

What Mary Knew:
The Location of the Reader in Charles Brockden Brown's
Edgar Huntly

Naoto Kojima

1. Between Gothic Romance and Sentimental Novel

One of the distinctive characteristics of Charles Brockden Brown's fourth novel *Edgar Huntly* is that there is almost no voice of women in Edgar's memoir. In *Wieland*, Clara Wieland plays an important role as the narrator and the leading character of the horrific tale. Contrary to its title, *Ormond* in fact consists of a long letter concerning "the history of Constantia Dudley" (3), written by her closest friend Sophia Westwyn. Although *Arthur Mervyn* has male narrators and the male protagonist, Mervyn's story is closely related to female characters such as Clemenza Lodi, Eliza Hadwin, and Achsa Fielding. In contrast to these novels, as Steven Watts points out, "*Edgar Huntly* betrayed virtually no sign of women." He argues that "these fleeting, often distasteful female images in his last major novel implied that for Brown, the acute social tensions of liberalizing change were creating gender tensions as well" (120). Developing these gender issues in *Edgar Huntly*, Elizabeth Hinds states that "[f]or all intents and purposes, the women of Edgar's tale have no more voice than the Indians, whose tongue Edgar knows but refuses to reproduce" (154). In other words, "*Edgar Huntly's* geography is fundamentally a man's world" (Barnard and Shapiro xxxiii).

As scholars have called attention, Brown's literary career has a crucial turning point after publishing *Edgar Huntly*. It is a move from early major gothic romances (*Wieland*, *Ormond*, *Arthur Mervyn*, and *Edgar Huntly*) to final two sentimental novels (*Clara Howard* and *Jane Talbot*) and then to journalism and cultural criticism during the 1800s. In April 1800, responding to his brother James's objection to "the gloominess and out-of-nature incidents of" his earlier fictions, Brown wrote that the time had come "for dropping the doleful tone and assuming a cheerful one, or, at least substituting moral causes and daily incidents in place of the prodigious or the singular." Thus he declared that he "shall not fall hereafter into that strain" (Dunlap 2:100). In fact, after *Edgar*

Huntly, he “never wrote another Gothic scene” and “would only write happy endings” (Kafer 185). As Watts sums up, “[o]n or about April 1800 Charles Brockden Brown changed” (131).

To be fair, we should note that recent scholars have questioned “the notion that Brown’s later career repudiates his earlier one” and that it was “the results of an unfortunate career move and . . . unworthy of serious study” (Waterman 186). Instead, according to Bryan Waterman, they stress the continuity throughout Brown’s whole career by examining how “his later editorial career, journalism, and even the late novels . . . take up the same questions that had fueled his earlier fiction” (186-87). Even if this is a reasonable observation, however, the fact remains that Brown’s feverish bout of creative activity during 1798 and 1799 drastically calmed down thereafter and he quitted writing fictions after 1801. At least as a novelist or a romancer, something happened to Brown in 1800.

As is indicated by the shift of the title character from male to female, Brown’s turn of literary mode is inextricably interwoven with the issue of gender. According to Fiedler, “Brown’s desire to return to the woman-centered novel with which Richardson began” is marked in his turn. “The later books,” writes Fiedler, “portray a world of female interests regarded through female eyes, perhaps partly as a bid for the alluring female audience that had already made Mrs. Rowson’s fortune” (99). Michael Gilmore states that the “pattern of oscillation or ambivalence toward women’s perspective persisted throughout Brown’s career” (650). With these remarks in mind, in this paper, I would like to demonstrate that the gender tension in “a man’s world” of *Edgar Huntly* is also a tension between gothic romance and sentimental novel,¹ and that it should be understood in connection with the location of the reader in this text. Edgar’s subjectivity and his narrative are always in tension with the recipient of his letter, Mary Waldegrave. Although Mary is totally silent and absent from Edgar’s tale, the relationship between the writer Edgar and the reader Mary foregrounds his repressed anxiety in this novel. By analyzing Edgar’s narrative, I show that *Edgar Huntly* can be read as a romance of reading.

