

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Neil Finlayson

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in English
York University
Toronto, Ontario

May 2019

©Neil Finlayson, 2019

Abstract

This dissertation contextualizes and accounts for the proliferation of representations of wander that permeate British Romanticism. The prominence of wander in this writing is an articulation of the embodiment of a new temporal mode, namely the quantified temporality of modernity. The study begins by identifying two main versions of Romantic wander: one that is free and naturalized, and one that is monotonous and dispossessing. The duality of wander maps onto two distinct aspects of clock time; a temporality that becomes increasingly entrenched, socially, culturally, and economically, over the course of the eighteenth-century. Through reading four explicit representations of Romantic wander, the dissertation argues that clock time's open permissiveness is performed in Romanticism as a rhetoric of free wander, while clock time's structured monotony is demonstrated by the experience of displaced and alienated wander. William Wordsworth's *The Excursion* (1814) rhetorically positions free wander as an antidote to the industrialization and solipsism of modernity that is encroaching upon the poem's pastoral space; however, the rhetoric of wander in the text becomes ideological, in its naturalization of an economical temporal expenditure. Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* (1814) demonstrates how the rhetoric of free wander is a privileged fiction, and shows how wander, when experienced by a nameless, connectionless young woman, is not only alienating, but dangerous. Samuel Taylor Coleridge's *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (1798, 1817) draws a link between the dispossessed wander of the Mariner and the newly mechanized, rationalized, and instrumental world he uncovers inadvertently on his voyage—the wandering Mariner becomes the first itinerant, individuated, and time-bound subject of modernity. Finally, Charles Robert Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820) functions as a cautionary tale of the alienation that accompanies modern subjectivity and its quantified temporality. Ultimately, wander functions as a kind of warning, as Romanticism paces the uncertain ground of modernity. The duality of wander makes intelligible the duality of the temporality of modernity—a time that is alternately the rhetorical buttressing of class and gender privilege, as well as a means of discipline and a form of dispossession.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother and late father, Jean and Ralph Finlayson. Without their love, guidance, and support, none of this would have been possible. Romantics both, from them I learned the importance of striving to “see into the life of things.”

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisory committee, Ian Balfour, Karen Valihora, and Kim Michasiw, for their insight and support, both as readers and teachers. In particular, I thank Ian for not only guiding my thinking on theory and Romanticism, but for remaining supportive throughout what turned out to be a very long haul. I would also like to thank my examination committee members, Douglas Freake, Mark Cauchi, and Marcie Frank, for their engagement and encouragement. I thank my fellow graduate students, for countless late nights of insightful conversations, and for their continued camaraderie. I thank my friends and family, for their encouragement and support along the way. To my brothers, thank you for looking out for me, and keeping things light. To my mum, for keeping us going spiritually and financially. Quite simply, I would not have been able to complete this without her. Last, I thank Lisa and Maisie for suffering through this with me for far, far too long. Their limitless good will, kindness, love, and encouragement kept us afloat when we needed it most.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter One	
Introduction: Wandering on the Clock.....	1
Chapter Two	
Spending Time: <i>The Excursion</i> and the Rhetoric of Wander.....	41
Chapter Three:	
<i>The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties</i> and the Limits of Wander.....	97
Chapter Four:	
Wandering through Modernity: Clock Time and <i>The Rime of the Ancient Mariner</i>	156
Chapter Five:	
The Fall of Wander: <i>Melmoth the Wanderer</i> and the Torment of Time.....	205
Chapter Six:	
Conclusion: The Warning of Wander.....	248
Bibliography.....	254

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Chapter One:

Introduction: Wandering on the Clock

There are two distinct versions of wander in Romanticism. Most immediately, Romantic wander signifies a free and unstructured movement that fosters imaginative growth and development. Wordsworth begins *The Prelude* by harnessing exactly this sense of wander when he states, “I look about, and should the guide I chuse / Be nothing better than a wandering cloud / I cannot miss my way” (1: 16-18). Coleridge likewise deploys this version of wander in “Frost at Midnight,” as he imagines, “thou, my babe! shalt wander like a breeze / By lakes and sandy shores” (54-55). This iteration of wander is echoed throughout Romanticism, from Mary Robinson’s opening call of “Spirit Divine! with thee I’ll wander!” in “To the Poet Coleridge,” to Keats’ “Ode to Psyche,” which opens, “I wander’d in a forest thoughtlessly” (2-3; 7). Despite this, wander in Romanticism is by no means an exclusively positive and freeing movement. Romantic wander is equally a forced, displaced, and alienating experience. As Susan Wolfson observes, Romanticism continuously represents “encounters with outcasts of all kinds—refugees, the poor, abandoned and fallen women, discharged soldiers, sailors, vagrants, peasants, north-country shepherds and smallholders, abject slaves” (8). This iteration of Romantic wander—evident in Blake’s opening lines of “London,” “I wander thro’ each charter’d street / Near where the charter’d Thames does flow. / And mark in every face I meet / Marks of weakness, marks of woe”—is far afield from a wander regarded as the very summit of an imaginative and integrative freedom (1-4). Wander in Romanticism is

both freedom and alienation; *both* individual possibility and abjection; *both* the trope of the Romantic bard and the trope of the Wandering Jew. To wander in Romanticism is to be free and unchecked—to be devoid of social parameters, and to be capable of envisioning and imagining new modes of being; however, to wander in Romanticism is also to be atomized and abject, to be uprooted and listless—to be over-determined.

I argue that the duality of Romantic wander, as both a movement of liberation and alienation, reflects the expansion and naturalization of the temporality of clock time that occurs over the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Wander in Romanticism—through both its instantiations—encodes the ways in which clock time begins to radically restructure experience. In “Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism,” E.P. Thompson calls attention to the significant shift in temporal consciousness ushered in by the sociopolitical promotion of clock time over the course of the eighteenth-century. Thompson argues that the onset of industrialization oversees the imposition of “a new time-discipline,” which calcifies into a “propaganda of time-thrift” “directed at the working people” (90). Thompson writes, “a general diffusion of clocks and watches [occurs] (as one would expect) at the exact moment when the industrial revolution demanded a greater synchronization of labour” (69). The expansion and enfranchisement of clock time carries out what Cesare Cassarino identifies as the “objectification” of time (226). Clock time disentangles temporality from traditional, cultural and economic practices, and, in so doing, transforms time into an objective and open horizon of being, in and of itself. However, this newly objectified time is established and structured outside of individual ontology, and becomes an

external site of temporal estrangement. Clock time appears to give time by rendering it an open and available object, but it does so by way of wrenching time free from bodies that are already temporal (226). “This is the historical conjuncture,” Cassarino writes, “when the double-edged liberation of productive forces from the various yokes of premodern social arrangements increasingly realizes the vital potentials latent in time . . . as well as increasingly turns time into dead and deadening time” (226). The doubled representation of wander in Romanticism—wander as free and wander as “dead and deadening”—encodes and figures the experience of temporality within the new and equally doubled temporal mode of clock time.

The duality of Romantic wander and its reflection of the duality of clock time, however, can be understood further as being comprised of both a rhetoric of wander and an experience of wander. The positive version of wander, as a free, natural, and developmental movement, constitutes a rhetorical fashioning of wander; one that makes an objective, quantified configuration of time acceptable and desirable. The negative version of wander, as an uprooted, compulsory, and alienated movement, represents the more authentic and genuine experience of time as homogenous, repetitive, and ceaselessly sequential. Accordingly, the positive rhetoric of wander is not a means of resistance or opposition to clock time, as one might imagine, but rather a rhetorical, if not an ideological, means of making clock time amenable as a new mode of organizing and articulating subjectivity. The positive and rhetorical iteration of wander renders palpable and acceptable the structuring of clock time, and assists in its naturalization and domestication. The negative experience of wander, on the other

hand, actively diagnoses the temporal alienation and dispossession of clock time. As I will argue, the positive rhetoric of wander proves to be accessible only to those who enjoy a marked class and gender privilege. The negative experience of romantic wander, however, lays bare the temporal alienation and dispossession of clock time experienced more broadly.

Embedded in the very title of what is arguably Wordsworth's most anthologized poem, "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud," the word wander might metonymically stand for Romanticism itself. Indeed, several of Wordsworth's canonized texts present wander of one form or another, from *The Prelude*, to "The Female Vagrant," to "The Idiot Boy," to "Resolution and Independence." Wander, in both its positive, rhetorical form, and in its negative, experiential form, is also prominent in the writing of Coleridge. While "This Lime-tree Bower My Prison" uses the word wander to convey an imagined and productive natural movement, *The Wanderings of Cain* depicts wander as a compulsory and alienated act. Wander, in both senses, is integral to numerous other texts that might well stand as canonical statements of Romanticism. Percy Shelley's "Alastor," Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, and Byron's *Don Juan*, which ironically "Forbids all wandering as the worst of sinning," each prominently feature wandering (1: 52). Romanticism also offers several presentations of the dispossessed Wandering Jew, from Mathew Lewis' *The Monk*, to Percy Shelley's first and last major poems, *Queen Mab* and *Hellas*. Indeed, Gothic texts are often powered by the wanderings of their heroine. The opening chapter of Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* presents the narrator's observation that "M. St. Aubert loved to wander, with his wife and daughter, on the

margin of the Garonne,” a movement Emily St. Aubert continues throughout the novel (1).

The proliferation of wander in Romanticism is rooted in the Romantic reclamation of the mode of romance. Susan Wolfson argues that “the rapid changes, new demands, and confusions of the age often pressed writers into imagining worlds elsewhere, the impulse of the mode from which the ‘Romantic’ era gets its name: the ‘Romance’” (6). Wolfson observes how the revival of the quest motif in Scott, Byron, and others, the resurgence of antique settings, plots, and spellings, from the “Ancient Marinere” to many of Keats’ poems, and the oft-used subtitle of “a romance” appended to many of the Gothic texts published in the period, all underscore Romanticism’s interest in the mode of romance (6). Indeed, both Harold Bloom and Northrop Frye call attention to the ways in which the mode of romance underwrites and animates Romanticism. Bloom sees the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries as, “the period during which romance as a genre, however displaced, became again the dominant form” (3). Similarly, Frye states that the “romance form revives” in Romanticism “so significantly as to give its name to the whole movement” (2, 37). However, as Bloom and Frye observe, Romanticism’s adaptation of romance enacts a pivotal transformation from the external to the internal, from a quest without to a quest within. “The movement of quest-romance, before its internalization by the High Romantics,” Bloom writes, “was from nature to redeemed nature, the sanction of redemption being the gift of some external spiritual authority, sometimes magical” (5-6). Romanticism takes the external, social quest, and transfers it into an internal and

individual quest of imaginative and creative freedom. "In Romanticism," Frye writes, "the poet himself is the hero of the quest . . . he turns away to seek a nature who reveals herself only to the individual" (37). The artist becomes the quester in Romantic romance, where "the most comprehensive and central of all Romantic themes, then, is a romance with the poet for hero" (37). Bloom attests to this, by claiming that Romanticism's interest in romance is "more than a revival, it is an internalization of romance, particularly of the quest variety, an internalization made for more than therapeutic purposes, because made in the name of humanizing hope that approaches apocalyptic intensity" (5). The Romantic poet, Bloom argues, "takes the patterns of quest-romance and transposes them into his own imaginative life, so that the entire rhythm of the quest is heard again in the movement of the poet himself from poem to poem" (5).

The internalization of romance, where the quest becomes an act of artistic self-redemption, however, is a double-edged sword. The self-wandering of the internal Romantic quester runs the risk of derailing into an endless solipsism, self-consciousness, and alienation. Frye identifies this danger in observing how figures of Romantic tragedy are characterized by their displaced wander. "The exile or wanderer," in Romanticism, "is usually isolated by an introverted quality of mind. Byron's *Childe Harold*, the *Ancient Mariner*, and Shelley's *Alastor* and *Wandering Jew* figures," Frye writes, "show us, in very different contexts, aspects of the tragic situation, from a Romantic point of view, of being detached from society and its conventional values" (41). *Hamlet*, Frye observes, is a crucial pretext for this tragic Romantic wanderer, as they both share an "excess of

conscious awareness over the power of action” (40-41). Bloom underlines the potential perils of the Romantic quester in observing how the internal quest of the Romantic poet is always in danger of veering into the swamp of self-consciousness. “The quest,” Bloom writes, “is to widen consciousness as well as to intensify it, but the quest is shadowed by a spirit that tends to narrow consciousness to an acute preoccupation with self” (6). The wandering quest of Romanticism strikes out to attain an imaginative and freeing artistic consciousness, but that quest is haunted by the spectre of the endless and alienated wandering of self-consciousness. “This shadow of imagination,” writes Bloom, “is solipsism” (6).

Romanticism’s harnessing of romance is thus alternately freeing and disabling. Patricia Parker shows how this duality and ambiguity is part and parcel of the mode of romance. “‘Romance,’” Parker writes, “is characterized primarily as a form which simultaneously quests for and postpones a particular end, objective, or object” (4). Romance has an object, but the very object of the form of romance is to place that object beyond reach. Parker states, “when the ‘end’ is defined typologically, as a Promised Land or Apocalypse, ‘romance’ is that mode or tendency which remains on the threshold before the promised end, still in the wilderness of wandering ‘error,’ or ‘trial’” (4). As a mode, romance dwells in uncertainties—it opens the prospect of social- or self-realization through wander, but does so at the risk of never reaching an end. Indeed, citing *Paradise Lost*, a text that emerged through Milton’s conscious rejection of romance, Parker shows how wander, as the spirit and the very energy of romance, becomes pejorative and erroneous. Parker states, “The multiple play upon ‘error’ and

‘wandering’ in *Paradise Lost* shares this aspect of the potentially endless,” and “the provision of a limit to ‘wandering’ in Raphael’s ‘be lowly wise’ suggests, by indirection, the possibility of trespass or transgression, and indeed it is Eve’s ‘wand’ring vanity’ which leads to the first trespass and the beginning of all moral error” (140). Wander, via romance, is associated in Milton with error, deviance, transgression, and trespass.

“‘Error’ in its many contexts,” writes Parker, “seems, indeed, to be weighted according to whether or not it has an end, or *telos*. The vain curiosity of ‘wand’ring thoughts’ that dream of ‘other Worlds’ is dangerous only insofar as it approaches Belial’s ‘thoughts that wander through Eternity’” (140).

The spectre of an endless self-consciousness and alienation that looms over Romantic wander maps onto the concern that the wandering of romance borders on error and transgression, which Parker finds in Milton. Wander in Romanticism, then, carries both the tradition of free and generative integration, as a harnessing of the quest-romance, as well as the possibility of error, abjection, and alienation. Romantic wander is doubled—it is at once the possibility of freedom and the danger of infinite dispossession. Wolfson confirms this duality, by showing how romance makes itself felt in Romanticism as both a positive, inspirational legacy, as well as a deceptive and illusionary pitfall. Wolfson writes, “Romance is not only the genre of enchanted dreams and inspired visions, but also of superstitions and spells, delusions and nightmare” (7). Romanticism’s adaptation of romance offers the opportunity for creative affirmation, but carries with it the risk of enchanted delusion. Wolfson writes, “the magical mystery

tour of supernatural romance may hold the keys to paradise or the passage to hell, or both by turns" (7).

The idea that romance in Romanticism carries with it the dangers of enchantment and delusion is underlined by both Barbara Fuchs and Patricia Parker. Fuchs argues that Romanticism's conjuring of romance is rooted in a naïve nostalgia of the past. The Romantic undertaking of romance, Fuchs claims, "revives and recirculates many of the topoi associated particularly with medieval romance, such as the marvelous, the magical, the mysterious," but fails to fully "engage" romance, and remains "not particularly interested in romance as narrative strategy or form" (122). Accordingly, it "privileges a certain nostalgic purchase on times gone by, idealizing what it imagines as the organic culture of a romance past, and its seductive appeal" (123). Romance for the Romantics is alluring, seductive, and misleading, Fuchs argues, it "beguiles these poets even when they know better, luring them towards an irretrievable past" (123). Similarly, Parker shows that for the inheritors of Milton "'Romance' was an ambivalent mode . . . because its charms were indistinguishable from its snares" (163). "*Paradise Lost*," writes Parker, "delivers a harsher judgment on the dangers of wandering and the post-Miltonic poems which are closest to the form of the companion poems frequently internalize the anxieties of the epic's darker moral, the possibility of wandering past a point of no return" (163). Romanticism's use of romance is freighted with the Miltonic concern that the wandering of romance opens the possibility of interminable alienation, "a dream from which there was potentially no awaking and a 'suspension' from which there might be no exit" (163). "From the Romantics forward,"

Parker claims, “the poet himself approaches the condition of the wanderer between two worlds, a solidarity doomed to an existence which is neither life nor death,” and “the figure of the poet as vagabond or exile becomes virtually inseparable from the differentiated, exiled nature of poetic language” (224). The wandering of romance then comes to Romanticism bearing both the possibility of freedom, and the dangers of delusion, misdirection, perilous self-consciousness, and alienation.

Critical assessments of wander in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British literature identify the wanderer as a figure who heralds the rise of modernity. Ingrid Horrocks argues that the figure of the wanderer in eighteenth-century poetry comes to “eclipse” the “metaphor of the prospect viewer” as a vital means of addressing the fragmentation of traditional society (666). Horrocks writes,

In the increasingly urbanized and commercialized environment of the second half of the eighteenth-century, in a world that was being changed by enclosure and the instability of empire, the wanderer came to importance in order to perform a similar generalizing function to that which had formerly been annexed to the prospect viewer in literary and political imaginings of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. (665)

The wanderer, argues Horrocks, emerges as a poetic perspective through which an increasingly atomized society might be reconciled to its own fragmentation. “The shift,” Horrocks writes, “involves a kind of stepping down, in both literal and figurative terms, of the writer and the imagined observer, from the hilltop to the fields and the town”

(666). Horrocks notes that “poets such as Thomas Gray, Oliver Goldsmith and William Cowper propose the viewpoint of a wanderer” in order to advocate “a new idea of community,” as older social modes begin to break down (666). However, in taking on this wandering stance of “mobility,” late eighteenth-century poets effectively usher in the “possibility of alienation from any place or position” (666). Writers adopt the perspective of the wanderer as a means of forging sympathetic social communities in a rapidly de-centralizing world; however, this very shift from a fixed and landed perspective to a mobile and uprooted one paradoxically furthers the very fragmentation that was being addressed. The wanderer, Horrocks states, “is developed in an effort to imagine how a rapidly de-centering society could still be represented as a connected whole, but carries with it into the very structure of its new identity elements of the anxieties that made it necessary in the first place” (667).

Harold Bloom and Geoffrey Hartman also see in the wanderer an anticipation of the anomie and atomization of modernity. Bloom observes how Romantic wanderers are part “of the Gothic Revival,” “its first version is clearly to be related to the ballad of *The Wandering Jew* in Percy’s *Reliques*,” but he reads this “major Romantic archetype,” whom he describes as “the man with the mark of Cain, or the mocker of Christ who must expiate in a perpetual cycle of guilt and suffering, and whose torment is in excess of its usually obscure object and source,” as a direct precursor and progenitor to the modernity of later writers like Dostoevsky (1). Hartman identifies the figure of the wanderer as a sign of modernity manifested by Romanticism’s struggle with self-consciousness, in the wake of the French Revolution. Hartman argues that one of the

chief concerns of Romanticism is its overcoming of the “division in the self” of self-consciousness; a division that he argues Romanticism identifies as “death-in-life” (558). Accordingly, Hartman reads the wanderer as a reflection of the burden of self-consciousness that Romanticism strives to transcend. Hartman writes, “the theme which best expresses this perilous nature of consciousness, and which has haunted literature since the Romantic period, is that of the Solitary, or Wandering Jew” (558). Hartman states,

He may appear as Cain, Ahasuerus, Ancient Mariner, and even Faust. He also resembles the later (and more static) figures of Tithonus, Gerontion, and *poète maudit*. These solitaires are separated from life in the midst of life, yet cannot die. They are doomed to live a middle or purgatorial existence which is neither life nor death, and as their knowledge increases so does their solitude. It is consciousness, ultimately, which alienates them from life and imposes the burden of a self which religion or death or a return to the state of nature might resolve. Yet their heroism, or else their doom, is not to have this release. (558)

The wanderer figures the burden of self-consciousness, where one has heroically extricated one’s self from the traditional, organic community, but then takes on the full weight of that isolation in the process. Wander, then, becomes the ceaseless and pained movement of this self-consciousness—free from tradition, and yet devoid of the consolation offered by the parameters of traditional society. Hartman aptly figures the

wanderer's burden of modernity by quoting an observation made by Yeats: "'I write, write, write,' said Mme. Blavatsky, 'as the Wandering Jew walks, walks, walks'" (559).

Margaret Doody and Fred Botting likewise see the wanderer as a post-French revolutionary figure of modernity; however, they regard this figure as a socially critical force in Romanticism. In *Gothic*, Fred Botting observes how wander either takes the form of a "defiant rebel against the constraints of social mores," or that of a roving figure of the "romance tradition;" but in both of these cases wander acts as a mode of social critique (92). Botting writes,

The individual in question stands at the edges of society and rarely finds a path back into the social fold. The critical distance taken with regard to social values derives from radical attacks on oppressive systems of monarchical government. Instead, the consciousness, freedom and imagination of the subject is valued. Usually male, the individual is outcast, part victim, part villain. (92)

The Romantic wanderer is a figure that embodies and continues the French Revolution's critique of oppressive institutions (Botting 93). These figures, Botting writes, in their "identification with Prometheus and Milton's Satan" are "heroes because of their resistance to overpowering tyranny" (92). Wanderers combat the "real evil" that is "manifested in government hierarchies, social norms, and religious superstition," a resistance to traditional structures of power that makes them heroic figures of modernity (93). Margaret Doody also sees wander as a movement that encodes the more rebellious and reforming impulses of modernity. Doody writes,

“Wandering” is the quintessential Romantic activity, as it represents erratic and personal energy expended outside a structure, and without progressing to a set objective. Impelled either by the harshness of a rejecting society or by some inner spiritual quest, the Wanderer leaves the herd and moves to or through some form of symbolic wilderness or wildness, seeing a world very different from that perceived by those who think they are at the centre. Alien and alienated, yet potentially bearing a new compassion or a new wisdom, the Wanderer draws a different map. (vii)

The Romantic wanderer’s quest is antagonistic to traditional social modes, and, according to Doody and Botting, promotes new and alternate ways of being.

As these critics maintain, both versions of Romantic wander function as signs of modernity. The free and empowered wanderer is an agent of social critique forged over the course of the Enlightenment. The displaced and dejected wanderer, on the other hand, is a dispossessed subject, who carries the weight of a newly alienating self-consciousness. Both iterations proliferate and circulate in the wake of the French Revolution. The duality of wander, moreover, reflects a duality that lies at the very core of modernity itself. In *Alternative Modernities* Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar understands modernity as inherently “divided” and “Janus-like” (9). Gaonkar argues that the concept of modernity contains two distinct and conflicting strains. The first is an historical, Enlightenment configuration of modernity that is characterized by the regulation and standardization of society “set free from constraints imposed by tradition” (2). The

second strain is an opposing “cultural modernity,” which, starting “with the Romantics in the late eighteenth century,” registers the disgust with “the middle-class ethos” and “its discounting of enthusiasm, imagination and moral passion in favor of pragmatic calculation and the soulless pursuit of money” (2). Modernity is the reorganization of society through the promotion of disciplines and institutions, but it is also an aesthetic resistance to this standardization and regulation, which puts a “high premium . . . on spontaneous expression, authentic experience, and unfettered gratification of one’s creative and carnal urges” (3). Gaonkar argues that the divide of modernity he uncovers is apparent in the duality and division that pervades arch-modern figures. “Marx’s ‘revolutionary,’ Baudelaire’s ‘dandy,’ Nietzsche’s ‘superman,’ Weber’s ‘social scientist,’ Simmel’s ‘stranger,’ Musil’s ‘man without qualities,’ and Benjamin’s ‘flaneur,’” Gaonkar writes, are all suspended between the “intoxicating rush of an epochal change” and a newly imposing and regulatory social framework (3). Gaonkar argues that these figures aptly personify modernity’s divided position, where one is “at once disengaged and embroiled, reflexive and blind, spectators and participants” (3). The duality of wander in Romanticism reflects a duality that lies at the centre of modernity itself: the positive, rhetoric of wander seeks to advance a new subjective mode through what it presents as a free and open temporality; but the negative, experience of wander demonstrates the alienation and atomization that clock time engenders.

I argue that the duality of Romantic wander reflects two responses to the singularity of clock time. The first response is the positive, rhetorical promotion of clock time as an open, deregulated venue of being; and the second is the negative,

experiential revelation of clock time as temporal alienation. In this light, positive, rhetorical wander becomes an ideology of clock time, as it strives to assist in the naturalization of what amounts to a disciplinary temporal mode. To be sure, both Anne D. Wallace and Celeste Langan each show how the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century emergence of pedestrianism has an ideological imperative. The rise in walking, Wallace shows, is due to an increasingly mobilized rural class brought on by the early phases of industrialization. Wallace argues that “the transport revolution beginning in the mid-eighteenth century . . . altered the socio-economic context of walking by making fast, cheap travel available to the laboring classes, thus increasing the attractiveness of travel in general and removing walking’s long-standing implication of necessity and so of poverty and vagrancy” (10). The ideological promotion of walking was also central to the process of enclosure, which oversaw the private appropriation of “almost all of the remaining agricultural land—about 50 per cent of England’s total cultivated area—by the mid-nineteenth century” (10). The tension between private land and long-standing public footpaths, “the controversy over public rights of way through private lands,” was somewhat attenuated by walking, as “English common law provides that public use itself creates public right of way” (10). Walking, Wallace asserts, became a means of “unenclosing that path, reappropriating it to common use and preserving a portion of the old landscape against change” (10). However, as Wallace argues, the re-appropriation of walking was less an act of resistance than it was an ideological naturalization of the enclosure. Walking, Wallace argues, gained a representational genre of its own towards the end of the eighteenth-century through

the reclamation of the georgic mode, which was re-invigorated by replacing the “ideological space vacated by the farmer” with the walker (11). Wallace identifies this mode as the “peripatetic,” which she claims “represents excursive walking as a cultivating labour capable of renovating both the individual and his society by recollecting and expressing past value” (11). Walking becomes ideological in so far as it strives to reconnect uprooted and atomized walkers back into a cohesive social domain. The rhetoric of walking, like the positive, rhetoric of wander, masks the disciplinary foreclosure of traditional labour practices through the positive discourse of organic mobility.

Celeste Langan also identifies walking with a kind of ideological work. In *Romantic Vagrancy* Langan figures “vagrancy” as “the framing issue of Romantic form and content,” through its promotion of what she identifies as “the *pathos* of liberalism” (14). Romanticism’s representation and “idealization” of vagrancy displays a “mobility that appears to guarantee to the vagrant a residual economic freedom, despite his or her entire impoverishment” (17). This move, Langan asserts, is seconded by the bourgeois poet’s “reduction and abstraction” of “speech-acts that appear to consolidate residual political identity,” where “the poet and the vagrant together constitute a society based on the twin principles of freedom of speech and freedom of movement” (17). The vagrant’s walk, argues Langan, and its pathology as marked by Romanticism, undertake an ideological obfuscation of the material, and work to naturalize newly emerging economic relations. Walking in Romanticism mystifies the material. Langan writes, “coming and going becomes, *in itself*, the pure form of freedom, an absolute

unmarked by origin and destination, by interest or antipathy” (20-21). Building on the work of Wallace and Langan I argue that the positive, rhetoric of wander ideologically contains, naturalizes, and renders desirable the temporality of clock time.

