

The “cult of domesticity,” the ideology of “separate spheres,” and the “culture of sentiment” have together provided a productive paradigm for understanding the work of white women writers in creating a middle-class American culture in the nineteenth century. Most studies of this paradigm have revealed the permeability of the border that separates the spheres, demonstrating that the private feminized space of the home both infused and bolstered the public male arena of the market, and that the sentimental values attached to maternal influence were used to sanction women’s entry into the wider civic realm from which those same values theoretically excluded them. More recently, scholars have argued that the extension of female sympathy across social divides could violently reinforce the very racial and class hierarchies that sentimentality claims to dissolve.¹

This deconstruction of separate spheres, however, leaves another structural opposition intact: the domestic in intimate opposition to the foreign. In this context *domestic* has a double meaning that not only links the familial household to the nation but also imagines both in opposition to everything outside the geographic and conceptual border of the home. The earliest meaning of *foreign*, according to the *OED*, is “out of doors” or “at a distance from home.” Contemporary English speakers refer to national concerns as domestic in explicit or implicit contrast with the foreign. The notion of domestic policy makes sense only in opposition to foreign policy, and uncoupled from the foreign, national issues are never labeled domestic. The idea of foreign policy depends on the sense of the nation as a domestic space

imbued with a sense of at-homeness, in contrast to an external world perceived as alien and threatening. Reciprocally, a sense of the foreign is necessary to erect the boundaries that enclose the nation as home.

Reconceptualizing domesticity in this way might shift the cognitive geography of nineteenth-century separate spheres. When we contrast the domestic sphere with the market or political realm, men and women inhabit a divided social terrain, but when we oppose the domestic to the foreign, men and women become national allies against the alien, and the determining division is not gender but racial demarcations of otherness. Thus another part of the cultural work of domesticity might be to unite men and women in a national domain and to generate notions of the foreign against which the nation can be imagined as home. The border between the domestic and foreign, however, also deconstructs when we think of domesticity not as a static condition but as the process of domestication, which entails conquering and taming the wild, the natural, and the alien. Domestic in this sense is related to the imperial project of civilizing, and the conditions of domesticity often become markers that distinguish civilization from savagery. Through the process of domestication, the home contains within itself those wild or foreign elements that must be tamed; domesticity not only monitors the borders between the civilized and the savage but also regulates traces of the savage within itself.²

If domesticity plays a key role in imagining the nation as home, then women, positioned at the center of the home, play a major role in defining the contours of the nation and its shifting borders with the foreign. Those feminist critics and historians whose work has been fundamental in charting the paradigm of separate spheres, however, have for the most part overlooked the relationship of domesticity to nationalism and imperialism. Their work is worth revisiting here because their language, echoing that of their sources, inadvertently exposes these connections, which scholars have just recently begun to pursue. Jane Tompkins, for example, lauds Catherine Beecher's *Treatise on Domestic Economy* as "the prerequisite of world conquest" and claims of a later version that "the imperialistic drive behind the encyclopedism and determined practicality of this household manual . . . is a blueprint for colonizing the world in the name of the 'family state' under the leadership of Christian women."³ As her title indicates, Mary P. Ryan's *Empire of the Mother: American Writing about Domes-*

ticity, 1830–1860 employs empire as a metaphor framing her analysis; yet she never links this pervasive imperial metaphor to the contemporaneous geopolitical movement of imperial expansion or to the discourse of Manifest Destiny. This blind spot, I believe, stems from the way that the ideology of separate spheres has shaped scholarship; until recently it has been assumed that nationalism and foreign policy lay outside the concern and participation of women. Isolating the empire of the mother from other imperial endeavors, however, runs two risks: first, it may reproduce in women's studies the insularity of an American studies that imagines the nation as a fixed, monolithic, and self-enclosed geographic and cultural whole; second, the legacy of separate spheres that sees women as morally superior to men can lead to the current moralistic strain in feminist criticism, which has shifted from celebrating the liberatory qualities of white women's writing to condemning their racism. In this essay I try instead to understand the vexed and contradictory relations between race and domesticity as an issue not solely of individual morality nor simply internal to the nation but as structural to the institutional and discursive processes of national expansion and empire building.⁴

My essay poses the question of how the ideology of separate spheres in antebellum America contributed to creating an American empire by imagining the nation as a home at a time when its geopolitical borders were expanding rapidly through violent confrontations with Indians, Mexicans, and European empires. Scholars have overlooked the fact that the development of domestic discourse in America is contemporaneous with the discourse of Manifest Destiny. If we juxtapose the spatial representations of these discourses, they seem to embody the most extreme form of separate spheres: the home as a bounded and rigidly ordered interior space is opposed to the boundless and undifferentiated space of an infinitely expanding nation. Yet these spatial and gendered configurations are linked in complex ways that are dependent upon racialized notions of the foreign. According to the ideology of separate spheres, domesticity can be viewed as an anchor, a feminine counterforce to the male activity of territorial conquest. I argue, to the contrary, that domesticity is more mobile and less stabilizing; it travels in contradictory circuits both to expand and contract the boundaries of home and nation and to produce shifting conceptions of the foreign. This form of traveling domesticity can be analyzed in the writings of Catherine Beecher and

Sara Josepha Hale, whose work, despite their ideological differences as public figures, reveals how the internal logic of domesticity relies on, abets, and reproduces the contradictions of nationalist expansion in the 1840s and 1850s. An analysis of Beecher's *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* demonstrates that the language of empire both suffuses and destabilizes the rhetoric of separate spheres, while an analysis of Hale's work uncovers the shared racial underpinnings of domestic and imperialist discourse through which the separateness of gendered spheres reinforces the effort to separate the races by turning blacks into foreigners. The essay concludes with suggestions about how understanding the imperial reach of domestic discourse might remap the way we read women's novels of the 1850s by interpreting their narratives of domesticity and female subjectivity as inseparable from narratives of empire and nation building.