2. Male-Male Relationship: Edgar as a Sentimental Reader

One of the most confusing elements in *Edgar Huntly* is no doubt the presence of Clithero. Most critics have regarded Clithero as Edgar’s “alter ego” or “double.” Yet although this conventional observation seems absolutely

correct, it does not tell us the reason why Edgar so eagerly cares about Clithero. What is really at stake is, to quote Bill Christophersen's questions, "what does the identification suggest? . . . What does Waldegrave's death have to do with Edgar's adventures? Why does Edgar become a sleepwalker? What does his somnambulism mean in relation to Clithero's? Why, in short, does the first half of the book [Clithero episode] exist?" (130-32). Clithero is an enigma for the reader as well as for Edgar. In order to think about these puzzling questions in this "charmingly, . . . maddeningly disorganized book" (Fiedler 157), I would suggest that one of the functions of Clithero episode is to foreground Edgar's position as a reader and his male sentimentalism.²

Let me begin by focusing on Edgar's first encounter with Clithero. Searching for clues to the identity of his friend Waldegrave's murderer, one night Edgar visits the Elm tree, where he sees someone digging the earth. He calls to the man but the latter passes him "without appearing to notice" his existence. Musing about this incident, Edgar concludes: "It could not fail to terminate in one conjecture, that this person was *asleep*. Such instances were not unknown to me, through the medium of conversation and books. Never, indeed, has it fallen for my own observation till now, and now it was conspicuous and environed with all that could give edge to suspicion, and vigour to inquiry" (*EH* 10). Thus Edgar first meets Clithero as a sleepwalker. This passage shows that before he listens to Clithero's history, and even before he recognizes the man as Clithero, one of the servants of his neighbor, Edgar becomes intrigued by the man's somnambulism. He observes that "[t]he incapacity of sound sleep denotes a mind sorely wounded" (11) and begins to "plan the means of discovering the secret that was hidden under these appearances" (13). To read signs and symptoms of the man's somnambulism is the central concern for Edgar in his relationship with Clithero.

Edgar's obsessive interest in Clithero's disease persists throughout the story. In the last chapter, after Edgar returns from his Indian-killing adventure to his hometown Solesbury, he has a reunion with his former mentor Sarsefield. With the hope of getting him to agree to relieve Clithero of his sense of guilt, Edgar tells a long tale about Waldegrave's death and Clithero's sleepwalking. Contrary to Edgar's expectation, however, Sarsefield refuses to "cure" Clithero by saying this: "Common ills are not without a cure less than death, but here, all remedies are vain. Consciousness itself is the malady; the pest; of which he only is cured who ceases to think" (184). Here Edgar and Sarsefield make different observations about Clithero's mental disorder. Both

posit themselves “as a physician observing Clithero, the diseased patient” (Murison 256), but while Edgar believes it is curable by shaking off his obsessive thought, Sarsefield says unlike “common ills” it is incurable unless he “ceases to think.” Therefore, for Sarsefield, “[t]o prolong his life, would be merely to protract his misery” (*EH* 184). More important to my discussion here is the fact that Sarsefield defines consciousness as the “pest.” By paraphrasing the word “malady” in an almost unconscious manner, Sarsefield reveals that consciousness is contagious, and so is the somnambular self. In fact, Edgar’s somnambulism occurs as if it follows Clithero’s disease.

Why did Edgar become a somnambulist? His first sleepwalking is conducted on the night when the “half indignant apparition” of Waldegrave visits him (88). Being reluctant to keep his promise to destroy Waldegrave’s letters and manuscripts, Edgar starts sleepwalking in order to conceal them. Therefore it might be said that a sense of guilt for Waldegrave is the reason of Edgar’s somnambulism, but it should also be noted that the ghost of Waldegrave appears just after Edgar reads Mrs. Lorimer’s manuscript. In short, he was infected with the “pest” through the act of reading. After reading her long tale “with unspeakable eagerness,” Edgar says: “By drawing forth events into all their circumstances, more distinct impressions were produced on the mind, and proofs of fortitude and equanimity were here given to which I had hitherto known no parallel. No wonder that a soul like Clithero’s . . . should be overborne by horror at the view of the past” (82). Mrs. Lorimer’s “fortitude and equanimity” becomes horror. Through reading, Edgar traces the other reader’s feelings, and becomes haunted by it.

The location of Edgar as a reader is clearly described in his response to Clithero’s narrative. Deeply moved by what he heard, he compares Clithero’s story with his previous experience of reading fiction.