The entrenchment of clock time that transpires in the early nineteenth-century is the result of numerous economic, technological, and social changes that occur throughout the eighteenth-century. Mechanical clocks had been in existence since the medieval period, but their increased ubiquity and pervasiveness, and, moreover, their fundamental restructuring of economic and cultural life is a product of the eighteenth-century. G.J. Whitrow argues that time grows increasingly standardized throughout the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries. The rise of Protestantism, and Puritanism specifically, oversees the movement away from a more localized sense of time—a time marked by seasonal labour and religious and cultural customs—to a regimented, structured, and homogeneous time characterized by routine and practice. Whitrow states,

In England, belief in the uniformity of time was greatly influenced by the Puritans in their strong opposition to the practices of the Roman Church, in particular to the idea of special days in the ecclesiastical calendar. Instead, the Puritans advocated a regular routine of six days of work followed by a day of rest on the Sabbath, the famous Non-conformist ethic. During the course of the seventeenth century, despite the reaction against Puritanism that followed the restoration of the monarchy in 1660,

this point of view became increasingly influential, so that by the end of the century it had come to be generally accepted. (109-10)

Puritanism's methodical approach to life refigured time as a regulated and regulating horizon of religious and economic practice (110). Over the course of the eighteenth-century this Protestant-led notation and demarcation of time was naturalized, and "the abstract framework of uniformly divided time gradually became the new medium of daily existence" (110).

In addition to Protestantism, Whitrow argues that the rise of the "mercantile class" also greatly contributed to the increased standardization of time (110). Feudalism, Whitrow argues, connected time directly to the land: "as power was concentrated in the ownership of land, time was felt to be plentiful and was primarily associated with the unchanging cycle of the soil" (110). Accordingly, the move towards an economy of "mobility"—an economy governed by "the increased circulation of money and the organization of commercial networks"—oversaw the displacement of traditional and landed notions of time (110). This fundamental economic and social shift replaced the time "associated . . . with cataclysms and festivals," with time as the measure of "everyday life" (110). The onset of capitalism demanded a more uniform temporality, which cut across regional and cultural differences. Whitrow notes how the expression "time is money," which might well amount to capitalism's motto, clearly reveals the imperative capitalism had for a quantifiable and exchangeable temporality (110). Whitrow goes on to show how this temporal transformation is an eighteenth-century development. Time at the beginning of the eighteenth-century, as reported by

Samuel Pepys, still seemed to be relatively unstructured. Whitrow notes that Pepys “lived by the church bells of London and occasionally a sun-dial . . . [and] moved around from public places to coffee houses and taverns hoping to do business” (112). However, by the century’s end, clock time is less a passing object of observation than it is the means through which bodies are regulated and routinized.

David S. Landes argues that the increased structuring of time, that takes place from early modernity to the Industrial Revolution, reorganized notions of subjectivity. Technological developments in timekeeping oversaw what Landes identifies as the “privatization (personalization) of time,” through the increased availability and possession of domestic clocks and personal watches—a development that replaced time as a social and communal concern with time as a means of individual regulation (92). The locus of time was transferred from “the cry of the night watch, the bell of the church, or the turret clock in the town square,” to the “home or . . . person” (Landes 92). This transference, Landes writes, became “a major stimulus to the individualism that was an ever more salient aspect of Western civilization” (92). The rise of the personal and domestic clock assisted in reconfiguring time as an omnipresent and disciplinary venue of being in and of itself. The public clock, Landes states, was sometimes too distant to be noted; however, “a chamber clock or watch is something very different: an ever-visible, ever-audible companion and monitor” (92).

The increased ubiquity of clock time helped to generate and facilitate newly time-bound subjects, as both watches and domestic clocks “gave the hour at all times and in all places” (Landes 96). Time, under the measure of the clock, became a means

of constant, continuous supervision. As a result, clock time was instrumental in the manufacturing of the modern bourgeois subject (96). “A turning hand,” writes Landes, “specifically a minute hand (the hour hand turns so slowly as to seem still), is a measure of time used, time spent, time wasted, time lost . . . a prod and key to personal achievement and productivity” (92-3). The watch and domestic clock thus became the monitors of modern subjectivity—the means of organizing and regulating one’s actions. Landes writes, “what the clock was to the cloistered ascetics of the Middle Ages, the watch was to the in-the-world ascetics of post-Reformation Europe” (96). However, the prominence of personal and domestic clocks was just as much cultural as it was technological. Landes claims that these new temporally organized subjects were largely “North European and Protestant,” which was due to the fact that “the clock and watch industry [was] concentrated” “north of the Alps,” but was equally due to the “chronometric aspect” of “Calvinist Europe” (96). Landes writes, “Calvin himself, so impatient of ornament and distraction, accepted the watch as a useful instrument” (97). Innovations in the technology of clock making, and a Protestant worldview that valued a methodical and uniform notion temporality, thus combined to allow for the appearance of “a new kind of man, one who became more and more common with the growth of business and the development of a characteristically urban style of life” (96).

Landes observes how this expansion of clock time was nowhere as prevalent as it was in eighteenth-century Britain, where the clock making industry found fertile ground in Britain’s “efficient techniques, low costs, and access to large markets” (238). Furthermore, Britain was “a relatively urbanized society” and “the incomes of the

middle class were proportionately higher” than other places in Northern Europe, which made the “demand for timepieces” in Britain greater than anywhere else (Landes 238, 239). The result of these social and economic factors was a Britain “time-bound in its activity and consciousness,” and the growth and expansion of a “time awareness” that permeated all aspects of British culture (Landes 239). There arose, Landes writes, “a dense grid of coach services, competing fiercely not so much in price as in speed,” where “drivers were given locked clocks to hold them to their place, while the passengers with their own appointments to keep checked their watches” (239-40). In the British eighteenth-century clock time became the medium within which one thought, acted, and moved.

The increased regulation of British life through the naturalization of clock time is perhaps most widely evident in the changes that occurred in labour practices towards the end of the eighteenth-century. The rise of capitalism required a sense of time that was uniform and suitable to the demands of production. Capitalism needed to expunge the more traditional approaches to time it regarded as irregular and disruptive. The development of “the factory,” Landes argues, accomplished this, by ushering in “a new mode of industrial organization that had discipline as its *raison d’être*” (240). Factories, and the clocks upon which they relied, re-scripted labour practices and further established clock time as a means of regulating and disciplining subjects. Landes writes, “from the 1770s on an increasing number of workers found themselves employed in jobs that required them to appear by a set time every morning and work a day whose duration and wage were a function of the clock” (240-1). Labour itself was structured

and organized by the clock, and labourers were disciplined by clock time's routine, as workers, "coming as they did from cottages and fields," "felt the factory to be a kind of jail, with the clock as the lock" (Landes 241). In factory production the clock reigned supreme: "employers reserved the harshest fines for latecomers and absentees—that was the stick—while a favourite prize for good workers was a clock—that was the carrot" (241). To be sure, fear that owners had "some way [of] slowing or setting back the clock so as to steal additional labour" fuelled "workers' concern to defend themselves," and "led numbers of them to buy their own watches" (241, 242). Ironically, the very resistance to exploitation under a clock-governed mode of production was, in fact, only a deeper commitment to clock time.

E.P. Thompson also demonstrates how clock time became the dominant means of organizing economic and cultural life in Britain by the end of the eighteenth-century. Thompson argues that the Industrial Revolution was enabled by a change in time-sense that occurred over the eighteenth-century. Thompson writes, "as the seventeenth century moves on, the image of clock-work extends, until, with Newton, it has engrossed the universe [and] by the middle of the eighteenth century (if we are to trust Sterne) the clock had penetrated to more intimate levels" (57). Thompson goes on to examine the extent to which the social and economic changes necessary for the industrialization of the nineteenth-century relied upon "changes in the inward notation of time" (57). This change in the conception of time began with the increase in timepieces. Thompson observes that "there were a lot of timepieces about in the 1790s," where the "emphasis" upon a timepiece shifted "from 'luxury' to

‘convenience,’” and where “even cottagers” began to accumulate “wooden clocks costing less than twenty shillings” (69). The influx of timepieces fostered a harmonization and standardization of temporality that was necessary for industrialization.

Prior to the “synchronization of labour” demanded by industrialization, work, Thompson writes, was structured around “task-orientation,” rather than the clock (Thompson 71). Task-orientation is a more collective approach to labour that takes its time based upon the immediacy and urgency of a particular task, where the task sets the time of production, and not the other way around. In task-orientation, “social intercourse and labour are intermingled—the working-day lengthens or contracts according to the task—and there is no great sense of conflict between labour and ‘passing the time of day’” (Thompson 60). Moreover, individual work—not just the task-based labour of the community—was also free from the jurisdiction of the clock. Thompson states, “the work pattern was one of alternate bouts of intense labour and of idleness, wherever men were in control of their own working lives” (73). Prior to the institutionalization of clock time, work was irregular and intermittent. This is exemplified by customs like “Saint Monday,” a day of idleness that “appears to have been honoured almost universally wherever small-scale, domestic, and outwork industries existed” (Thompson 74). The lack of structured productivity and the “heavy weekend drinking” that customs like Saint Monday encouraged, thus became the target of Methodists and Victorian temperance tracts alike, which had the express purpose of installing a routinized and disciplinary sense of time based upon the clock (76, 75).

Thompson shows how this “time-discipline” was established and naturalized over and against the more erratic, and yet “humanly comprehensible,” time of task-orientation, through the implementation of a discourse and practice of economical temporal expenditure (60). Thompson writes, “we are entering here, already in 1700, the familiar landscape of disciplined industrial capitalism, with the time-sheet, the time-keeper, the informers” (82). So valuable was the measure of time to the regulation of labour, Thompson argues, that the “warden of the mill was ordered to keep the watch under lock and key” (82). This increased time-discipline was not limited to the factory. Thompson claims that both enclosure and agricultural improvement were equally invested in the “efficient husbandry of the time of the labour force” (78). Rural workers in the face of these top-down changes in agriculture could either be subject to “partial employment and the poor law, or submit to a more exacting labour discipline” (78). Alongside the repressive and disciplinary means of enacting time-discipline were more covert and ideological means of imposing clock time. Both the domestic realm and the school emerged as spaces through which time-thrift could be discursively marshaled. Thompson states that moralists such as Rev. J. Clayton advocated early rising and dutiful work, and Clayton discouraged the tea table, as a ““devourer of time and money,”” and frowned upon “wakes and holidays and the annual feasts of friendly societies” (83). Thompson states that Clayton was one of many moralists engaged in “the quite sharp attack upon popular customs, sports, and holidays which was made in the last years of the eighteenth-century and the first years of the nineteenth” (84).

Schools were also institutions of time-discipline regulated by the clock. Thompson writes, “once within the school gates, the child entered the new universe of disciplined time;” a discipline that also applied to teachers, who, at Methodist schools in York, were “fined for unpunctuality” (84). John Wesley, whose Methodism bears a name that stands as a testament to the significance of structured time, “rose every day at 4 a.m.” and “ordered that the boys of Kingswood School must do the same” (88). From these “Puritan, Wesleyan, or Evangelical traditions” the gospel of clock time becomes increasingly secularized and widespread over the course of the eighteenth-century, and reaches “its apogee” in the twentieth century “with Henry Ford;” via Benjamin Franklin “who had a life-long technical interest in clocks,” and who claimed, in his *Autobiography*, that as a printer in 1720s London he never “follow[ed] the example of his fellow-workers in keeping Saint Monday” (89). Thus clock time became over the eighteenth-century the dominant means of organizing and disciplining economic production and subjectivity. Thompson observes that the third generation to work under the clock “struck for overtime or time-and-a-half,” and thereby fully “accepted the categories of their employers” of a fully naturalized and entrenched clock time (86). By the end of the eighteenth-century time becomes that which “must be consumed, marketed, put to *use*,” and it becomes “offensive for the labour force merely to pass the time” (Thompson 90-91).

The naturalization of clock time that occurs over the eighteenth-century is evident in the fiction of the period. Ian Watt’s *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* identifies how the transition in the cultural understanding of

time was instrumental in the forming of the eighteenth-century British novel. Watt argues that the ascendance of the novel in the eighteenth-century was due, in part, to the shifting sense of temporality that began in the early modern period. Indeed, this transition in time-sense, Watt notes, oversaw the emergence of time itself “not only as a crucial dimension of the physical world, but as the shaping force of man’s individual and collective history” (22). Prior to the time of modernity, the classical world did not consider time to be consequential. Watt writes,

The restriction of the action of tragedy to twenty-four hours, for example, the celebrated unity of time, is really a denial of the importance of the temporal dimension in human life; for, in accord with the classical world’s view of reality as subsisting in timeless intervals, it implies that the truth about existence can be as fully unfolded in the space of a day as in the space of a lifetime. (23)

The timelessness of pre-modern narrative, Watt claims, becomes unhinged over the course of early modernity, which comes to view time as a venue of being in and of itself. The increasing significance of time in relation to human action is galvanized in the novel, which, as Watt argues, oversees the full-fledged formalization of time through its dependence upon causality, development, and change. The plot of the novel actively uses “past experience as the cause of present action,” where “a causal connection operating through time replaces the reliance of earlier narratives on disguises and coincidences” (22). The novel thus relies upon time as its very means of generation; the novel exists because time is perceived as a frame in which events transpire, and in which

subjects are transformed. “The novel,” Watt writes, “has interested itself much more than any other literary form in the development of its characters in the course of time” (22).

Watt further observes how the novel formalizes clock time through its interest in the minutiae of everyday life. Watt argues that “the novel’s closeness to the texture of daily experience directly depends upon its employment of a much more minutely discriminated time-scale than had previously been employed in narrative” (23). Stuart Sherman develops this idea in *Telling Time: Clocks, Diaries, and English Diurnal Form 1660-1785*, in which he finds a relationship between the continuous sequence of clock time and eighteenth-century prose narrative. Sherman claims that Christiaan Huygens’s mid-seventeenth-century innovation to clockwork—the regulating pendulum—greatly enhanced the precision of chronometry. The pendulum, Sherman writes, “immediately imparted to the machinery a new accuracy,” and altered cultural understandings of time over the eighteenth-century by recasting clocks as audibly perceptible temporal registers (4). Sherman writes, “the new clocks were the first to make the *progress* of time available to the sense by way of a running report” (5). The figurative, onomatopoetic “*Tick, Tick, Tick*” of the clock, Sherman argues, provided “an emblem for a new construction of time as series within series, concentric and cumulative” (5). This “new chronometry,” Sherman claims, became a centralizing factor in the construction of eighteenth-century narrative: “the serial and closely calibrated temporality that became a widespread preoccupation on clocks and watches became concurrently a widespread practice in prose written, distributed, and read over steady, small increments of real

time” (9). Clock time, Sherman asserts, gives rise to and conditions an entirely new mode of being that is reflected by the novel, but is also evident in “diaries, periodicals, daily newspapers, diurnal essays” (8). Sherman goes on to observe how this “new, pervasive textual timing” altered subjectivity as well (8). One began to see and understand one’s self through “a continuous self-construction, a running report on identities both shifting and fixed, private and public” (8). Clock time became the technology through which subjects understood and represented themselves. As Sherman notes, “diurnalists began ‘humanizing’ time on a new pattern at just that juncture when a new time was made available to be so engaged” (12). Clock time thus elicited a modal shift in economic, social, and subjective being.

Through the technological, economic, and cultural shifts that occur over the course of the eighteenth-century, clock time becomes the dominant mode of temporality in Britain. To be sure, this new temporal mode gains both a physics and a metaphysics in Newton and Kant. Wai-Chee Dimock argues that Newtonian mechanics, which were foundational for eighteenth-century thought, effectively translated time into space, by making time linear and homogenous. Dimock writes, “Space and Time are absolute for Newton not only in the sense that they are objective and immutable but also in the sense that they are fixed numbers, expressible as ‘absolute places’” (155). Time in Newtonian physics is transformed into an external, spatial set of coordinates that are both physical and absolute. “Conceived in this image,” Dimock continues, “time functions in exactly the same way as a spatial coordinate. It is a place, a location, a sequence of units on a calibrated line—and, for all those reasons, a

container to which any event can be assigned” (155). Through linearization time consists of spatial, sequential, and singular units, wherein each moment has its own designated coordinate through which time unstoppably moves. Time under Newton becomes a “container” of being—a sequence of points on a line one’s life transpire *in*—and in its formalization all time becomes homogeneous, equivalent, and standardized (156). Dimock writes, “Newton spatializes time and, in the same gesture, standardizes it” (156). Indeed, the enlightenment metaphor of God as the grand clockmaker demonstrates how time is understood as divinely and universally spatial.

Kant, Deleuze shows, transposes the absoluteness of time from the scale of the universal and objective, to the scale of the particular and the subjective. Deleuze argues that Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* envisions a new temporality in which time becomes the primary underlying venue of subjectivity. Kant internalizes the spatial and linear temporality Newton had ascribed to the universe. Time in Kant’s first critique is “*out of joint, the door off its hinges,*” which “signifies the first great Kantian reversal: movement is now subordinated to time” (27). Kant’s configuration of time, Deleuze claims, is “unilinear and rectilinear, no longer in the sense that it would measure a derived movement, but in and through itself, insofar as it imposes the succession of its determination on every possible movement” (28). Time under Kant is no longer an effect or response to movement or change—it is no longer the marking of difference or of heterogeneity—but is instead the means of determining and measuring movement. Time under Kant becomes a primary horizon of being. Deleuze argues that Kant’s configuration of time converts time into a formal entity: “everything that moves and

changes is in time, but time itself does not change or move, any more than it is eternal. It is the form of everything that changes and moves, but it is an immutable form that does not change . . . the immutable form of change and movement” (29). This formalization of time organizes and standardizes temporal experience. Deleuze writes, “our undetermined existence is determinable only in time, under the form of time” (29). The formalizing of time undertaken by Kant repositions subjectivity as that which occurs in time: “existence can never be determined as that of an active and spontaneous being, but as a passive ‘self’ that represents to itself the ‘I’” (30).

This sense of time, Deleuze argues, is the time of modernity, a time that is characterized by displacement and uprooted-ness. “Time,” Deleuze maintains, “is no longer the cosmic time of an original celestial movement, nor is it the rural time of derived meteorological movements. It has become the time of the city and nothing other, the pure order of time” (28). Deleuze reads the implications of Kantian time in *Hamlet*, whom he views as “not a man of skepticism or doubt, but the man of the *Critique*” (30). The “passive existence” of Hamlet is “eminently Kantian,” because “[Hamlet’s] own movement results from nothing other than the succession of the determination . . . [he] is the first hero who truly needed time in order to act” (28). Kant, on the other end of the Enlightenment from Newton, retains the notion that time is a sequential, spatial, means of determination, but relocates it inside the subject, and thus transposes the site of time (while retaining its form) from God the clockmaker to the modern subject.

In “Time Matters: Marx, Negri, Agamben, and the Corporeal” Cesare Casarino shows the philosophical and cultural traditions out of which the modern temporality of clock time emerges and coalesces, and underlines how clock time is fully realized under industrial capitalism. Casarino, via Agamben and Negri, historicizes and theorizes the “dominant conception of time in the West” as the “unhappy offspring of the arranged marriage between . . . the circular and cyclical time of Greco-Roman antiquity, and . . . the continuous and linear time of Christianity” (220). “The two patriarchs arranging, presiding over, and officiating at such a marriage” Casarino continues, “turn out to be Aristotle and Hegel” (220). Although the temporality of Christianity and the temporality of the Classical world are seemingly opposed to one another, the former represented by its linearity and the latter by its cyclicity, the two temporalities converge upon their privileging and enshrining of presence. “These two conceptions of time,” Casarino observes, “intersect at one point, namely, the instant” (220). Both of these representations of time regard time “as a homogenous and quantifiable succession of instants, in which each instant is understood as always fleeting and hence as inconsequential in and of itself, or, put differently, as acquiring significance only insofar as it negates itself” (220). Western time’s privileging of the present is thus forged upon negation, in which “each instant can find its realization and fulfillment only in the next instant, and so on ad infinitum” (220). Accordingly, time, in this formulation, is never had or seized, but rather endlessly deferred. Casarino states, “during such a time, we are always waiting—as our redemption is always already being deferred to that impossible instant which will end all instants and abolish time altogether” (220).

Western time is thus “understood as lack, negation, and destruction that conspires against the works of human history by bringing them down to ruination and reducing them to a heap of dust” (220). It is this sense of time, with its prioritization of the present, that prefigures and underwrites the clock time of modernity. Casarino, paraphrasing Agamben, writes, “such a spatialized, measurable, quantifiable, homogenous, empty, and teleological time found its apotheosis with capitalist modernity and . . . the specular and complementary temporalities of industrial wage labour and of bourgeois historicism” (220). Clock time is forged upon the traditions of western temporality, “a time against which humans must fight tirelessly by spatializing, measuring, and quantifying it” (220).

In spite of its actual negation of temporality, clock time’s objectification of time represents time as that which is open and available. The clock seemingly offers a new venue for being and a new time for action divorced from traditional cultural modes; however, this openness comes at a cost. Casarino states, “it is then under capitalist modernity that time as productivity is at once exponentially intensified and denigrated, at once exponentially potentiated and objectified” (226). Time freed up from traditional parameters affords new moments that can now be productively used, but those moments must now also be arranged along an external and infinite chain of moments, and therefore surrendered. This “double-edged” nature of clock time—wherein moments are available, but are only available by virtue of their fundamental in-availability—is encapsulated, Casarino argues, by Hegel’s remark, “Time is the thing existing which is not when it is, and is when it is not” (226, 237). The “Aristotelian-

Hegelian time” that underwrites clock time is the “homogenous succession of quantified instants in which each and every instant realizes itself only in the next instant, thereby negating itself in and as the present instant” (237). Clock time makes time available through its spatial objectification, but in that objectification time for the subject is endlessly deferred and infinitely postponed.

Clock time, like the modernity in which it blossoms, is inherently doubled or divided. It offers time as open and available, but also defers and postpones time indefinitely through its irreversible sequence. I argue that Romantic wander figures this exact duality. Wander is the movement of clock time *par excellence*. In its connotation as open and free, wander performs the promise facilitated by clock time’s objectification of time. In this formulation, time is geometrically and sequentially set forth, made available, and waiting to be filled. Wander as a free, spontaneous, and unstructured movement reflects the clock’s interpretation of time as open and awaiting. And yet, wander also figures the temporal dispossession that is underwritten by clock time. Wander as an endless, forced, and alienated movement mirrors the experience of time as a homogenous and interminable sequence. Wander, like clock time, is the movement of freedom in its formalization of openness; however, wander, like clock time, is the forced and ceaseless movement of alienation in its formalization of temporal deferral. Romantic wander, as both an iteration of freedom and an iteration of dispossession, doubles the duality that characterizes clock time.

The presentation of both the positive rhetoric of free wander and the negative experience of alienated wander, as they correspond to the positive and negative

valences of clock time, is exemplified by two of Wordsworth's poems. In "I wandered Lonely as a Cloud" and "Song for the Wandering Jew," wander signifies clock time—the former through its positive rhetorical fashioning of wander as that which yields time, and the latter as the alienated experience of wandering through clock time. "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud" begins with what appears to be a veneration of free wander. The speaker states "I wandered lonely as a cloud / That floats on high o'er vales and hills, / When all at once I saw a crowd, / A host, of golden daffodils" (1-4). Through the act of wander the speaker is placed in an open, unregulated, and natural space. Moreover, this openness allows for a harmonious communion with the natural world, "a Poet could not but be gay, / In such a jocund company" (15-16). Wander, then, engenders the experience of an open and unstructured temporality through this natural encounter. Despite this, what appears to be an unfettered temporal experience is, in actuality, underwritten and structured by the sequence of clock time. The experience which wander elicits for the speaker is actively deferred in the very moment at which the experience takes place. The speaker states, "I gazed—and gazed—but little thought, / What wealth the show to me had brought" (17-18). The experience itself, rather than occurring in and of itself, is, instead, projected onto an imagined future. The moment of experience is, in effect, transposed onto a future moment, rather than actually and actively being seized. The act of wander facilitates the delineation of time into a series and a sequence of moments, and in so doing, it inscribes the structure and sequence of clock time. The final stanza of the poem demonstrates how clock time's spatial organization of time enacts its endless deferral. The speaker states,

For oft, when on my couch I lie
 In vacant or in pensive mood,
 They flash upon that inward eye
 Which is the bliss of solitude;
 And then my heart with pleasure fills,
 And dances with the daffodils. (19-25)

The final stanza is composed of a recollection, “For oft,” that is delivered in the present tense, “on my couch I lie,” that is then channeled into a future-oriented sequence, “And then my heart with pleasure fills, / And dances with the daffodils.” This phrasing models time as a sequence of past, present, future, where each temporal space endlessly gives way to the next one. Within that sequence, the speaker’s experience of the daffodils is put on hold indefinitely. The experience of the speaker’s dancing heart remains temporally suspended, and altogether hypothetical or utopian, as the experience appears only as a deferred temporal projection. It is only after the twice imagined “And then”—only after a future-oriented sequence has been established—that something approaching temporal realization can be posited. The act of wander, rather than giving rise to a free and unfettered temporal experience, reveals how the seeming openness of time is, in fact, a surrendering of time to the sequential structure of the clock. The speaker’s wandering is, after all, “lonely;” a loneliness that grows into a deeper alienation in the poem through the “vacant” or “pensive mood” in which the speaker “oft” finds himself. The rhetoric of free wander as a point of access for undetermined time hides the structure of clock time it actively, if unconsciously, promotes.

In "Song for the Wandering Jew" Wordsworth stages the other version of Romantic wander—wander as alienation—and in so doing he demonstrates the temporality of modernity's inherently dispossessive structure. The Wandering Jew, the belatedly revealed speaker of the poem, recounts four examples of figures of nature finding a space of repose within the natural world, before describing his own inability to attain a resting place, as an uprooted wanderer. The Wandering Jew observes how the "torrents from their fountains," the roaming "chamois," the wind-tossed "Raven," and the cave-less "Sea-horse" are each subject to the chaos and flux of the natural world, and yet each finds its "Resting-places" within a seemingly inhospitable natural world (1, 6, 9, 13). The Wandering Jew, however, figures himself as the sole counterpoint. The final stanza of the poem reads, "Day and night my toils redouble! / Never nearer to the goal, / Night and day, I feel the trouble, / Of the Wanderer in my soul" (17-20). Unlike the water, chamois, raven, and sea-horse, there is no end to the "toils" of the Wandering Jew. Moreover, the difference between the Wandering Jew and the natural examples he cites is articulated through the language of time. Markers of temporality—"Day and night" and "Night and day"—are only introduced in the poem when the Wandering Jew describes his existence; and they are absent altogether from his description of the natural world. His own estrangement from nature is, in effect, conjugated through these markers of time, which render the Wandering Jew a temporal subject. Furthermore, the time that is outlined by the Wandering Jew is successive, ceaseless, and alienating. Rather than possessing time, he remains transfixed in a deferred temporal sequence, where he is "never nearer to the goal." Indeed, his

temporal alienation is reflected further in the disconnection that lies between the poem's title and the poem's speaker. In spite of the Wandering Jew being the poem's speaker, the title—a "Song for the Wandering Jew" and not a song *by* the Wandering Jew—denies the Wandering Jew that position. The Wandering Jew is cast outside of his own lament; objectified in his temporal objectification. The Wandering Jew's wander shows his temporal alienation and reflects clock time's ceaseless sequence of "day and night, night and day."