Domesticity dominated middle-class women's writing and culture from the 1830s through the 1850s, a time when national boundaries were in violent flux; during this period the United States doubled its national territory, completed a campaign of Indian removal, fought its first prolonged foreign war, wrested the Spanish borderlands from Mexico, and annexed Texas, Oregon, and California. As Thomas Hietala has shown, this convulsive expansion was less a confident celebration of Manifest Destiny than a response to crises of confidence about national unity, the expansion of slavery, and the racial identity of citizenship—crises that territorial expansion exacerbated.⁵ Furthermore, these movements evoked profound questions about the conceptual border between the domestic and the foreign. In the 1831 Supreme Court decision, *Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia*, for example, Indians were declared members of “domestic dependent nations,” neither foreign nationals nor United States citizens.⁶ This designation makes the domestic an ambiguous third realm between the national and the foreign, as it places the foreign inside the geographic boundaries of the nation. The uneasy relation between the domestic and the foreign can also be seen in the debates over the annexation of new territory. In the middle of the Mexican War President Polk insisted that slavery was “purely a domestic question” and not a “foreign question” at all, but the expansion he advocated undermined that distinction and threatened domestic unity by raising the ques-

tion of slavery's extension into previously foreign lands.⁷ In debates about the annexation of Texas and later Mexico, both sides represented the new territories as women to be married to the U.S.; Sam Houston, for example, wrote of Texas presenting itself "to the United States as a bride adorned for her espousals"; and President Taylor accused annexationists after the Mexican War of trying to "drag California into the Union before her wedding garment has yet been cast about her person."⁸ These visions of imperial expansion as marital union carried within them the specter of marriage as racial amalgamation. While popular fiction about the Mexican War portrayed brave American men rescuing and marrying Mexican women of Spanish descent, political debate over the annexation of Mexico hinged on what was agreed to be the impossibility of incorporating a foreign people marked by their racial intermixing into a domestic nation imagined as Anglo-Saxon.⁹ One of the major contradictions of imperialist expansion was that while it strove to nationalize and domesticate foreign territories and peoples, annexation incorporated nonwhite foreign subjects in a way perceived to undermine the nation as a domestic space.

My point here is not to survey foreign policy but to suggest how deeply the language of domesticity suffused the debates about national expansion. Rather than stabilizing the representation of the nation as home, this rhetoric heightened the fraught and contingent nature of the boundary between the domestic and the foreign, a boundary that breaks down around questions of the racial identity of the nation as home. If we begin to rethink woman's sphere in this context, we have to ask how the discourse of domesticity negotiates the borders of an increasingly expanding empire and a divided nation. Domestic discourse both redresses and reenacts the contradictions of empire through its own double movement to expand female influence beyond the home and the nation while simultaneously contracting woman's sphere to police domestic boundaries against the threat of foreignness both within and without.

At this time of heightened national expansion, proponents of a "woman's sphere" applied the language of empire to both the home and women's emotional lives. "Hers is the empire of the affections," wrote Sarah Josepha Hale, influential editor of *Godey's Lady's Book*, who opposed the women's rights movement as "the attempt to take woman away from her empire of home."¹⁰ To educational reformer

Horace Mann, “the empire of the Home” was “the most important of all empires, the pivot of all empires and emperors.”¹¹ Writers who counseled women to renounce politics and economics, “to leave the rude commerce of camps and the soul hardening struggling of political power to the harsher spirit of men,” urged them in highly political rhetoric to take up a more spiritual calling, “the domain of the moral affections and the empire of the heart.”¹² Catherine Beecher gives this calling a nationalist cast in *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* when, for example, she uses Queen Victoria as a foil to elevate the American “mother and housekeeper in a large family,” who is “the sovereign of an empire demanding as varied cares, and involving more difficult duties, than are exacted of her, who wears the crown and professedly regulates the interests of the greatest nation on earth, [yet] finds abundant leisure for theaters, balls, horse races, and every gay leisure.”¹³ This imperial trope might be interpreted as a compensatory and defensive effort to glorify the shrunken realm of female agency, in a paradox of what Mary Ryan calls “imperial isolation,” whereby the mother gains her symbolic sovereignty at the cost of withdrawal from the outside world.¹⁴ For these writers, however, metaphor has a material efficacy in the world. The representation of the home as an empire exists in tension with the notion of woman’s sphere as a contracted space because it is in the nature of empires to extend their rule over new domains while fortifying their borders against external invasion and internal insurrection. If, on the one hand, domesticity draws strict boundaries between the home and the world of men, on the other, it becomes the engine of national expansion, the site from which the nation reaches beyond itself through the emanation of woman’s moral influence.

The paradox of what might be called “imperial domesticity” is that by withdrawing from direct agency in the male arena of commerce and politics, woman’s sphere can be represented by both women and men as a more potent agent for national expansion. The outward reach of domesticity in turn enables the interior functioning of the home. In her introduction to *A Treatise on Domestic Economy*, Beecher inextricably links women’s work at home to the unfolding of America’s global mission of “exhibiting to the world the beneficent influences of Christianity, when carried into every social, civil, and political institution” (12). Women’s maternal responsibility for molding the character of men and children has global repercussions: “to American women,

more than to any others on earth, is committed the exalted privilege of extending over the world those blessed influences, that are to renovate degraded man, and 'clothe all climes with beauty'" (14). Beecher ends her introduction with an extended architectural metaphor in which women's agency at home is predicated on the global expansion of the nation:

The builders of a temple are of equal importance, whether they labor on the foundations, or toil upon the dome. Thus also with those labors that are to be made effectual in the regeneration of the Earth. The woman who is rearing a family of children; the woman who labors in the schoolroom, the woman who, in her retired chamber, earns with her needle, the mite to contribute for the intellectual and moral elevation of her country; even the humble domestic, whose example and influence may be molding and forming young minds, while her faithful services sustain a prosperous domestic state;—each and all may be cheered by the consciousness that they are agents in accomplishing the greatest work that ever was committed to human responsibility. It is the building of a glorious temple, whose base shall be coextensive with the bounds of the earth, whose summit shall pierce the skies, whose splendor shall beam on all lands, and those who hew the lowliest stone, as much as those who carve the highest capital, will be equally honored when its top-stone shall be laid, with new rejoicing of the morning stars, and shoutings of the sons of God. (14)

One political effect of this metaphor is to unify women of different social classes in a shared project of construction while sustaining class hierarchy among women.¹⁵ This image of social unity both depends upon and underwrites a vision of national expansion, as women's varied labors come together to embrace the entire world. As the passage moves down the social scale, from mother to teacher to spinster, the geographic reach extends outward from home to schoolroom to country, until the "humble domestic" returns back to the "prosperous domestic state," a phrase that casts the nation in familial terms. Women's work at home here performs two interdependent forms of national labor; it forges the bonds of internal unity while impelling the nation outward to encompass the globe. This outward expansion in turn enables the internal cohesiveness of woman's separate sphere by making women agents in constructing an infinitely expanding edifice.

