885, which were to become Modern Italian Poets (1887). Finally, these varied literary pursuits made him an appropriate candidate for the Atlantic subeditorship (1866-1871) under James T. Fields and the later full editorship (1871-1881).

His political appointment also provided circumstances that influenced the subject, technique, and form of much of his fiction. Fragments of his experience offered several fictional models. The setting of A Foregone Conclusion (1875) is the Venice that Howells knew. Its characters are the American consul Henry Ferris, also a developing artist; the American tourists Florida and Mrs. Vervain; and the agnostic Italian priest Don Ippolito, who appears to have been taken from Howells's Venetian acquaintance, Padre Libera.114 A Fearful Responsibility (1881) collects the title story, first printed in Scribner's (June, July, 1881), "At the Sign of the Savage," first printed in the Atlantic (July, 1877), and "Tonelli's Marriage," first printed in the Atlantic (July, 1868). A Fearful Responsibility revisits the Venice setting. Its Professor Elmore is "a literary American" who wishes to write a history of Venice; he meets Consul Henry Ferris (reappearing from Foregone Conclusion), the artist manque who has already completed (with reference I believe to the Don Ippolito of Foregone Conclusion) a "metaphysical conception of a Venetian Priest."115 Ferris is one of "the authors or artists with whom it is the tradition to fill that post [the Venetian consulate]" (p. 21). Both Elmore and Ferris appear to be fragments of Howells himself, for they, like him, are intellectuals and artists who look to the Venetian sojourn as a means to a more creative life. Elmore comes into charge of a Miss Mayhew, as Howells
came into the guardianship of his sister-in-law, Mary Mead. Hoskins, the California sculptor, is taken in part from Howells's acquaintance in 1864 with Miner Kellogg, a Cincinnati painter, and in part from Larkin Mead, Howells's brother-in-law and viceconsul, who also had artistic intentions. "At the Sign of the Savage" expands on the confusion of an American couple traveling through southern Germany to Italy, and the help given by an American consul. "Tonelli's Marriage" narrates an Italian love story against the local color of Venetian customs and a Venice depressed by Austrian domination. All of these characters and settings were of course suggested by Howells's experience abroad.

Interestingly, the consul's apprenticeship as writer of travel books influenced his early fictional technique and form, and continued to be felt in the mature fiction. Organized topically, Venetian Life is marked by a continuous interplay of contrasting values whose sources are the Venice that Howells as Italian partisan and fair-minded journalist wished to describe and the Venice that Howells as Victorian, pragmatic, progressive, and unsuperstitious American wished to judge. He continued to condemn the reactionary influence of Catholicism and dead social tradition on the free exchange of ideas and political progress. He saw hope that with the eventual overthrow of Austrian control the city and the northern Italian provinces would move toward democratic structure that would in turn stimulate commercial progress. At the same time Howells was a Venice-lover who saw that most of his judgments arose from his own preconceptions. The narrative grows warm in consequence of this ameliorating awareness, where it is not spoiled by the tendency to catalogue masses of detail. He pointed out this awareness quite explicitly in the concluding pages of the book.
The result is the dominating tone of affection, even suspension of judgment at points, that softens the judgments that in fact occur. Thus Howells narrated the indifference of an Italian crowd to the hot pursuit of a wife by an armed husband. The wife, Howells explained, had lost her rights and offended the traditional privilege of the male to have a mistress, for she had reproached her husband for his transgression. Good taste required silence. With mild irony Howells assumed the Italian view in his conclusion: "It was entirely a family affair, it seemed; the man, poor little fellow, had a mistress, and his wife had maddened him with reproaches. Come si fa? He had to stab her" (p. 358).

The writer's organization of Venetian Life and Italian Journeys introduced him, then, to the technique of analysis by contrast, which he used in the early fiction. From the cultural contrast between his Italian priest, Don Ippolito, and his emancipated American Girl, Florida Vervain, sprang the **donnée** of A Foregone Conclusion. Unlike protected Italian girls of good family, Miss Vervain freely chooses to have private meetings with Don Ippolito in order to learn Italian; she speaks in a friendly manner that suggests to the priest her love for him. Unaware that she acts in her compassion like other American girls of her age and class, he takes her declared intention to help him leave the priesthood also as a declaration of love. He decides to announce his love and to break away from the traditions that bind him. His agnosticism has led him to wish foregoing his life as a priest and seek immigration to America; he is the Italian hero, though pathetic, that Venetian Life implicitly calls for. This **donnée** leads to Ferris's assumption that Florida does indeed love the priest and his subsequent decision to leave Venice. Similarly, the con-
trast of cultural values provided the donnee of A Fearful Responsibility, which is a fictional analysis of American attitudes toward marriage and the protection of women. Miss Lily Mayhew, a less colorful form of Florida Vervain, meets by chance an Austrian officer who takes her American openness as invitation and proposes marriage on the slightest acquaintance. Aware of his obligation to protect her, Professor Elmore overprotects Lily from natural friendships. Returning to the United States, he is aware that the return separates Lily from those who presume on her innocence but unaware that it also separates her from the sculptor Haskins, whom she really loves and whom Elmore would have admitted as candidate for Lily’s affection.