Through its two modalities, Romantic wander represents the fundamental restructuring of experience elicited by the temporality of modernity. The rhetorical positioning of wander as free and positive signifies clock time's promise of freeing up time and making it available as an open, objective, and sequential space of being. However, the experience of wander as dispossession and alienation figures the fundamental negation of time that underwrites this homogeneous temporal sequence. By reading four texts that feature explicit and emphatic figures of wander, I trace out a shift from the rhetorical fashioning of free wander to the representation of the alienating experience of wander. I begin with Wordsworth's *The Excursion* to show how the rhetoric of wander is presented as an antipode to modernity. Wordsworth's long poem tries to buttress free wander as a means of staving off the excessive solipsism of an encroaching, alienating modernity; however, his venerated old Wanderer advances a mode of purposive walking and economic time-management that shows the rhetoric of wander to be in the service of naturalizing an emerging economic liberalism—one that demands both productive movement and a thrifty stewardship of time. Next, I look to

Frances Burney's *The Wanderer: or Female Difficulties* to demonstrate how the rhetoric of free wander functions as an ideology that masks class and gender privilege. Burney's wandering protagonist—an initially nameless, connectionless exile of the French Revolution—strives to make use of clock time as an open means of attaining economic independence, but it proves to be a dead-end; then, Juliet attempts to live the Romantic rhetoric of wander as a mode of freedom, but that also fails. The novel shows how access to free and open time is inherently class and gender dependent, and, as a result, the rhetoric of free wander is exposed as a fiction. In spite of Juliet's efforts, *The Wanderer* shows free time and free wander to be privileged modalities, possible only through the maintenance of authoritative social typologies of class and gender. I then turn to Coleridge's *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, which shows the experience of wander to be the very movement of social and temporal alienation. The Mariner's killing of the Albatross encodes an ethos of modernity, with its individualism, scientific speculation, economic and cultural exploitation, and its geometric, cartographical organization of space and time. The Mariner's irreversible arrow performs the movement into the new, successive temporality of modernity, and the effect of his transition is a ceaseless, displaced, and alienating wander. Finally, I look to Charles Robert Maturin's 1820 Gothic novel *Melmoth the Wanderer* to demonstrate how the experience of wander signifies transparently the alienation and dispossession of the temporality of modernity. The wander of the novel's eponymous quasi-protagonist is coextensive with the transposition of his organic life and time for a temporally constrained sentence of 150 years, which he has brokered infernally. The Wanderer's

life is time as quantity, measure, and sequence; and the effect of his temporal alienation is figured through his wander. However, the Wanderer's wander is more than alienation, he is an anti-social figure of menace and anomie. The Wanderer's wander signifies the violent, instrumental rationalism of modernity—an excessive individualism that systematizes and tortures bodies, localities, and moments, into disciplinary and determinative chronological sequences. The Wanderer is effectively the unrepentant Mariner, a figure whose wander encodes his membership and complicity in a violent modernity, which his heirs—both familial, as well as cultural and historical—must witness, heed, and strive to recover from.

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Chapter Two:

Spending Time: *The Excursion* and the Rhetoric of Wander

Wordsworth's 1814 dramatic poem *The Excursion* traces out the Poet's, the Wanderer's, and the Pastor's attempts at the "renovation" and "healing" of the despondent, "wounded spirit" of the Solitary (9: 784, 785). Having experienced individual tragedy, with the premature deaths of his wife and two young children, and then public, political tragedy, with the zealotry and corruption of the French Revolution, the Solitary has retreated to the "rugged hills" of remote, northern England "where now he dwells, / And wastes the sad remainder of his hours / In self-indulging spleen" (2:326-328). The excursion that constitutes *The Excursion*, then, becomes a means of redressing this excessive solipsism, where the Wanderer, Poet, Pastor, and Solitary wander, in order to reconnect the alienated Solitary to the "Mind's excursive Power" (4: 1259). Despite this, the Solitary's despondent withdrawal is rooted in his experience of an abrupt and incomprehensible mutability that is not unique to him alone. Indeed, mutability and change stand as ominous spectres on the horizon of the pastoral space of *The Excursion*, from the loss of traditional economic and cultural relations, to the disruption and displacement caused by war, to the growth of "huge Town[s]" "from the germ / Of some poor Hamlet," to the appearance of what Blake calls "dark Satanic mills" (8: 121, 119-120). The mutability that strikes the Solitary—the same that levels Robert and Margaret in the Wanderer's account of the ruined cottage of Book I, and the same that reappears throughout the poem to threaten traditional institutions—signals the

emergence and experience of a new temporal mode that formalizes time as a sequence of change, and externalizes time as a determinative and definitive venue of being in and of itself; namely, the temporality of clock time. However, the wandering that is presented as a means of attenuating the despondency and dispossession of clock time turns out to be a decidedly more mandatory and purposive movement than one might imagine—a movement that actively re-inscribes clock time, rather than overturning it. Intentional and purposive wander becomes a means of occupying and spending time, and, in so doing, this wander reinstates the successive temporality of clock time it seemed intent on counteracting. Rather than overcoming the mutability and alienation of clock time, wander in *The Excursion* is a purposive movement, the seeming freedom of which is, in actuality, an ideological underpinning of the movement of clock time.

Since the time of its publication *The Excursion* has been maligned by a critical tradition of “romantic humanism” that prioritizes a more visionary poetic stance (Galperin 31). William Galperin writes, “from Coleridge to Hazlitt to Arnold to present day, it has become the ‘tradition’ of Wordsworth criticism to enlist the poem as a warning sign of Wordsworth’s decline” (29). Geoffrey Hartman presents a softened version of this narrative of decline when he argues that “*The Excursion* offers us not a vision, but a voice,” and that it deploys a “visionary element” that is “almost denuded of visual supports,” wherein “the poet’s flight from vision causes a warp of obliquity felt throughout *The Excursion*” (292, 293). This critical narrative draws its strength from the religious dogmatism it finds in some of the text’s speakers, and from the apostasy it locates in its writer—a critical impulse Galperin sees as “the efforts in the long run to

save Wordsworth from himself" (31). Despite this, the poem, as more recent criticism shows, is far more dialogic than this critical narrative allows. Frances Ferguson has shown that "the strangeness of *The Excursion*, is that it is the Reader's rather than the Poet's poem," and that in the poem "perception and reading are allied (and occasionally identical) operations" (205, 204). This "curious reversal of the Poet-Reader relationship," Ferguson argues, presents a "challenge" to the "moral authority of poetry" (205, 206). Ferguson writes, "One of the most striking features of *The Excursion* is the proliferation of near-poets. The Wanderer (that poet sown by nature), the Solitary (a former preacher and political rhetorician), the Pastor (the pronouncer both of sermons and of 'authentic epitaphs'), and the Poet overpopulate the rhetorical field" (208). Richard Gravil also overturns this critical narrative and similarly paces the text's rhetorical ground, by identifying the irony that underwrites this dramatic poem. Rather than reading the poem as a monologic, Wordsworthian statement, Gravil finds an ironic staging of four subtly differentiated figures: the Wanderer, "to whom Wordsworth gives his own childhood and experience of nature;" the Solitary "in whom Wordsworth expresses his own experience of revolutionary sympathies and his own moral crisis;" the Poet "who is less Wordsworth than either of these;" and the Pastor, who is "(perhaps) Wordsworth as he might have been if he had followed the family expectations that he would take holy orders" (144). Gravil goes on to show how the perceived identities of these poetic speakers are consistently undermined. "It tends to be assumed that the Solitary is indeed a cynic, even a misanthrope," Gravil writes, but "is he really as bad as that? And, come to that, is the Wanderer as good as that?" (145). The Solitary "has

ample cause to be miserable,” and the Wanderer’s “unbending, almost Asberger’s—like discourse” should not be so readily taken at face value (145, 147). Furthermore, the Wanderer and the Pastor, the two chief advocates of the poem’s seeming promotion of a naturalized English order, Grivil claims, might themselves be “at times, at least, ‘straw men’” (146). For Grivil, the irony of the text’s speakers undercuts the poem’s perceived didacticism, and he claims the poem might be more productively read not as a “dogmatic poem,” but “as a quasi-dramatic contest of ideas, in which there is pointedly no outcome” (146). Following this more recent criticism, I argue *The Excursion* presents a rhetorical space in which authority remains contested and contestable because it effectively maps out the transition from a more agrarian and homogeneous social compact to a rapidly industrializing, heterogeneous, and mutable world. Accordingly, poetic authority necessarily becomes an un-authoritative and singular voice among many, and the visionary poetic utterance becomes yet another rhetorical prescription.

To that end, *The Excursion* presents a rhetorical version of wander as a free and freeing movement that keeps one attuned to a rustic and natural life; a life immune from the perils of despondency. This rhetoric of wander is personified and espoused, mainly, by the figure of the Wanderer himself—a figure “brought up in nature, by nature,” who “stands before us as the embodiment of natural wisdom,” as Geoffrey Hartman observes (305). The Wanderer is introduced through the admiring perspective of the Poet, whose depiction of the Wanderer’s youth valorizes the pure and simple life, devoid of spatial and temporal restraint. The Wanderer was raised “Far from sight the City spire, or sound / Of Minster clock!” (1: 140-141), was at a young age “sent abroad /

In summer to tend herds," (1: 216-217), and as a youth "oftentimes deceived / The listless hour, while in the hollow vale, / Hollow and green, he lay on the green turf / In pensive idleness" (1: 279-282). The bucolic wandering of the Wanderer's life, the Poet shows, has bestowed upon him a natural wisdom—what Hartman reads as his ability to look "at nature as a seer" (303). The Poet states, "From his native hills / He wandered far; much did he see of Men / Their manners, their enjoyments, and pursuits, / Their passions, and their feelings; chiefly those / Essential and eternal in the heart" (1: 369-373). And it is through "his habitual wanderings out of doors" that he comes to acquire "his religion," "Self-taught, as of a dreamer in the woods" (1: 434, 439, 440). As Richard Gravil argues, the Wanderer, imbued with Wordsworth's "own childhood and experience of nature," is "Wordsworth as he might have been had he not gone to Cambridge" (144).

The Poet continues to position wander as essential to a naturally integrated life in his depiction of his and the Wanderer's friendship. As the Wanderer's "chosen Comrade," the Poet recalls how wander functions as a privileged point of access to a free and spiritually engaged life (1: 64). The Poet states,

On holidays, we wandered through the woods,
 A pair of random travellers; we sate—
 We walked; he pleas'd me with his sweet discourse
 Of things which he had seen; and often touch'd
 Abstrusest matter, reasonings of the mind
 Tuned inward; or at my request he sang

Old songs—the product of his native hills. (1: 64-71)

Wander is linked with freedom, fellowship, lofty contemplation, and the prolonged revival of local and rustic customs. The Poet maintains his own rhetorical veneration of wander as the excursion gets underway. As the Poet and the Wanderer make their way to the Solitary's valley, the Poet extolls the political virtues of wander, by identifying it as an egalitarian and democratic movement. The Poet observes,

The Wealthy, the Luxurious, by the stress
 Of business roused, or pleasure, ere their time,
 May roll in chariots, or provoke the hoofs
 Of the fleet coursers they bestride, to raise
 From earth the dust of morning, slow to rise;
 And They, if blessed with health and hearts at ease,
 Shall lack not their enjoyment: —but how faint
 Compared with our's! who, pacing side by side,
 Could with an eye of leisure look on all
 That we beheld. (2: 101-109)

Not only does wander keep one naturally and culturally integrated, but it facilitates an economic freedom as well, where class hierarchies are overcome by eschewing horse and carriage for “the middle of the public way” (1:39). Both the Poet and the Wanderer rhetorically establish wander as the movement of a naturalized liberty.

Wordsworth's revision and transformation of the Pedlar from *The Ruined Cottage* to the Wanderer of *The Excursion* highlights *The Excursion's* rhetorical praise of

wander. Critics have shown how early reviewers took issue with the Wanderer's former occupation of peddling. Quentin Bailey observes that "critics objected to the Wanderer's social status," and, as proof, Bailey cites Hazlitt's claim, "we go along with him, while he is the subject of his narrative, but we take leave of him when he makes pedlars and ploughmen his heroes and the interpreters of his sentiments" (113). Sally Bushell shows that Francis Jeffrey's review of *The Excursion* in *The Edinburgh Review* likewise rooted its censure "primarily in terms of class" (3). Bushell writes, "Jeffrey famously began his review with the statement 'This will never do!' and went on to ask, 'Why should Mr Wordsworth have made his hero a superannuated Pedlar?'" (3-4). Bailey suggests that "Wordsworth's caution" in distancing the Wanderer from his peddling was a response to "the disrepute in which pedlars were held" (114). Pedlars, Bailey writes, had "for several decades been subjected to a number of regulations and were frequently harassed by magistrates and constables" because they "were widely held to be the backbone of the trade in pilfered and stolen goods; they were also implicated in the huge trade in counterfeit money" (114). However, Pedlars were also "an essential part of the rural economy, providing goods and services no one else could" (Bailey 115). Bailey attests to this by quoting Charles Lamb's review of *The Excursion*, wherein Lamb praises Wordsworth's "recognition that the pedlars of the period provided a spiritual as well as a material service to the communities they served" (115). Wordsworth thus emphasizes and escalates the spiritual dimension of the rustic pedlar in his upgrading of the Pedlar to the Wanderer.

The shift from pedlar to wanderer spiritualizes and de-commercializes the Wanderer. The Poet stresses the past social centrality of pedlars, by observing that although “their hard service” might be “deemed debasing now,” it had “Gained merited respect in simpler times; / When Squire, and Priest, and they who round them dwelt / In rustic sequestration, all, dependent / Upon the PEDLAR’S toil” (1: 354, 355-358). The Poet refigures this itinerant, commercial lifestyle as solid footing for a general understanding of British society. The Poet furthers this by underlining the solemn and natural morality the Wanderer has acquired from his peddling: “In the woods, / A lone Enthusiast, and among the fields, / Itinerant in this labour, he had passed / The better portion of his time” (1: 376-379). Peddling is figured as a vital precursor to the more spiritual act of wander. Indeed, after retirement, the Wanderer continues to wander: “His Calling laid aside, he lived at ease: / But still he loved to pace the public roads” (1:414-417). Wander becomes more than a calling, and that which one never lays aside. As Frances Ferguson states, “the biography of the Wanderer, which the Poet relates, does much less to establish the character of the Wanderer than to reveal the tenuousness of his links to the earth,” and ““the excursive power’ of the Wanderer’s mind depends greatly upon the fact that he is no longer tied to any vocation—even one so peripatetic as that of a pedlar” (201).

Although *The Excursion* presents a rhetorical fashioning of wander as a free and natural movement, it also reveals wander to be a rarified endeavour that is increasingly under threat. At different times, both the Poet and the Solitary link the Wanderer to the tradition of medieval romance. The Poet observes, “In days of yore how fortunately

fared / The Minstrel! wandering on from Hall to Hall, / Baronial Court or Royal; cheered
 with gifts" (2: 1-4). By positioning the Wanderer as a living incarnation of this
 tradition—as one who “walked—protected from the sword of war”—the Poet couches
 the act of wander within an historical tradition of freedom and social mobility (2: 13).
 The Solitary similarly casts the Wanderer as a medieval figure of romance, although as a
 knight-errant, rather than a minstrel: “Errant Those, / Exiles and Wanderers—and the
 likes are These; / Who, with their burthen, traverse hill and dale, / Carrying relief for
 Nature’s simple wants” (8: 47-50). The Wanderer’s placement within this tradition
 continues the rhetorical construction of wander as a free and historical right of way, but
 it also positions the Wanderer as a thing of the past. Indeed, the Wanderer responds to
 the Solitary by declaring the disappearance of his former profession. The Wanderer
 states, “But, if to these Wayfarers once pertained / Aught of romantic interest, ’tis gone;
 / Their purer service, in this realm at least, / Is past for ever” (8: 86-88). The Wanderer’s
 wander, romantic as it might be, is outmoded. Clare A. Simmons argues that
 medievalism, as it develops later in the nineteenth-century through figures such as John
 Ruskin, functions as a means of articulating a distance between a glorified past and a
 present perceived to be in decline. Simmons states,

When Wordsworth wrote *The Excursion* the word ‘medieval’ was yet to
 enter the English language. Examples of medievalism nevertheless
 appear as soon as thinkers and artists detected difference and distance
 between themselves and the Middle Ages, usually prompted by a need to
 find a critical distance from the present . . . medievalism looks for value

by contrasting the style, ethics, and society of the past with the present.

(131)

The “sentimental medievalism” elicited by the Wanderer compromises the tenability of the rhetoric of wander it supports, by couching that rhetoric within an inherently nostalgic discourse that takes issue with present (133).

In addition to the potentially outmoded status of the Wanderer, the act of wander itself appears to be a privileged movement that is, for the most part, removed from, and out of touch with, everyday life. The poem opens with an image of laboured walking that actively counteracts the rhetoric of wander established elsewhere in the text. The Poet states,

Across a bare wide Common I was toiling
 With languid feet, which by the slippery ground
 Were baffled; nor could my weak arm disperse
 The host of insects gathering round my face,
 And ever with me as I paced along. (1: 21-25)

Rather than engaging in freeing and bucolic wander, the Poet struggles and stumbles through nature. This is repeated, William Howard observes, as the Poet follows the Wanderer up the steep ascent to the Solitary’s valley: “here, too, he bemoans the topographical resistance to his progress,” and stands “in contrast” to the Wanderer who “appreciates the prospect of discovery and reward: *he climbs*” (520, 521). The sheer physical challenge that constitutes rural ambulation calls attention to the idealism that informs the rhetoric of wander, and, hence, its removal from everyday life. This

removal is furthered in the reversed allusion the poem makes in its opening lines to the concluding lines of *Paradise Lost*. As David Simpson points out, the Poet reverses the ejection from the garden by crossing a plain under a hot sun “mounted high” in order to make his way back into a “grateful resting-place” (1: 1, 20). Simpson writes, “the final lines of Milton’s poem have Adam and Eve descending out of Eden to a plain parched with punishing heat; Wordsworth who knew perfectly well that he was risking geographical incoherence to bring it about, has his poem begin there, and moves from thence to a landscape that is, for the narrator, Edenic” (205). The figurative return to Eden undertaken by the Poet, therefore, casts the Wanderer, whom he finds there—

“Him whom I sought; a Man of reverend age, / But stout and hale, for travel unimpaired”—as a removed and sheltered figure of paradise (1: 33-34). The idealness of the Wanderer is heightened further by the fact that before he is encountered he is proleptically envisioned as a “dreaming man / Half conscious of the soothing melody, / With side-long eye looks out upon the scene,” by the Poet as he labours across the ground swatting flies (1: 14-16). Upon arriving at the “roofless Hut” under the “lofty elms” the Poet sees the Wanderer as an incarnation of the dreaming man: “Supine the Wanderer lay” (1: 470). The Edenic, sheltered, and removed nature of the Wanderer troubles the poem’s rhetoric of wander, by raising questions as to its accessibility and viability. Simpson goes on to point out how the poem tries to reconcile satanic individualism and freedom with Edenic collectivity and security through the act of wander. The poem expresses the “desire to wander within safe limits,” and thus to have “the best of both worlds;” however, Simpson adds, this is “hard to achieve in a

world where the conventions of patronage have disappeared” (207). This kind of “productive wandering” is only possible through the “supportive presence” of a “helping hand” (208). Simpson argues that “the role of patron is now fulfilled by Lord Lonsdale, as the dedicatory sonnet makes clear,” and this patronage demonstrates how the “wandering powers of the poet’s mind are not independent of Lonsdale’s goodwill” (208). Wander is thus a removed, idealized, and, indeed, patronized endeavour. The rhetoric of wander as free and unencumbered, as promoted by both the Poet and the Wanderer, must be actively buttressed and protected.

The idea that wander in *The Excursion* is, in fact, far more rarified and contained than its rhetoric would suggest is evident in the Wanderer’s purposiveness. Throughout the poem the Wanderer ensures that the excursion remains on task and free from any of the deviations and diversions one might expect from an act of wander. Before heading to the valley of the Solitary the Poet describes his and the Wanderer’s wander:

Such intercourse I witnessed, while we roved
 Now as his choice directed, now as mine;
 Or both, with equal readiness or will,
 Our course submitting to the changeful breeze
 Of accident. But when the rising sun
 Had three times called us to renew our walk,
 My fellow Traveler said with earnest voice,
 As if the thought were but a moment old,
 That I must yield myself without reserve

To his disposal. (2: 84-93)

What begins as a free and directionless movement—where each takes turns leading, following, and deviating at will—becomes a directive to follow and to keep to one singular direction. Early in Book II, wander gives way to teleological and purposive walking. This more forceful and focused ambulation is continued as the two make their way towards the Solitary. As the Poet and the Wanderer come across a Maypole celebration the Poet wonders, “shall we quit our road and join / These festive matins?” (2: 146-147). The Wanderer shuts down the prospect by stating “Not loth / Here would I linger, and with you partake, / Not one hour merely, but till evening’s close, / The simple pastimes of the day and place” (2: 147-150). The Wanderer claims he would stay and happily deviate or wander from their course, but he tempers this desire by asserting the need to finish what one starts, and by offering a slight reprimand on the dangers of deviation:

But know we not that he, who intermits
 The appointed task and duties of the day,
 Untunes full oft the pleasures of the day;
 Checking the finer spirits that refuse
 To flow, when purposes are lightly changed?
 We must proceed—a length of journey yet
 Remains untraced. (2:155-160)

The Wanderer cautions against the dangers of wandering by presenting wander as an act that threatens the economical expenditure of time.

This injunction to stay on course is advanced by the Wanderer throughout the text. As the Solitary hosts the Poet and the Wanderer at his abode, he brings “from the Cupboard wine and stouter cheer” (2: 933); however, the Wanderer waves this hospitality off, stating: “Nay, nay, / You have regaled us as a Hermit ought; / Now let us forth into the sun!” (2: 935-937). Again, the Wanderer eschews dalliance and deviation, and ensures that the group keeps moving. Tellingly, the Poet reports that the Solitary, “Our Host / Rose, though reluctantly, and forth we went” (2: 937-938). The Solitary’s reluctance to move registers the obligation to move that comes from the Wanderer. This prodding is continued later on, as the Solitary plans to take his leave after the Wanderer delivers a lengthy discourse in Book IV: “Nay,” The Wanderer states, “The fragrant Air its coolness still retains; / The Herds and Flocks are yet abroad to crop / The dewy grass; you cannot leave us now, / We must not part at this inviting hour” (5: 65, 66-70). The Wanderer, like a shepherd, continues to herd and corral the group by proposing a visit to the village churchyard. The Wanderer wanders less than he purposively walks, which reconfigures his wander as an act of productive expenditure.

Celeste Langan argues that walking in the early-nineteenth-century becomes a means of authorizing and performing an emergent liberalism. Langan states, “the liberal subject is constituted as an essentially *mobile* subject, dispossessed of local attachments” (230). This mobility, with its attendant severing of locality, however, becomes an injunction and a compulsion to keep moving. Langan uses the example of the cost of a liberal education to underline the paradox of liberalism: “Liberal education frees the subject to travel (in a ‘liberal’ quasi-geographical space where ‘every road is

open') but subjects him to debt, so deep a debt that digression is out of the question, since tenure or security is always already receding" (234). The liberal subject's freedom is forged, therefore, upon the directive of mobility that must be performed and enacted so as to mask and erase its obligatory nature. Langan asserts that despondency—the kind experienced by Margaret and the Solitary—develops within an inability to perform the fiction of liberalism, where the desire for actual mobility is thwarted. The restorative cure for this lapse, Langan argues, is walking. Langan writes: "what Wordsworth identifies as cause of despondency and default, the mistaken transformation of negative freedom (of movement) into positive right (expectation that 'open' roads must yield advancement) is corrected by the recommendation to *walk*" (228). Walking becomes the way in which the ethos of liberalism is constituted as a mode of being in and of itself. The Wanderer's purposive wander is precisely this form of productive walking that underwrites liberalism; it is that which "mime[s] the aesthetic virtue of 'purposiveness without purpose'" (231). The wander advocated by the Wanderer is not intent on aimless and radical freedom, but proffers instead a purposiveness that becomes a purposefulness in its performance of a productive, intentioned liberalism. Within liberalism, Langan writes, "the cure for dispossession and unemployment—vagrancy—is walking" (238). The Wanderer's wander thus takes on a decidedly ideological turn, where what appears to be unstructured freedom is an injunction to adhere to a newly emerging socio-economic modality.

Following Langan I argue that the rhetorical fashioning of wander in *The Excursion* is effectively the promotion of a more disciplinary walking—a walking that

presents time as that which ought to be productively put to use. The Wanderer, in his tramping, “had observed the progress and decay / Of many minds and bodies too; / The History of many Families” (1: 404-406). The knowledge he gains from his walking is “gathered up from day to day,” and is a testament to time spent (1: 424). After leading the Poet away from the Maypole festivities, the Wanderer justifies this persistence by yoking walking with the productive passing of time. The Wanderer says to the Poet, “You will receive, before the hour of noon, / Good recompense, I hope, for this day’s toil—” (2: 164-165). The connection between walking and the productive passing of time is evident in the Wanderer’s depiction of Margaret’s tale as well. The Wanderer halts his narrative soon after beginning, to turn to the time of day, and to question whether or not recounting the sad story is its most fitting expenditure:

’Tis now the hour of deepest noon,—
 At this still season of repose and peace,
 This hour, when all things which are not at rest
 Are cheerful; while this multitude of flies
 Is filling all the air with melody;
 Why should a tear be in an Old Man’s eye? (1: 623-628)

The Poet soon after asks the Wanderer to “resume his story,” and the “Old Man” consents, but does so through language that promotes the useful expenditure of time (1: 654, 655). The Wanderer claims that the wrong way to recount the tale would be for the purposes of a “vain dalliance” of “a moment pleasure,” and he chastises this more free and detached approach to storytelling—one that is more akin to wander (1: 659,

661). Instead, he advances a more committed purposiveness in his storytelling, the aim of which is for “future good” (1: 662). To that end, the Wanderer concludes his tale by rerouting the story’s pathos back into productive walking. He states,

That what we feel of sorrow and despair
 From ruin and from change, and all the grief
 The passing shews of Being leave behind,
 Appeared an idle dream, that could not live
 Where meditation was. I turned away
 And walked along my road in happiness. (1: 979-984)

In his retelling, the Wanderer denies his own temporal experience—an experience that is necessarily deviating if not derailing—so as to fold Margaret’s narrative back into a past, which in turn powers the purposive walking of the present and future. Rather than being affected or put off course by the sorrow he had experienced at the ruined cottage, he continues down the road, and in that continuance he converts his experience into a productive temporal expenditure. The Wanderer’s insistence on moving on enacts a discipline of time-thrift that yields the productivity of the Wanderer’s state of peace, pleasure, and the sense of plenty. To be sure, the Wanderer’s recounting of Margaret’s narrative is punctuated by markers of passing time, and, moreover, is structured by his own repeated walking visitations, where each return to the cottage—each increment of time passed—elicits further disorder and decline. Each walk passes time and casts Margaret within a sequential and irreversible temporality starting with the very beginning of the tale: “Not twenty years ago, but you

I think / Can scarcely bear it now in mind, there came / Two blighting seasons” (1: 566-568). The purposive walking advocated by the Wanderer promotes a notion of time that is a forwardly-oriented and productive.

The rhetoric of wander in *The Excursion* yokes productive walking with the productive spending of time as a means of offsetting the emergence and persistence of another response to clock time and its mutability: namely, “Despondency.” Citing Coleridge’s suggestion that “the larger project of ‘The Recluse’” might operate as a “remedy for the ‘malaise’ of postrevolutionary depression,” Langan argues that this despondency is rooted in the seismic sociopolitical shift of the French Revolution (226). This “mental or emotional breakdown,” Langan writes, is “attributable, no doubt, to a multitude of causes, but chiefly to the collapse of what recent political theorists have named ‘the Jacobin imaginary’” (226). Langan sees this collapse as a response to the change “much lamented by Burke, from a discourse of obligations to one of rights” that accompanies the Revolution (226). “The subject,” Langan writes, “no longer knows himself by virtue of what he owes to past, present, and future generations” (226). Although the Solitary actually does suffer from the collapse of the Jacobin imaginary, as he becomes a “despondent subject and defaulted citizen,” I identify this despondency as an effect of another modal shift: the change in temporality from a more landed, agrarian, and seasonal time to the more modern, industrial, and mutable temporality of clock time (227). Such a shift in temporal experience wrenches bodies from time tied to labour, seasonal, and cultural practices to time as time—as an external and independent, unidirectional and disciplinary horizon of being.