I had communed with romancers and historians, but the impression made upon me by this incident was unexampled in my experience. My reading had furnished me with no instance, in any degree, parallel to this, and I found that to be a distant and second-hand spectator of events was widely different from witnessing them myself and partaking in their consequences. My judgment was, for a time, sunk into imbecility and confusion. My mind was full of the images unavoidably suggested by this tale, but they existed in a kind of chaos, and not otherwise, than gradually, was I able to reduce them to distinct particulars, and subject

them to a deliberate and methodical inspection. (63)

Obviously here Edgar locates himself in the position of reader, and from here on, the novel's action concerns Edgar's response to Clithero's narrative. Michael Davitt Bell picks up this passage and identifies two different kinds of response in Edgar: "Consciously, he is filled with compassion, with a sympathy that overwhelms moral judgment—which is to say that, on the conscious level, he reacts like a good reader of sentimental fiction . . . Unconsciously, Edgar reacts to Clithero's story with a very different sort of sympathy. . . . Just as Clithero acted against Mrs. Lorimer 'in obedience to an impulse which he could not control nor resist,' . . . so Edgar is propelled 'unavoidably' into a 'kind of chaos'" (53-54). What I would add to his analysis is that this uncontrollable sympathy has effects on the reader's body (Luciano 6-11; Murison 260-65). Thus Edgar's body becomes somnambular.

Sarsefield exemplifies a different kind of reader. While Edgar retells his tale to him, he fixes his eye "upon the countenance of Sarsefield." He is absorbed in Edgar's storytelling, and "his indignation and his fury grew less, and at length gave place to horror and compassion." After a while, however, Sarsefield "recover[s]" and makes a comment. He acknowledges that Edgar's story is true and that "[a] tale like this could never be the fruit of invention or be invented to deceive" (*EH* 182), but his conclusion about Clithero is very rational and self-possessed: "I have listened to your tale, not without compassion. What would you have me to do? To prolong his life, would be merely to protract his misery" (184). He is immunized against the "pest" of storytelling. Thus, in this novel, the difference between Edgar and Sarsefield is described in terms of their readership. In contrast to Sarsefield, "a good republican reader," Edgar "reads like woman" (Luciano 6-7).

It therefore seems possible to define Edgar as a sentimental male. Detecting "the paradoxical figure of the sentimental male" of Edward Hartley in *Clara Howard*, the plot of which is largely a reuse or rewrite of *Edgar Huntly*,³ Bruce Burgett argues that "[b]y substituting Hartley for Huntly, Brown produces an early version of . . . the melodrama of sentimental manhood" (115-16). In the same vein, Leonard Tennenhouse regards Edward Hartley as a revision of Henry Mackenzie's Harley, "the British prototype of the man of feeling," and states that by constructing the successful marriage "between the American Hartley and the British Clara Howard" (74), this novel illustrates "how American literature revised the figure of the man of feeling" (73). From my

perspective, however, Brown had already created “the paradoxical figure of the sentimental male” in *Edgar Huntly*. Unlike his surrogate father Sarsefield, the embodiment of “man of reason,” Edgar exemplifies the man of feeling in American wilderness. In the following, I show that his sentimental manhood becomes paradoxical because of the existence of the female recipient of his letter.

3. Edgar and His Recipient: Mary as the Hinge

In *Edgar Huntly*, the act of reading is foregrounded not only as the matter of subjectivity of its protagonist but also as the framework of the novel itself, and Mary Waldegrave serves as the hinge between content and form. Her position is important when compared to Brown's other major novels. *Wieland* is presented as a long letter written by Clara Wieland, but the recipient of her letter is not identifiable. *Ormond* is also a kind of epistolary novel and the recipient is identified as “I. E. Rosenberg” (3), but this possibly German person seems to have no essential relationship with the content of the story. *Arthur Mervyn* has very complicated narrative structure, but as a whole, it is not written for any particular recipient. In contrast to these stories, *Edgar Huntly* has a distinctive characteristic as an epistolary novel. The recipient of the letter is clearly identified, and she has a very close relationship with the narrator: she is a sister of his dead friend Waldegrave and also his fiancée. Therefore, the reader of *Edgar Huntly* cannot read Edgar's narrative without being conscious of the other audience of this story. In this respect, while Mary is totally absent from the content of the story, she is always present as the frame of the novel.

In fact, we acutely become aware of her presence especially when the “sincerity” of Edgar is put into question. Among the more or less “unreliable” narrators of Brown's fictions, it is probably fair to say that Edgar is the most puzzling figure. Many critics focus on Edgar's unreliability, and some of them go so far as to suggest that Edgar may be the real culprit of the death of Waldegrave (Bernard 30-53; Christophersen 126-64; Grabo 78). Although it seems far-fetched to say that Edgar killed Waldegrave, the temptation to overinterpret Edgar's unreliability is quite understandable. This is partly due to the fact that he is a somnambulist, and that he is the only narrator in Brown's fiction who commits murder. Yet this is also because he seems too merciless and unfair to his recipient. When we detect some duplicity in Edgar, we already represent Mary.