Beecher thus introduces her detailed manual on the regulation of the home as a highly ordered space by fusing the boundedness of the home with the boundlessness of the nation. Her 1841 introduction bears a remarkable resemblance to the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny, particularly to this passage by one of its foremost proponents, John L. O'Sullivan:

The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness. In its magnificent domain of space and time, the nation of many nations is destined to manifest to mankind the excellence of divine principles; to establish on earth the noblest temple ever dedicated to the worship of the most high—the Sacred and the True. Its floor shall be a hemisphere—its roof the firmament of the star-studded heavens, and its congregation an Union of many Republics, comprising hundreds of happy millions, calling, owning no man master, but governed by God's natural and moral law of equality.¹⁶

While these passages exemplify the stereotype of separate spheres (one describes work in the home and the other the work of nation building), both use a common architectural metaphor from the Bible to build a temple coextensive with the globe. O'Sullivan's grammatical subject is the American nation, which is the implied medium in Beecher's text for channeling women's work at home to a Christianized world. The construction of an edifice ordinarily entails walling off the inside from the outside, but in both these cases there is a paradoxical effect whereby the distinction between inside and outside is obliterated by the expansion of the home/nation/temple to encompass the globe. The rhetorics of Manifest Destiny and domesticity share a vocabulary that turns imperial conquest into spiritual regeneration in order to efface internal conflict or external resistance in visions of geopolitical domination as global harmony.

Although imperial domesticity ultimately imagines a home coextensive with the entire world, it also continually projects a map of unregenerate outlying foreign terrain that both gives coherence to its boundaries and justifies its domesticating mission. When in 1869 Catherine Beecher revised her *Treatise* with her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe, as *The American Woman's Home*, they downplayed the earlier role of domesticity in harmonizing class differences while enhancing domesticity's outward reach. The book ends by advocat-

ing the establishment of Christian neighborhoods settled primarily by women as a way of putting into practice domesticity's expansive potential to Christianize and Americanize immigrants both in Northeastern cities and "all over the West and South, while along the Pacific coast, China and Japan are sending their pagan millions to share our favored soil, climate, and government." No longer a leveling factor among classes within America, domesticity could be extended to those conceived of as foreign both within and beyond American national borders: "Ere long colonies from these prosperous and Christian communities would go forth to shine as 'lights of the world' in all the now darkened nations. Thus the Christian family and Christian neighborhood would become the grand ministry as they were designed to be, in training our whole race for heaven."¹⁷ While Beecher and Stowe emphasize domesticity's service to "darkened nations," the existence of "pagans" as potential converts performs a reciprocal service in the extension of domesticity to single American women. Such Christian neighborhoods would allow unmarried women without children to leave their work in "factories, offices and shops" or their idleness in "refined leisure" to live domestic lives on their own, in some cases by adopting native children. Domesticity's imperial reach posits a way of extending woman's sphere to include not only the heathen but also the unmarried Euro-American woman who can be freed from biological reproduction to rule her own empire of the mother.

If writers about domesticity encouraged the extension of female influence outward to domesticate the foreign, their writings also evoked anxiety about the opposing trajectory that brings foreignness into the home. Analyzing the widespread colonial trope that compares colonized people to children, Ann Stoler and Karen Sánchez-Eppler have both shown how this metaphor can work not only to infantilize the colonized but also to portray white children as young savages in need of civilizing.¹⁸ This metaphor at once extends domesticity outward to the tutelage of heathens while focusing it inward to regulate the threat of foreignness within the boundaries of the home. For Beecher, this internal savagery appears to threaten the physical health of the mother. Throughout the *Treatise*, the vision of the sovereign mother with imperial responsibilities is countered by descriptions of the ailing invalid mother. This contrast can be seen in the titles of the first two chapters, "Peculiar Responsibilities of American Women"

and “Difficulties Peculiar to American Women.” The latter focuses on the pervasive invalidism that makes American women physically and emotionally unequal to their global responsibilities. In contrast to the ebullient temple building of the first chapter, Beecher ends the second with a quotation from Tocqueville describing a fragile frontier home centered on a lethargic and vulnerable mother whose

children cluster about her, full of health, turbulence and energy; they are true children of the wilderness; their mother watches them from time to time, with mingled melancholy and joy. To look at their strength, and her languor one might imagine that the life she had given them exhausted her own; and still she regrets not what they cost her. The house, inhabited by these emigrants, has no internal partition or loft. In the one chamber of which it consists, the whole family is gathered for the night. The dwelling itself is a little world; an ark of civilization amid an ocean of foliage. A hundred steps beyond it, the primeval forest spreads its shade and solitude resumes its sway. (24)

The mother’s health appears drained not by the external hardships inflicted by the environment but by her intimate tie to her own “children of the wilderness,” who violate the border between home and primeval forest. This boundary is partially reinforced by the image of the home as an “ark of civilization” whose internal order should protect its inhabitants from the sea of chaos that surrounds them. Yet the undifferentiated inner space, which lacks “internal partition,” replicates rather than defends against the boundlessness of the wilderness. The rest of the treatise, with its detailed attention to the systematic organization of the household, works to “partition” the home in a way that distinguishes it from the external wilderness.¹⁹

The infirmity of American mothers is a pervasive concern throughout the *Treatise*, yet its physical cause is difficult to locate in Beecher’s text. Poor health afflicts middle-class women in Northeastern cities as much as women on the frontier, according to Beecher, and she sees both cases resulting from a geographic and social mobility in which “everything is moving and changing” (16). This movement affects women’s health most directly, claims Beecher, by depriving them of reliable domestic servants. With “trained” servants constantly moving up and out, middle-class women must resort to hiring “ignorant” and “poverty-stricken foreigners,” with whom they are said in *Ameri-*

can Woman's Home to have a “missionary” relationship (332). Though Beecher does not label these foreigners as the direct cause of illness, their presence disrupts the orderly “system and regularity” of house-keeping, leading American women to be “disheartened, discouraged, and ruined in health” (18). Throughout her *Treatise* Beecher turns the absence of good servants—at first a cause of infirmity—into a remedy; their lack gives middle-class women the opportunity to perform regular domestic labor that will revive their health. By implication, their self-regulated work will also keep “poverty-stricken foreigners” out of their homes. Curiously, then, the mother’s ill health stems from the unruly subjects of her domestic empire—children and servants—who bring uncivilized wilderness and undomesticated foreignness into the home. The fear of disease and of the invalidism that characterizes the American woman also serves as a metaphor for anxiety about foreignness within. The mother’s domestic empire is at risk of contagion from the very subjects she must domesticate and civilize, her wilderness children and foreign servants, who ultimately infect both the home and the body of the mother.²⁰