The Excursion presents a world in flux where change, mutability, and, indeed, catastrophe, are no longer containable within traditional social and cultural structures. In the post-French-Revolutionary and early-Industrial-Revolutionary space of the text, clock time becomes the means through which mutability is formalized and contained. Clock time presents time as a forwardly moving sequence of uniform and quantified moments. The sequence at once gives time, as open and available units of expenditure, but it takes time as well, as each moment must be relinquished to the sequence of past, present, and future. The positive stance of clock time thus seeks to fill and spend time as it appears in the sequence. The negative stance, on the other hand, watches helplessly as time forever recedes into an irretrievable past. Clock time, therefore, engenders two distinct temporal responses: the positivity of filling time as it becomes available, and the negativity of surrendering time to the unidirectional and interminable sequence. Both of these responses to clock time are presented in *The Excursion*. The Wanderer advances the positivity of clock time through his purposiveness, while Margaret and the Solitary display the negativity of clock time through their despondency. Thus Margaret and the Solitary as well as the Wanderer function within the same temporal mode: they represent two distinct responses to, and sides of, the emergent temporality of clock time as sequential, formalized change. Margaret's and the Solitary's response takes the form of despondency, as they register time as an irreversible sequence with an irretrievable and painful past. The Wanderer, on the other hand, actively and productively passes time by filling each successive present. *The Excursion* then pits one response against the other, as the Wanderer's purposiveness

becomes the positive corollary to the two cautionary tales of Margaret's and the Solitary's despondency.

The dual response to clock time, as the temporality of mutability, presented by *The Excursion* is better understood through Paul De Man's consideration of Wordsworth's other figurations of temporality. De Man shows how mutability in Wordsworth's texts tends to signify temporality. Time, he argues, can only ever be understood negatively because "the relationship between the self and time is necessarily mediated by death; it is the experience of mortality that awakens within us a consciousness of time that is more than merely natural" (17). Only in seeing one's self as a non-self—in realizing that the self "never exists in isolation, but always in relation to entities, since it is not a thing but the common center of a system of relationships or intents"—can one glean a sense of one's authentic temporality (16). The negative understanding of time, however, opens a gap between understanding and language. "This negativity is so powerful," De Man observes, "that no language could ever name it for what it is; time itself lies beyond language and beyond the reach of imagination" (17). Within this gap, De Man argues, Wordsworth "can only describe the outward movement of time's manifestation, and this outward movement is necessarily one of dissolution" (17). Accordingly, time becomes simply the movement of difference or of "dissolution." Therefore, negative temporal insight, when depicted in "the privileged language of the imagination," becomes "the generalized statement of the truth of this experience in its universality" (17). The insight of the self's authentic sense of its non-self—as an object caught up in a vast network—is the insight and authentic

understanding of temporality; however, when that insight is translated back into the imagination, as the discourse of the self, that insight becomes a grand and transcendental, but insufficient and somewhat banal statement about change. De Man writes, “Dissolution thus becomes mutability, asserted as an unfailing law that governs the natural, personal, and historical existence of man” (17).

Nonetheless, the insight remains in spite of being lost in translation. “To name mutability as a principle of order,” de Man writes, “is to come as close as possible to naming the authentic temporal consciousness of the self” (17). Wordsworth’s poetry is not about the eternal laws of nature—it is not a re-hashing of the universalizing figure of time’s remorseless scythe—but the necessarily independent problem of temporality. De Man states, “the bond between men is not one of common enterprise, or of a common belonging to nature: it is much rather the recognition of a common temporal predicament that finds its expression in the individual and historical entities that strike the poet as exemplary” (15). What appear to be general and universal statements of nature as change are, in effect, specific, local, and untranslatable accounts of authentic temporality. “Examples abound” in Wordsworth’s poetry, “from ‘The Ruined Cottage’ to ‘Resolution and Independence,’ and in the various time-eroded figures that appear throughout *The Prelude*” argues De Man (15). What each of these examples “share is not nature but time, as it unfolds its power in these individual and collective histories” (15). De Man is not writing about clock time, but his formulation of mutability, as authentic, negative temporal insight or as positive, imaginative statement, maps on to the dual responses that clock time produces, as the temporality of mutability. If

mutability is a transfiguration of a particular temporal predicament, then the movement of this figure from an authentic negative temporal realization, through death, to a general affirmative temporal statement of the imagination reflects the two poles occupied by Margaret/the Solitary and the Wanderer. The Wanderer becomes the imaginative translator of despondency converting the authentic understanding of the temporal predicament into a universal stance, while the other two experience a negative but authentic temporality that leaves them despondent.

The Excursion indexes and registers these two distinct responses to the temporality of clock time through its presentation of two distinct iterations of wander. David Simpson observes how the rhetoric of wander espoused by the Poet and the Wanderer is far from ironclad, for as the Poet “celebrates the apparently perpetual motion of wandering, so he recognizes it as the trope of alienation and displacement, and finds himself longing for a place at the fixed centre of a troubled world” (206). Margaret’s and the Solitary’s despondency in clock time is presented through their respective acts of displaced and alienated wander, while the Wanderer’s productive expenditure of clock time is presented through his affirmative rhetoric of free wander. Whereas Margaret and the Solitary are despondent objects of clock time who wander aimlessly, the Wanderer is an imaginary subject of clock time who wanders purposively. Paul Fry attests to how the presentation of wander in the poem is both negative and positive at once: “wandering too is as often as not a dubious pastime, and has been ever since the river in Milton’s Eden followed its mazy course. Yet in one sense or another wandering is what everybody does, and Wordsworth seems for the most part relatively

uninterested in controlling the sometimes Spenserian or Miltonic ironies associated with the word" (168). Margaret and the Solitary are the inverse of the Wanderer: while he productively spends time through positive, purposive wander, they experience this same time as alienation, and they wander negatively and listlessly as a result. While the wander of Margaret and the Solitary is dispossessed and pained, the wander advocated by the Wanderer is ideological, in so far as it strives to replace authentic temporal insight with a universalizing productivity, where time as loss is transfigured into time spent.

The ruined cottage narrative of Book I dramatizes how clock time, as the formalization of the temporality of mutability, generates despondent wander. The sweeping changes that visit Margaret's life begin with the loss of her husband Robert, who likewise experiences the temporality of mutability, grows despondent, and becomes an alienated wanderer as a result. The tale of the ruined cottage is presented through the language of clock time: "Not twenty years ago" occurred "Two blighting seasons" (1:566, 568); Margaret "Went struggling on through those calamitous years" (1: 580); and, it is "ere the second autumn" that Robert is "smitten with perilous fever," and soon finds that what was stored to meet "the hour of accident or crippling age / Was all consumed" (1: 581, 583, 586-587). It is clock time itself as the form of the temporality of mutability that befalls the cottagers. The change that clock time discloses to the cottagers, moreover, is embodied by industrialization, which is itself underwritten by clock time. Cottage production and local weaving are, at this time, under threat. The Wanderer observes: it was "A time of trouble; shoals of Artisans /

Were from their daily labour turn'd adrift" (1: 589-590). As Fiona Stafford shows, "commercial imperatives drove traditional cottage industry into decline, as Wordsworth observed in a series of poems on the silence of 'the cottage Spinning-wheel'" (126). Clock time, therefore, doubly affects the cottagers. Not only does it elicit unforeseen and uncontrollable change, it underwrites and authorizes the large-scale industrial production that renders the cottage industry obsolete.

The ascendance of clock time converts Robert into a despondent and temporally alienated subject. The Wanderer recounts:

A sad reverse it was for Him who long
 Had filled with plenty, and possess'd in peace,
 This lonely Cottage. At his door he stood,
 And whistled many a snatch of merry tunes
 That had no mirth in them; or with his knife
 Carved uncouth figures on the heads of sticks—
 Then, not less idly, sought, through every nook
 In house or garden, any casual work
 Of use or ornament; and with a strange,
 Amusing, yet uneasy novelty.
 He blended, where he might, the various tasks
 Of summer, autumn, winter, and of spring (1: 598-607)

Robert is uprooted from his own traditionally constituted temporality, as he becomes a detached, idle, and ironic figure—humming merry tunes without mirth, or tossing his

children “with a false unnatural joy” (1: 617). Moreover his “uneasy” blending of tasks from all seasons at the same time stresses the fundamental temporal dispossession he experiences. Robert is now removed from a more landed, seasonal temporality where labour and time are intertwined organically. This temporal alienation and dispossession is ultimately figured through his alienated wander. The Wanderer recalls how “day by day he drooped, / And he would leave his work—and to the Town, / Without an errand, would direct his steps, / Or wander here and there among the fields” (1: 611-614). This is extended to the point where Robert’s temporal up-rootedness finds its full articulation in his complete conversion to the professional wander of soldiering. Ultimately Robert joins the military leaving behind the “pieces of money” he earns in so doing, and he departs in secret, lest Margaret “should follow with my Babes, and sink / Beneath the misery of that wandering Life” (1: 703, 713-714). Robert’s enlistment is presented as a life of wander because his military regimentation completes his status as a dispossessed temporal object.

The same temporal dispossession that Robert experiences happens to Margaret as well, soon after Robert’s departure. The Wanderer recalls her decline in time, which again stresses how it is time as mutability that is visited upon the cottagers. Throughout his portrayal of Margaret’s narrative the Wanderer draws attention to the passage of time that indexes each of his visits: “We parted.— ’Twas the time of early spring” (1: 723); “I journey’d back this way / Towards the wane of Summer” (1: 739); “I returned, / And took my rounds along this road again / Ere on its sunny bank the primrose flower / Peeped forth, to give an earnest of the Spring” (1: 848-851); “In bleak December, I

retraced this way" (1: 890); "Did many seasons pass ere I return'd / Into this tract again" (1: 905-906). The Wanderer's repeated visits to the cottage reveal Margaret's status as cast within a forward-moving sequence of change. This begins with her experience of Robert's departure, which is also relayed through explicit markers of clock time: "two wretched days had pass'd, / And on the third" she noticed the packet containing the money from his enlistment (1: 695-969); and she learns her husband's fate "ere that day was ended, / That long and anxious day!" (1: 706-707).

The loss of Robert converts Margaret into an object caught within the sequential change of clock time, where for "Nine tedious years / From their first separation, nine long years, / She lingered in unquiet widowhood" (1: 906-908). The despondency Margaret experiences in this temporal sentence of widowhood indicates her own alienation. The Poem registers this temporal dispossession through the entropic decline of Margaret's "poor Hut" which "Sank to decay" (1: 935, 936). The Wanderer observes that her house

Bespake a sleepy hand of negligence.

The floor was neither dry nor neat, the hearth

Was comfortless, and her small lot of books,

Which, in the cottage window, heretofore

Had been piled up against the corner panes

In seemly order, now, with straggling leaves

Lay scattered here and there. (1: 856-863)

The disordered cottage, and the abandonment and neglect of her labours, show how Margaret becomes detached from her more local, seasonal temporality. The Wanderer recalls how, “Alone, through half the vacant Sabbath-day” either in “yon arbour” or “On this old Bench / For hours she sate” (1: 912, 914-915). Margaret’s despondency is caused and measured by the hours ticked out by the clock. Indeed, upon one of his visits, the Wanderer finds Margaret has wandered off from the cottage, and as he awaits her return he notes, “Deeper shadows fell / From these tall elms;—the Cottage-clock struck eight” (784). The clock becomes the sole functioning object in the formerly productive and flourishing cottage. In this declining rural space, the clock is the only thing that continues to work.

The temporal alienation Margaret experiences in clock time is realized in her despondency and in her aimless wander. She returns to her cottage to find the Wanderer waiting and says, “It grieves me you have waited here so long / I’ve wandered much of late” (1: 788-789); and soon after she declares, “I have been travelling far; and many days / About the fields I wander, knowing this / Only, that what I seek I cannot find. / And so I waste my time: for I am changed” (1: 797-802). Margaret’s wander reveals a listlessness that she cannot help but vocalize as a waste of time. In both cases, her wander is presented as the opposite of productive temporal expenditure. Rather than having and productively spending time, Margaret’s wander wastes time and wastes the time of the waiting Wanderer. The Wanderer expresses frustration at having to wait for Margaret’s return from her wander. As he “waited her return” (1: 745) he recounts

his experience of waiting *in time*, which finally builds to his frustration and “sad impatience” (1: 770):

Ere this an hour
 Was wasted.—Back I turned my restless steps,
 And as I walked before the door, it chanced
 A Stranger passed; and, guessing whom I sought,
 He said that she was used to ramble far.—
 The sun was sinking in the west (1: 764-769)

The Wanderer subtly casts judgment upon Margaret for failing to become a functioning subject of clock time. He notes the decline of the cottage and garden, which “appeared / To lag behind the season” (1: 753-754), but also her “idle loom” (1: 886); and he recalls how on a visit “That very time / Most willingly she put her work aside, / And walked with me along the miry road” (1: 897-899). Her reluctance to work in time is part and parcel of her increased detachment. The Wanderer is disturbed by her unproductive use of time—a waste that causes the Wanderer to note, “the longer I remained more desolate” (1: 776). William Galperin observes that Margaret herself becomes incapable of “trying to change her situation” because she grows too “self-occupied” (360). Margaret is unable to “defend herself or her world from the ravages of subjectivism and desire” (360). This “individuation” becomes an “inescapable and tragic state” Galperin suggests (360). But the source of this individuation is a clock time that produces subjects accountable to a new and disciplinary frame of being. Against such temporal

organization the Wanderer posits the reclamation and re-affirmation of individuation through the productive expenditure of time.

The Solitary's tale of loss echoes that of Margaret's, but the Solitary continues to live. As an educated but lapsed liberal subject, the Solitary is not outmoded, like the cottage weavers, but he is in need of an active re-acclimatization to the temporality of clock time. To be sure, the Solitary, in his past life, enjoyed the same belief and commitment to free wander as the Wanderer continues to espouse, and, like the Wanderer, the Solitary had linked that free wander to the productive expenditure of time. The Solitary recalls how, "to endear the hours / Of winter, and protect that pleasant place. / —Wild were the walks upon those lonely Downs, / Track leading into track, how marked, how worn" (3: 538-541). The Solitary and his wife were "unmolested Wanderers" whose free movement in nature was coextensive with their free movement in time, where "all the grove and all the day was" theirs (3: 548, 557). The equation of this wander with productivity is furthered in the Solitary's claim that he continued to wander while domestic demands kept his wife at home. The reproductive productivity of domesticity "Endeared [his] wanderings; and the Mother' kiss, / And infant's smile, awaited [his] return" (3: 590-591). Free wander effectively underwrites the making of the Solitary's family abode, and authorizes the temporal expenditure that constitutes that domestic life. However, like Margaret mutability befalls him as his family dies in quick succession. Tellingly, he figures the onset of this change through measured time when he states, "Seven years of occupation undisturbed / Established seemingly a right to hold / That happiness" (3: 631-632). The shock of this change

oversees the Solitary's shift into the other available temporal response of despondency. The battle for the heart and mind of the Solitary that constitutes *The Excursion*, then, can be read as a figure for the struggle to install the positive version of time as a productive expenditure, over and against the persistence of the negative experience of time as alienation and waste. As Hartman observes "at the dramatic center of the poem stands the Solitary: can his mind be restored to health" (300). The tension of the poem rests upon the reconversion of this lapsed subject: the "alter ego of the Wanderer," as Paul Fry puts it, "a clinical exhibit of what happens when idealism fades" (166).

Like Margaret, it is clock time—as the temporality of mutability—that strikes the Solitary, and rattles his notion of time as a productive expenditure. The deaths of his children come as bolts from the blue: "But at once / From some dark seat of fatal Power was urged / A claim that shattered all.—Our blooming Girl, / Caught in the gripe of Death, with such brief time" (3: 645-648); and, "—With even as brief a warning—and how soon / With what short interval of time between / I tremble yet to think of—our last prop, / Our happy life's only remaining stay— / The Brother followed; and was seen no more!" (3: 654-658). The deaths evoke a crisis, but it is their unexpectedness *in time*, the idea that things can occur "at once" and "with what short interval of time," that is equally unimaginable. This mutability is uncontainable for the Solitary. He states, "What followed cannot be reviewed in thought" (3: 689). His response to this rapid and uncontainable change is to become an object of time, rather than a productive temporal subject. His "Soul / Turned inward,—to examine of what stuff / Time's fetters are composed; and Life was put / To inquisition, long and profitless!" (3:703-706). The

Solitary grows “Hopeless, and still more hopeless every hour,” as time itself becomes an external and irreversible venue where he can only ever realize “what I myself have lost, / Nor can regain” (3: 797, 968-969).

Also like Margaret, the Solitary performs his temporal response of despondency through displaced and uprooted wander. After his second disillusionment with the world—the violent cooption of the French Revolution—the Solitary flees Europe for North America to wander aimlessly: “Here may I roam at large;—my business is, / Roaming at large, to observe, and not to feel” (3: 899-900). Indeed, this wander is linked to the feeling of powerlessness he experiences as a result of sequential and forward-moving time:

Who, having o’er the past no power, would life

No longer in subjection to the past,

With abject mind—from a tyrannic Lord

Inviting penance, fruitlessly endured.

So like a Fugitive, whose feet have cleared

Some boundary, which his Followers may not cross. (3: 881-886)

The Solitary’s aimless wander is underwritten by the temporal dispossession he experiences as an object of clock time.

The Solitary lives on, but the life he lives might be characterized as a life-in-death, or at least by the Wanderer. The Solitary’s seclusion is designed to stave off the temporality of mutability. He states that “Security from shock of accident” and “Release from fear; and cherished peaceful days” ought to be “the prime object of a wise Man’s

aim” (3: 370, 371, 369). The Solitary fearfully marks time as ceaseless and irreversible change, and seeks to mitigate the blows of that change by preemptively severing his own attachments to life. He states,

Oh! tremble Ye to whom hath been assigned
 A course of days composing happy months,
 And they as happy years; the present still
 So like the past, and both, so firm a pledge
 Of a congenial future, that the wheels
 Of pleasure move without the aid of hope.
 For Mutability is Nature’s bane. (3:459-465)

The Solitary’s retreat has rendered him a passive and despondent object of clock time, rather than its active subject. His association with clock time is laid bare as the group enters the cottage that houses his apartment. “All within,” states the Poet “As left by that departed company, / Was silent; and the solitary clock / Ticked, as I thought, with melancholy sound.—” (2: 669, 670-671). The Solitary and the solitary clock are aligned—they both tick out the passing of time. The Solitary, “Beguiling harmlessly the listless hours,” views time as an external and passing sequence, and not a productive venue of being: “If I must take my choice between the pair / That rule alternately the weary hour, / Night is than day more acceptable (3: 140, 281-283). The Solitary’s despondency arises from his authentic experience of the temporality of clock time as nothing more than a wearying sequence. The Solitary, Frances Ferguson observes,

“forcefully locates the apocalyptic strain in the poem’s obsession with time and mortality” (209).

What is at stake for the Wanderer, then, is not simply the Solitary’s despondent state, but the threat his despondency raises to the Wanderer’s own project of a liberalized and naturalized clock time. Hartman identifies the Solitary as “the Hamletian man in black, and a dangerous part of the Poet’s mind,” and the Wanderer’s goal is to attenuate the dangers this despondency brings to his configuration of clock time (307). The Wanderer’s own version of the Solitary’s tale, which he delivers to the Poet as the two make their way to the Solitary’s valley, censures the Solitary’s misspent time and misdirected wander. The Wanderer recounts how after his tragedy the Solitary “wept, he prayed / For his dismissal; day and night” (2: 214-215), and how soon after “An uncomplaining apathy displaced / This anguish; and, indifferent to delight, / To aim and purpose, he consumed his days, / To private interest dead, and public care” (2: 219-221). The Solitary, the Wanderer observes, allows his days and nights to be consumed, rather than productively filling them himself. Moreover, the Solitary’s wander, claims the Wanderer, has also been misguided: “After a wandering course of discontent / In foreign Lands,” the Solitary “Among these rugged hills” now “dwells, / And wastes the sad remainder of his hours / In self-indulging spleen” (2: 321-322, 326-328). The wandering that the Solitary partakes in does not lead to the productive expenditure of time, but instead signifies and reifies his own position as an object of clock time—he wastes the time that the Wanderer deems must be productively spent. For the Wanderer, it is more than just the Solitary’s social integration that is at stake in *The*

Excursion, it is the maintenance of the rhetoric of wander and the notion of time as productive expenditure, which that rhetoric serves.

The attempt to convert and restore the Solitary to public life is, therefore, also an attempt to reconcile the Solitary to clock time, and to re-naturalize clock time in the process. In Book IV “Despondency Corrected,” a title Richard Gravil claims is valid only if we “construe ‘corrected’ as synonymous with upbraided,” the Wanderer roots this task in his call to the Solitary to reintegrate with nature (149). The Wanderer states:

Quit your Couch—
 Cleave not so fondly to you moody Cell;
 Nor let the hallowed Powers, that shed from heaven
 Stillness and rest, with disapproving eye
 Look down upon your taper, through a watch
 Of midnight hours, unseasonably twinkling
 In this deep Hollow; like a sullen star
 Dimly reflected in a lonely pool.
 Take courage, and withdraw yourself from ways
 That run not parallel to Nature’s course.
 Rise with the Lark! your Matins shall obtain
 Grace, be their composition what it may,
 If but with her’s performed; climb once again,
 Climb every day, those ramparts; meet the breeze
 Upon their tops,—adventurous as a Bee

That from you garden thither soars, to feed
 On new-blown heath; let yon commanding rock
 Be your frequented Watch-tower; roll the stone
 In thunder down the mountains: with all your might
 Chase the wild Goat; and, if the bold red Deer
 Fly to these harbours, driven by hound and horn
 Loud echoing, add your speed to the pursuit:
 So, wearied to your Hut shall you return,
 And sink at evening into sound repose. (4: 481-504)

For the Wanderer, natural integration is the means through which social integration becomes possible. The hermit's life of late night, solitary contemplation runs counter to "Nature's course." The Solitary, argues the Wanderer, needs to think less and do more. Accordingly, the Wanderer offers the rhetoric of natural wander as the means of facilitating this. The Solitary needs to climb, roll, chase, and speed through nature—taking his cue from the local fauna. This reintegration with nature via a free and unencumbered movement, however, is also distinctly temporal. The Wanderer's harangue asserts the observance of a more normative, diurnal temporality—what Graviel identifies as the Wanderer's overly simplistic philosophy of "early to bed, early to rise" (150). By advocating the Solitary rise with the lark and turn in at evening, the Wanderer places the Solitary back in line with a productive temporal expenditure. The Wanderer's solution to the Solitary's despondency is to reacclimatize him to clock time through the rhetoric of wander that naturalizes the productive spending of time. Indeed, the

Wanderer's urging of the Solitary to "roll the stone / In thunder down the mountains" invokes a classical equivalent to the monotony and disciplinarity of clock time: the Sisyphean punishment of eternal, repetitive labour. However, the Wanderer occludes the monotony of Sisyphus, by calling attention only to the rock's thunderous descent, and not to the ceaseless repetition of pushing it back up.

The Wanderer's suggestion that the Solitary reconnect with nature is thus more clearly a directive for him to spend time. The Poet echoes the Wanderer's claim by likewise extolling "the liberty, for frail, for mortal man / To roam at large among unpeopled glens" (4: 514-515). And, like the Wanderer, the Poet connects this free wander to a quantified temporality: "Be this continued so from day to day, / Nor let it have an end from month to month!" (4: 537-538). The rhetoric of wander becomes the means through which the temporality of modernity, as alienation and despondency, is naturalized and converted into productive expenditure. The Wanderer goes on to place this capacity to occupy time productively within a larger, purposive life narrative, where harnessing the power to spend time bestows the power to spend time. The Wanderer states:

Whosoe'er in youth
 Has, through ambition of his soul, given way
 To such desires, and grasped at such delight,
 Shall feel the stirrings of them late and long;
 In spite of all the weakness that life brings,
 Its cares and sorrows; he, though taught to own

The tranquilizing power of time, shall wake,

Wake sometimes to a noble restlessness—

Loving the spots which once he gloried in. (4: 540-547)

Free wander enables a forward projection and a forward temporal movement that seems to retain the past as a continuously vital reservoir; however, the future-oriented movement of the language (shall feel, shall wake), ensures that past and future remain in their sequential order, and that time as a forward-moving sequence remains firmly intact. The wandering life elicits the “tranquilizing power of time,” and anaesthetizes subjects to clock time’s external sequencing of time. The Wanderer’s promotion of free wander is linked invariably to the expenditure of time: “Turn your steps / Wherever fancy leads, by day by night” (4: 552-553).

If the Wanderer’s efforts to reengage the Solitary turn out to be in the service of naturalizing clock time and of overriding its alternate response of despondency, then those efforts run the risk of becoming ideological. But what ideology does the Wanderer serve? The Wanderer’s Christianity and praise of rustic life, complete with its gendered hierarchies, would seem to align him with a traditional Tory paternalism; and yet, his natural supernaturalism and his rhetorical promotion of clock time also places him in league with an emergent bourgeois liberalism. Hartman argues that the Wanderer veers towards propping up traditional interests: “religion and eloquence are still close enough so that as the Wanderer waxes in eloquence he also grows in religion. The poem, instead of keeping to the dilemma of the Solitary, becomes on occasion a defence of the Established church” (301). This is furthered by the fact that the text

seems to surrender the Wanderer's authority to the Pastor, in both the Churchyard Books and in granting the Pastor the final word in his closing vesper of Book IX.

However, the High Church leanings of the Wanderer are compromised by his own self-taught Calvinism and by the inflection of his religious views with natural, classical, and pastoral examples. Both Hodgson and Galperin see the Wanderer, in spite of his characterization as a wise and venerable old man, as possessing an almost juvenile worldview. Hodgson argues, "in too many such ways, the philosophical arguments of *The Excursion*, especially those of the Wanderer, are simply childish and naïve" (168). Accordingly, Hodgson continues, the text shows how "Wordsworth's poetic decline after 1807 results not from his loss of youthful spontaneity, his adoption of a transcendental creed, or his conversion to Christian orthodoxy, but from a basic philosophical naïvety and immaturity" (168). Galperin also reads the Wanderer's spiritual and ethical views as somewhat inchoate. Galperin states,

As his inability to correct the Solitary's 'despondency' confirms, the Wanderer does less to remedy the Solitary's problem than to 'correct' or reinscribe 'despondency' as a tendency toward secularization that shows the spirit of this age to be much like that of any other. Correspondingly, the presence of the Solitary lets us appreciate how, in comparison to him, the Wanderer is a case of arrested development, whose recourse to the 'infancy of society' as an exemplary moment in history is an outward token of his inability to grow up. (47)

Instead of offering a meaningful response, the Wanderer, Galperin shows, can only turn away from the present and recede into a nostalgic enchantment with the past.

Andrew Hubbell, on the other hand, reconciles both the conservative and the liberal strains of the Wanderer by arguing that *The Excursion*, “skeptical of the established ideologies of both right and left,” strives to find a “hybrid vision” over and against the “dead-end discourse of political philosophy” (44). Hubbell writes,

Given . . . the political climate of the early Regency, *The Excursion* must begin by rewriting the rhetoric of poverty created by Burke and other major theorists of poverty, Thomas Malthus and Jeremy Bentham. The rewriting of this debate is necessarily going to be paradoxical, mixing conservative, liberal, humanist, religious, socialist, statist, and *laissez-faire* language to create a new platform. (47)

According to Hubbell, the Wanderer’s blending of various religious, political, and rhetorical stances reflects the poem’s larger interest in “providing a dramatic contrast to the dominant language—utilitarian, statistical, abstract, allegorical—used at that time to describe the poor” (49). This hybridized perspective, “a poetics of specificity that could account for the suffering of individuals,” Hubbell shows, “would not be welcomed by either the utilitarian radicals nor the paternalist conservatives because it is a radical challenge to a discourse shared across the political spectrum that dehumanized the poor” (49).