Besides the technique of employing cultural contrasts as the impetus of plot and the means of analysis, Venetian Life and Italian Journeys also introduced Howells to the potential value of a recurrent persona to present a characteristic set of values and fictional point of view. Above I have suggested that two sides of the writer appear in the travel books: the objective journalist and the subjective American. The consequence of this wedding of purposes is in effect one of the fictional characters that recurs in Howells’s writing. The observer of Venetian life is a rational American skeptic who wishes to distinguish between the valuable and the meretricious, praise the former, and condemn the latter; he is at once sophisticate and modest. This portrays accurately, I believe, the Basil March of Their Wedding Journey and Their Silver Wedding Journey. He is eminently willing to be exposed to the perils of Niagara, the St. Lawrence River, and Quebec City, as well as new experience generally, but he also requires the privilege of irony and skepticism. March is there-
fore an extension of the observer in the travel books. He was to recur in *An Open-Eyed Conspiracy* (1897) and *A Hazard of New Fortunes* (1890).

In the latter Howells applied March effectively to a literary purpose. A magazine editor, March is by training and inclination a close and sympathetic reporter, yet skeptical and ironic in the fashion of the earlier Basil March. He is therefore suited to Howells's requirement of a focal character who is neither doctrinaire socialist nor doctrinaire reactionary and who, by virtue of his occupation as journalist, is likely to be at the center of action in this story of the clash between labor and capital.

Additionally, the travel books, the direct product of his political appointment, taught Howells the use of concrete detail to enhance verisimilitude in his fiction. The travel books are of course accounts of the real world filtered through the writer's sensibility. To the degree that Howells manipulated his observations for particular effects, he treated his observations as a writer of fiction manipulates his objects. As I wish to show in detail below, he characterized Venice in his capacity as a debunker of myths, a somewhat gentler version of Twain's American-Innocent. It was therefore no difficult move for him to use details of travel for verisimilitude in fiction. *A Foregone Conclusion* is filled with the details of travel. Don Ippolito walks to Ferris's consulate and is overcome by the ponderous dignity of the consular emblem, "an oval sign painted with the effigy of an eagle, a bundle of arrows, and certain thunderbolts, and bearing the legend, CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES, in neat characters" (p.2). Having gained facility in Italian, Howells renders the impression of an English speaker hearing spoken Italian by offering literal translations, much as Hemingway treats Spanish. Often the expertise of travel lends
genuine authenticity to the characters and their circumstances, although it is sometimes superfluous. Ferris is in Venice because as an artist he wishes to study Venetian art and use the leisure of his position to develop as a painter. (p. 15). Florida Vervain wishes to visit the Island of San Lazzaro, "where for reasons of her own she intended to venerate the convent in which Byron studied the Armenian language..." (p. 24). Thus a background of travel detail envelops A Foregone Conclusion, as it does the other early fiction, Their Wedding Journey and A Chance Acquaintance (1873). In the latter, more strictly a novel than Their Wedding Journey, Howells makes an awkward and humorous adaptation of travel expertise by informing the reader that Mrs. Ellison is fond of second-hand information and then reporting some of her second-hand information about Arnold's expedition against Quebec in 1775. 118

Finally, the travel books offered a literary form from which Howells learned to structure fiction. The form, quite simply, was the journey to a point of interest and the return. In Italian Journeys it was the trip from Venice to Naples and back again, which served as a convenient framework for discussion of the cities and their characteristic institutions as the travelers experienced them. Their Wedding Journey capitalizes on this form by taking the fictional characters Basil and Isabel March on a belated honeymoon to Niagara Falls, thence down the St. Lawrence River aboard a steamboat to Quebec. Their trip is the basis for commentary on the heat of summertime Boston, the Hudson River, train travel, railroad depots, the dangers of going over the falls of the St. Lawrence, prostitutes, the open market in Montreal, Quebec hotels, the uncertain virtues of actresses, and the difficulties of custom regulations. It is not a
novel; there is no conflict, complication, dénouement. Neither is it strictly a travel book, unless one wishes to call it fictionalized travel. In the ambiguity of its status, I think one sees Howells's development from travel writer to novelist. A Chance Acquaintance, published the year after Their Wedding Journey, uses much the same travel framework but also employs a weak plot in the story of Kitty Ellison, another of Howells's recurrent types of the New Woman. She falls in love with Bostonian Miles Arbuton during a trip on the St. Lawrence with her cousins, Colonel and Mrs. Ellison. During their visit to Quebec City, Mrs. Ellison providentially sprains her ankle, an accident that gives Miles and Kitty time to explore the city together and fall in love (and Howells to use his knowledge of Quebec City in some detail). In a weak conclusion Howells has Arbuton reveal his true Bostonian character by snubbing Kitty, who breaks off their engagement and continues the trip.