This reading of Beecher suggests new ways of understanding the intricate means by which domestic discourse generates and relies on images of the foreign. On the one hand, domesticity’s “habits of system and order” appear to anchor the home as a stable center in a fluctuating social world with expanding national borders; on the other, domesticity must be spatially and conceptually mobile to travel to the nation’s far-flung frontiers. Beecher’s use of Tocqueville’s ark metaphor suggests both the rootlessness and the self-enclosed mobility necessary for middle-class domesticity to redefine the meaning of habitation to make Euro-Americans feel at home in terrain in which *they* are initially the foreigners. Domesticity inverts this relationship to create a home by rendering prior inhabitants alien and undomesticated and by implicitly nativizing newcomers. The empire of the mother thus shares the logic of the American empire; both follow a double compulsion to conquer and domesticate the foreign, thus incorporating and controlling a threatening foreignness within the borders of the home and the nation.



The imperial scope of domesticity was central to the work of Sarah Josepha Hale throughout her half-century editorship of the influen-

tial *Godey's Lady's Book*, as well as to her fiction and history writing. Hale has been viewed by some scholars as advocating a woman's sphere more thoroughly separate from male political concerns than Beecher did.²¹ This withdrawal seems confirmed by the refusal of *Godey's* even to mention the Civil War throughout its duration, much less take sides. Yet when Hale conflates the progress of women with the nation's Manifest Destiny in her history writing, other scholars have judged her as inconsistently moving out of woman's sphere into the male political realm.²² Hale's conception of separate spheres, I will argue, is predicated on the imperial expansion of the nation. Although her writing as editor, essayist, and novelist focused on the interior spaces of the home, with ample advice on housekeeping, clothing, manners, and emotions, she gave equal and related attention to the expansion of female influence through her advocacy of female medical missionaries abroad and the colonization of Africa by former black slaves. Even though Hale seems to avoid the issue of slavery and race relations in her silence about the Civil War, in the 1850s her conception of domesticity takes on a decidedly racial cast, exposing the intimate link between the separateness of gendered spheres and the effort to keep the races apart in separate national spheres.

In 1846, at the beginning of the Mexican War, Hale launched a campaign on the pages of *Godey's Lady's Book* to declare Thanksgiving Day a national holiday, a campaign she avidly pursued until Lincoln made the holiday official in 1863.²³ This effort typified the way in which Hale's map of woman's sphere overlaid national and domestic spaces; *Godey's* published detailed instructions and recipes for preparing the Thanksgiving feast, while it encouraged women readers to agitate for a nationwide holiday as a ritual of national expansion and unification. The power of Thanksgiving Day stemmed from its center in the domestic sphere; Hale imagined millions of families seated around the holiday table at the same time, thereby unifying the vast and shifting space of the national domain through simultaneity in time. This domestic ritual, she wrote in 1852, would unite "our great nation, by its states and families from the St. John to the Rio Grande, from the Atlantic to the Pacific."²⁴ If the celebration of Thanksgiving unites individual families across regions and brings them together in an imagined collective space, Thanksgiving's continental scope endows each individual family gathering with national meaning. Furthermore, the Thanksgiving story commemorating the founding of New En-

gland—which in Hale’s version makes no mention of Indians—could create a common history by nationalizing a regional myth of origins and imposing it on the territories most recently wrested from Indians and Mexicans. Hale’s campaign to transform Thanksgiving from a regional to a national holiday grew even fiercer with the approach of the Civil War. In 1859 she wrote, “If every state would join in Union Thanksgiving on the 24th of this month, would it not be a renewed pledge of love and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States?”²⁵ Thanksgiving Day, she hoped, could avert civil war. As a national holiday celebrated primarily in the home, Thanksgiving traverses broad geographic circuits to write a national history of origins, to colonize the western territories, and to unite North and South.

The domestic ritual of Thanksgiving could expand and unify national borders only by also fortifying those borders against foreignness; for Hale, the nation’s borders not only defined its geographical limits but also set apart nonwhites within the national domain. In Hale’s fiction of the 1850s, Thanksgiving polices the domestic sphere by making black people, both free and enslaved, foreign to the domestic nation and denying them a home within America’s expanding borders. In 1852 Hale reissued her novel *Northwood*, which had launched her career in 1827, with a highly publicized chapter about a New Hampshire Thanksgiving dinner showcasing the values of the American republic to a skeptical British visitor. For the 1852 version Hale changed the subtitle from “A Tale of New England” to “Life North and South” to highlight the new material on slavery she had added.²⁶ Pro-union yet against abolition, Hale advocated African colonization as the only means of preserving domestic unity by sending all blacks to settle in Africa and Christianize its inhabitants. Colonization in the 1850s had a two-pronged ideology, both to expel blacks to a separate national sphere and to expand U.S. power through the civilizing process; black Christian settlers would thereby become both outcasts from and agents for the American empire.²⁷

Hale’s 1852 *Northwood* ends with an appeal to use Thanksgiving Day as an occasion to collect money at all American churches “for the purpose of educating and colonizing free people of color and emancipated slaves” (408). This annual collection would contribute to “peaceful emancipation” as “every obstacle to the real freedom of America would be melted before the gushing streams of sympathy and charity” (408). While “sympathy,” a sentiment associated with

woman's sphere, seems to extend to black slaves, the goal of sympathy in this passage is not to free them but to emancipate white America from their presence. Thanksgiving for Hale thus celebrates national coherence around the domestic sphere while simultaneously rendering blacks within America foreign to the nation.

For Hale, colonization would not simply expel black people from American nationality but would also transform American slavery into a civilizing and domesticating mission. One of her Northern characters explains to the British visitor that "the destiny of America is to instruct the world, which we shall do, with the aid of our Anglo-Saxon brothers over the water. . . . Great Britain has enough to do at home and in the East Indies to last her another century. We have this country and Africa to settle and civilize" (167). When his listener is puzzled by the reference to Africa, he explains, "That is the greatest mission of our Republic, to train here the black man for his duties as a Christian, then free him and send him to Africa, there to plant Free States and organize Christian civilization" (168). The colonization of Africa becomes the goal of slavery by making it part of the civilizing mission of global imperialism. Colonization thus not only banishes blacks from the domestic union, but, as the final sentence of *Northwood* proclaims, it proves that "the mission of American slavery is to Christianize Africa" (408).