I argue that the Wanderer’s amalgamation of both Tory and Whig values is an attempt to contain and domesticate rapid social, cultural, and economic change within

traditional structures. The Wanderer's naturalization of clock time thus finds a way to couch this new temporal mode deep within a rhetorical configuration of traditional British culture. The poem's borrowings of pastoral and georgic tropes attest to this. Fiona Stafford argues that Wordsworth updates and renovates the tradition of the pastoral to address contemporary social concerns. Stafford writes, "By avoiding the nymphs and swains, Wordsworth was able to recover some of Virgil's original pathos as well as his moral and social concerns" (123). *The Eclogues*, Stafford argues, stress the onus that falls upon the poet to take on social and economic issues: "*The Eclogues* actually begin with lines on the poet's duty to meditate on rural matters, and contrast ideas of domestic attachment and rural plenitude with images of displacement and repossession" (123). Wordsworth's undertaking of the pastoral, Stafford shows, comes at a moment at which traditional rural life finds itself under erasure. "By 1800," Stafford writes, "the irreversible changes in rural communities brought on by successive enclosures, the movement of labour, the introduction of industrial methods into traditional crafts, the pull of new manufacturing centres and military recruitment, were widely recognized" (124). Within this context of rapid social change Wordsworth draws upon the pastoral to create "an image of an ideal that can speak to everyone, irrespective of their own circumstances" (Stafford 125). The pastoral then becomes a mode through which Wordsworth advocates a productive social, economic, and political agenda, and productively seeks "ways to counter the losses sustained by the rural communities" (Stafford 126). The pastoral in Wordsworth's hands becomes a purposive genre: "for just as it seems to be perpetually backward-looking and elegiac, it turns out

to be the form most concerned with continuity, with youth and with the future,” and thus becomes for Wordsworth “the mode for assuring cultural and national survival” (Stafford 132).

Kevis Goodman shows how Wordsworth draws upon the georgic to advocate for the productive social work of mourning, over and against an individuated and despondent solipsism. “*The Excursion’s* turn to the georgic, to the Virgilian background as mediated through Thompson, Cowper, and others,” writes Goodman, “imagines the verbal mediations that guide a response to history as collective labor, and it renders the work of mourning not as a private affair, a lyric moment, but as a communal undertaking” (167, 168). Wordsworth draws upon the georgic in order to establish a communal poetic productivity that can offset and counteract the angst of solipsism. Focusing on the exhumation of the lives of the mountain churchyard undertaken by the Pastor, Goodman argues that “local storytelling and the transmission of tales between characters, which Walter Benjamin called ‘an artisan form of communication,’ become in the language of the poem as a whole, a form of georgic husbandry” (168). “The Pastor,” Goodman writes, “attempts to close the wound of history, personal and national, that the melancholic Solitary has suffered, to combat the danger that the poem identifies as ‘uncomplaining apathy,’ or insensibility to history” (168). Wordsworth’s harnessing of the georgic links deep tradition with social productivity.

The Excursion’s generic borrowings of the pastoral and the georgic channel the Wanderer’s call for a free and uninhibited wander through a socially productive turbine. Indeed, as Joshua Crandall observes, the pastoral has embedded within it a sociological

or ethnographical directive. Crandall states, “In the late seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries, critics and poets approached the pastoral through ethnographic attempts to identify the properties of localized groups of people and an ethnological drive to compare these groups according to some sort of societal norm” (956). This ethnographical turn in the pastoral forms a pivotal pretext in subsequent discourses of the social sciences. “The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century development of pastoral comparison,” argues Crandall, “helps us recognize a concurrent ‘pastoral modernity’ cultivating a field of inquiry that would later be tilled by the sciences of culture and society” (957). The Wanderer’s comments on economic change and on the social aims of education reflect this harnessing of the pastoral for socially scientific ends. Crandall writes,

In their attempts to define the environmental and customary features of their pastoral settings, these poets invited readers to ponder the relation between the practices and objects that distinguish a given society and to compare these cultural settings with one another. In doing so they subjected social worlds to the kind of analysis that had hitherto been associated with the study of the natural world, anticipating the outlook and methods of the developing social sciences. (978)

The Excursion’s use of the pastoral harnesses a genre that allows for development and change from within a traditional space. The Wanderer can have his cake and eat it too, in advancing the new mode of temporal expenditure that is clock time, from within traditional, landed cultural identities. He thus *liberally* bridges radical bourgeois change

(clock time and industrialization) with a traditional Tory world-view (seasonal and pastoral). The poem uses the free and bucolic wandering associated with Arcadia for the productive temporality demanded by the rapidly industrializing landscape.

The Wanderer continues to walk this line between tradition and modernity in the critique he provides of the industrializing world. The Wanderer offers several images of the loss of traditional, rural life at the hands of industrialization, but he does so in order to bring these more egregious instantiations of modernity into line with his rhetoric of a free and willing temporal expenditure. The Wanderer observes and laments the social and cultural change that accompanies industrialization. The factory is a dominating force that supplants rural labour with a uniform and disciplinary mode of production.

Then, in full many a region, once like this
 The assured domain of calm simplicity
 And pensive quiet, an unnatural light,
 Prepared for never-resting Labour's eyes,
 Breaks from a many-windowed Fabric huge;
 And at the appointed hour a Bell is heard—
 Of harsher import than the Curfew-knoll
 That spake the Norman Conqueror's stern behest,
 A local summons to unceasing toil!
 Disgorged are now the Ministers of day;
 And, as they issue from the illumined Pile,

A fresh Band meets them, at the crowded door,—
 And in the Courts—and where the rumbling Stream,
 That turns the multitude of dizzy wheels,
 Glares, like a troubled Spirit, in its bed
 Among the rocks below. Men, Maidens, Youths,
 Mother and little Children, Boys and Girls,
 Enter, and each the wonted task resumes. (8: 167-185)

Industrialization disrupts traditional economic practices, and overwrites long-standing domestic roles, where adult and child, and woman and man work machines side by side; but it also supplants traditional notions of temporality with a new and disciplinary clock time. Summoned to work by the clock, and working around the clock, this new mode of industrial production violently wrenches bodies into an uprooted and detached temporality that channels work within set hours that commences and terminates at set times. The changes wrought by industrialization are not just economic and environmental, but modal—the shift is a shift in the very experience of time itself. Indeed, the Poet's inquiry as to "Where now the beauty of the Sabbath kept / With conscientious reverence, as a day" stresses the extent to which the changes of industrialization are fundamentally temporal (8: 248-249). The Poet acknowledges the loss of a more heterogeneous, localized temporality when he asks, "and where the winning grace / Of all the lighter ornaments attached / To time and season, as the year rolled round?" (8: 248-253).

Despite this, the factory, with its “unceasing toil,” is presented as a glaring example of an excessive and misguided interpretation of clock time, rather than proof positive of the need for its complete condemnation. The factory is figured as a foreign and invading body—its call to work is harsher than the “Curfew-knoll / That spake the Norman Conqueror’s stern behest.” Indeed, the Wanderer goes on to compare the factory to another “foreign” body, the Catholic Church. The Factory is the new “Temple—where is offered up / To Gain—the Master Idol of the Realm, / Perpetual sacrifice,” and its practices and demands are figured as a continuation of medieval Catholic practices (185-187).

Our Ancestors, within the still domain
 Of vast Cathedral or Conventual Church,
 Their vigils kept; where tapers day and night
 On the dim altar burned continually,
 In token that the House was evermore
 Watching to God. Religious Men were they;
 Nor would their Reason, tutored to aspire
 Above this transitory world, allow
 That there should pass a moment of the year,
 When in their land the Almighty’s Service ceased. (8: 188-197)

The factory is in line with a long tradition of superstition, idolatry, slavishness and subjugation—a continued aftershock of the medieval foreign influence of the Norman

Conquest and the Papists. The factory is problematic because its demands are perpetual and insatiable, and because of its capacity for enchantment and possession.

David Simpson addresses the Wanderer's ambiguous position regarding modernity, by showing how his critique of the rapid changes of industrialization is offset by other moments in the text that show how a simplistic belief in the rural idyll is no longer tenable. Simpson states that the Wanderer takes on an "almost proto-Marxist" perspective in his analysis of "the labour patterns and consequent cultural profile of the factory economy" over and against "agrarian experience" (189); however, these views are tempered, if not neutralized, by the ways in which the poem makes it "implausible to suggest that the agrarian ideal is a potential solution for doing away with all forms of social disjunction and distinction" (195). Indeed, rather than a "naïve utopianism" the Wanderer's critique of industrialization, Simpson argues, is based more upon its implementation (195). The Wanderer's concerns address "woes of a variable human nature suffering the developments of a modern manufacturing society," against which the Wanderer might posit a more incremental approach—the "'trickle-down' model of social reform that characterizes much of Wordsworth's later thought" (196, 198).

Indeed, in the same breath the Wanderer turns from condemning industrialization to extolling its virtues. The Wanderer is impressed with British ingenuity and the sheer power of industry. After drawing a comparison between monastic rites and industrial rites, the Wanderer states:

Triumph who will in these profaner rites
Which We, a generation self-extolled,

As zealously perform! I cannot share
 His proud complacency; yet I exult,
 Casting reserve away, exult to see
 An intellectual mastery exercised
 O'er the blind Elements; a purpose given,
 A perseverance fed; almost a soul
 Imparted—to brute Matter. I rejoice,
 Measuring the force of those gigantic powers,
 Which by the thinking Mind have been compelled
 To serve the will of feeble-bodied Man. (8: 200-209)

The Wanderer cannot help but be impressed by this new “inventive Age,” and is almost triumphant in his appraisal of the power of industry (8: 89). There is a sense of awe and wonder in his tone as he observes this “new and unforeseen Creation rise/ From out the labours of a peaceful Land,” a technological capacity capable of “Wielding her potent Enginery to frame / And to produce, with appetite as keen / As that of War, which rests not night or day” (8: 92-93, 94-96). Paul Fry argues that the Wanderer walks a fine line between the more conventional Wordsworthian concern for modernity’s erasure of traditional life, and a celebratory, proto-Victorian acclaim for industrialization. Fry states that the Wanderer “has the largely negative feelings any Wordsworthian character must have about the coming of industrialization, but uniquely in his case these feelings are tempered by his curiously Heideggerian fascination with the machine’s imposition of authority—mastery—of the natural world” (165). The Wanderer

expresses concern for the loss of traditional society, but at the same time his language reveals an awe-struck fascination with the capabilities of industry. The Wanderer observes how the traditional “foot-path faintly marked” (8: 107) has “vanished, — swallowed up by stately roads” (8: 111), and he notes how a small village, at “social Industry’s command,” can be “rapidly” converted into a “huge town, continuous and compact, / Hiding the face of earth for leagues” (8: 120, 118, 121-122). Despite his concerns, the roads are “stately” and the towns are impressively and expediently built. Fry continues, “the Wanderer, like Heidegger, is of two minds . . . we can either harness the Rhine . . . or share Being with the river. But as a social theorist, the Wanderer betrays the Coleridgean dream of a great philosophical poem transcendently derived by extending the theme of mastery into a utilitarian dream of imperial Englishness” (165).

The Wanderer advances just such a vision of imperialism when he draws a link between Britain’s ascendant industrial power and what he deems to be its colonial imperative, in what amounts to an early iteration of “The White Man’s Burden.” As Simpson observes, the Wanderer extolls the “virtues of colonialism,” by claiming that, “the ideal social life is something that it is Britain’s duty to export” (194). The Wanderer’s “views of the benefits of colonialism,” Simpson continues, “are an early version of an ideology that would become extremely popular later in the century” (196). The softer and more subtle suggestion by the Wanderer in Book VIII that Britain’s industrial mastery might extend to “Men of all lands,” who “shall exercise the same / In due proportion to their Country’s needs,” is itself extended into an open call for a more

dominating imperialism (8: 214-215). The Wanderer anticipates “the coming of that glorious time” when “this Imperial realm ”shall admit / An obligation, on her part, to teach / Them who are born to serve her and obey” (9: 292, 294, 295-297). His endorsement of British capitalist and military interests, his claim that Britain “must complete / Her glorious destiny” in exporting its civilization, contradicts the defences of a traditional, parochial England he seems to make elsewhere (9: 410-411). The Wanderer’s endorsement of British imperialism is ideological, and demonstrates his capacity to couch hegemonic interests within the context of traditional, British life. His support for colonial endeavours—the line he draws from an essential English way of life to its largescale colonial exportation—is akin to the through-line he uncovers and develops between simple, English life and the clock’s mechanical rendering of time. Clock time becomes an acceptable mode of existence because the Wanderer presents it through the rhetoric of free and open wander, wherein time is freely available for spending.

Indeed, the Wanderer’s naturalization of clock time transfigures his rhetoric of wander into an ideology. To be sure, the Wanderer explicitly embeds clock time deep within the rustic landscape. Summoning a pastoral example, the Wanderer states:

—The Shepherd Lad, who in the sunshine carves,
 On the green turf, a dial—to divide
 The silent hours; and who to that report
 Can portion out his pleasures, and adapt
 His round of pastoral duties, is not left

With less intelligence for moral things

Of gravest import (4: 797-803)

His example of the Shepherd Lad casts clock time back in time to a mythical and pastoral Britain, as an innate and natural mode of time. The rustic Shepherd naturally uncovers clock time, as the quantified sequence of irreversible moments, in his roughly-made sundial, and he then proceeds to live according to its abstract delineation of the day.

This figure of a naturally sanctioned clock time is elevated by the Wanderer into a moral law—a “measure and a rule” found “within” the shepherd—that governs an Imagination “left free / And puissant to range the solemn walks / Of time and nature, girded by a zone / That, while it binds, invigorates and supports” (4: 818-821). The Wanderer thus retroactively entrenches this modern and sequential temporality inside a traditional rustic topoi, and in so doing he asserts that this structured temporality functioned as a “rock” upon which an integrated and connected life was forged (4: 812).

The Wanderer continues his ideological positioning of clock time as a deep-seated element of traditional Britain in his depiction of a hardworking and elderly rustic couple in Book V. For the third time in the poem a cottage clock is depicted, but unlike the clocks belonging to Margaret and the Solitary, both of whom experience clock time as dispossession via their despondency, the clock belonging to the rustic pair is warmly embedded as a fundamental component of economical and moral cottage life. The Wanderer recounts staying with the couple, and notes how the following morning, “Rouzed by the crowing cock at dawn of day, / I yet had risen too late to interchange / a morning salutation with my Host, / Gone forth already to the far-off seat / Of his day’s

work” (5: 807-811). The old man is an excellent steward of time-thrift and time-management, as his hard work is rooted in an economical expenditure of time—he rises at the cock’s crow. The crowing cock precedes the chiming clock, which is soon after depicted as a source of companionship to the old woman during her long, work-filled days. The Wanderer quotes the old woman:

Save when the Sabbath brings its kind release,
 My Help-mate’s face by light of day. He quits
 His door in darkness, nor till dusk returns.
 And, through heaven’s blessing, thus we gain the bread
 For which we pray; and for the wants provide
 Of sickness, accident, and helpless age.
 Companions have I many; many Friends,
 Dependants, Comforters—my Wheel, my Fire,
 All day the House-clock ticking in mine ear,
 The cackling Hen, the tender Chicken brood
 And the wild Birds that gather round my porch. (5: 819-824)

The hardship and privation of the old couple is contained within an ideological narrative wherein hard work and productive temporal expenditure are the conditions of a happy domestic existence. Life is challenging, but doable, and their hard work and time management signify their moral value. Here cock and clock become interchangeable, as the clock is presented as simply an extension and continuation of an already naturalized temporal regulation. The couching of the ticking clock within these other images of

rustic life works to install and inscribe clock time at the very hearth of English cultural life. The Wanderer makes this ideology even more explicit. After recalling the old woman's speech, he ejaculates: "O happy! yielding to the law / Of these privations, richer in the main!" and goes on to state, "For you the hours of labour do not flag; / For you each Evening hath its shining Star, / And every Sabbath-day its golden Sun" (5: 839-841). Far from attenuating or even giving voice to this hard, rustic privation the Wanderer imposes an ideological narrative of hard work and productive temporal expenditure as the morally superior way of life. The Wanderer projects an essential and simplistic joy upon the rural couple—in assuming their hours do not flag—and, in so doing, whitewashes poverty and privation; but he also hides clock time's status as central to the industrializing and enclosing economy that actively places the very way of life he venerates at the brink of extinction.

The Excursion's final Book presents an excursion within an excursion undertaken by the Wanderer, Poet, Solitary, Pastor, and the Pastor's family. This self-reflexivity underlines the poem's self-perpetuating logic, where rather than enacting movement, development, or change, the poem becomes a closed-off, self-referential, and ideological statement unto itself. Indeed, the ultimate destination of the group's micro-excursion reifies the reduced and contained version of wander the Wanderer advances. Simpson writes, "the island in the lake upon which they alight is a place of limited wandering" (210). Having presented the rhetoric of free wander, the group then performs this rhetoric by actively passing the evening through their outing. However, the self-reflexivity of the poem's ideology is reflected tellingly in the image of the Ram

they encounter reflected in the lake. As the group prepares to embark on their micro-excursion they perceive

A two-fold Image; on a grassy bank
 A snow-white Ram, and in the crystal flood
 Another and the same! Most beautiful,
 On the green turf, with his imperial front
 Shaggy and bold, and wreathed horns superb,
 The breathing Creature stood; as beautiful,
 Beneath him, shewed his shadowy Counterpart.
 Each with his glowing mountains, each his sky,
 And each seemed centre of his own fair world (9: 443-451)

The doubled Ram and landscape reflect the doubling back of the poem upon itself—the manufacture of an ideological system whose mirror imaging reveals its own illusoriness. The poem, like the image, remains a closed system—a simulacrum of English parochial life. The image is an ideal and idealized framing of reality, but its sheer duality plays back upon the viewer and makes clear the viewer’s own ideological manufacture of reality—the doubled image reflects the doubling of reality undertaken by the Wanderer’s ideology. The poem reaches its limits with the mirroring of the Ram, by showing the limits of its hegemonic representation of reality. As Fry observes, the reflection “is a transitory trick of relation that cannot be reflected on because it reflects no authentic working of the mind” (172). The Wanderer’s ideology will persist, but the desire that this fantasy is something other than ideology cannot—a “breath” can

“disperse” it (9: 457, 455). The Pastor’s wife confides to the Poet, after seeing the reflected Ram:

I love to hear that eloquent Old Man
 Pour forth his meditations, and descant
 On human life from infancy to age.
 How pure his spirit! in what vivid hues
 His mind gives back the various forms of things,
 Caught in their fairest, happiest attitude!
 While he is speaking I have power to see
 Even as he sees; but when his voice hath ceased,
 Then, with a sigh I sometimes feel, as now,
 That combinations so serene and bright,
 Like those reflected in yon quiet Pool,
 Cannot be lasting in a world like ours” (9: 469-473)

Like the Ram, the Wanderer’s rhetoric needs to be uttered to retain its coherence. The Wanderer’s rhetoric is a fiction overlaid upon a shifting economy and a shifting temporality that fails to persist after being uttered. His fiction of a free wander as the means of accessing a free time that might combat and abate the despondency of modernity falls dead as soon as it drops from his lips. Indeed, the length of *The Excursion*, and of the Wanderer’s various speeches therein, arguably, attest to this.

It is the Pastor who has the final say in the poem concluding with his High Church “Vesper service” (9: 753). “The Wanderer,” writes Fry, “has now long since fallen silent,

and the eclipse of the visionary imagination he champions by the Pastor's knowingly attenuated orthodox reflections restores the link, scorned by Wordsworth in earlier years, between the vocation of wandering and Picturesque tourism" (173). The transfer of authority from the Wanderer to the Pastor completes the anesthetization of the rhetoric of wander. The Wanderer's ideology becomes a preamble to the doctrinal, High Church and Tory-sanctioned pronouncement of the Pastor. However, the Solitary's state remains undeterminable. The Solitary

took the slender path that leads
 To the one Cottage in the lonely dell,
 His chosen residence. But, ere he turned
 Aside, a welcome promise had been given,
 That he would share the pleasures and pursuits
 Of yet another summer's day, consumed
 In wandering with us through the Vallies fair
 And o'er the Mountain-wastes. 'Another sun,'
 Said he, 'shall shine upon us, ere we part,—
 Another sun, and peradventure more;
 If time, with free consent, be yours to give,—
 And season favours. (9: 771-782)

As Frances Ferguson observes "authority is never quite awarded . . . the Solitary's despondency and his rhetoric are never decisively expunged" (208). For Hodgson this marks a small redemption for the text: "the Solitary's resistance to the combined and

blended arguments of the Wanderer and the Pastor represents a lingering philosophical honesty by which Wordsworth at least preserves, almost despite himself, a strong core of intellectual respectability” (169). The Solitary does promise to engage again in the excursive powers of free wander, and yet his voiceless-ness—his promise is relayed indirectly by the Poet—and his own solitary walk home complicate and undermine that claim. The final assertion of time at the end of the poem, however, is telling: the possibility of further wander is bound up and connected to the possibility and availability of more time. The poem concludes by again linking wander to the productive expenditure of time. Free consent and free time are mandatory prerequisites for wander. Wander allows for free time, as long as one freely surrenders that time.

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Chapter Three:

The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties and the Limits of Wander

There are two versions of wander present in Frances Burney's 1814 novel *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*. The first depicts the movement of a subject displaced by the French Revolution, who strives and fails to find refuge in and around the provincial town of Brighthelmstone. The second describes the seemingly free movement of a member of the aristocracy. Both versions of wander are undertaken by the same figure: Burney's eponymous protagonist, who changes from a nameless and abject stranger to the titled Juliet Granville as the novel unfolds. *The Wanderer* charts this duality of wander onto the duality of clock time, where free wander encodes an open and available temporality of leisure, and where forced wander signifies clock time's sequencing, structuring, and disciplining of experience. The novel's paralleling of wander and time reveals how wander articulates class and gender privilege in early-nineteenth-century England. To be wealthy and male is to have time, and thus to have access to free and permissible wander; to be working and female, on the other hand, is to lack time, and to experience wander as a form of dispossession. *The Wanderer* demonstrates the power of this class-gender privilege by painstakingly detailing Juliet's inability to leverage clock time in "good old true-blue nonrevolutionary common sense England" (Doody 361). By harnessing a post-revolutionary, bourgeois subjectivity, Juliet strives to use clock time as a venue for productive self-maintenance; however, Juliet's attempts at independence are halted at every turn by an economy that remains

beholden to landed, aristocratic interests. Furthermore, Juliet's access to free wander, and the independence it seems to offer, is possible, ultimately, only through a forced narrative intervention, which restores Juliet to her patronymic title and instantiates an anti-Jacobin, marriage plot. Accordingly, the text shows how the notion of wander that posits solitary and unfettered movement as a viable post-revolutionary mode of being is a privileged fiction. Wander, Burney reveals, does not convey a universal freedom, nor does it give rise to social mobility or independence; instead its significance depends upon the social and economic status of its agent, where one wanders freely if one is privileged, and one wanders mandatorily if one is not. Wander is either freedom or alienation depending upon one's gender and social standing, and *The Wanderer* shows how the movement between the two remains untenable.

The Wanderer's title draws attention to its borrowings from the mode of romance. Although the eighteenth-century is regarded generally as the period that elicited the rise of the novel—to use Ian Watt's influential term—the boundaries between the more medieval, aristocratic romance and the more modern, bourgeois novel of this period are difficult to maintain. Barbara Fuchs argues that critical efforts from the eighteenth-century on down have tried to establish the modern, reality-based novel as separate and distinct from fanciful romance; however, this critical distancing has been challenging to uphold. Fuchs writes, "an important aspect of romance as critical idiom in this period is its increasing marginalization as the less-favoured category, associated with fantasy and the past instead of the realism increasingly valued by critical taste" (105). Despite this critical bias, Fuchs shows how classifications of the

novel and romance tend to break down, “with the terms used analogously . . . or with critics’ recognition that the traits considered exclusive to each kind of text actually appear in the other” (105). Fuchs writes, “a survey of literary criticism from the period reveals that both authors and critics recognized the close similarities between romance and the novel,” and that “the categories were still in flux in the middle of the eighteenth-century” (106). The very attempt to contrast and differentiate the novel from romance, however, shows the interests and desires of an emerging class, as it tries to define itself. The rising middle class needed a more nationalistic, domestic, and economic mode of fiction that better reflected the materials and characters it perceived day to day. Romance, with its continental and aristocratic associations, required a name change, and a renovation, to articulate the desires of the emergent bourgeoisie.

Northrop Frye, before developing a more synchronic mythopoeia of romance, calls attention to the class interests that romance has historically and diachronically served. Frye argues that romance is “nearest of all literary forms to the wish-fulfillment dream” (186). “In every age,” writes Frye, “the ruling social or intellectual class tends to project its ideals in some form of romance, where the virtuous heroes and beautiful heroines represent the ideals, and the villains the threats to their ascendancy” (186). This has been the case, Frye shows, in each of the mode’s historical articulations, from its medieval origins, to its flourishing in early modernity, to its resurgence in the eighteenth-century. The assertion of class interests was “the general character of chivalric romance in the Middle Ages, aristocratic romance in the Renaissance, bourgeois romance since the eighteenth century” (186). Indeed, Frye finds in romance

the veritable engine of dialectical, historical change, where emerging groups define and project their desires, aspirations, and heroic qualities, and play out their ascendancy along the lines of romance's trajectory. Frye writes, "there is a genuinely 'proletarian' element in romance too which is never satisfied with its various incarnations, and in fact the incarnations themselves indicate that no matter how great a change may take place in society, romance will turn up again, as hungry as ever, looking for new hopes and desires to feed on" (186).

Frederick Jameson echoes Frye in his claim that romance functions as a more shadowy analogue to ideology. Focusing on romance's structuring of good and evil and its inherent nostalgia—both of which are recounted by Frye—Jameson argues that romance is the mode through which radical social change is articulated. Jameson shows how romance's clear delineation of good and evil derive from a pre-modern "magical thought mode," "which springs from a precapitalist, essentially agricultural way of life" (141). This more Manichaeian worldview makes romance the optimal mode for addressing and rectifying class tensions forbidden by contemporary ethical parameters. Jameson writes,

This genre is dependent for its emergence on the availability of a code of good and evil which is formulated in a magical, rather than a purely ethical, sense. This code finds its expression in the vision of higher and lower realms in conflict, yet it does not seem inconsistent to suggest that it is itself dependent on a kind of historical coexistence within the social order itself between two distinct moments of socioeconomic

development. Romance as a form thus expresses a transitional moment, yet one of a very special type: its contemporaries must feel their society torn between past and future in such a way that the alternatives are grasped as hostile but somehow unrelated worlds. (158)

Romance provides the language to address and attenuate internal class conflict. Re-scripting one group as good and the other as evil formalizes and dramatizes social and economic tensions, while the nostalgia of romance maps out the return to a more harmonious and homogeneous world. Romance appears at moments of dialectical change, where political, social, and economic tensions begin to buckle. Romance possesses the “symbolic answer to the question of how my enemy can be thought of as being evil, that is, as other than myself and marked by some absolute difference, when what is responsible for his being so characterized is simply the identity of his own conduct with mine” (161). Romance, then, becomes an ideological vehicle, by undertaking the symbolic work of an emerging class-consciousness. The “persistence of romance,” Jameson writes, “raises something like an aesthetic counterpart to the problem of ideology” (162). Romance appears as a “deep-rooted ideology which has only too clearly the function of drawing the boundaries of a given social order and providing a powerful deterrent against deviancy or subversion” (140).