By the writing of A Foregone Conclusion, his next novel, Howells had learned how to develop incident more coherently from the nature of his fictional personae and donnée. As I have shown above, the impetus of the novel comes from the assumptions that Florida Vervain and Don Ippolito make about each other from quite different sets of cultural preconceptions. Especially Don Ippolito is victimized by his preconceptions, which make impossible the discovery of the truth that Florida is his patroness, not his mistress. After the priest's death releases him from disgrace, Ferris remarks:

I can see how in many things he was the soul of truth and honor. But it seems to me that even the life he lived was largely imagined. I mean that he was such a dreamer that once having fancied himself afflicted at being what he was, he could go on and suffer as keenly as if he really were troubled by it. Why might n't it
be that all his doubts came from anger and resentment towards those who made him a priest, rather than from any examination of his own mind? I don't say it was so. But I don't believe he knew quite what he wanted. If he had, it seems to me he had opportunity to prove it. But when that sort of subconsciousness of his own inadequacy came over him, it was perfectly natural for him to take refuge in the supposition that he had been baffled by circumstances. (pp. 263-264)

The mischance resulting from the interplay and contrast of values is the source of the novel's energy, just as the contrast between the American observer and Venice generates the dominant interest of Venetian Life. There is therefore a thread of circumstances in the novel that no longer requires the overriding framework of a journey to provide structure, which the writer here foregoes.

Even so, vestiges of the journey structure of Their Wedding Journey and A Chance Acquaintance appear in A Foregone Conclusion. Parts of the novel are trips about Venice which serve as setting and frame for the embroidery of the plot, especially in the long excursion of Ferris, Florida and Mrs. Vervain, and Don Ippolito from Venice to Stra, there to observe ruined pleasure palaces and formal gardens. They begin at the Casa Vervain and speak of the Eighteenth Century as they ride a gondola to the mainland. Thus it is a trip in time and space. In Ferris's thinking the political excesses and moral wickedness of the Eighteenth Century explain the ruin they observe in the Nineteenth Century, as they float along the canal, a conclusion that characterizes the consul as he makes it. In the preceding century, Ferris suggests, Don Ippolito might have expected to have a comfortable position as abbate di casa and participate in the patrician pleasures of gilded barges, dancing, and chocolate and lemonade. As Howells develops conflicts between his characters through their reactions to what
they see, he is also, in effect, offering a Venetian panorama. They tour the grand canal, pass San Giorgio, pass the Austrian lagoon forts and customs barges, observe Italian spring verdure and ruined rococo palaces with formal gardens and statuary, and take pleasure in the colors of an Italian sunset. In this best of the early fiction the form of the travel book and the requirements of fictional technique meet coherently. The detail does not seem superfluous, as in A Chance Acquaintance; the characters are more fully realized than earlier personae by virtue of the conflicting cultural milieus.

This analysis of the effect of Howells’s political appointment on his literary production reveals what one must accept about the appointment of all the writers considered in this study: their appointment was only one of the host of causes affecting their productivity as men of letters. In Howells’s case it had the most directly salutary effect of all the appointments I have examined, for the continuity that exists between his appointment, his early literary journalism, and his early fiction reveals a developing organic growth that offers a striking contrast to the effect of appointment on most writers, even those few others who were young writers when they received office. From a complex of possible causes, including literary fatigue, age, undeveloped talent, the uncertainties of audience and the book trade, even the respite from these conditions that office offered, Hawthorne is a more typical case than Howells of the effect of office on writers. Their imaginative writing was characteristically a thing apart from office, untouched in substance of form by its nature. This is not to say they were untouched by political beliefs, which closely related to receiving office, were separate effects from the effect of office itself.
All writers were susceptible to political beliefs and to reflecting them in their writing, whether or not they sought office.

Although political appointment had a limited fertilizing effect on a few writers, it did produce a collective body of travel literature. Not surprisingly, appointments to the foreign service placed certain of these writers in surroundings that excited their interest and provided the substance of books. Travel books were an exploitable literary form that could supplement a writer's career, if not provide a dominant thrust. Along with biography, history, and genial criticism, it could make up a writer's career. Perhaps the best example is the production of the man of all letters, Henry Theodore Tuckerman, for whose *A Month in England* (1853) Hawthorne expressed admiration as a model of the correct travel book. Tuckerman's more than twenty titles include biographies of Washington, John Pendleton Kennedy, and Irving, studies of Washington Allston and other Hudson Valley painters, studies of English and American writers, and travel books about England, Italy, and Paris. As I have shown above, a similar impulse operated in the literary careers of Irving and Howells, who functioned on several literary fronts.

Ranging in period from C. E. Lester's *My Consulship* (1853) to John Hay's *Castilian Days* (1871), these travel books were written either during the writer's tenure, as in the instance of Hay's *Castilian Days* and Howells's *Venetian Life*, or from notes made while in office, as in the instance of Lester's *My Consulship*, Hawthorne's *Our Old Home*, and Howells's *Italian Journeys*. Since each reveals the diverse interests of its writer, each is a quite different book. Lester's book shows a dilettante's interest in art, the improvement of the foreign service, the descendents of Amerigo
Vespucci, dreams, and American travelers; it reveals a congenial writer of no deep interests whose style sometimes comprises dashes and apostrophes. Hay's Castilian Days reveals the anti-European condemnations of an American chauvinist certain of Anglo-Saxon superiority and republican virtue. Hawthorne's Our Old Home is the most intimate and finely polished of the books, although parts of it were taken from the notebooks with little revision. Unlike the others, Howells's two travel books are also designed to be useful as guidebooks; the result is sometimes a dutiful cataloguing of sights.