Since Mary is absent from Edgar's tale, her name does not appear until Weymouth visits Edgar. In fact, one of the crucial roles of the intervening episode of Weymouth seems to introduce the recipient's name and her situation into the story. Weymouth, a former friend of Waldegrave's, comes to Edgar in order to seek the restitution of a fortune which he entrusted to Waldegrave for safekeeping, and he tells his history to Edgar. While this sudden appearance of Weymouth shatters Edgar's expectation of inheritance from Waldegrave and further aggravates his sleepwalking, it also reveals a lot of information about the situation of Edgar and his recipient. Until here, readers are unapprised of the fact that Edgar is engaged with Mary, or of the fact that Waldegrave and Mary lived in Philadelphia and now Mary lives alone in Abington, about twenty miles southwest of where Edgar lives. When Edgar readily agrees to restore the money to Weymouth without any material evidence (again, Edgar "reads" Weymouth's story with deep sentimental compassion) and tries to console Mary in an apologetic tone, the authenticity of his "memoir" is, if not negated, relativized to some extent. In this sense, I agree with Andrew Newman that Chapters 13, 14, and 15 function as "not only the structural fulcrum but also the thematic center of the narrative" (329), yet it is not because of the intervention of Weymouth, but because of that of Mary as the reader.

Then, what kind of reader is Mary? Although there is only secondhand information about her, we can trace the description of Mary's character in Weymouth-Mary episode. Reluctant to comply with her request for a copy of his brother's letters, Edgar says that these letters and manuscripts contain a "poison" of deism, and therefore "these letters would communicate the poison when the antidote could not be administered" (*EH* 89). Then he continues that women do not have this "antidote" by nature. He writes:

Thou, like others of thy sex, art unaccustomed to metaphysical refinements. Thy religion is the growth of sensibility and not of argument. Thou art not fortified and prepossessed against the subtleties with which the being and attributes of the deity have been assailed. Would it be just to expose thee to pollution and depravity from this source? To make thy brother the instrument of thy apostasy, the author of thy fall? That brother, whose latter days were so ardently devoted to cherishing the spirit of devotion in thy heart? (90)

By quoting this passage, I do not to intend to condemn Edgar for his overt

sexist remark. Nevertheless, it is obvious here that Edgar takes for granted the prevailing ideology that woman is more associated with sensibility and sentiment than argument and rationality. In refusing to transcribe the manuscripts for Mary's use, Edgar imposes the role of a sentimental reader on Mary and at the same time differentiates himself from her: "With regard to me, the poison had been followed by its antidote; but with respect to others, these letters would communicate the poison when the antidote could not be administered" (89). Moreover, reproducing Weymouth's narrative, Edgar notes that there is "little sympathy or union" between Mary and her former co-tenants in Philadelphia. They say that Mary "was a topping dame whose notions were much too high for her station. Who was more nice than wise." Although Weymouth acknowledges that their comment on Mary is so much biased by "prejudice and envy" (99), Edgar uses his privileged position as narrator, stresses Mary's intellectual weakness, and in so doing constructs his rational manhood.

4. Repression of Sentimental Fiction: Edgar as a Gothic Writer

As a writer of memoir, Edgar represses women's voice. For example, Edgar can understand words or "jargon" (138) of Old Deb, the Delaware Indian matriarch, but "Deb's language is not directly reported. Edgar allows her to speak, but only to the dogs" (J. Hinds 338). Similarly, Edgar somehow never quotes a single line from Mrs. Lorimer's manuscript (*EH* 82). The captive girl, who is rescued from Indians by Edgar, is "unable to talk coherently." Instead of letting her speak in the first person, he just notes: "I collected from her, at length, that her father's house had been attacked on the preceding evening, and all the family but herself destroyed" (122). On the other hand, however, Mrs. Lorimer and Old Deb are the two most powerful and propertied figures and play the role of patronesses of Clithero and Edgar. In this sense, as Elizabeth Hinds remarks, "[w]ith great irony, Brown has cast women in the most powerful positions in the novel" (158). In fact, the plot of *Edgar Huntly* is in a sense summarized as the transition of the patroness's role from Old Deb to Mrs. Lorimer.