If romance is the venue within which the desire for social change is performed and played out, then it becomes a fitting mode for *The Wanderer's* delving into post-revolutionary English society. Like *The Excursion*, *The Wanderer* presents a world in the throes of deep socio-economic change. Transpiring “during the dire reign of the terrific

Robespierre,” the text traces out the effects of the French Revolution as they lap up upon the English shore (11). The town of Brighthelmstone—which doubles the seaside town of Brighton made fashionable in the late-eighteenth-century by the Prince Regent—presents a heterogeneous social world, in which aristocrats, such as Lord Melbury, Lady Aurora, Sir Jaspar Herrington and the Iretons, rub shoulders with members of the gentry, like Elinor and Harleigh, with social upstarts and the newly moneyed, like the Miss Bydel (“a collateral and uneducated successor to a large and unexpected fortune”) and the self-made grocer Mr. Tedman, and with members of the working class, like Gooch, the young farmer, and Flora, the young shop girl, whom Juliet strives to save from the rake Sir Lyle Sycamore (80). Juliet, Burney’s initially nameless and origin-less protagonist, becomes the quester of this romance that effectively brings this social heterogeneity to a boil. However, Burney’s use of romance in *The Wanderer* is far more ironic, and far less cut and dried, than it is a straightforward, allegorical, wish-fulfillment of the bourgeoisie. The nobility in the novel are by no means the sole source of evil. Indeed, in the end, “the youthful aristocrats, Lord Melbury, Harleigh, Lady Aurora, Lady Barbara, and Juliet are unequivocally the most virtuous figures in the novel, and the happy ending assigned to Juliet derives explicitly from her lineage and integrity,” as Tara Czechowski observes (700). Moreover, the heterogeneous Juliet, who is both English and French, both aristocratic and bourgeois, both decorum-minded and independent, is not a middle-class hero. The antagonistic wrongdoers of *The Wanderer* occupy both the right and the left of the political spectrum. The decadence, selfishness, and cruelty of the aristocracy is represented by characters like the Iretons and Lord

Denmeath, who polices the boundaries of the nobility by blocking Juliet's rightful claim to her title. But this more conservative evil is matched on the left by the brutish Jacobin Commissary, whom we later learn has forced Juliet's hand in marriage to secure the dowry offered in the relinquishment of her title. These competing class interests are echoed, but softened, by the Burkean Harleigh and the Wollstonecraftian Elinor, who both aim to help, but more often hinder Juliet in her quest.

While *The Wanderer's* complicated politics stands as its most enduring critical legacy, which I detail below, I argue that the novel harnesses ironically the wandering, questing motif of romance in order to show that wander is incapable of dialectically overturning socio-economic structures. The text demonstrates this through the language of time, where wander reflects alternately one's experience of time as a halting and disciplinary structure, or one's experience of time as a free and open venue of being. Burney's novel shows the disruptive, alienating, and harried experience of time that working-class, and working-class women in particular, experience in this changing world; while showing at the same time the glut and excess of time enjoyed by the wealthy. Wander is not productive or generative of time, but that which underlines the temporality one is always already allotted by virtue of one's economic standing. Wander in the text is not the heroic bourgeois overcoming of the stodgy aristocracy; instead, it is the means through which both the pains and the privileges of class and gender are experienced. As the engine of romance and, increasingly, the movement of Romanticism, wander is ironically repurposed by *The Wanderer* to show how it is not productive of social change, but representative of two irreconcilable and calcified social

categories, in the freedom it offers to the wealthy, and in the alienation it reveals for the working class.

The text's ironic refashioning of the mode of romance is evident from Juliet's first appearance, where she begs passage aboard a ship fleeing Reign of Terror France. Disguised as a beggar in blackface, Juliet is the romance protagonist writ-large—the outsider, with obscure birth and origins making a fateful and destined oceanic crossing. Frye argues that generally the romance-quest begins with an allusion to the flood: “the infant hero is often placed in an ark or chest floating on the sea . . . from there he drifts to land . . . or is rescued from among the reeds and bulrushes on a river bank” (198). Additionally, Frye shows how romance's central concern of rebirth might be displaced onto a hero who eventually “returns from a quest disguised, flings off his beggar's rags, and stands forth in the resplendent scarlet coat of the prince” (187). The opening of the text repurposes both of these tropes, in Juliet's status as a disguised beggar, and in her being plucked off the shore and restored to England by boat. However, the novel ironizes directly these tropes of romance. The passengers on board the boat at first ignore Juliet's pleas for help, and when, after a brief debate, she is admitted, they gawk at and mock her appearance. Indeed, the passengers on board appear as dutiful readers of romance by trying out various literary genres upon the relatively silent Juliet. Juliet's fellow English passengers, prompted by her disguised “dusky hue” and “large black patch, that covered half her left cheek,” take turns projecting various narrative identities upon her (19, 20). Elinor claims that the mystery surrounding Juliet offers “the vivifying food of Conjecture,” and she proceeds to figure Juliet as a character in a

romance (12-13). Elinor says to Harleigh, “you are such a complete knight-errant, that you would just as willingly find her a tawny Hottentot as a fair Circassian,” and claims that Harleigh is “such a very disciple of Cervantes” so as to give Elinor “no doubt” that the “tattered dulcinea has secured [his] protection for the whole voyage” (12, 13). After seeing Juliet “at prayers” Elinor casts her as a romance heroine: “she’s a nun, then, depend upon it. Make her tell us the history of her convent,” and she continues the device by stating that Harleigh “must fall in love with her, I suppose, as a thing of course” (13, 18). Harleigh partakes in his own projection, by imagining Juliet to be the victim of Jacobin violence in supposing Juliet’s bandages are the result of her “scrambling from some prison” (20). Additionally, the Admiral, who later turns out to be Juliet’s uncle, imposes upon Juliet the more patriarchal narrative script of the chaste, pious young woman, whom he praises as a “good example” for giving “thanks” (14). However, soon after landing the Admiral modifies his narrative, by inscribing Juliet with the equally patriarchal script of the fallen woman. Alongside his benevolence of granting her a guinea the Admiral instructs her to “conduct [her]self in a becoming manner,” in spite of how, he assumes, she had “demeaned” herself “up to this present date” (36). Mrs. Maple, on the other hand, regards Juliet as an object of her snobbish derision bristling at having “such company as this,” and states, “we did not pay such a price to have” the boat “made a mere common hoy” (20). The novel begins with a self-reflexive positing and rejecting of various romance plots through the ironic identification and projection of the genre back upon itself.

The novel continues its ironizing of romance by converting the conventional obscurity of the romance hero into the very problem that Juliet faces as she tries to make her way in a society that demands the qualifications of name, family, and recommendation. Juliet's outsider-ness aligns her with the traditionally heroic role of the romance heroine, and yet, the codes of the social world she enters use exactly this obscurity as a means of denigrating and mocking her. This is made manifest by the way in which the word "wanderer" takes the form of an ironic and insulting moniker for Juliet in the first part of the novel. Juliet's status as an "unfathomable 'other,'" as Sara Salih puts it, places her under rigorous scrutiny, and transforms her from a literal wanderer into a nefarious, predatory, and enterprising huckster (302). In the early pages of the text, the narrator repeatedly refers to Juliet as "the Wanderer" (54, 59, 67), and Juliet herself uses the word to describe the difficulties she faces: "I am in so forlorn a situation . . . a poor destitute Wanderer, in search of any species of subsistence" (49). But in addition to this more benign and descriptive designation, the word is also applied to Juliet as an insult. Elinor, soon after first encountering Juliet, calls her "so glaring an adventurer . . . a Wanderer—without even a name!" (33). The use of the word as a slight is interchangeable with the numerous other insulting monikers levelled at Juliet: "dingy, dowdy heroine" (50), "black fugitive" (50), "maimed and defaced Dulcinea" (50), "wandering Creole" (50), "frenchified swindler" (57), "unknown pauper" (59), "bold young stroller" (74), "female fortune hunter" (75), "illegitimate stroller" (86). The feminine pejorative appellation of wanderer—which Margaret Doody reminds us is also slang for prostitute—is how Juliet is identified by this social world. It is not until her

more refined, aristocratic gifts and her familial lineage are revealed, that the appellation of wanderer takes on its more positive connotations.

The title of Burney's text further underlines the disjunction between the word wanderer, replete with its heroic, romance connotations, and the figure to whom it is applied. Like Burney's other novels *The Wanderer* is named after its protagonist; however, unlike *Evelina*, *Cecilia*, and *Camilla*, *The Wanderer's* title withholds the identity of its protagonist in her very naming. Juliet's namelessness—her marked absence of a social identity—challenges the premise and scope of the novel as a form that projects individual development. Moreover, the novel's full title—*The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*—qualifies the word wanderer, and the singularity of its placeholder, in order to make a more generalized statement about female subjectivity. Indeed, Julia Epstein reads the novel as a universal articulation of female experience in late-eighteenth-century England: Burney "traces and analyzes the lot of women in every class of life, from pampered aristocrat to comfortable bourgeoisie to respectable working woman to starving shopgirl to farmer's wife to rural cottager" (191). However, the "or" of the title, coupled with the semicolon, rather than the more transparent equalization of a colon, stops short of equating Juliet as a wanderer, with female difficulties. The paused, alternative offering of "female difficulties" prevents the universalizing of Juliet's narrative with the narratives of all women, and in so doing resists the establishment of a totalizing and essential female subjectivity. Interestingly, the words "female difficulties" appear in the text in block letters on two separate occasions. The first comes as an aside to herself: "Deeply hurt and strongly affected, how insufficient, she exclaimed, is a

FEMALE to herself! How utterly dependent upon situation—connexions—circumstance! How nameless, how for ever fresh-springing are her DIFFICULTIES, when she would owe her existence to her own exertions!" (275). The words "FEMALE" and "DIFFICULTIES" are joined here through association, rather than by a singular, universalizing statement. These difficulties are contextual and social, and not essential. The explicit articulation of the subtitle appears again, later, when Juliet is speaking with Elinor. When Juliet "lamented the severe DIFFICULTIES of a FEMALE, who, without fortune or protection, had her way to make in the world," the term is contested vehemently by the more overtly feminist Elinor (397). Elinor "with strong derision, called out, 'Debility and folly! Put aside your prejudices, and forget that you are a dawdling woman, to remember that you are an active human being, and your FEMALE DIFFICULTIES will vanish into the vapour of which they are formed'" (397). Elinor's stern rebuke of Juliet's well-earned observation relies upon a universalism predicated on the rights of man. Because her own privilege affords her independence, she assumes a universal equality amongst men and women, and lays the blame of women's inequality on women's own inability to get over the essentialized weakness she imbues them with. In this light, the plurality and multiplicity implicit in the words "female difficulties" as used by Juliet offers a non-essential and non-universal stance on the social and economic inequality experienced by women; which Elinor, who deals in universals, fails to grasp. Moreover, the de-essentializing subtitle conveys, again, Juliet's status as an ironic romance heroine—she is not the lone hero indicative and representative of the aspirations of an entire class, but one particular individual.

Perhaps the most explicit ironic repurposing of the quest-romance that *The Wanderer* partakes in is in the prolonged stasis that characterizes Juliet's quest—a stasis that is formally reified by the sheer length of the novel. Despite the complexity and extent of Juliet's history, her story remains concealed from readers and characters alike for the bulk of the narrative. Juliet's real name is not revealed until nearly halfway through the novel, and the details of her aristocratic origins, the circumstances of her disinheritance, her forced marriage in France, and her subsequent escape, are withheld longer still. In prolonging and sustaining the lack of origin and namelessness of her protagonist, Burney breaks with the more developmental conventions of late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth century prose fiction. Frye argues that romance "at its most naïve" "is an endless form in which a central character who never develops or ages goes through one adventure after another until the author himself collapses" (186). And yet, Frye continues, "as soon as romance achieves a literary form, it tends to limit itself to a sequence of minor adventures leading up to a major climactic adventure, usually announced from the beginning, the completion of which rounds off the story," which comprises the quest; or, "the element that gives literary form to the romance" (186-187). The quest economizes romance, by reducing the narrative to "two main characters, a protagonist or hero, and an antagonist or enemy," and by producing a "dialectical" mechanism that ensures "everything is focused on a conflict between the hero and his enemy" (187). *The Wanderer*, however, actively eschews this dialectical economy, by repeatedly staging Juliet's refusal to disclose her identity—to the frustration of the local gentry and the novel's contemporary critics alike. Instead of

placing Juliet upon a developmental narrative arc, *The Wanderer*, for the first half of the novel, concerns itself with the immediacy of the present. Julia Epstein observes, “Burney keeps even the reader of *The Wanderer* and virtually all of the characters in the dark, asking us to accept her protagonist on faith as a woman without a history, radically present tense in the story but supported by no narrative framework until very late in the work” (176). Accordingly, for much of the text Juliet’s quest is her own daily maintenance, rather than the pursuit of some future-oriented utopia. Juliet’s time in England is exactly that: a period of time that she strives to pass without notice or event, until her and her guardian the Bishop’s safety might be guaranteed. Juliet describes her charge in England as a directive to do nothing but pass time. Juliet states, “the Marchioness conjured me, nevertheless, to forbear applying to my family; or avowing my name, or my return to my native land, till I should be assured of the safety of the Bishop” (750). Her action for much of the novel consists of her own daily maintenance, so she might pass this “dread interval of suspense” (752).

The Wanderer’s focus upon its protagonist’s present represents, Stuart Sherman argues, a “new kind of novel” (264). Sherman observes that the interruptions and interventions Juliet faces in her attempts to exist in time are so pervasive that they constitute “the novel’s chief source of significant repetition” (266). Juliet, Sherman states, “finds that no time is her own: whenever she enters a room in search of a moment’s solitude, she finds there a new figure, usually a new antagonist” (266). Sherman claims it is exactly this crucial and innovative component of the novel that Hazlitt succinctly identifies, but fundamentally misreads, when, in his censorious review

of the novel he writes, “the reader is led every moment to expect a denouement, and is as constantly disappointed on some trifling pretext. The whole artifice of her fable consists in coming to no conclusion” (264). Sherman observes that the novel’s “principle of structure” that frustrates Hazlitt is exactly what Burney had intended in constructing a more experimental text that was based upon the “reality of time” as “interruptive, ongoing, repetitious” (264, 265). The novel’s concluding description of Juliet as a “female Robinson Crusoe,” Sherman claims, amounts to a doubly apt metaphor. Crusoe reflects a “masculine privilege” “taken to a painful extreme,” wherein “All his time is his own, to dispose and record as he will;” however, women are placed “in a particular, uninhabitable bind” because, like Crusoe, they must still reckon with the deep isolation of existence, but lack adequate time and space to grapple with that solitude (267).

The Wanderer’s sustained deferral of Juliet’s past suspends readers in a successively unfolding present. Suzie Asha Park observes that Juliet retains her silence so pervasively “that it is no wonder critics from Burney’s time to our own have complained that the novel goes nowhere” (135). By standing mute on her past, Juliet, Park claims, undermines an emerging Romantic imperative of self-disclosure; the palpability of which is evident in the endless calls Juliet faces to provide an account of herself. Park states, “the wanderer’s reserve instead questions and challenges the very pressure to disclose depths that an increasingly Romantic culture both exerts and manages to veil as a gentle invitation to express the self freely” (127). The significance of Juliet’s “elusiveness and reticence,” Park continues, “is not to produce the illusion of

depth but to reveal the illusory basis of authoritative forms imposed upon character” (130). Juliet’s silence on her past challenges what Park calls the “rubric of Romantic expression,” wherein the “demand for disclosure elicits narratives that merely reinforce prior assumptions” (134, 130).

Rather than ebulliently obliging and enabling narrative typologies through self-expression, Juliet’s silence foreshortens the developmental scripts these typologies map out. Accordingly, Juliet is marked and observed successively in time—a motif that recurs throughout the text. To return to Juliet’s crossing of the English Channel, her shipmates’ sustained projection of genres upon Juliet necessarily remain unsubstantiated and unverified by Juliet’s silence, which results in their continuous observance of Juliet in an unfolding present. Her muteness forces the “group of provincials,” as Doody calls them, back from their various narrative projections that gather no momentum from Juliet’s silence, to the present of her body in time (328). The passengers observe: “just then the stranger, having taken off her gloves, to arrange an old shawl, in which she was wrapt, exhibited hands and arms of so dark a colour;” and moments after, “the wind just then blowing back the prominent borders of a French night-cap, which had almost concealed all her features displayed a large black patch that covered half her left cheek” (19, 20). Both of these unveilings occur suddenly—“just then”—and happen explicitly in time, and both elicit further inquiry; but the continued lack of response from Juliet forces their gaze back to the present of her person.

The projection of typologies upon Juliet, whether they are radical and feminist or anti-Jacobin and patriarchal, has been doubled by critical conceptions of the novel since

the time of its publication. Critics of *The Wanderer* have been divided on its politics. As an independent woman compelled to earn her living, Juliet exposes and criticizes a rigidly narrow socio-economic world that polices female subjectivity; and yet, Juliet's unmistakable aristocratic refinement, her inherent virtue and decorum, and the novel's more patriarchal conclusion, that recounts her restoration to her patronymic lineage and her subsequent marriage, seem to re-enforce the values of traditional society. The critical divide over *The Wanderer's* politics dates back to its politicized reception. Doody argues that the political context of 1814, "just after the defeat of Napoleon," was one of "right-wing triumph," and was unreceptive to "pleas for more social justice or appeals for a better understanding of France" (332). Accordingly, the "first reviewers of Burney's novel," Doody continues, "were not simply enlightened persons of taste . . . they had axes to grind" (333). This censure was not exclusive to either the left or the right. The "subversively Romantic and democratic" spirit of the novel—its assertion that "England ought to change"—was perceived to be an "affront" to "public guardians of the Right;" while its calling out of Britain's misogyny rankled the "radical democrat" Hazlitt, whose radicalism, Doody recalls, "most definitely" did not apply "to women" (333). The critical context in which the novel was published thus demanded from the book a clear and unambiguous political stance, which both the right and the left found wanting. Doody observes that "for feminist readers in the later twentieth century, as for male conservatives in the Regency era," the novel remains troublesome and perplexing for failing to align itself with either a straightforward conservatism or an anti-hegemonic radicalism (335).

Julia Epstein views *The Wanderer* as a radical feminist text, where “Juliet’s stripped-down female status (stateless, placeless, and penniless as well as nameless, married yet not married, of high birth yet not recognized) raises explicitly Burney’s political analysis of the position of women” (177). Similarly, George E. Haggerty argues that the novel forges a strong gender critique in its representation of the entitlement and privilege that men enjoy over women. The male characters “assert in mere insult and bravado” what they “lack in authority,” and Juliet is constantly beleaguered by men of all classes as “every male character presents a challenge” to her “independence and sense of self determination” (33). Debra Silverman likewise underlines the novel’s feminist politics, by arguing that “*The Wanderer* addresses most explicitly, and at times brutally, the difficulties that face women who want (out of both desire and necessity) to attain some amount of independence and economic self-sufficiency” (68). Through Juliet, Silverman continues, Burney “offers a critique of a society in which a woman without a ‘name’ is subject to bigotry and callousness” (68).

However, the decorum and propriety Juliet exhibits throughout the narrative, coupled with the fact that, in the end, “the novel restores an aristocrat to her proper place,” as Tara Czechowski puts it, places the text in a far more conservative light (700). This conservatism is amplified by the neutralizing of the Jacobin Elinor—a narrative outcome that would seem to position Burney as yet another of “the nineteenth-century promoters of domestic ideology” (Burgess 142). Indeed, Deborah Kennedy argues that in spite of “its realistic examination of questions of women’s rights and women’s work,” the novel’s reinstatement of Juliet to her proper social class and its denigration of

Elinor's radicalism renders it a "conservative fairy tale" (9). The Wollstonecraftian Elinor articulates explicitly a radical feminist point of view, but her perspective is undermined by her characterization as excessively passionate, brash, and suicidal. In comparing Juliet and Elinor, Catherine Frank shows that the two characters present competing versions of female subjectivity, which the novel reconciles conservatively by rewarding and restoring Juliet, and by staging Elinor's ultimate enticement into the virtues of a High Church conservatism by Harleigh. Frank argues that Elinor disavows "the proper feminine desire for marriage and domesticity" in her "revolutionary fervour," and therefore "provides an object lesson in the contaminating influence of French thought," which the novel ultimately purges (431-432). Juliet, on the other hand, signifies the corruption of the "English body politic . . . under siege," which necessitates her marriage to Harleigh for the "recuperation of national security through domestic stability" (433). Frank states, "Juliet must be recuperated into the upper-class" through her "innately genteel and retiring qualities," which "entitle her to be there" (445). William Galperin also finds that the comparative representations of Juliet and Elinor expose a lingering conservatism in the novel. Galperin argues that *The Wanderer* offers a "foreshortened Romanticism" that transposes real social change for the appearance of social change (385). "Burney's is a reconstruction or taming of romanticism to more hegemonic purposes," in its suppression of the radically liberating Romanticism offered by Elinor (Galperin 385). "Even as Burney allows Elinor her critical function in this text," Galperin states, "she is much more intent upon writing a narrative that effectively traces one woman's odyssey from beggar (indeed a beggar in blackface) to aristocrat" (385).

Burney thus “demonizes” Elinor “by depicting her as both obsessive and deranged,” and undermines Elinor’s offering of a romanticism that “entails an abandonment of virtually all vocabularies and typologies of change and their attendant narratives” (Galperin 384). Juliet’s transition from beggar to aristocrat is not a critique of class structures, but the ideological containment of the counter-hegemonic claims to freedom presented by Elinor. “To see a beggar become a duchess, or a duchess become a beggar,” Galperin writes, “is not to witness productive social change but to be diverted from liberty by maintenance of narratives that are interchangeably progressive *and* aristocratic . . . where mobility and change coexist comfortably and seamlessly with the usual—and still arbitrary—gradations of status and authority” (385).

Juliet’s initially disguised appearance of darkened skin has also divided critics on the novel’s politics. Tara Czechowski argues that the novel’s alignment of Juliet with blackness works to draw out and critique a “persistent aspect of racist thinking in its early phases: the correlation between crime and blackness” (679). Through her exoticism, the suspicion of her character, her alias, and the work she undertakes, Juliet is associated with “the black poor” and the increasingly racialized and criminalized body of the “buskers and beggars of the street” (691). Juliet, Czechowski observes, is, like a slave, “renamed,” and is “compelled to make a living in occupations traditionally assigned to people of African descent” (691, 692). For Czechowski, Juliet figures, in a radical and critical way, the “bigotry” that is an “integral aspect of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century social organization, which had become especially fraught in light of the French Revolution” (700). Sara Salih, however, argues that the novel

appropriates and repurposes problematically the violence of slavery, in order to draw parallels for white women. Salih states, "*The Wanderer* does not document the inhumanities of the slave trade, but rather the plantocratic tendencies displayed by the English characters establish the opportunistic textual connection between the sufferings of middle-class English women and slaves labouring overseas" (312). Salih claims that the "issue of enslavement is never directly canvassed in the novel," and so "its invocation of 'negritude' is cursory, opportunistic, and disturbing in its racial implications" (313). For Salih, the novel "leaves existing racial and social hierarchies intact, forcing the reader to accept that the novelist's attitudes, as manifested in her fiction at least, are more conservative than radical;" a reality that is overlooked because it remains "unpalatable" for "Burney commentators who would like to incorporate the author into a socialist feminist 'canon'" (314).

Margaret Doody reconciles these critical divisions by asserting that Burney consciously and performatively combines radicalism and conservatism because she understands how narratives necessarily encode political desires. "Burney has stock tropes of both right and left novels of the 1790s—radical and anti-Jacobin," Doody writes, and Burney "deliberately mixes ideological elements—knowing that the plot situations themselves are ideological elements" (325). Burney, aware that politics are produced and advanced through narratives, constructs a narrative that stages and dramatizes this very politicization. Indeed, as Park argues, the "criticism ends up exerting the very pressure to disclose legible motives that the novel works against" (139). "One of the major strengths of this dark novel," Pam Perkins writes, "is that

Burney refuses to endorse fully either the radical or the conservative point of view or to give any easy answers to the intractable problems caused by a society which defines 'woman' by her supposed exclusion from the public, economic world which she is perforce dependent upon" (79). The novel stages this politicization, therefore, to demonstrate how women's bodies are necessarily sites of political inscription.

In this light, Juliet's refusal to disclose her identity signifies her attempt to forge and occupy an identity independent of those prescribed by politicized typologies. Juliet is striving for anonymity in England, as she attempts to carve out her own space and inscribe her own independence. However, as a hybridized, liminal figure Juliet is denied, again and again, the independence she seeks in an economic mode that functions exclusively upon stable notions of family and class. Juliet displays an unmistakable aristocratic refinement—a "language," "air," and "manner" that indicates her having "received the education" and "lived the life of a gentlewoman" (75) as Harleigh observes—and yet, at the same time she "must work for a living" and "[struggle] to pay for lodgings, food, and clothing" (Epstein 181). This duality—her apparent aristocratic refinement and her apparent need for work—shuts Juliet out of an economy in which refinement precludes one from having to work in the first place. "To acquire independence, that belongs, physically, to sustaining life by her own means, was her most earnest desire," the narrator observes, and "her many accomplishments invited her industry, and promised its success;" however, "to bring them into use was difficult" (146). As the narrative progresses, "difficult" proves to be an understatement.

Unable to allay suspicions about her character and her motives, Juliet is compelled to leave Mrs. Maple and the Jodrells, and to take an apartment and earn her own living in Brighthelmstone. In so doing, Juliet takes on and harnesses what amounts to a bourgeois subjectivity, where, in both rhetoric and practice, she espouses its chief tenets: fair and contractual dealing, interpersonal relationships that are governed by a belief in mutual self-interest, a dedication to hard labour, and a careful and economical management of her time. By working dutifully in time, Juliet hopes she might find the means to secure the independence she seeks. Juliet comes by this bourgeois ethos honestly. In spite of her noble lineage, Juliet also possesses a bourgeois pedigree through her mother, the “orphan and destitute daughter of an insolvent man of business” from Yorkshire (641). However, the bourgeois subjectivity Juliet comes to inhabit is more immediately the result of her experience of the French Revolution. Both Juliet and her fellow émigré Gabriella, who also has an aristocratic lineage, have experienced firsthand the violence of the Revolution, and they espouse its values of self-maintenance, self-reliance, and equality through labour, as a result. Indeed, when questioned about working in their London haberdashery Gabriella replies, “the French Revolution has opened our eyes to a species of equality more rational, because more feasible, than that of lands or of rank; an equality not alone of mental sufferings but of manual exertions” (639). This belief in a value and worth measured by individual exertion breaks with the aristocratic worldview of inheritance and title. Juliet embodies the same commitment to independence and self-fashioning, and becomes the very emblem of the Protestant work ethic. Indeed, Juliet’s namelessness reflects her

inclusion in the expansion and enfranchisement of a class characterized by its absence of name and title. Furthermore, the name that Juliet ends up adopting ties her to the lifeblood of the emerging bourgeois economy: money. Upon arriving in England Juliet enquires for a “letter directed for L.S.,” which is later misheard as the surname “Ellis” (31). Juliet conveniently adopts this name in lieu of having to disclose her actual identity (31). The initials L.S., however, carry the monetary resonance of pounds, shillings, and pence: Lsd (Doody 329). The name figures Juliet as a sign of the ascendant capitalist economy, wherein hard currency comes to displace landed wealth and title.

The Wanderer foregrounds the transformative power of Juliet’s post-revolutionary spirit in the radical transformation she makes from her disguised state, as a pauper in blackface, to a naturalized English woman. Upon attending Mrs. Ireton to London after landing on British soil, Juliet slowly loses the traces of her disguise in a passage focalized through the eyes of Mrs. Ireton:

This was a manifest alteration in the complexion of her attendant, which, from a regular and equally dark hue, appeared on the same morning, to be smeared and streaked; and, on the third, to be of a dusky white. This failed not to produce sundry inquisitive comments; but they never succeeded in obtaining any explanatory replies. When, however, on the fourth day, the shutters of the chamber, which, to give it a more sickly character, had hitherto been closed, were suffered to admit the sunbeams of a cheerful winter’s morning, Mrs. Ireton was directed, by

their rays, to a full and marvelous view, of a skin changed from a tint nearly black, to the brightest, whitest and most dazzling fairness. (42-43)

Juliet's transformation is almost incomprehensible to the more traditional and static worldview of Mrs. Ireton. Indeed, Mrs. Ireton is almost unable to see it—she “[stares] at this unexpected metamorphosis” with “unmingled amazement”—until the change cannot be denied (43). Mrs. Ireton struggles with marking Juliet's alteration, because her worldview altogether disallows for the possibility of individual alteration. Mrs. Ireton can only see fixed and changeless identities, such as birth, title, and nation. Juliet lies “beyond what [Mrs. Ireton] could have conjectured,” because in Juliet Mrs. Ireton encounters a subject who lies beyond the organizational confines of traditional identity (43). Juliet accentuates this when she dismisses herself from Mrs. Ireton, who is pressing Juliet to provide an account of herself. Juliet departs “without deigning to make any answer,” and leaves Mrs. Ireton “in speechless rage at this unbidden retreat” (44). As a self-defining subject, Juliet is unaccountable to the world of rank and tradition that organizes Mrs. Ireton's mode of being. It is significant, moreover, that Juliet's alteration transpires over time—it begins the “same morning” and is completed on the “fourth day.” Juliet's transformation takes place in an unfolding present, the efficacy and modality of which are altogether alien to Mrs. Ireton's more traditional worldview.