In 1852 Hale published the novel *Liberia*, which begins where *Northwood* ends, with the settlement of Liberia by freed black slaves.²⁸ Seen by scholars as a retort to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Liberia* can also be read as the untold story of Stowe's novel, beginning where she ends, with former black slaves immigrating to Africa.²⁹ Although the subtitle, "Mr. Peyton's Experiment," places colonization under the aegis of white males, the narrative turns colonization into a project emanating from woman's sphere in at least two directions. In its outward trajectory, the settlement of Liberia appears as an expansion of feminized domestic values. Yet domesticity is not only exported to civilize native Africans; the framing of the novel also makes African colonization necessary to the establishment of domesticity within America as exclusively white. While Hale writes that the purpose of the novel is to "show the advantages Liberia offers to the African," in so doing it construes all black people as foreign to American nationality by asserting that they must remain homeless within the United States: At the same time, Hale paints a picture of American imperial-

ism as the embodiment of the feminine values of domesticity: “What other nation can point to a colony planted from such pure motives of charity; nurtured by the counsels and exertions of its most noble and self-denying statesmen and philanthropists; and sustained, from its feeble commencement up to a period of self-reliance and independence, from pure love of justice and humanity” (iv). In this passage America is figured as a mother raising her baby, Africa, to maturity; the vocabulary of “purity,” “charity,” “self-denial,” and “love” represents colonization as an expansion of the values of woman’s separate sphere.

The narrative opens with a threat to American domesticity on two fronts. The last male of a distinguished Virginia family is on his death bed, helpless to defend his plantation from a rumored slave insurrection; the women of the family, led by his wife, “Virginia,” rally with the loyal slaves to defend their home from an insurrection that never occurs. Thus the novel opens with separate spheres gone awry, with the man of the family abed at home and white women and black slaves acting as protectors and soldiers. While the ensuing plot to settle Liberia overtly rewards those slaves for their loyalty by giving them freedom and a homeland, it also serves to reinstate separate spheres and reestablish American domesticity as white.

When the narrative shifts to Africa, colonization has the effect not only of driving black slaves out of American nationhood but also of Americanizing Africa through domesticity. A key figure in the settlement is the slave Keziah, who has nursed the white plantation owners. She is the most responsive to Peyton’s proposal for colonization because of her desire both to be free and to Christianize the natives. Her future husband, Polydore, more recently arrived from Africa and thus less “civilized,” is afraid to return there because of his memory of native brutality and superstition. This couple represents two faces of enslaved Africans central to the white imagination of colonization: the degenerate heathen represented by the man and the redeemed Christian represented by the woman. Keziah, however, can only become a fully domesticated woman at a geographic remove from American domesticity. When Keziah protects the plantation in Virginia, her maternal impulse is described as that of a wild animal—a “fierce lioness.” Only in Africa can she become the domestic center of the new settlement, where she establishes a home that resembles Beecher’s Christian neighborhood. Keziah builds a private home with

fence and garden, and civilizes her husband while expanding her domestic sphere to adopt native children and open a Christian school.

Keziah's domestication of herself and her surroundings in Africa can be seen as a part of the movement in the novel noted by Susan Ryan, in which the freed black characters are represented as recognizably American only at the safe distance of Africa.³⁰ Once banished from the domestic sphere of the American nation, they can reproduce themselves for readers as Americans in a foreign terrain. The novel not only narrates the founding of Liberia as a story of colonization, but Hale's storytelling also colonizes Liberia as an imitation of America, replete with images of an open frontier, the *Mayflower*, and the planting of the American flag. A double narrative movement at once contracts American borders to exclude blacks from domestic space and simultaneously expands U.S. borders by recreating that domestic space in Africa. The novel thus ends with a quotation that compares the Liberian settlers to the Pilgrims and represents them as part of a global expansion of the American nation:

I do not doubt but that the whole continent of Africa will be regenerated, and I believe the Republic of Liberia will be the great instrument, in the hands of God, in working out this regeneration. The colony of Liberia has succeeded better than the colony of Plymouth did for the same period of time. And yet, in that little company which was wafted across the mighty ocean in the *May Flower*, we see the germs of this already colossal nation, whose feet are in the tropics, while her head reposes upon the snows of Canada. Her right hand she stretches over the Atlantic, feeding the millions of the Old World, and beckoning them to her shores, as a refuge from famine and oppression; and, at the same time, she stretches forth her left hand to the islands of the Pacific, and to the old empires of the East. (303)

African slaves are brought to America to become Christianized and domesticated, but they cannot complete this potential transformation until they return to Africa.

Hale's writing makes race central to woman's sphere not only by excluding nonwhites from domestic nationalism but also by seeing the capacity for domesticity as an innate, defining characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race. Reginald Horsman has shown how by the 1840s the meaning of Anglo-Saxonism in political thought had shifted from

a historical understanding of the development of republican institutions to an essentialist definition of a single race that possesses an innate and unique capacity for self-government.³¹ His analysis, however, limits this racial formation to the male sphere of politics. Hale's *Woman's Record* (1853), a massive compendium of the history of women from Eve to the present, establishes woman's sphere as central to the racial discourse of Anglo-Saxonism; to her, the empire of the mother spawns the Anglo-Saxon nation and propels its natural inclination toward global power.³² In her introduction to the fourth part of her volume on the present era, Hale represents America as manifesting the universal progress of women that culminates in the Anglo-Saxon race. To explain the Anglo-Saxon "mastery of the mind over Europe and Asia," she argues that

if we trace out the causes of this superiority, they would center in the moral influence, which true religion confers on the female sex. . . . There is still a more wonderful example of this uplifting power of the educated female mind. It is only seventy-five years since the Anglo-Saxons in the New World became a nation, then numbering about three million souls. Now this people form the great American republic, with a population of twenty three millions; and the destiny of the world will soon be in their keeping! Religion is free; and the soul which woman always influences where God is worshipped in spirit and truth, is untrammled by code, or creed, or caste. . . . The result before the world—a miracle of advancement, American mothers train their sons to be men. (564)

Hale here articulates the imperial logic of what has been called "republican motherhood," which ultimately posits the expansion of maternal influence beyond the nation's borders.³³ The Manifest Destiny of the nation unfolds logically from the imperial reach of woman's influence emanating from her separate domestic sphere. Domesticity makes manifest the destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race, while Manifest Destiny becomes in turn the condition for Anglo-Saxon domesticity. For Hale domesticity has two effects on national expansion: it imagines the nation as a home delimited by race and propels the nation outward through the imperial reach of female influence.