In contrast to the nonspeaking Indian warriors who are "like the supernumerary henchmen in an action movie, whose principle function is to die, flagrantly, at the hands of the hero," Old Deb "is by far the most well-developed Indian character in the novel" (Newman 333). She is "the only Indian

who merits a name" (Sivils 293). More to the point, all districts of Norwalk were "once comprised within the dominion of" the tribe of Delawares or Lennilennapee, and Old Deb had "much consideration and authority among her countrymen" because of "[h]er birth, talents, and age." Huntly's house was built on the land of the Delawares after "perpetual encroachment of the English colonists" (EH 136-37). In short, Old Deb is an original owner of Huntly's land. Moreover, Edgar highlights his special relationship with her. According to Edgar, they frequently visited each other from his early years. She "contract[s] an affection for" him, and regards him "with more complacency and condescension than any other received." He "had taken some pains to study her jargon" and he even gave her "the appellation of *Queen Mab*" (138). He crows about the fact that her nickname "originated with" himself and that "Old Deb and Queen Mab soon came into indiscriminate and general use" (136, 138).

Thus, Edgar eagerly insists on his special knowledge and personal connection with Old Deb. The important thing is that in doing so, he qualifies himself as the heir to the wilderness of Norwalk. In this light, the battle between Delaware Indians and Edgar can be seen as that among the sons of Old Deb. As Jared Gardner persuasively argues, "Edgar claims his ownership of the forest, and the rights, skills, and qualities of the Indian, not by becoming an Indian, but by killing Indians" (75). To put it differently from my perspective, Edgar's desire is to inherit Old Deb by abandoning her. The Indian Uprising episode fulfills his wish.

While suppressing the language of the two mother figures, Edgar as a writer uses their property in order to construct gothic stories. Indeed, the most notable gothic scenes are set in their residence: Mrs. Lorimer's house in Dublin and Old Deb's hut in Norwalk. Both stories illustrate the logic of what Elizabeth Hinds calls "the anxiety of indebtedness" (152). She writes, "[a]long with their inherited gifts of patronage, Edgar and Clithero seem to have imbibed a resentment toward their patrons, for the other side of inheritance is indebtedness" (151). Clithero confesses his anxiety as follows: "No time would suffice to discharge the debt of gratitude that was due to her. Yet it was continually accumulating. If an anxious thought ever invaded my bosom it arose from this source" (EH 31). In this light, "Clithero's attempted murder of Mrs. Lorimer appears as an outburst of repressed vengeance for her overabundant gift-giving" (E. Hinds 152).

However, there is a crucial difference between Clithero and Edgar: Edgar can write a story, while Clithero cannot. Edgar eliminates his sense of guilt and

recovers from somnambulism by constructing his memoir based on the gothic logic of the anxiety of indebtedness. In the beginning of the novel, when he set out to write a letter, he had not recovered from his emotional instability yet: "am I sure that even now my perturbations are sufficiently stilled for an employment like this? That the incidents I am going to relate can be recalled and arranged without indistinctness and confusion? That emotions will not be re-awakened by my narrative, incompatible with order and coherence?" (EH 5). In contrast, when he is finishing his story, Edgar gets totally stable and satisfied: "Suspensions and doubts, by which my soul was harassed, and which were injurious to the innocent are now at an end. . . . The shedder of blood no longer lives to pursue his vocation, and justice is satisfied." He concludes, "[t]hus have I fulfilled my promise to compose a minute relation of my sufferings." By creating his gothic romance, Edgar frees himself from the past and even mentions his "schemes for the future" (187).

What is totally excluded here is, above all, Mary's story. Edgar successfully finishes his narrative by repressing the reality of his relation with Mary. What is not explicitly mentioned in his story is the fact that he will abandon her and marry Clarice in order to receive financial assistance from Mrs. Lorimer and Sarsefield. Seen from Mary's perspective, *Edgar Huntly* is a perfect example of sentimental fiction: the story of a virtuous but temptable heroine who gets dumped by her merciless fiancé when she loses her money. In this sense, it may be possible to say that *Edgar Huntly* is the reverse side of stories like *Charlotte Temple*. In fact, in *Clara Howard*, Brown adopts the plot of Edgar, Mary, and Clarice to a great extent and creates a more cheerful but unexciting story of Edward, Mary, and Clara. To put it differently, the fact that Brown has to write another story in order to revise the Edgar-Mary relationship indicates that scapegoating Mary's sentimental story is crucial to the aesthetics of *Edgar Huntly*.