Despite this, the novel reveals almost immediately the incommensurability of the bourgeois notion of economic production and exchange, adopted by Juliet, with the economy of the nobility. This is first exemplified in Juliet's inability to collect payment for the music lessons she provides to the fashionable young women of Brighthelmstone.

Because traditional economic relations of class and connection continue to overpower the efforts of rational individuals producing and exchanging goods in the context of a rational market, Juliet finds her ability to collect payment for her services almost impossible. Lady Arramede, because of her wealth, cannot “possibly attend . . . to such pitiful claims,” and recommends Juliet “apply to her steward at Christmas, which was the time, she believed, when he settled her affairs” (298). “The aristocrats who owe Juliet money,” Andrea Henderson argues, “tend to delay payment or neglect it altogether, and they justify themselves by belittling the service or product they have received from her” (11-12). Juliet’s attempts at exchanging her time and her labour for money are incongruous with an aristocratic notion of payment that settles accounts along more traditional lines. Juliet, Henderson writes, “has no place in a system of blood and patronage relations” (16). In *Brithelmstone*, Juliet does not find rational economic actors pursuing their own self-interest; rather, she finds herself continuously stymied by an economic mode that is deeply rooted in traditional social connections.

The same challenges overwhelm Juliet and Gabriella’s needlework business. Both regard time as a productive venue within which they can find the means for self-determination. Their “project of needle-work” is figured as an act of “industry” and “independence,” and their commitment to their “youth and strength” is regarded as the means through which they might be preserved from “pecuniary obligation” (400, 401). Indeed, their bourgeois productivity is realized through the metric of clock time. The initial success they experience is indexed by their economical use of time. The two had, at first, “more employment than time, though they limited themselves to five hours for

sleep; though their meals were rather swallowed than eaten,” and their labour gives them “not a moment for any kind of recreation, of rest, or of exercise” (402). Despite their total absence of rest, this time becomes for Juliet the most fulfilling to her since “her arrival on the British shores” (402). Through their commitment to the bourgeois productivity of clock time they find, however precarious, the means of self-preservation.

They do enjoy some success initially, but the hasty departure of Gabriella signals the end of their business. Juliet tries to not let this blow “consume her time;” however, her economical time-thrift is soon overwhelmed (402). Juliet’s clientele consists of “every rich female at Brighthelmstone,” and they view their relationship with Juliet as one of benevolent patronage, rather than one of rational economic exchange (404). As with her music lessons, Juliet cannot obtain payment for her services from these “careless triflers,” who “seemed to estimate her time and her toil as nothing” (405, 404). Juliet’s patrons place no value upon her time, and they “ordinarily condemned” her “to wait in passages, or anti-chambers, for whole hours, and even whole mornings” (404). Within this aristocratic economic mode, time remains the privilege of class, which leads an exasperated Juliet to question: “the time which they thus unmercifully waste in humiliating attendance, however to themselves it may be a play-thing, if not a drug, is, to those who subsist but by their use of it, shelter, clothing, and nourishment?” (405). Juliet draws a parallel between time and individual maintenance, and in so doing draws a distinction between her own bourgeois modality and the aristocratic economy. When payment is secured for her labour, it is done so “with the parade of generosity,” and not through the due recognition of “debts of common justice” (404). Furthermore,

the patronage and connection that characterizes this economy places Juliet in a double bind. She can only get business through personal introduction, but because of that direct social connection, she then cannot expect payment by virtue of the fact that she “was brought forward by recommendation” (404). It is revealing that Juliet bases her critique of this economic mode through her figurative appeal to “common justice” and to “common humanity, nay, common sense” (405). Her appeal to commonality reflects her desire for a common market, for a shared understanding of economic value and of the protocols of economic exchange.

Burney, Pam Perkins argues, underlines the economic limitations Juliet faces by “[refusing] to palliate either her heroine’s poverty or the steadily increasing difficulties that she encounters in trying to earn her living” (73). In revealing the challenges Juliet endures, the novel shows the tension in post-revolutionary England between an ascendant bourgeois class and a reactionary, conservative nobility. Andrea Henderson argues that through Juliet’s economic struggles the novel strives to imbue the “labourer/producer” with her own “political independence,” “over against the aristocrat/consumer” (3). *The Wanderer* does this, Henderson writes, through a “mystification of the commodity, by insisting on the aloof independence of both labour and its products,” and “uses the apparent autonomy of things—which Marx decries—as a means to argue for the autonomy of the makers of those things” (3). Despite this, in the economic world of Brighthelmstone, Henderson continues, “economic interactions” are not as yet based on the value of production, but remain “inevitably complicated by considerations of rank, family connections, and other social relations” (14).

The Wanderer indexes Juliet's inability to leverage a bourgeois subjectivity in an economy controlled by landed interests through the language of clock time. Rather than facilitating Juliet's independence, clock time in the economy of the nobility becomes a dispossessing structure. Because the power brokers of this economy have time as an open venue of leisure, clock time fails to allow for Juliet's self-preservation, and becomes, for her, an instrument of alienated labour. This is made explicit when Juliet goes to work as a mantua maker. Here she finds clock time, and the new form of industrial labour it regulates, to be dispossessing and monotonous. Doody attests to this when she writes, "Burney seems to be the first novelist to investigate at any depth the phenomenon now known to us as 'alienation,' the state in which the worker feels no personal participation in the labor by which he—or she—earns a livelihood but is simply a devitalized functionary performing perpetual routine tasks" (356). Juliet desires to work for Miss Hart in a casual manner, free from any traditional commitment that might bind her to "learn the art of mantua-making as a future trade, or employment" (451). She wants only to be "serviceable" and "to continue, or to renounce her engagement, from day to day" (451). Juliet eschews the more traditional, artisan-apprentice approach to labour, with its more permanent engagements, for the "self-dependence" she believes might be gained from contracting one's labour in time (451). However, upon taking up her position Juliet notes how this daily work is both monitored and monotonous. Juliet finds that "the unremitting diligence with which she had begun her new office, had advanced her work with a rapidity, that made the smallest relaxation cause a sensible difference in its progress" (453). In an almost assembly-line fashion,

Miss Hart monitors the pace of production, and grows disappointed when she “[observes], how much quicker business had gone on the first week” (453). Henderson notes the proto-industrial character of Juliet’s work as a mantua maker: “while we never see Juliet working with industrial machines, we do see her working in factory conditions—i.e., as part of a group of workers gathered under a single roof whose labour is overseen by a supervisor” (17). Instead of releasing Juliet from traditional and confining economic relations, clock time ushers in a new form of alienation. Juliet wonders, “what is the labour that never requires respite? What the mind, that never demands a few poor unshackled instants to itself?” (453). “To be a labourer,” Henderson observes, “is to be reduced to a machine, attached inescapably to the world of made objects but also to the world of production in general” (17). Juliet is “deadened by uninteresting monotony . . . the unvarying repetition of stitch after stitch, nearly closed in sleep her faculties, as well as her eyes,” and she characterizes the work as possessing a “fatiguing uniformity” (454). Moreover, Juliet finds that clock time engenders precariousness in addition to alienation. Juliet is free from “all continued constraint” and “set freshly at liberty every evening,” but she becomes “a stranger to security” as well, and is “subject to dismissal, at the mercy of accident, and at the will of caprice” (455). Indeed, she ultimately loses her position when demand for her services declines after the termination of some “work of importance just ordered for a great wedding in the neighbourhood” (450). Within an aristocratic economic mode, clock time cannot deliver economic independence.

Clock time might fail those striving for independence within the economy of nobility, but for the wealthy it provides and enables time as an ever-unfolding venue of leisure and consumption. Juliet's stint at the milliner's shop shows its wealthy patrons to be decadent and extravagant wasters of time. Time for these patrons is a privilege of their wealth: "the ladies whose practice it was to frequent the shop, thought the time and trouble of its mistress, and her assistants, amply paid by the honour of their presence" (426). The wealthy demonstrate a "total absence of feeling and of equity . . . for the indigent and laborious," and display the "most callous disregard to all representations of the dearness of materials, or of the just price of labour" (428, 427). Time is a privilege of wealth, and those who are forced to work for their living must enable and encourage this privilege. Juliet observes that the shop greets the wealthy and their "strolling . . . instantly, and with fulsome adulation," while the "meaner, or economical, whose time had its essential appropriations, were obliged to wait patiently" (428). "The rich and grand" are "capricious, difficult, and long in their examinations, because their time was their own" (428). Time for the affluent is there for the spending—a privilege underwritten by the very absence of time available to those in their service.

The temporal inequality of the economy of nobility reveals clock time to be a function of power, one that authorizes the wealthy and disciplines working people. After the failure of Juliet's numerous occupations the only means of preservation that remains available to her is to become a "toad-eater;" or, "a person who would swallow any thing, bad or good; and do whatever he was bid, right or wrong; for the sake of a

little pay" (520, 521). The designation of "toad-eater" for one who would do something for "a little pay" reveals the ethos of a traditional economy that finds the very idea of exchanging labour for money to be a revolting proposition. Juliet's status as a labourer and Mrs. Ireton's position as her aristocratic employer are each registered by time, where, via a zero-sum structure, Juliet's lack of time signifies Ireton's surplus. While in Mrs. Ireton's service, Juliet is endlessly beleaguered by her wealthy charges, as "the encroachments upon her time, her attention, her liberty" are never ending (495). "Every moment of time, and consequently all means of comfort" lie at Mrs. Ireton's "disposal," and she views Juliet as yet another object over which she might extend her temporal privilege (491). Juliet, in her service to Mrs. Ireton, becomes a means of occupying her time, "a treasure, which might rescue [Mrs. Ireton's] unoccupied hours from weariness and spleen" (491). The decadence of time displayed by the Iretons is encapsulated in the small building on the Ireton grounds dubbed the "Temple of the Sun" (496). This building "like every place which Mrs. Ireton capriciously, and even for the shortest interval, inhabited" is "filled with materials for recreation, which, ingeniously employed, might have whiled away a winter; but which, from her fluctuating whims, were insufficient even for the fleet passage of a few hours" (496). The objects that populate the Temple of the Sun are all diversions and distractions with which to pass the time: "books; various pieces of needle-work; a billiard-table; a chess-board; a backgammon-board; a cup and ball, &c. &c.; all, in turn, were tried; all, in turn, rejected" (496). It is significant that after all of Juliet's failed attempts at securing her independence—from music instructor, to public performer, to needle-worker, to

milliner's shop attendant, to mantua maker—she ends up in a position that most transparently reveals the power structure that underwrites the economy of the nobility, and makes most apparent the decadent expenditure of leisure time that characterizes that economy. In drawing this sharp contrast, the novel shows how clock time reaffirms more readily existing class dynamics, than it allows for the promotion of independence. *The Wanderer* demonstrates how clock time for the wealthy is the open and available time of leisure and consumption; while for those who must work, clock time is alienating, monotonous, and disciplinary.

The productive bourgeois ethos channeled by Juliet ultimately fails her as a means of attaining independence within the economy of the nobility. Her inability to leverage clock time results in her “again” becoming a “Wanderer,” after she is detected at her final occupation of haberdasher with Gabriella in London (655). In the text's most explicit and literal presentation of wander, Juliet seeks “concealment” in the area of the New Forest, by hoping to find lodging “with a rustic family . . . in so retired and remote a spot” (659). Unable to find traction with the bourgeois ethos, Juliet is ejected effectively from the town economy, with its aristocratic underpinnings, and is cast into the “rawer world” of the English countryside (Doody 359). Juliet wanders this countryside not as a self-styled figurative outcast, nor as a pejoratively figurative female adventurer, but as a literal wanderer—a displaced and alienated outcast unable to find a space of repose. Wandering through the “rough and violent” world of rural England, Juliet's wander is neither freeing, spiritually engaging, nor bucolic; it is dangerous (Doody 359).

The Wanderer, Carmel Murphy claims, shows how “Britain is erroneously identified as a site of liberty, failing to provide the heroine with the safe-haven that it had represented in anti-jacobin novels” (495). Indeed, “Burney’s heroine,” Murphy continues, “narrowly avoids rape on more than one occasion in the novel” (495). Juliet’s movement through the town of Romsey underlines the lack of freedom and the endangerment that her displaced wander exposes her to. Upon entering Romsey, Juliet, mistaken for a girl with whom she swapped bonnets to better blend in, is accosted with “terms of coarse endearment” by a passing carter—a sexual threat that is repeated as she leaves town, and later as she enters the New Forest (666). In Romsey, Juliet finds she can remain “aloof of all intrusive impertinence” by keeping a “deep care in her countenance, which, to the common observer, seemed but an air of business,” as she moves through town (667). To be sure, her practised bourgeois subjectivity finds a home as she makes her way through what is presented as a bustling site of economic productivity:

Carts, wagons, and diligences, were wheeling through the town; market-women were arriving with butter, eggs, and poultry; work-men and manufacturers were trudging to their daily occupations; all was alive and in motion; and commerce, with its hundred hands, was every where opening and spreading its sources of wealth, through its active sisters, ingenuity and industry. (666-667)

Romsey, in sharp contrast to Brighthelmstone, is figured as a locus of economic production characterized by ingenuity, industry, and commerce. Juliet is at home in the

bourgeois-inflected Romsey, and she is able to pass as one of its citizens, “nearly unnoticed, and wholly unmolested,” because she, like the town, espouses the same productive work ethic: “everyone, like herself, alert to proceed, and impressed with the value of time, because using it to advantage, pursued his own purpose” (656, 667). However, as Juliet begins to note a “general desertion” signaling the onset of “the rural hour of repast” upon leaving town, Juliet is again solicited sexually (668). Juliet is thrice deterred from appealing for assistance from “countrymen” at various cottages (668). The first offers to grant her water if she were to “pay him with a kiss;” she has “not courage to make her demand” from the second cottage peopled by “some men” “smoaking at the door;” and the third offers “a familiar invitation to partake of a cup of cyder” (668). As soon as Juliet leaves the commercial space of the town, her movement becomes a wander that leaves her open to danger. Indeed, Juliet’s movement is viewed as the wandering of a prostitute. The apparent aimlessness of Juliet’s movement comes to resemble the “strolling” of prostitution:

Now, too, her distress received the tormenting augmentation of intrusive interruption; for, in losing the elasticity of her motions, she lost, to the vulgar observer, her appearance of innocence. Her eye, eagerly cast around in search of an asylum, appeared to be courting attention; her languor seemed but loitering; and her slow unequal pace, wore the air of inviting a companion. (668)

Juliet’s fatigued walking is misread as the active wandering of sexual solicitation.

Moving beyond the prescribed commercial space of Romsey opens Juliet up to danger,

and reveals the complete impossibility of her own self-determination. In her displaced wander Juliet becomes a marked object, rather than a self-possessed wandering subject.

The Wanderer emphasizes Juliet's sheer distance from a more subjective, freeing, and aesthetically enabled iteration of wander, by exposing and eliminating the illusions that inform the Romantic rhetoric of wander. Juliet first enters the New Forest with the perspective of the removed, urban, aesthetic observer. She "mount[s] a hillock to take a general survey of the spot," which is described as "sublimely picturesque," complete with "richly variegated woods, whose aged oaks appeared to be spreading their venerable branches to offer shelter from the storms of life" (676). The scene also offers the prospect of gentle "zephyrs," the sun setting in the "benignant west," and "the extatic wild notes, and warbling . . . of the feathered race" (676). Initially, Juliet views the landscape for its aesthetic value. She imbues the natural world with a moral beauty and a timelessness that is capable of restoration and benevolent shelter. However, Juliet is soon cured of this misconception when she seeks shelter at the cottage of Nat Mixon and his family. She encounters at the cottage not a scene of natural, rustic liberty and vitality, but one of squabbling, meanness, and crime. The cottagers "answered morosely" to her request for hospitality, by explaining "that they had neither bed nor room for travellers," and "they went on with their supper, now helping, and now scolding their children, and one another" (678). Juliet places "half-a-crown upon the table" to "quicken their attention," and they rise "bowing and courtying and each offering her their place, and their repast" (678). In spite of offering

the money, Juliet feels “mortified that so mercenary a spirit could have found entrance in a spot which seemed fitted to the virtuous innocence of our yet untainted first parents; or to guileless hospitality of the poet’s golden age” (678). Juliet’s fantasy of rural life bursts, as she realizes that it too is governed by a more crass commercialism. Indeed, in perhaps a moment of willful denial—a denial that maintains her fantasy of rustic morality—Juliet has to “with difficulty persuade herself that she was not eating venison,” when served “slices of such fine-grained mutton,” and, in so doing, she convinces herself that the cottagers are not engaged in illegal poaching (679). The cottagers are “rough to their children, and gross to each other; the woman looked all care and ill humour; the man, all moroseness and brutality,” and they fall “below [Juliet’s] expectations,” which disrupts Juliet’s removed and idealized fantasy of rural life (679).

The bursting of this idyll is achieved finally as Juliet awakes in the night with the fear that she has “fallen” into a “den of thieves” (679). Upon overhearing the couple discussing how to get past the sleeping Juliet, Juliet becomes a Gothic heroine entrapped by banditti, and she plays the part by feigning sleep. Juliet hears “something fall, or thrown down, from within, weighty, and bearing a lumpish sound that made her start with horror;” an attentiveness that is “perceived by the hostess,” and Juliet “struggle[s] vainly to resume her serene appearance of repose” (681). Juliet misreads a “large clot of blood” and the “bloody spots” that mark the passageway as signs of “some victim of murderous rapacity” with which she grows “wholly absorbed” (682). Poaching becomes murder in Juliet’s naïve understanding of the rural world. But her temporary

shift into the Gothic underlines, for Juliet, the disconnection between distanced pastoral, idealizations of rustic life, and its reality. Juliet makes her way out of the cottage and eventually “[seats] herself upon the stump of a large tree, where deaf, from mental occupation, to the wild melody of innumerable surrounding singing birds, she shudderingly, and without intermission, bathed her bloody hand in the dew” (684). The trees, which previously had the effect of making “heaven and eternity seem in full view,” are now reduced to a “stump,” and the transport of the singing birds becomes a more ominous “wild melody” (676, 684). Juliet’s cleansing of her hand in the early morning dew signals how she has been marked by the abject materiality of nature, and her repetitive and unstoppable wiping stresses the indelibility of this materiality. This awakening of Juliet is coded through her better understanding of her wander as an uprooted and alienating experience. As Juliet regains the road, the narrator notes how the forest has lost its natural wonder for Juliet: “where, now, was the enchantment of its prospects? Where, the witchery of its scenery?” and observes how Juliet can now see “nothing but her danger” and can “make no observation but how to escape what [the forest] menaced” (685-686, 686). To be sure, the text reveals the sheer physical challenges, difficulties, and dangers of wander. As she makes her way through the forest “she wandered sometime in this fruitless research” (656), and later she goes “wandering on, by paths unknown to herself, with feet not more swift than trembling” (662); later still she notes “how little fitted to the female character . . . this hazardous plan of lonely wandering” (671); and soon after, “she wandered thus for some hours, now sinking into marshy ground, now wounded by rude stones, now upon a soft smooth

plain, and now stung or torn by bushes, nettles, and briars; till she concluded it to be about midnight" (704). Wander for Juliet is not the means of attaining a bucolic liberty, it is an exhausting, dangerous, and relentless pacing of difficult ground. Again "and again," Juliet goes "in search of a new asylum," and again and again "[becomes] a Wanderer" (703). Mrs. Ireton who mockingly referred to Juliet, when in her employ, as "a person of another century. A wandering Jewess," was making a prophetic statement—Juliet is far closer to the abject, itinerant figure of the Wandering Jew than she is to the masculine poet bounding through the natural world in pursuit of individual freedom (485).

Juliet's experience of dispossessed wander thus provides her with the means of critiquing the literary and discursive celebrations of rustic life she had commenced with. The novel shows how these acts of praising rural life are rooted, more often than not, in a disconnected and wealthy urban fantasy. Those who view shepherds and peasants "through their imaginations," Juliet observes later in the text, fail to see how the working, rural poor "are the instruments" for the wealthy (701). The "enlightened rambler, or affluent possessor" might be "charmed" by "the verdure of the flower-motleyed meadow; the variegated foliage of the wood; the fragrance and purity of the air, and the wide spreading beauties of the landscape," but the "labourer" remains entirely devoid of these pleasures (700-701). The labourer's experience with the natural world is centred upon the hardship of toil and production, and not upon some disinterested beauty. "If the vivid field catches" the labourers' "view," Juliet observes, "it is but to present to them the image of the scythe, with which their labour must mow

it; if they look at the shady tree, it is only with the foresight of the ax, with which their strength must fell it" (701). Perkins states, "Even rustic life and labour, which Juliet initially views with the sentimentality encouraged by popular writing and art, palls when she views it firsthand and realizes that the Romantic taste for nature, no less than society's taste for art is a leisured one supported by the hard work of the less privileged" (77). Unlike "those who are born and bred in the capital," Juliet notes how "the most delightful view which the horizon can bound, affords not to the poor labourer the joy that is excited by the view of the twilight through which it is excluded; but which sends him home to the mat of straw, that rests, for the night, his spent and weary limbs" (700, 701). Perkins writes, "the Wordsworthian idea that peasants achieve moral exaltation through 'honest labour' is, Juliet concludes, a pernicious fiction of the intelligentsia" (77).

Accordingly, through Juliet's rough and dangerous experience of wander, *The Wanderer* challenges the rhetoric of wander aligned with Romanticism taking root in early-nineteenth-century Britain. Published the same year as *The Excursion*, the novel offers a counter-narrative to the unstructured and freeing movement posited by the Romantic rhetoric of wander, by underlining how free wander is necessarily underwritten by class and gender. Doody argues that Juliet is the novel's "truly Romantic figure, 'The Wanderer'—the very phrase is in the Romantic mode," but she observes also how that figure is gendered male, and pejoratively gendered female (328). Doody writes, "Juliet is a Wanderer, like a beggar, like a Romantic poet, or—in a woman's case—like a prostitute" (329). Juliet's wander places her alongside the many

“lonely wanderers, from Rousseau’s ‘Solitary Walker’ to Wordsworth’s poetic population of ‘wanderers,’ like the Old Cumberland Beggar, the Female Vagrant, the Leech Gatherer,” but in so doing it ironizes the masculine individualism elicited by Romantic wander (328-329). Perkins also demonstrates how wander in Romanticism tends to reflect male privilege: “readers of 1814 were familiar with works by authors from Rousseau through Wordsworth to Byron which focused on the private reflections of wandering heroes . . . beggars and gentleman alike commune with nature, drawing irreproachable moral conclusions about society and human nature from their solitary musings” (73). Women, however, are unable to access wander as a space of solitary contemplation. What constitutes individual development and growth for men becomes a questioning of character for women. Wander “grants spiritual freedom to male romantic figures from the Leech Gatherer to Childe Harold,” Perkins argues, but it signifies prostitution or destitution for women (74). Wander, writes Perkins, “only leads Juliet into ever narrower social and economic options,” and the “isolation and anonymity” that she faces underlines how “this paradigmatic romantic activity—wandering—is incompatible with femininity” (74). Maria Jerinic shows similarly how Juliet’s wander differs from more stock representations of Romantic wander. Jerinic claims that unlike one of Radcliffe’s heroines, for whom wandering is “of particular importance because it signifies the heroine’s desire to gain liberty, both physical freedom and the freedom to marry the man of her choice,” Burney’s use of the figure has the opposite effect (71). “While in Radcliffe’s novels, wandering is integral to the power and success of her heroines,” Jerinic states, “for Burney, Juliet’s status as a

'Wanderer' is a problem, as the novel's subtitle, *Female Difficulties*, suggests" (71).

Wander fails to "provide Juliet with liberty," and "while she runs from the ever-present threat of economic and sexual exploitation, her wanderings only intensify her vulnerability" (71). Far from being the freeing and transformative means for attaining independence wandering for Juliet is downright dangerous.

The sustained challenges Juliet faces in her wandering underscore how the rhetoric of Romantic wander is underwritten by a class and gender privilege. As an interesting counterpoint, Elinor, whose wealth affords her a freedom of mobility and, moreover, a freedom to perform the vagrant tramping of a wanderer, undertakes the anonymous wander that Juliet is unable to do. Earlier in the text as Juliet is about to perform publicly, as a means of fulfilling her mounting pecuniary obligations, her performance is halted before it begins by "a strange figure, with something foreign in his appearance" (356). The manner and clothing of this stranger, who speaks "broken English," code him as the exotic outsider (356).

His dress and figure were equally remarkable. He was wrapped in a large scarlet coat, which hung loosely over his shoulders, and was open at the breast, to display a brilliant waistcoat of coloured and spangled embroidery. He had a small, but slouched hat, which he had refused to take off, that covered his forehead and eye-brows, and shaded his eyes; and a cravat of enormous bulk encircled his chin, and enveloped not alone his ears, but his mouth. Nothing was visible but his nose, which was singularly long and pointed. The whole of his habiliment seemed of

foreign manufacture; but his hair had something in it that was wild, and uncouth; and his head was continually in motion. (357-358)

The figure turns out to be Elinor who disrupts the performance with a dramatic suicide attempt, accompanied by a declaration of her devotion to Harleigh. Elinor has the resources to actively perform the role of the exotic Wandering Jew—a performance she can launch publicly from the gallery to carry out her own desires. Indeed, we learn soon after that Elinor had devoted significant time and resources to her performance of the exiled wanderer: “Elinor had travelled post to Portsmouth, whence she had sailed to the Isle of Wight. There, meeting with a foreign servant out of place, she engaged him in her service, and bid him purchase some clothes of an indigent emigrant. She then dressed herself grotesquely yet, as far as she could, decently, in man’s attire” (395). Elinor’s disguised vagrancy ironizes a statement she makes earlier in the text that could well stand as a distillation of Romanticism at its most radical: “I detest all aristocracy: I care for nothing upon the earth but nature; and I hold no one thing in the world worth living for but liberty! and liberty, you know, has but two occupations,—plucking up and pulling down. To me, therefore, ’tis equally diverting, to see a beggar swell into a duchess, or a duchess dwindle into a beggar” (110-111). But this sentiment is undercut by the fact that she performs this transition for self-serving purposes. Elinor possesses the class freedom to perform exactly the kind of social demotion her politics call for, but undertaking such a transition is underwritten by her wealth in the first place. Her class privilege allows her to espouse and enact an independent wander and a political and class freedom, which remains untenable for unknown, working women.

The Romantic rhetoric of wander is revealed therefore to be a fiction—a fiction that reifies the distance between the nobility and the peasantry. Whether it is the wander of romance or the wander of Romanticism, wander is incapable of generating independence or social change in *The Wanderer*. As if to drive this point home, *The Wanderer* enacts a form of Deus ex Machina to restore forcefully Juliet to the nobility to which she always already belongs, and to engage performatively a more purposive, anti-Jacobin, marriage plot to carry out the novel's resolution. After being detected in the New Forest, Juliet tries to make her escape from the pursuant "Mounseer, the smuggler," who is working on behalf of the Commissary for "a great reward" (721). However, as Juliet escapes, she is corralled back from her anonymous wander. The text delimits her wandering by channeling her into an unavoidable and inevitable track that leads directly to Harleigh and the Commissary. As Juliet tries to flee, she sees

In a short time, the sight of several hostellers, helpers, and postilions, before a large house, which appeared to be a capital inn, [that makes] her cross the way. She wished to turn wholly from the high road; but low brick-walls had now, on either side, taken place of hedges, and she searched in vain for an opening. Her earnestness to press onward, joined to her fear of looking up, made her soon follow, unconsciously, an ordinary man, till she was so close behind him, as suddenly to perceive, by his now well known coat, that he was the pilot! . . . turning short back, speeded her retrograde way with all her force . . . she heard footsteps following. Hopeless of saving herself, if watched or suspected by flight;

as she knew that there was no turning for at least half a mile; she darted precipitately into the inn; which seemed alone to offer her even a shadow of any chance of concealment. (723)

Juliet is funneled back towards the inn, and her wander is foreshortened and curtailed, as she is pushed into the building that contains the revelation of her history, and the means of reinserting her back into a narrative trajectory. This channeling, moreover, is continued at the inn itself, where Juliet frantically strives to find a means of egress, as she flees the voices of her pursuers she hears around her. Fumbling from one hall to another Juliet finally manages to find an obliging door.