Advocating domesticity's expansive mode, *Woman's Record* includes only those nonwhite women whom Hale understood to be contributing to the spread of Christianity to colonized peoples. In the

third volume, Hale designates as the most distinguished woman from 1500 to 1830 an American missionary to Burma, Ann Judson, a white American (152). The Fourth Era of *Woman's Record* focuses predominantly on American women as the apex of historical development. In contrast to the aristocratic accomplishments of English women, "in all that contributes to popular education and pure religious sentiment among the masses, the women of America are in advance of all others on the globe. To prove this we need only examine the list of American female missionaries, teachers, editors and authors of works instructive and educational, contained in this 'Record'" (564). While Anglo-Saxon men marched outward to conquer new lands, women had a complementary outward reach from within the domestic sphere.

For Hale, African colonization can be seen as part of the broader global expansion of woman's sphere. In 1853 Hale printed in *Godey's Lady's Book* "An Appeal to the American Christians on Behalf of the Ladies' Medical Missionary Society," in which she argued for the special need for women physicians abroad because they would have unique access to foreign women's bodies and souls.³⁴ Her argument for the training of female medical missionaries both enlarges the field of white women's agency and feminizes the force of imperial power. She sees female medical missionaries as not only curing disease but also raising the status of women abroad: "All heathen people have a high reverence for medical knowledge. Should they find Christian ladies accomplished in this science, would it not greatly raise the sex in the estimation of those nations, where one of the most serious impediments to moral improvement is the degradation and ignorance to which their females have been for centuries consigned?" (185). Though superior to heathen women in status, American women would accomplish their goal by imagining gender as a common ground, which would give them special access to women abroad. As women they could be more effective imperialists, penetrating those interior feminine colonial spaces, symbolized by the harem, that remain inaccessible to male missionaries:

Vaccination is difficult of introduction among the people of the east, though suffering dreadfully from the ravages of small-pox. The American mission at Siam writes that thousands of children were, last year, swept away by this disease in the country around them. Female physicians could win their way among these poor children

much easier than doctors of the other sex. Surely the ability of American women to learn and practice vaccination will not be questioned, when the more difficult art of inoculation was discovered by the women of Turkey, and introduced into Europe by an English woman! Inoculation is one of the greatest triumphs of remedial skill over a sure loathsome and deadly disease which the annals of Medical Art record. Its discovery belongs to women. I name it here to show that they are gifted with genius for the profession, and only need to be educated to excel in the preventive department.

Let pious, intelligent women be fitly prepared, and what a mission-field for doing good would be opened! In India, China, Turkey, and all over the heathen world, they would, in their character of physicians, find access to the homes and harems where women dwell, and where the good seed sown would bear an hundredfold, because it would take root in the bosom of the sufferer, and in the heart of childhood. (185)

In this passage the connections among women circulate in many directions, but Hale charts a kind of evolutionary narrative that places American women at the apex of development. Though inoculation was discovered by Turkish women, it can only return to Turkey to save Turkish children through the agency of English women transporting knowledge to Americans, who can then go to Turkey as missionaries and save women who cannot save themselves or their children. While Hale is advocating that unmarried women be trained as missionaries, the needs of heathen women allow female missionaries to conquer their own domestic empire without reproducing biologically. Instead, American women are metaphorically cast as men in a cross-racial union, as they sow seeds in the bosom of heathen women who will bear Christian children. Through the sentiment of female influence, women physicians will transform heathen harems into Christian homes.

My reading of Hale suggests that the concept of female influence so central to domestic discourse and at the heart of the sentimental ethos is underwritten by and abets the imperial expansion of the nation. While the empire of the mother advocated retreat from the world-conquering enterprises of men, this renunciation promised a more thorough kind of world conquest. The empire of the mother shared with the American empire a logical structure and a key contra-

diction: both sought to encompass the world outside their borders; yet this same outward movement contributed to and relied on the contraction of the domestic sphere to exclude persons conceived of as racially foreign within those expanding national boundaries.



Understanding the imperial reach of domesticity and its relation to the foreign should help remap the critical terrain upon which women's domestic fiction has been constructed. We can chart the broader international and national contexts in which unfold narratives of female development that at first glance seem anchored in local domestic spaces. We can see how such narratives imagine domestic locations in complex negotiation with the foreign. To take a few well-known examples from the 1850s, Susan Warner's *The Wide Wide World* sends its heroine to Scotland, while the world of Maria Cummins's *The Lamplighter* encompasses India, Cuba, the American West, and Brazil. In E. D. E. N. Southworth's *The Hidden Hand*, the resolution of multiple domestic plots in Virginia relies on the participation of the male characters in the Mexican War, while the geographic coordinates of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* extend not only to Africa at the end but also to Haiti and Canada throughout.³⁵ Such a remapping would involve more than just seeing the geographic settings anew; it would turn inward to the privileged space of the domestic novel—the interiority of the female subject—to find traces of foreignness that must be domesticated or expunged. How does this struggle with foreignness within “woman's sphere” shape the interiority of female subjectivity, the empire of the affections and the heart? While critics such as Gillian Brown, Richard Brodhead, and Nancy Armstrong have taught us how domestic novels represent women as model bourgeois subjects,³⁶ my remapping would explore how domestic novels produce the racialized national subjectivity of the white middle-class woman in contested international spaces.