5. Revenge of the Reader: The Gothic of Miscarriage

To be precise, "a man's world" of Edgar is *almost* completed when he finishes his long letter to Mary. His story will be truly completed only when his original concern, that is, to cure Clithero's somnambulism, is solved. However, "a strange reversal occurs in three concluding letters" (Grabo 61), and the real climax of this novel takes place not in Edgar's narrative, but in these supplementary letters, which are written several months after his narrative is

done. In these letters, Edgar's world is doubly undermined.

First, the ruin of Edgar's narrative is caused by Clithero. Edger, who "cannot admit the belief that his misery is without cure" (*EH* 189), goes to Old Deb's hut to see Clithero. Hoping to relieve him, Edgar assures him that he did not kill Mrs. Lorimer, only to reactivate Clithero's vengeful thoughts. The first two appended letters are written by Edgar, which inform Sarsefield that Clithero has set out to New York to visit Mrs. Lorimer with the intention of performing "a new crime" (192). His wish to save Clithero—and in so doing to save himself—is now frustrated.

The second incident derives from the first, and it is more critical in several ways. Although Sarsefield "designed that all these proceedings should be concealed from" his wife (Mrs. Lorimer), the second letter from Edgar was delivered to her and "opened immediately by her" in his absence (194). Then he states:

You know what is, at present, her personal condition. You know what strong reasons I had to prevent any danger or alarm from approaching her. Terror could not assume a shape more ghastly than this. The effects have been what might have been easily predicted. Her own life has been imminently endangered and an untimely birth, has blasted my fondest hope. Her infant, with whose future existence so many pleasures were entwined, is *dead*. (194)

What happened here is that Edgar's letter killed the reader's unborn child. This disastrous consequence has profound significance not only to Edgar as a character but also to Edgar as a writer and thus to the structure of *Edgar Huntly* itself, for it confronts him with the fact that his writing is fundamentally based on the abuse of his reader. It also reminds the reader of this letter—Edgar as well as the reader of *Edgar Huntly*—of the existence of another possibly pregnant woman: Mary Waldegrave. Although the text does not have full evidence of Mary's pregnancy, Weymouth's tale definitely implies the possibility that she "appears to be pregnant" (Luciano 13). According to Weymouth, Mary's co-tenants in Philadelphia "could not but mention their suspicions that she had good reasons for leaving the city, and for concealing the place of her retreat. Some things were hard to be disguised. They spoke for themselves, and the only way to hinder disagreeable discoveries, was to keep out of sight" (*EH* 99-100). Moreover, when we think of the fact that the story

comes to an abrupt end with the announcement of Mrs. Lorimer's miscarriage, the possibility of Mary's pregnancy cannot be ruled out. If this is the case, the ending of *Edgar Huntly* depicts the gothic of miscarriage. In the letter from Sarsefield, finally, the repressed reader returns: Mary returns to "a man's world" of Edgar. Thus, Edgar can no longer hold his stable position as the letter writer, and therefore he falls into the location of the reader in the end.

Notes

¹ I use the terms "romance" and "novel" in line with Richard Chase's classic explanation that "the main difference between the novel and the romance is in the way in which they view reality." According to Chase, "[t]he novel renders reality closely and in comprehensive detail. It takes a group of people and sets them going about the business of life." "By contrast," Chase continues, "the romance, following distantly the medieval example, feels free to render reality in less volume and detail. It tends to prefer action to character, and action will be freer in a romance than in a novel, encountering, as it were, less resistance from reality" (12-13). I also adopt Ian Duncan's account of gothic romance in this paper. "By the 1790s," writes Duncan, "the Gothic romance is a dominant literary genre that marks a decisive alienation of novelistic representation from its official province, 'real life and manners, and the time in which it is written.' . . . The Gothic rehearses a turn against 'real life' into the 'imagination' that never quite completes the passage into an alternative version of reality" (20-21).

² Steven Shapiro discusses homoerotic relations and male sentimentalism in the cultural context of eighteenth century Atlantic world and argues that "*Edgar Huntly* investigates the cultural politics surrounding the potential formation in the 1790s of an erotic based collective" (217).