Even so, there runs through these books a coherent and developing pattern of belief about the requirements of the travel book that makes these products of political appointment relevant to the student of travel literature. In this pattern the writer moves from his position as retailer of stock associations with past glories, the natural sublime, architectural splendor, and great men, all related in conventional and elevated rhetoric, to his new position as critic of Europe and debunker of myths, using an informal and native rhetoric. The former position is best seen in the writing of Irving. Although he wrote no travel books as a result of office, his earlier The Sketch-Book (1819) and Bracebridge Hall (1822) collect travel sketches that show the writer's critical principle and its effect. In the preface to Bracebridge Hall Geoffrey Crayon explains his theory of the book. Although considered an American demi-savage by some and aware that his style is considered derivative, he wishes to honor the England he knows from books. Since he has received an essentially English education, his mind is "filled with historical and poetical associations, connected with places, and manners, and customs of Europe. . . ." Having arrived in England, he is impressed by
the grandeur and melancholy of Tintern Abbey and Conway Castle. He ex-
periences more pleasure in the "delicious crowd of remembered associations
than by the melody of its notes" when he hears an English nightingale.
London's past—Westminster Abbey, St. James Park, London Bridge, St. Paul's—
enrapture him. This pleasure is his apology for the conventional sights
he details in conventional prose:

I have mentioned these circumstances, worthy reader, to show
you the whimsical crowd of associations that are apt to beset
my mind on mingling among English scenes. I hope they may, in
some measure, plead my apology, should I be found harping upon
stale and trivial themes, or indulging an overfondness for any-
thing antique and obsolete. I know it is the humor, not to say
cant of the day, to run riot about old times, old books, old
customs, and old buildings; with myself, however, as far as
I have caught the contagion, the feeling is genuine.121

Irving brought this theory of travel literature to bear on the "West-
minster Abbey" essay of Sketch-Book and "St. Mark's Eve" of Bracebridge
Hall. Not the least of Spain's attractiveness to him as the writer of
the romantic histories Alhambra and Conquest of Granada, products of his
first political appointment, was the effect of Spain's heroic past on its
present character. Considering the tendency of medieval historians to
accept marvelous and apocryphal stories, he justified them and himself
(and made the claim of historical truth to appease those readers who re-
quired it) by pointing out that Spain is a country where the grandeur and
nobility of its past continues to be realized in its present:

To discard, however, everything wild and marvelous in this portion
of Spanish history, is to discard some of its most beautiful, in-
structive, and national features; it is to judge of Spain by the
standard of probability suited to tamer and more prosaic countries.
Spain is virtually a land of poetry and romance, where every-day
life partakes of adventure, and where the least agitation or excite-
ment carried everything up into extravagant enterprise and daring
exploit. The Spaniards, in all ages, have been of swelling and
baggard spirit, searing in thought, pomposus in word, and valiant, though vain-glorious, in deed.122

Beginning with Lester's My Consulship, the travel books of Hawthorne, Howells, and Hay are in great part reactions against the rhetorical conventions of the genteel travel book. The reaction seems to have developed from a sense of literary and national independence from Europe; in these writers it grew also from the intimate exposure of long residence abroad. Their political appointment was therefore a cause of their critical reactions in travel accounts. It is the impulse in Innocents Abroad (1869) that led Mark Twain to deride evidences in art and history of past European glory and these gullible American tourists who accept them and seek culture abroad. Significantly, one of the objects of Twain's scorn is conventional travel-book rhetoric that leads one to perceive falsely. Thus in Nazareth one tourist, then another in similar terms, apostrophizes the graceful, Madonna-like beauty of a native girl. Twain's Innocent corrects them: "She is not tall, she is short; she is not beautiful, she is homely; she is graceful enough, I grant, but she is rather boisterous." Seeking the source of these opinions, he finds their parallel embalmed in a current travel book.123

In the light of this unfortunate influence on perception, Lester called for true accounts of foreign travels:

Indeed, so false are the paintings we have of Italian life and manners, I am persuaded a book could, and ought to be written about Italy, that would be as original and nearly as interesting, as the authentic journal of a man who had really been in the moon—the whole secret would consist in telling the truth. But nearly every traveler, and perhaps every one, who has written about Italy, (and the remark might apply to all other countries,) wrote to please his readers. They suppose a writer on Italy must tell only of palaces, and painting, golden sunsets, and hanging gardens, and dark-eyed girls with glossy black hair, and ruby lips; and about ten thousand other things of the same description, pretty much all of which are a thousand times inferior to the
same things in the United States. I have made a vow to instruct a portion of mankind in some of these matters if I live long enough. I have no room in this book to do it, but I can make a beginning. Other writers, and the great mass of them wish to keep up the idea, that Italy is a particularly romantic country, that there is something wonderful about it, that human life is a different thing here, from what we find it everywhere else (sic syntax). They have a pride about being connoisseurs, or amateurs, or dilettanti; or there is some humbug, or smoke about. I think that if a plain straightforward man, would write an honest account about Italy, it would be a prodigiously interesting book, for in the doing of it, he would have to deal in facts of an agreeable nature, which always have a dramatic influence upon the imagination.124

This is an interesting statement because it is in effect the literary program of these writers of travel accounts under political appointment. Lester's juxtaposition of connoisseurs and dilettantes with humbug and smoke suggests their criticism of the genteel travel book and the substitution of a new truth through the new rhetoric implied in such words as humbug and smoke. Lester had a moment of self-perception when he said My Consulship was not to be the book to carry out the program. His experience as Consul gave him an objective insight into the weaknesses of both Italian and American national life. For example, considering the fabled ceremonial display of European civil authority, he points out that at the Genoese governor's annual ball no one took pleasure because of the fear of offending etiquette. The guests were made rigid for form: "European balls are only big puppet-shows—attitudinizing, bowing, complimenting, simpering, remarks about costumes, diamonds, pearls, necklaces, and that everlasting round of fripperies which make up the staple of such occasions, with languid and unjoyous dancing" (I, 82). Having had official experience of the inelegancies of American tourists, he finds nothing so irritating as their "all-pervading pride" in the "omnipotence, supremacy
and destiny of America and Americanism...." (I, 84). Although his experience as consul seems to have freed him to observe truly, he is characteristically overcome by Italian art and history and remains influenced by conventional travel associations. Observing Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper," he is overcome by its glory and moved to recall childhood memories. He is similarly overcome by evidences of Christian history and beauty of traditional customs (I, 130, 131-133, 163-166). At times Lester appears to transcribe from notebooks his immediate impressions without subjecting them to the control of a uniform tone of plan (I, 88-100). My Consulship is an unevenly written book that fails to carry out its purpose coherently, although much of it is plain narration in a simple prose style that conceals no "humbug and smoke."

Although Hawthorne agreed in theory with the aesthetic of the conventional travel book, he remained closer to the truth of his own unique experience than Lester. I do not find that Our Old Home (1863) applies perfectly Hawthorne's announced theory. In "Up the Thames" he noted the futility of the effort to recreate a sense of original scenes in travel books. He believed that the chief value of this kind of literature is "for reviving the recollections and reawakening the emotions of person already acquainted with the scenes described," of which Tuckerman's Month in England is an admirable example. The writer can render the object only by fetching up reactions that convention has developed:

Correct outlines avail little or nothing, though truth of coloring may be somewhat more efficacious. Impressions, however, states of mind produced by interesting and remarkable objects, these, if truthfully and vividly recorded, may work a genuine effect, and, though but the result of what we see, go further towards representing the actual scene than any direct effort to paint it. Give the emotions that cluster about it, and, without being able to analyze
the spell by which it is summoned up, you get something like a simulachre of the object in the midst of them. (p. 306)

To this point Hawthorne could be speaking of the writer's use of his unique impressions. He concluded his remarks, however, with the rationale of conventional travel literature: "From some of the above reflections I draw the comfortable inference, that, the longer and better known a thing may be, so much the more eligible is it as the subject of a descriptive sketch" (p. 306).

Hawthorne's decision about the aesthetic of Our Old Home comes from his feeling of frustration in defining his true reactions to English sights. In The English Notebooks he remarked the recurrent difficulty of recording true visual experience in words, since meaning shifts with expression and the multiple meanings of the experience defy expression. On July 13, 1855, he pointed out that one cannot truly see English scenery, such as Windermere Lake, for "every point of beauty is so well known, and has been described so much, that one must need look through other people's eyes, and feels as if he were looking at a picture rather than a reality." By July 23 he was convinced that one could not offer detailed description of nature, since its multiplicity is falsified by a point of view; generalized details are therefore as effective as "all the art of word-painting." During the family vacation of the following summer, Hawthorne continued to voice his despair of recording true descriptions of natural beauty. Toward the end of his appointment he decided that the writer's recourse is a substitution of reality. Noting Sir Walter Scott's literary simulation of scenery (which Hawthorne finds not to correspond with the fact), the consul appears to favor conventional description of the natural sublime: "Nature is better, no doubt; but Nature cannot be exactly re-produced on canvas or in print;
and the artist's only resource is to substitute something that may stand in stead of and suggest the truth."  

He was equally frustrated in attempts to exhaust the meaning of English monuments, especially the cathedrals. On June 17, 1856, he recorded his recognition from experiment that "a few tombstones, and a bit of glass from a painted window" did not equal Salisbury Cathedral. Since the cathedrals were among the few things that impressed him, he wished especially "to take them wholly in; and above all, I despise myself when I sit down to describe them." During his last year of tenure he suspected of Newstead Abbey that "ten thousand people (three-fourths of them Americans)" had written impressions that give no true idea of the place, of which his would be an addition. Lincoln Cathedral, he also noted, defied his attempts.