Many domestic novels open at physical thresholds, such as windows or doorways, that problematize the relation between interior and exterior; the home and the female self appear fragile and threatened from within and without by foreign forces. These novels then explore the breakdown of the boundaries between internal and external spaces, between the domestic and the foreign, as they struggle to renegotiate and stabilize these domains. This negotiation often takes

place not only within the home but also within the heroine. The narrative of female self-discipline that is so central to the domestic novel might be viewed as a kind of civilizing process in which the woman plays the role of both civilizer and savage. Gerty in *The Lamplighter*, for example, like Capitola in *The Hidden Hand*, first appears as an uncivilized street urchin, a heathen unaware of Christianity whose anger is viewed as a “dark infirmity” and whose unruly nature is in need of domesticating. We later learn that she was born in Brazil to the daughter of a ship captain, who was killed by malaria, the “inhospitable southern disease, which takes the stranger for its victim.”³⁷ To become the sovereign mother of her own domestic empire, Gerty must become her own first colonial subject and purge herself of both her origin in a diseased uncivilized terrain and the female anger identified with that “dark” realm. This split between the colonizer and the colonized, seen here within one female character, appears in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* racially externalized onto Eva and Topsy.³⁸

My point is that where the domestic novel appears most turned inward to the private sphere of female interiority, we often find subjectivity scripted by narratives of nation and empire. Even at the heart of *The Wide, Wide World*, a novel usually understood as thoroughly closeted in interior space, where the heroine disciplines herself through reading and prayer, her favorite book is the popular biography of George Washington, the father of the nation. Her own journey to live with her Scottish relatives can be seen as a feminized reenactment of the American revolution against the British empire. Similarly, in *The Hidden Hand*, the most inner recess of woman’s sphere is conjoined with the male sphere of imperial conquest. While the American men in the novel are invading Mexico, in Virginia, a bandit, significantly named “Black Donald,” invades the heroine’s chamber and threatens to rape her. To protect the sanctity of her home and her own chastity, Capitola performs a founding national narrative of conquest. She drops the rapist through a trap door in her bedroom into a deep pit dug by the original owner in order to trick the Indian inhabitants into selling their land. The domestic heroine thus reenacts the originating gesture of imperial appropriation to protect the borders of her domestic empire and the inviolability of the female self.

Feminist criticism of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* has firmly established that the empire of the mother in Stowe’s novel extends beyond the home to the national arena of antislavery politics. This expansive move-

ment of female influence, I have been arguing, has an international dimension that helps separate gendered spheres coalesce in the imperial expansion of the nation by redrawing domestic borders against the foreign. In light of my reading of Hale's *Liberia*, we might re-map the critical terrain of Stowe's novel to ask how its delineation of domestic space, as both familial and national, relies upon and propels the colonization of Africa by the novel's free black characters. Rather than just focusing on their expulsion at the end of the novel, we might locate, in Toni Morrison's terms, "the "Africanist presence" throughout the text.³⁹ Africa appears as both an imperial outpost and a natural embodiment of woman's sphere, a kind of feminized utopia, that is strategically posed as an alternative to Haiti, which hovers as a menacing image of black revolutionary agency. The idea of African colonization does not simply emerge at the end as a racist failure of Stowe's political imagination; rather, colonization underwrites the racial politics of the domestic imagination. The "Africanist presence" throughout *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is intimately bound to the expansionist logic of domesticity itself. In the writing of Stowe and her contemporary proponents of woman's sphere, "Manifest Domesticity" turns an imperial nation into a home by producing and colonizing specters of the foreign that lurk inside and outside its ever shifting borders.

Mount Holyoke College

Notes

I wish to thank the organizers of the conference "Nineteenth-Century American Women Writers in the Twenty-First Century" (Hartford, May 1996) for inviting me to present my first formulation of the ideas in this essay. Special thanks to Susan Gillman, Carla Kaplan, Dana D. Nelson, and Priscilla Wald for their helpful and encouraging readings at crucial stages.

- 1 Influential studies of this paradigm by historians and literary critics include Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood," *American Quarterly* 18 (summer 1966): 151-74; Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catherine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1973); Nancy Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1977); Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1977); Nina Baym, *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America, 1820-1870* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1978); Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (Cam-

bridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981), and *Empire of the Mother: American Writing about Domesticity, 1830–1860* (New York: Institute for Research in History and Haworth Press, 1982); Mary Kelley, *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1984); Jane Tompkins, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790–1860* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985); Gillian Brown, *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1990); and the essays in *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Shirley Samuels (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992). See also the useful review essay by Linda K. Kerber, “Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman’s Place: The Rhetoric of Women’s History,” *The Journal of American History* (June 1988): 9–39.

- 2 On the etymology of the word *domestic* and its relation to colonialism, see Karen Hansen, ed., *African Encounters with Domesticity* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1992), 2–23; and Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 31–36. On the uses of domesticity in the colonial context, see Vicente L. Rafael, “Colonial Domesticity: White Women and United States Rule in the Philippines,” *American Literature* 67 (December 1995): 639–66.
- 3 Tompkins, *Sensational Designs*, 143, 144. Despite Tompkins’s well-known debate with Ann Douglas, both critics rely on imperial rhetoric. While Tompkins applauds the imperialist impulse of sentimentalism, Douglas derides sentimental writers for a rapacious reach that extends as far as the “colonization of heaven” and the “domestication of death” (240–72).
- 4 Even recent revisionist studies that situate woman’s sphere in relation to racial and class hierarchies often overlook the international context in which these divisions evolve. In the important essays in *Culture of Sentiment*, for example, many of the racialized configurations of domesticity under discussion rely on a foreign or imperial dimension that remains unanalyzed. To take a few examples, Laura Wexler’s analysis of Hampton Institute makes no mention of its founding by influential missionaries to Hawaii (“Tender Violence: Literary Eavesdropping, Domestic Fiction, and Educational Reform,” 9–38); Karen Halttunen’s analysis of a murder trial revolves around the uncertain identity of a white woman’s foreign Spanish or Cuban lover (“‘Domestic Differences’: Competing Narratives of Womanhood in the Murder Trial of Lucretia Chapman,” 39–57); Lynn Wardley ties domesticity’s obsession with detail to West African fetishism (“Relic, Fetish, Femmage: The Aesthetics of Sentiment in the Work of Stowe,” 203–20). Several essays note comparisons of slavery to the oriental harem, including Carolyn Karcher on Lydia Maria Child’s antislavery fiction (“Rape, Murder, and Revenge in Slavery’s