³ Norman Grabo describes in detail the resemblances of the plot and characters between *Clara Howard* and *Edgar Huntly* (129-32). What I would add to his analysis is that the story of *Clara Howard* starts on the day after *Edgar Huntly* finished his narrative. Edward Hartley receives Mary's letter written in "Abingdon" and it is dated "Nov. 11" (*Clara Howard* 12).

Works Cited

Barnard, Philip and Stephen Shapiro. Introduction. *Edgar Huntly*. By Brown. ix-xliii.
 Bell, Michael Davitt. *The Development of American Romance: The Sacrifice of Relation*.
 Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980. Print.

- Bernard, Kenneth. "Edgar Huntly: Charles Brockden Brown's Unsolved Murder." *Library Chronicle* 33 (1967): 30-53. Print.
- Brown, Charles Brockden. *Clara Howard; In a Series of Letters with Jane Talbot, A Novel*. Ed. Sydney J. Krause. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 1986. Print.
- . *Edgar Huntly; Or, the Memoir of a Sleep-Walker, with Related Texts*. (EH.) Ed. Philip Barnard and Stephen Shapiro. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006. Print.
- . *Ormond; Or, the Secret Witness, with Related Texts*. Ed. Philip Barnard and Stephen Shapiro. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2009. Print.
- Burgett, Bruce. *Sentimental Bodies: Sex, Gender, and Citizenship in the Early Republic*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998. Print.
- Chase, Richard. *The American Novel and Its Tradition*. 1957. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. Print.
- Christophersen, Bill. *The Apparition in the Glass: Charles Brockden Brown's American Gothic*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1993. Print.
- Duncan, Ian. *Modern Romance and Transformation of the Novel: The Gothic, Scott, Dickens*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.
- Dunlap, William. *The Life of Charles Brockden Brown: Together with Selections from the Rarest of His Printed Works, from His Original Letters, and from His Manuscripts before Unpublished*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: J.P. Parke, 1815. Print.
- Fiedler, Leslie A. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. 2nd ed. 1966. Champaign, Ill.: Dalkey Archive, 1997. Print.
- Gardener, Jared. *Master Plots: Race and the Founding of an American Literature 1787-1845*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1998. Print.
- Gilmore, Michael T. "The Literature of the Revolutionary and Early National Periods." *The Cambridge History of American Literature*. Vol. 1. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 539-693. Print.
- Grabo, Norman S. *The Coincidental Art of Charles Brockden Brown*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1981. Print.
- Hinds, Elizabeth Jane Wall. *Private Property: Charles Brockden Brown's Gendered Economics of Virtue*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997. Print.
- Hinds, Janie. "Deb's Dogs: Animals, Indians, and Postcolonial Desire in Charles Brockden Brown's *Edgar Huntly*." *Early American Literature* 39.2 (2004): 323-54. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Oct. 2012.
- Kafer, Peter. *Charles Brockden Brown's Revolution and the Birth of American Gothic*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004. Print.
- Luciano, Dana. "'Perverse Nature': *Edgar Huntly* and the Novel's Reproductive Disorders." *American Literature* 70.1 (1998): 1-27. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Oct. 2012.
- Murison, Justine S. "Tyranny of Sleep: Somnambulism, Moral Citizenship, and Charles Brockden Brown's *Edgar Huntly*." *Early American Literature* 44.2 (2009):

243-70. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Oct. 2012.

Newman, Andrew. "'Light Might Possibly Be Requisite': *Edgar Huntly*, Regional History, and Historicist Criticism." *Early American Studies* 8.2 (2010): 322-57.

MLA International Bibliography. Web. 16 Oct. 2012.

Shapiro, Stephen. "'Man to Man I Needed Not to Dread His Encounter': *Edgar Huntly's* End of Erotic Pessimism." *Revising Charles Brockden Brown: Culture, Politics, and Sexuality in the Early Republic*. Ed. Philip Barnard, Mark L. Kamrath and Stephen Shapiro. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 2004. 216-51. Print.

Sivils, M. W. "Native American Sovereignty and Old Deb in Charles Brockden Brown's *Edgar Huntly*." *American Transcendental Quarterly* 14.4 (2001): 293-304. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Oct. 2012.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750-1850*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007. Print.

Waterman, Bryan. "Charles Brockden Brown, Revised and Expanded." *Early American Literature* 40.1 (2005): 173-91. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Oct. 2012.

Watts, Steven. *The Romance of Real Life: Charles Brockden Brown and the Origins of American Culture*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994. Print.