From this analysis one would expect to find little of Hawthorne's true reactions to English sights if, as he said in the notebooks and Our Old Home, this reality eludes description. Yet Our Old Home also details Hawthorne's particular reactions, which are often critical of English life or deflate the conventional reputation of English sights. Hawthorne's Liverpool appointment gave him an opportunity as resident to make first-hand observations that penetrate beyond the traveler's impressions and were potentially embarrassing to the English. In part, his reluctance to have Ticknor publish prematurely the book to be written from his journals came from his fear of scandalizing the English. Indications of Hawthorne's critical attitude occur in the notebooks, where he is unimpressed by parliament building, the tombs of English warriors in St. Paul's, and Scott's home at Abbotsford.
Although Hawthorne admired certain aspects of English life in *Our Old Home*, he withheld conventional adulation and established early the note of independent and personal criticism that persists in the book. In the first chapter, "Consular Experiences," he revised his journal account of the consular office in such manner as subtly to honor the rough vigor of American life and denigrate English life. From the journal he retained the description of his view from the consular office of British ugliness, a brick warehouse "plainer and uglier . . . than was ever built in America." He expanded the simple presence of an American map as part of the furniture of the office to a judgment in *OOH* about national destiny: "a large map of the United States (as they were, twenty years ago, but seem little likely to be, twenty years hence) . . . ." What was a map of Europe in the journal became a particularized map of England in *OOH* which suggested an ironic future: "[There was a similar map] of Great Britain, with its territory so provokingly compact, that we may expect it to sink sooner than sunder." In revision for *OOH* Hawthorne's notes of American ugliness became marks of admirable character. The "hideous" lithograph of General Taylor takes on, instead, "an honest hideousness of aspect," and Hawthorne added "a fierce and terrible bust of General Jackson" which frowns "immittigably at any Englishman who might happen to cross the threshold." The barometer of the journal, which "to-day, for a wonder, points to Fair," became in *OOH* a brief analysis of disagreeable English weather. Although Hawthorne also directed his irony toward American politics, tourists, and official life, this comparison of journal and book form of "Consular Experience" predicts the writer's tendency to offer analysis from his particular experience, not from the body of conventional associations that attached to venerated
objects in genteel travel books.

In his journal, for example, Hawthorne noted that he felt no emotional response to visiting the homes of writers. Scott's Abbotsford left him with no impression save irritation and embarrassment after his perception of the embalmed, museum-like character of the estate: "I do abhor this mode of making pilgrimage to the shrines of departed great men; there is certainly something wrong in it, for it seldom or never produces (in me, at least,) the right feeling." In **OOH** this spirit touches him in his visit to the birthplace of Shakespeare. Stratford left him unmoved; the deposits of the poet's early life, in their crudity and particularity, failed to generate a sense of the truer Shakespeare, the poet. Summarizing his indifference to the antique dust, he noted the "horrible impiety" of the views he expressed (pp. 117-128). Robert Burns's home, Hawthorne also discovered, was an "exceedingly unsuitable place for a pastoral and rural poet to live or die in--even more unsatisfactory than Shakespeare's home. . ." (p. 232).

The critical mood continued in his observations on great monuments. The Gothic character of the Cathedral of Lichfield reminds him of the mischief of the morbidity induced by "the Gothic imagination." This "sinister effect" makes impossible his appreciation of the beauty the cathedral may possess (pp. 157-158). Although he admired the grandeur of Westminster Abbey, he could not resist an ironic examination of some of its great tombs, for which "half-jocular criticism" he apologized, but extenuated his guilt by quoting Sir Godfrey Kneller's comment that fools are buried there (pp. 307-312).

Perhaps the most offensive of the chapters to an English sensibility is the chapter "Outside Glimpses of English Poverty." Its analysis is a pro-
duct of his Liverpool tenure, which gave him opportunity, as he noted, to observe what lay beyond the prosperous thoroughfares. In the slums of Liverpool he found a poverty beyond American experience:

But the dirt of a poverty stricken English street is a monstrosity unknown on our side of the Atlantic. It reigns supreme within its own limits, and is inconceivable everywhere beyond him. . . It is beyond the resources of Wealth to keep the smut away from its premises or its own fingers' ends; and as for Poverty, it surrenders itself to the dark influence without a struggle. (p. 236)

In the chapter he details the effect of English poverty as it brutalizes workers and their families, perpetuates itself in consequence of the helplessness of the poor, and slowly destroys their will to resist.