- Pleasant Homes: Lydia Maria Child's Antislavery Fiction and the Limits of Genre," 58-72) and Joy Kasson's analysis of Hiram's *The Greek Slave* ("Narratives of the Female Body: *The Greek Slave*," 172-90). The only essay to treat the imperial dimensions of domesticity is Lora Romero's "Vanishing Americans: Gender, Empire, and New Historicism" (115-27).
- 5 Thomas R. Hietala, *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in Late Jacksonian America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1985).
 - 6 *Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia*, in *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy: Documents and Essays*, ed. Thomas G. Paterson, 2 vols. (Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1989), 1:202.
 - 7 Quoted in Walter La Feber, *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad* (New York: Norton, 1989), 112.
 - 8 Quoted in George B. Forgie, *Patricide in the House Divided: A Psychological Interpretation of Lincoln and His Age* (New York: Norton, 1979), 107-8.
 - 9 On popular fiction of the Mexican War, see Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1984), 175-204.
 - 10 Sarah Josepha Hale, "Editor's Table," *Godey's Lady's Book*, January 1852, 88.
 - 11 Quoted in Ryan, *Empire of the Mother*, 112.
 - 12 From "The Social Condition of Woman," *North American Review*, April 1836, 513; quoted in Annette Kolodny, *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1984), 166.
 - 13 Catherine Beecher, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* (Boston: Marsh, Capen, Lyon, and Webb, 1841), 144. Subsequent references to this work are cited parenthetically in the text.
 - 14 Ryan, *Empire of the Mother*, 97-114.
 - 15 Kathryn Kish Sklar is one of the few scholars to consider Beecher's domestic ideology in relation to nation building. She analyzes the *Treatise* as appealing to gender as a common national denominator, and as using domesticity as a means to promote national unity to counterbalance mobility and conflicts based on class and region. Sklar fails to see, however, that this vision of gender as a tool for national unity is predicated upon the nation's imperial role (*Catherine Beecher*). Jenine Abboushi Dallal analyzes the imperial dimensions of Beecher's domestic ideology by contrasting it with the domestic rhetoric of Melville's imperial adventure narratives in "The Beauty of Imperialism: Emerson, Melville, Flaubert, and Al-Shidyac" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1996), chap. 2.
 - 16 John L. O'Sullivan, "The Great Nation of Futurity," in *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy*, ed. Paterson, 1:241.
 - 17 Catherine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe, *The American Woman's Home* (Hartford, Conn.: J. B. Ford, 1869), 458-59.

- 18 Karen Sánchez-Eppler, "Raising Empires like Children: Race, Nation, and Religious Education," *American Literary History* 8 (fall 1996): 399–425; Ann Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's "History of Sexuality" and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1995), 137–64.
- 19 Although the cleanliness and orderliness of the home promises to make American women healthier, Beecher also blames a lack of outdoor exercise for American women's frailty, suggesting that the problematic space outside the home—the foreign—can both cause and cure those "difficulties peculiar to American women."
- 20 This generalized anxiety about contamination of the domestic sphere by children may stem from the circulation of stories by missionaries who expressed fear of their children being raised by native servants or too closely identifying with native culture. Such stories circulated both in popular mission tracts and in middle-class women's magazines such as *Godey's* and *Mother's Magazine*; see, for example, Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*; and Patricia Grimshaw, *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press, 1989), 154–78. The licentiousness of men was also seen as a threat to women's health within the home. For example, in "Life on the Rio Grande" (*Godey's Lady's Book*, April 1847), a piece celebrating the opening of public schools in Galveston, Texas, Sarah Josepha Hale quotes a military officer who warns that "liberty is ever degenerating into license, and man is prone to abandon his sentiments and follow his passions. It is woman's high mission, her prerogative and duty, to counsel, to sustain—as to control him" (177). On the borderlands, women have the role of civilizing savagery in their own homes, where men's passions appear as the foreign force to be colonized.

In general, domesticity is seen as an ideology that develops in middle-class urban centers, (and, as Sklar shows, in contrast to European values) and is then exported to the frontier and empire, where it meets challenges and must adapt. It remains to be studied how domestic discourse might develop out of the confrontation with foreign cultures in what has been called the "contact zone" of frontier and empire.

- 21 Sklar, *Catherine Beecher*, 163; Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 51–54.
- 22 Nina Baym, "Onward Christian Women: Sarah J. Hale's History of the World," *New England Quarterly* 63 (June 1990): 249–70.
- 23 Sarah J. Hale, "Editor's Table," *Godey's Lady's Book*, January 1847, 53.
- 24 Sarah J. Hale, *Godey's Lady's Book*, November 1852, 303.
- 25 Ruth E. Finley, *The Lady of Godey's, Sarah Josepha Hale* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1931), 199.
- 26 Sarah J. Hale, *Northwood; or, Life North and South: Showing the True Character of Both* (New York: H. Long and Brother, 1852.) See Hale's

- 1852 preface, "A Word with the Reader," on revisions of the 1827 edition. Further references to *Northwood* will be cited parenthetically in the text.
- 27 On the white ideological framework of African colonization, see George Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 6–22, 110–17; Susan M. Ryan, "Errand into Africa: Colonization and Nation Building in Sarah J. Hale's *Liberia*," *New England Quarterly* 68 (December 1995): 558–83.
- 28 Sarah J. Hale, *Liberia; or Mr. Peyton's Experiment* (1853; reprint, Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Gregg Press, 1968).
- 29 On *Liberia* as a conservative rebuff to Stowe, see Thomas F. Gossett, *"Uncle Tom's Cabin" and American Culture* (Dallas, Tex.: Southern Methodist Univ. Press, 1985), 235–36.
- 30 Susan Ryan, "Errand into Africa," 572.
- 31 Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981), 62–81.
- 32 Sarah J. Hale, *Woman's Record* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1853).
- 33 Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1980).
- 34 Sarah J. Hale, "An Appeal to the American Christians on Behalf of the Ladies' Medical Missionary Society," *Godey's Lady's Book*, March 1852, 185–88.
- 35 Susan Warner, *The Wide Wide World* (1850; reprint, New York: Feminist Press, 1987); Maria Susanna Cummins, *The Lamplighter* (1854; reprint, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1988); E. D. E. N. Southworth, *The Hidden Hand; or, Capitola The Madcap* (1859; reprint, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1988); Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852; reprint, New York: Viking Penguin, 1981).
- 36 Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987); Brown, *Domestic Individualism*; Richard Brodhead, "Sparing the Rod: Discipline and Fiction in Antebellum America," in *The New American Studies: Essays from "Representations,"* ed. Philip Fisher (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1991).
- 37 Cummins, *The Lamplighter*, 63, 321. On the male characters' involvement in imperial enterprises in India in *The Lamplighter*, see Susan Castellanos, "Masculine Sentimentalism and the Project of Nation-Building" (paper presented at the conference "Nineteenth-Century Women Writers in the Twenty-First Century," Hartford, May 1996).
- 38 On this split, see Elizabeth Young, "Topsy-Turvy: Civil War and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*," chap. 1 of *A Wound of One's Own: Gender and Nation in American Women's Civil War Writing* (forthcoming).
- 39 Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1992), 6.