Again, a comparison of the chapter with its origins in the journals reveals Hawthorne's impulse to emphasize the harshness of the English reality he sees. On two different occasions (April 14 and August 14, 1857), he recorded impressions of marriages in Manchester Cathedral which served as the genesis of the contrasting marriages of the poor and the rich in OOH. In the journal record of the marriage of the poor, Hawthorne saw the collective marriage of six couples as a representative example of rightful human pleasure denied by poverty. The women were prematurely aged; all wore shabby clothing. They married "with the idea of making their own misery less intolerable by adding another's to it." They lost their human individuality in the collective manner of their marriage, which seemed to make indistinct particular husband and wife. To the church officials they were humorous objects. In his note of the second marriage ceremony, Hawthorne made no mention of wealth and took pleasure in the crowd and appearance of bride, groom and their equipage. 131

In his revision of the two passages for OOH, the consul identified him-
self with the poverty-stricken betrothed: "They were my acquaintances of the poor streets..." He expanded upon their shabby appearance, which now makes them representative of human poverty; they were "the mere rags and tatters of the human race, whom some east-wind of evil omen... had chanced to sweep together into an unfragrant heap." He also developed further their collective marriage as an example of their common fate:

...after receiving a benediction in common, they assorted themselves in their own fashion, as they only knew how, and departed to the garrets, or the cellers, or the unsheltered street-corners, where their honeymoon and subsequent lives were to be spent. (pp. 360-361)

In his treatment of the second marriage Hawthorne de-emphasized the attractiveness of the original ceremony and made it an example of the unfortunate tendency of the English wealthy to derive their happiness in consequence of class exploitation. The simpler post-chaise of the journal became "a carriage and four horses, with a portly coachman and two postilions, that waited at the gate." The unspecified marriage official became a showier "Bishop and three or four clergymen." The bride Hawthorne could not see in the journal save for the whiteness of her dress in the crowd became "a creature so nice and delicate that it was a luxury to see her, and a pity that her silk slippers should touch anything so grimy as the old stones of the churchyard avenue." The unspecified crowd became "The crowd of ragged people, who always cluster to witness what they may of an aristocratic wedding..." Hawthorne concluded that one day English gentlemen will be forced to remedy this disparity between poor and rich (pp. 361-362). Clearly, the writer had no intention of pleasing the English at the expense of the truth of his impressions, and he was ready in his revision of the journals for Our Old Home to emphasize certain impressions
of British flaw.

Like Hawthorne, Howells in his travel books also refrained from conventional adulation of European sights and the European past. He announced his intention to strip the sham from his Venice in the first pages of Venetian Life, where he remarks the fraud of the theater he attended in Padua. From his box he could see the grossness of the stage flats off-stage, the scene shifters, and the players out of character as they waited to go on. Extending his experience as a metaphor of intention, he indicates his wish to reveal the true Venice, for his three-year residence as Consul has taught him "to know it differently from those writers who have described it in romances, poems, and hurried books of travel" which make a theatrical sham of the city. He will therefore not raise the curtain on only the Venice of Lord Byron, Samuel Rogers, and James Fenimore Cooper, but the swindling Venice that perpetuates romantic myth. In short, he will debunk the myths and the liars (pp. 9-12).

Howells takes recurrent pleasure in exploding in genial fashion the legends that gullible tourists accepted. He begins with "that pathetic swindle, the Bridge of Sighs," which he shows cannot have been the passage-way to death of any more noble prisoners than housebreakers, cutpurse knaves, and murderers (p. 13). From a like motive he exposes the discomfort of Italian homes and housekeeping, and the persistent notion among Italian servants that all Americans are rich (pp. 94-124). For a while he believes the gondoliers' assertions that the Italian patriot Marino Faliero was born in the house of his residence. After investigation Howells remarks wryly, "we were forced . . . to relinquish our illusion, and accredit an old palace-Saint Apostoli with the distinction we would fain have claimed for ours"
In his chapter on "Churches and Pictures" he regrets his inability to recite "criticisms which I neither respect for their honesty nor regard for their justice." Although an admirer of Ruskin's studies of Venetian art he detects inconsistencies in even his master critic. He will therefore limit his descriptions and compare the paintings he wishes to describe to objects in ordinary experience (pp. 154-156). Elsewhere, he points out that the fabled reputation of Venetian gondoliers as natural singers hardly corresponds with fact: "They are the only class of Venetians who have not good voices, and I am scarcely inclined to regret the silence which long ago fell upon them" (p. 337).

In *Italian Journeys* Howells exploited his role as debunker of storied reputation more directly as a source of humor than in *Venetian Life*. He is consistently the American Innocent whose job is to laugh at the explosions of fame's bubble, although he remains less flamboyant than Twain's Innocent. In "The Picturesque, the Improbable, and the Pathetic in Ferrara," he is an iconoclast; arriving at Ferrara he decides to visit the prison of Tasse, where "I went and paid this homage in the coal-cellar in which was never imprisoned the poet whose works I had not read" (p. 14). The narrative assumes a suggestion of the ribald when the writer described a fresco at Pompeii which depicted what Howells assumed to be a husband returning home late to a shrewish wife:

Nothing could have been better than this miserable wretch's cowardly haste and cautious noiselessness in applying his key; apprehension sat upon his brow, confusion dwelt in his guilty eye. He had been out till two o'clock in the morning, electioneering for Fansa, the friend of the people ("Fansa, and Roman gladiators," "Fansa, and Christians to the Beasts," was the platform), and he had left his *placens uxor* at home alone with the children, and now within this door that *placens uxor* awaited him! (p. 103)
At Herculaneum instead of the "large and highly ornamented theatre" their guidebook leads them to expect, they find "by the light of our candles, a series of gloomy hollows, of the general complexion of coal-bins and potato-cellers" (p. 109). At Padua they are shown a palace reputed to be the site of Count Ecelino's tortures of his enemies in the Thirteenth Century. The exhibition, Howells sees, has the character of a wax museum, with grisly remnants which their guide insists are original. As his narrative progresses, Howells repeats ironically the guide's insistence of the originality of each new waxen skeleton, skull, hand, or finger, as well as the instruments of torture, although they were permitted to understand that "the food we saw was of course not the original food" (pp. 207-215).

In his Castilian Days (1871) John Hay's impulse is similar to Howells's. He wishes to strip away the sham wrought by conventional writing about Spain in order to develop the thesis that Spain was victimized by its reactionary past. While Hay was Secretary of Legation in Madrid, the Spanish Cortes indecisively sought to develop a constitutional monarchy, finally to be established under King Amadeus in November, 1870. Hay expressed his dissatisfaction with the accession of Amadeus in the preface and concluding pages of Castilian Days, where he declared vigorously for a republic (pp. 413-414). His thesis reverses Irving's idea that Spain was dignified by its past, and Hay's purpose of exposure of present evil from past error is evident throughout. Of the travel books considered here, it is least touched by an ameliorating fair mindedness; its judgments are frequently harsh condemnations of Spanish Catholicism, aristocracy, politics, and national life that follow from the writer's political thesis. His book is as much a political document as a literary document. The national pride
that Howells expressed at certain points in *Venetian Life* and *Italian Journeys* becomes chauvinism in *Castilian Days*. Thus Hay explains the disproportionate love of Spaniards for honor by pointing out that unlike the northern European races, they were never modified by the progress of intelligence and the restraints of municipal law into a spirit of sturdy self-respect and a disinclination to submit to wrong. The Goths of Spain have unfortunately never gone through this civilizing process. Their endless wars never gave an opportunity for the development of the purely civic virtues of respect and obedience to law (p. 60).

Moreover, the people suffered then and now, the writer continues, from the twin despotism of Church and King, that provides "an absolute power...over body and soul." Hay's righteous stance persists in the book as he examines the reactionary influence of tradition, bullfighting, the church, and the aristocracy. Narrating his attendance of the Cortes, he details the indifference of Spanish legislators to poverty and economic decay but their readiness to split into multiple factions for slight cause (pp. 313-346).

These, then are the principal literary products of the political appointment of writers considered in this study. For the younger, developing writer political appointment offered the most favorable influence. It provided the conditions that made possible the literary development of Paulding, Burroughs, Harte, and Howells. It significantly influenced Howells, and the continuity between appointment and the form and substance of his early writing remains the most remarkable illustration of the favorable literary influence of official appointment on writers. It provided conditions that gave Irving's established literary career a new turn; it proved no inhibition to Whitman's established power as a poet. In consequence of foreign appointments, certain writers received an intimate knowledge of foreign countries from long residence abroad. This exposure
produced a body of travel literature; the nature of the experience was one cause of the characteristic stance of the writer. From more than a casual acquaintance and from a sense of literary and national independence, these travel writers, from Lester's *My Consulship* to Hay's *Castilian Days*, sought to winnow out false impressions of Europe gained from adulatory and conventional travel books and offer instead the assessments of a skeptical American sensibility.

The major value of this study, I believe, lies in its historical analysis of political appointment of writers. As a study in one aspect of the sociology of authorship in the Nineteenth Century, it contributes to an understanding of what it meant to be a man of letters, and especially a writer of imaginative literature, for political appointment was one of the available means of livelihood while writers of *belles-lettres* engaged in their first occupation. However, the spoils system that made the appointment of writers possible developed not as a system of literary sinecure but as a system of political reward that at once operated the machinery of government and enforced party strength. In consequence writers who performed political services, whose appointment served party interests, or whose friends influenced the patronage system, were soonest appointed. Although endorsers of writers frequently cited their literary ability, it remained insufficient qualification for office unless it accompanied a more beneficial political advantage. In this light the appointments of Freneau, Hawthorne, Howells, and Lowell are characteristic, stemming as they do from political service as well as literary reputation. As literary sinecure, political appointment had uncertain value. It was not designed to foster literature. No writer received appointment with the understanding he had no duties, although many
of the appointments required minimal attention to duty. Their political appointments became literary sinecures if writers were able to resolve other problems that inhibited them, as well as the hindrances that sprang from appointment. Frequently, and from causes additional to the character of the appointment, the literary result of official tenure was not a period of flowing but of infertility. In this respect Hawthorne's limited production of imaginative literature under appointment appears representative of the majority of writers in this study. This study shows how these effects came to be.
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