She seemed to herself a mere composition of terror. She flew up the stairs, meaning to regain her little chamber; but mistaking her way, found herself in a gallery, leading to the best apartments. Glad, however, rather than sorry, in the hope she might here be less liable to be sought, she opened the first door; and, entering a large vast room, locked and bolted herself in, with such extreme precipitance, that already she had sunk upon her knees, in fervent prayer, before a shadow, which caught her eyes, made her look round; when she perceived, at a distant window, a gentleman who was writing. (725)

Juliet is able, at last, to locate a room of her own in which to hide, only to find it already occupied by Harleigh. Juliet can only escape one male pursuer by running unintentionally into the arms of another. Indeed, as soon as she exits Harleigh's room she runs headlong into the pursuing Pilot, who "with arms wide extended, to prevent

her passing, loudly calls, '*Citoyen! Citoyen! Venez Voir! C'est Elle!*'" to the Commissary (726). Juliet, in spite of her attempts at independence, is reinstated forcefully to a more conventional, anti-Jacobin, marriage plot, wherein her experience of Revolutionary violence, her aristocratic origins, and her marriage to Harleigh all begin to lurch into action.

To be sure, the debate that ensues between the Commissary and Harleigh, soon after Juliet's capture, maps out the stakes of an anti-Jacobin narrative. The men's debate over the fate of Juliet doubles the highly politicized Revolutionary debate over rights. Harleigh demands to know "by what right" the Commissary claims Juliet, while claiming her himself "by the rights of humanity," to which the Commissary responds: "*il y a d'autres droits!*" (727). The language of rights that is played out over the "prostrate" Juliet is ironic, as her own rights conspicuously fall by the wayside (727). The Commissary, who is "dressed with disgusting negligence" and bears "an hideous countenance," figures Jacobinism as brutish and repugnant, but Harleigh's brand of natural English liberty is not beyond reproach (727). After Juliet is taken away, Harleigh sits alone and thinks despondently of how Juliet is "indisputably married! and can never, never—even in my wishes, now, be mine! A sudden sensation, kindred even to hatred, took possession of his feelings. Altered she appeared to him, and delusive" (730). Harleigh's own misogyny seeps to the surface after the debate over rights is definitively answered by the revelation of Juliet's nuptial ties. Despite this, the anti-Jacobin narrative jumps into action, as if spring-loaded, as Sir Jaspar appears out of nowhere, as the dutiful old aristocrat, to prevent Juliet's transport back to France, by arranging for

the Commissary to be “imprisoned for trial, or sent out of the country, by the alien-bill” (756).

Under Sir Jaspar’s protection Juliet at last reveals her recent history and explains her forced marriage as well as her mysterious and nameless exile in Britain, which signals the end of her alienated wander. However, at the exact moment at which Juliet provides an account of herself, and becomes realigned with her family and title, Sir Jaspar begins referring to her as a wanderer. Sir Jaspar’s repeated designation of Juliet as a wanderer performs the transition Juliet makes from literal, alienated wander to figurative, free, and privileged wander. However, this final figurative state of wander is denuded of any real independence, and becomes, instead, a diminutive that downplays Juliet’s struggles and obfuscates her ultimately confined status. “This forlorn, but most beautiful Wanderer,” Sir Jaspar states, “—this so long concealed, and mysterious, but most lovely incognita, is the daughter of the late Lord Granville, and the grand-daughter of the Late Earl of Melbury” (641). Sir Jaspar calls her a wanderer in the same breath as he identifies her patriarchal lineage, and converts her lived experience into an ironic appellation. When Sir Jaspar calls Juliet a wanderer a second time it completes the word’s ironization. Sir Jaspar recounts how he planned to “fix the matchless Wanderer in her proper sphere” (757). The designation of wanderer is here entirely fictional, if not ideological, as Sir Jaspar wishes to “fix” Juliet—a word that signifies the complete opposite of wander—at the very centre of British society. In calling Juliet a wanderer, Sir Jaspar contains and confines her—she is no longer alienated, but she is devoid of freedom.

With Juliet's identity revealed and her mysterious namelessness accounted for, she is granted finally the due space and time that goes with her station, but she loses all agency in the process. The ending of the novel oversees the transference of action from Juliet to a self-appointed male protectorate consisting of Sir Jaspar, Harleigh, Lord Melbury, and her uncle the Admiral. She is now temporally and spatially free—free to wander—but she is also far more circumscribed. This is evident upon Juliet's visit to Stonehenge, where Sir Jaspar takes her soon after her rescue. Juliet, "struck with solemn wonder," is free to roam throughout Stonehenge, and "for some time wandered amidst these massy ruins, grand and awful, though terrific rather than attractive" (765). However, her wander is closely monitored and impeded upon by Sir Jaspar. At Stonehenge, Juliet is lost freely "in deep and melancholy rumination," that is "till she was joined by the Baronet" (766). Sir Jaspar disrupts Juliet's own impressions of Stonehenge, and he goes so far as to suppose and even narrate her own experience. Sir Jaspar states, "You picture yourself perhaps, in the original temple of Gog and Magog? For what less than giants could have heaved stones such as these?" (766). Juliet is compelled out of her own sublime meditations by the interruptive Sir Jaspar, who forces Juliet to try "but vainly, to make a civil speech" until "Sir Jaspar, after having vainly awaited it, went on" (766). Juliet is pulled forcefully out of her freeing, wandering thoughts—in which there "was room for 'meditation even to madness'"—by this male intrusion that insists on regulating and controlling her experience (766). Additionally, Sir Jaspar colonizes and repurposes the "romantic spot" of Stonehenge to re-inscribe patriarchal hierarchies, and to reify Juliet as an object of desire (767). Sir Jaspar erects

his own Stonehenge consisting of “a large band-box, and a square new trunk, placed as supporters to an elegant Japan basket, in which were arranged various refreshments” (768-769). In the box are gifts for Juliet—“a complete small assortment of the finest linen” and “a white chip bonnet of the most beautiful texture”—that reaffirms masculine power and control over feminine bodies (769). Sir Jaspar offers space and time to Juliet in which to wander; but he also delimits, organizes, and controls that space and time in its very offering. Through her re-association with her patriarchal title Juliet grows entitled to wander freely, but it is a free wander that is, in actuality, rigorously policed.

With Juliet’s newfound free and open wander comes free time; and yet, the freedom and openness of both her wander and her time are always already restricted. While awaiting word of her and the Bishop’s safety in the “perfect retirement” of Milton-abbey Juliet “passed her time in deep rumination” and “wandered, as usual, in the view of Milton-abbey” (774). Juliet now has the freedom to wander and to “wear away the hours devoted to anxious waiting,” but this time and space are limited. In her wandering, Juliet “permitted not, however, her love of the country to beguile her into danger by the love of variety; she wandered not far from her new habitation, in the vicinity of Milton-abbey; of which she never lost sight from distance” (774). She may wander freely, but only within the prescribed confines of the abbey. Her temporal freedom is likewise curtailed. Juliet’s reunion with Lady Aurora near the novel’s end is depicted through a figuration of the experience of time before clock time:

While time was yet a stranger to regulation, and ere the dial shewed its passage; when it had no computation but by our feelings, our weariness, our occupations, or our passions; the sun which arose splendid upon felicity, must have excited, by its quick parting rays, a surprize nearly incredulous; while that which gave light but to sorrow, may have appeared, at its evening setting, to have revolved the whole year. This period, so long past, seemed now present to Lady Aurora and to Juliet; so unaccounted flew the minutes; so unconscious were they that they had more than met, more than embraced, more than reciprocated their joy in acknowledged kindred; that each felt amazed as well as shocked, when a summons from Mrs. Howel to Lady Aurora, told them that the day was fast wearing, away. (822)

The passage reminds readers of the fundamental shift in temporal experience brought about by the clock. Prior to the “computation” of time by the “dial,” temporality was a more embodied experience felt on an emotional, physical, and cultural level. This kind of temporal being, characterized by flux, and by intermittent bursts of acceleration or stasis, is rooted more immediately in experience. The advent of the clock, however, imbues time with an homogenous, repetitive monotony. Juliet and Aurora, if only briefly, are free to feel time as devoid of all quantification. However, their experience of a non-quantified time ends with the abrupt re-quantification of time. Their free time ends when the authoritative governess Mrs. Howell reasserts time as a sequenced structure, by announcing that “the day was fast wearing, away” (822).

With the recognition of Juliet's name and title comes the privilege of having time, but this privilege is at the expense of Juliet's loss of autonomy. Murphy argues that, "at the close of the novel, Burney's wanderer is saved not through her own exertions, but by her re-assimilation into society through the establishment of a fixed identity and her subsequent marriage with Harleigh" (497). In spite of, and in sharp counterpoint to, the great lengths to which Juliet had gone towards her own self-deliverance, the novel concludes with her taking on the position of a domestic object. It is Harleigh, Lord Melbury, and the Admiral who effectively oversee both the safe return of the Bishop, and Juliet's marriage to Harleigh. This concerted male resolution of Juliet's fate undermines Juliet's experience in the narrative. Indeed, Melbury delivers Harleigh's plan for Juliet's rescue in a particularly pedantic and patriarchal manner. Melbury says to Juliet, "your scruples we both think a little chimerical . . . Mr. Harleigh has found a way to reconcile all perplexities. He will save you, he says, in honour as well as in person" (852). Melbury continues this sense of entitlement over her fate in claiming that Harleigh "would rather endow [the Commissary with Juliet's] whole thirty thousand . . . than let [her] fall into his clutches" (852). Juliet is distanced and estranged from her own preservation and resolution (852). This is continued by Harleigh's revelation of the Commissary's arrest in France for "treasonable conspiracy," which presents "Harleigh vehemently break from the group by which he had been surrounded, rush precipitately forward to meet them, and, singling out Lord Melbury, encircle his lordship in his arms, exclaiming, 'My lord! my dear lord! Your sister is free!'" (855). Juliet is rendered a mere bystander to her own fate, as she becomes simply a secondary

spectator to the news of her own release (855). Anderson notes the constraint and powerlessness that characterizes Juliet in the subsequent arrangement of her marriage to Harleigh. The text, Anderson writes, “exposes the pain and frustration that women experience and the external restraints imposed on them. Even the lucky bride must articulate her love and pleasure from within a ‘chastened garb of moderation’ and only after Harleigh’s suit has been authorized by her brother, her guardian, and her uncle” (648). The fact that the details of the marriage are ironed out in the homo-social bathing machine attests to this: “the impatient Harleigh,” we are told, “besought Lord Melbury to be his agent with the guardian and the uncle of his lovely sister” who were presently in a “bathing-machine; in which the Admiral was civilly, though with great perplexity, labouring to hold discourse with the Bishop” (864).

Juliet becomes, effectively, the anti-wanderer at the novel’s end, as she is spatially limited through her entrenchment in domesticity. After the safe arrival of the Bishop Juliet awaits the celebratory dinner “in the beautiful verdant recess, between two rocks, overlooking the vast ocean, with which she had already been so much charmed” (859). The solitude she experiences here again recalls how the privilege she has regained grants time and space; but it is a time and space that remains delimited, as Juliet is hemmed in on all sides by the rocky recess and the ocean. Furthermore, her containment is patrolled by Melbury, and then by Harleigh, who agrees to act “as sentinel” (860). The enclosure of Juliet is continued at the celebratory dinner, where Juliet is “seated between her revered Bishop and beloved brother, and facing her generous uncle, and the man of her heart” (867). The fixity of Juliet is what

characterizes her married life with Harleigh as well. Juliet becomes a prototype of the nineteenth-century angel in the house, as the domestic angel of “Harleigh Hall” (871). The house is presented as the centre of an inner circle of social inclusion of the characters that have proven themselves worthy throughout the course of the novel. “The dearest delight of Harleigh,” the narrator continues, “was seeking to assemble around his Juliet her first friends” (871). As such Lady Aurora, Lady Barbara, Lord Melbury, Sir Jaspar, and Giles Arbe are all frequent guests “under her roof” (871). At the novel’s end Juliet remains transfixed within the domestic sphere. She has ample time for leisure, but always within the prescribed space of “the Happy Hall” (872). Indeed, the narrator emphasizes Juliet’s domestication at the novel’s end by explicitly stating how her role as wife and mother ensures she will wander no more: “a rising family . . . put an end to foreign excursions” (871).

The domestication of Juliet undermines and counteracts problematically the suffering she has experienced throughout the narrative, and the critical insight yielded by that suffering. The final pages of the novel recount the retroactive rewriting of Juliet’s displaced and alienated wander. Juliet’s wandering footsteps are retraced, her debts repaid, and her status reaffirmed as a form of *noblesse oblige*: Harleigh “paid, with high interest” “three half-guineas” to Mr. Tedman, and “no one to whom Juliet had ever owed any good office, was by her forgotten, or by Harleigh neglected,” and the two “visited, with gifts and praise, every cottage in which the Wanderer had been harboured” (871, 872). In retracing Juliet’s wandering steps, the couple reclaims and repurposes her abjection as simply the preamble to their inevitable, aristocratically

sanctioned marriage. For Harleigh this becomes an act of appropriation, particularly when “Harleigh bought of the young woodcutters, at a high price, their dog Dash” (871, 872). Harleigh’s purchasing of the dog Dash negates symbolically Juliet’s hard-won autonomy. Juliet’s encounter with the dog had figured, during her wander, her own ability to assert her independence and will over a symbolic predatory male. Juliet had stood her ground when approached by the growling dog while “bewildered in a thicket,” and “the dog, caught by her confidence . . . surveyed her, wagged his tail in sign of accommodation, and, gently advancing, stretched himself at her feet” (686, 687). Juliet’s mastery over the dog had signaled her attainment of self-possession, which she had then proceeded to enact over the dog’s owners, by thwarting their predatory, sexual advances with an “air and mien” that “caused, involuntarily, a suspension of their facetious design” (689). Harleigh’s buying of the dog, which then becomes his “new master’s inseparable companion in his garden, fields, and rides,” claims and contains this sign of Juliet’s independence, and repurposes it as an object of aristocratic leisure (872). By retracing Juliet’s steps, and making good on any of her outstanding obligations, the couple cancels out Juliet’s alienated wander, and reasserts and reaffirms a social and economic structure the novel had just spent several volumes critiquing.

Despite this, romance requires marriage for its resolution, and *The Wanderer* obliges. “It is written within the formula of the romance paradigm,” Silverman observes, “that no matter what the hardships of the Incognita, she will be rewarded in the end by a name and by marriage” (75). Sara Salih adds, “although Juliet slides to the

bottom rung of the social ladder where she finds herself reduced to the condition of a penniless vagrant, her ascent is relatively rapid, and at the end of the novel her experiences as a poor, homeless refugee are no more than bitter memories" (314). Juliet does get married, and social change in the novel is abandoned for social promotion, or, more accurately, social confirmation. However, there is something pre-emptive and forced in *The Wanderer's* conclusion. As Margaret Doody argues, Burney's "England presents not a pattern of cheerful order, but a complex structure of pain," which makes the dissonance of the obligatory happy ending all the more audible (Doody 361). Juliet's marriage cannot negate the decadence and corruption of the nobility she has witnessed, nor can it undo the vivid depictions of the challenges faced by women when negotiating public, economic space. The overlaying of the obligatory happy ending upon the lengthy detailing of female difficulties indicates a desire for social change that remains unattainable for Burney in 1814. In this light, the closure becomes mandatory because of an absence of an organic or formal means of realizing the social change that Juliet's experience in the text seems to call for.

The sheer length of *The Wanderer* attests to the tension between the call for change that emanates from the narrative and the happy ending of the marriage plot that calls the narrative belatedly but prematurely to a close. Miranda Burgess argues that the novel displays Burney's unease with the ascendant commercial economy and its reliance upon credit. Burgess claims that Burney is uneasy with social and economic changes that uproot traditional conceptions of value and worth aligned with family, land, and title; however, Burgess argues that Burney's texts are ultimately powerless in

arresting and correcting this change. Burney views the rise of credit and the commercial economy as that which obfuscates and blurs true, essential value, because credit “depended largely on the fashionable appearance of the debtor—an appearance easily assumed through pretense” (139). *The Wanderer* shows in detail, Burgess claims, how the “true character and worth (Juliet’s virtue and her noble birth) get lost in the system of financial and social credit” (145). Burney opposes the “layered representations” that constitute the superficial and artificial value of the commercial economy, and she advances instead a more traditional notion of fixed worth, thus “[countering] the triumph of commerce by a thorough retreat into the bosom of the genteel family” (146, 142). However, Burgess shows how Burney can only attempt to arrest this historical shift, she cannot stop it altogether. Rather than generating new alternatives to the changes of capitalism, Burney tries “escaping the march of commercial history only through a fictive historical return” (148). The novel is long because it cannot posit organically or formally a solution to the problems it identifies.

Helen Thompson similarly finds in *The Wanderer* the desire to restore naturalized and embodied nobility in a world in which the performance of nobility threatens to eclipse actual aristocratic being. Burney, Thompson argues, “reconstitutes the wanderer’s body in the interest of a postrevolutionary reconstitution of rank” (966). Accordingly, “the wanderer . . . suspends the prerevolutionary materiality of aristocratic display in an ineffable, but still material, modality of anonymous refinement” (967). Juliet remains a provoking and perplexing figure because she actively inscribes an aristocratic modality in spite of the work she must necessarily do to support herself.

However, this distinction threatens the essence it performs in the first place. Thompson writes,

The chance that labor and rank might be merely two competing performances, whose arbitration can only be settled by narrative insistence, represents the deepest historical threat to the wanderer's imagined transmutation of aristocratic being. In her efforts to support herself, the wanderer is in danger of affirming the bourgeois radical “ethos of the self-made individual,” whose de-essentializing promise is, paradoxically, also based in practice. (979)

The novel, then, aims to mitigate and “stabilize the difference between essentializing (aristocratic) and de-essentializing (bourgeois radical) practice” (979). Juliet’s embodying of nobility reflects a conservative desire to render the traditional, aristocratic political order self-evident—where Juliet is better because one’s social betters are naturally constituted and endowed. Despite this, Thompson points to the seeming endlessness of the novel to indicate the never-ending performance that is required to reify what is supposed to be naturally apparent: “this novel’s historical and formal failure” is its “interminable attempt to render revelatory the ideally self-evident” (981). The *Deus ex Machina* of the marriage plot is the formalization of the failure of aristocratic being to make its case organically. Both Burgess and Thompson concede that Burney’s conservative response to the rise of the bourgeois class implodes, or rather explodes, in its proliferation of narrative events—the former in a nostalgic dream, the latter in a never-ending reality.

But where these critics see failure might just as easily be identified as performance. I argue, the length of the text and its marriage plot resolution function as a formal systematic critique of a stagnant and corrupted aristocracy, and a revelation of the palpable absence of a narrative language with which that social mode might be taken to task. Juliet's attempt to harness a bourgeois modality and a neutral and productive temporality are done in good faith—her limitations and frustrations are palpable. These attempts articulate a desire to break with traditional class affiliations, and a need to establish an economic and social mode in which actual merit, emptied out of class and gender bias, might be measured. The seeming interminability of the novel in recounting the failure of that subjective mode, and in presenting Juliet's ensuing experience as an alienated and abject wanderer, reflects just how pressing that desire has become. Moreover, the novel's underlining of the privilege that entails free wander presents a strong critique of a Romanticism that would claim to present solutions to Juliet's difficulties. Elinor's Romanticism and Juliet's own Romanticism turn out to be privileged fictions, which either remain untested, in Elinor's case, or are proven to be un-roadworthy, in Juliet's case. If, as Murphy observes, "*The Wanderer* presents the French Revolution as an event of 'world historical' significance in the Lukacsian sense" and "offers a meditation on the irrevocable impact that the French Revolution has exerted on Burney's time and society," then the novel in its great length is more direct in indicating the pitfalls that lie ahead (491). Rather than positing free wander as a viable post-revolutionary stance, Burney shows how wander is not universal, but class and gender contingent. As such, the novel shows that the transposition of one

economic mode for another requires a thorough sounding of these material considerations, instead of the simplistic substitution of one set of universal claims for another. *The Wanderer's* performance of a conservative ending concedes that the violence and patriarchy that plague Juliet throughout the narrative cannot be denied or negated, and that the aristocratic system upon which that patriarchy is propagated can no longer organically be sustained.

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Chapter Four:

Wandering through Modernity: Clock Time and *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*

The Rime of the Ancient Mariner presents a shocking and irreversible encounter with modernity. The Mariner's experience at sea maps his departure from a more traditional social world into modernity, untethered from the bedrocks of King, country, and Christianity. The Mariner's abrupt and seemingly unmotivated execution of the Albatross shatters traditional, feudal notions of fellowship and hospitality, and sets the Mariner adrift in a world characterized by quantified and sequential space and time, and consisting of individuated and distinct subjects and objects. However, far from finding himself in a functioning and orderly world, the Mariner experiences this modernity as a form of systematic chaos, as he becomes suspended within a succession of events that he is incapable of controlling, and unable to understand. Meaning and significance elude the Mariner, as he becomes a subject of chronological time afloat in the homogenous space of the ocean. The Mariner remains indelibly marked and altered by his experience, and he continues to wander ceaselessly, and to repeat his tale with a "compulsive technique of total recall" (Empson 308). The Mariner is unable to understand the modernity he has inaugurated inadvertently, and so he wanders and retells his tale endlessly. Wander in *The Rime* is not the quintessentially Romantic movement of freedom, but the movement of a worrisome modernity that ushers in social, cultural, spatial, and temporal alienation. *The Rime* is thus a cautionary tale of a subject—indeed the first subject—caught within modernity's homogenous and

sequential space and time; one who lacks entirely the subjective technology required to orient one's self within such a brave new world. Finding himself unequipped to comprehend a world devoid of divine order, the Mariner wanders, and iterates his own alienation and temporal dispossession within a modernity he fails to grasp.

The Mariner's transgression, and his subsequent state of penitent guilt and endless wander, aligns him with the figure of the Wandering Jew. Harold Bloom sees the Mariner as an iteration of the "major Romantic archetype" of the "Wanderer," which itself belongs to "the tradition of the stories of Cain and of the Wandering Jew;" "a tradition of seemingly motiveless malevolence" (1, 2). Indeed, Humphrey House recalls how *The Rime* emerged in the wake of an attempted "collaboration with Wordsworth in a poem about Cain," which, Coleridge recollected, had ultimately "'broke up in a laugh: and the Ancient Mariner was written instead'" (214). House claims that the transition from a poem about Cain to the writing of *The Rime* "shows how the subject of terrible guilt, suffering, expiation and wandering was already in Coleridge's mind before the various hints which were to form the outline of the Mariner's story came together" (214). House argues that the Mariner, through his guilt, bears traces to the "two traditional figures, Cain and the Wandering Jew," and he notes how Coleridge had reviewed Lewis' *The Monk*, which also features a Wandering Jew, in "*The Critical Review* for February 1797" (215). Bryan Fulmer likewise reads the Mariner's crime and his subsequent wandering atonement as being cut directly from the "fabric of the Wandering Jew legend" (812). Fulmer argues that Coleridge's "readings in Schiller and Lewis, and probably in Scott and the *Reliques* ballad, and his joining the

character with Cain in the fragment” were “transmuted into the Mariner” (802). Coleridge’s narrative of the Mariner becomes a “transformation and retelling of the old adventure,” through its “recreation of the Wandering Jew’s crime, curse, punishment, and penitent wanderings” (799). Fulmer develops this connection in his identification of both the Mariner’s and the Wandering Jew’s transgressions as affronts to hospitality: the Wandering Jew’s crime was his refusal of “succour to Christ when He passed the unfortunate man’s door” (806). The Mariner, like the Wandering Jew, “acts without considering either the nature of the deed or its possible consequences,” and “his inhospitality to a member of the One Life separates him from the rest completely until he learns to feel and think” (806). The Mariner’s violation of hospitality (“he rejects the associations which the albatross has with Christ and Christian rituals and murders sanctity itself”) effectively re-enacts “the Jew’s repudiation of Christ,” which, Fulmer argues, casts him, like the Jew, into a perpetual state of penitence (807).

I argue that Coleridge harnesses the trope of the Wandering Jew to figure the condition of modernity—a condition characterized by relativity, itinerancy, and alienation. The Wandering Jew’s isolation and expiation results from his having to reckon with and provide significance to his own individual act of will—no matter how insignificant that act might be. Coleridge’s adaptation of this trope evinces the dispossession, isolation, and alienation within which subjects of modernity must contest with their own individual, subjective, and volitional acts—acts that necessarily bring unintended consequences and uncontainable significance. The solitary and endless penitence of the Wandering Jew then becomes a crucial pretext for grappling with not

just a world in which God is cruel, but a world in which God does not exist; a world in which subjects must continuously determine the significance of their own actions. The trope of the Wandering Jew becomes, for Coleridge, the urtext of modernity, wherein individuals are determined by their actions, and are no longer guided by divine ordinance. Fulmer observes the difference between Coleridge's iteration of the Wandering Jew and Shelley's; a difference that reifies two discernable stances of modernity. Fulmer writes, the "Mariner is not a Promethean figure of daring, an inquiring Spirit like Faust, a symbol of liberty, or a Romantic rebel from society," but "an object of pathos" because of "the relativity of his guilt and his exorbitant suffering" (814). The heroic, Baudelairean, or Nietzschean stance of modernity is anticipated by Shelley's Wandering Jew; while Coleridge uses the trope to figure modernity's more dispossessing and isolating implications. The Mariner iterates the Wandering Jew to articulate a world in which subjects must independently, and neurotically, determine meaning in the void of divine intervention. Wandering is neither heroic nor freeing, but the very movement of this solitary alienation.

Despite the aimless wander that characterizes the Mariner, *The Rime* is a product of walking. In *The Fenwick Notes* Wordsworth recalls how the poem derived from a conversation had during a walk, and, moreover, how its publication was intended to facilitate further excursions. Wordsworth writes,

In the Spring of the year 1798, [Coleridge], my sister, & myself started from Alfoxden, pretty late in the afternoon, with a view to visit Linton & the Valley of Stones near it, and as our united funds were very small we

agreed to defray the expense of the tour by writing a poem to be sent to the New Monthly Magazine set up by Phillips the Bookseller and edited by Dr. Aikin. Accordingly we set off and proceeded along the Quantock Hills, towards Watchet, and in the course of this walk was planned the Poem of The Ancient Mariner, founded on a dream, as Mr. Coleridge said, of his friend Mr. Cruikshank. Much of the greatest part of the story was Mr. Coleridge's invention; but certain parts I myself suggested, for example, some crime was to be committed which should bring upon the Old Navigator, as Coleridge afterwards delighted to call him, the spectral persecution, as a consequence of that crime and his own wanderings.

(39-40)

The Rime was created in the act of walking; and it was done so with the express purpose of financing future walks. Indeed, Wordsworth claims that from this productive pedestrianism sprang the whole of the *Lyrical Ballads* project. Wordsworth writes, "We returned by Dulverton to Alfoxden" and "The Ancient Mariner grew & grew till it became too important for our first object . . . and we began to talk of a volume, which was to consist as Mr. Coleridge has told the world, of Poems chiefly on supernatural subjects taken from common life but looked at, as much as might be, through an imaginative medium" (41-42). On Wordsworth's and Coleridge's collaborative planning of *Lyrical Ballads*, Paul Magnuson writes:

On November 12, 1797, Dorothy and William and Coleridge started on a walking tour, the expenses of which they planned to earn by writing a

ballad that they hoped to send to the *New Monthly Magazine*. There had been previous attempts at collaboration—"The Three Graves," which Wordsworth began and gave to Coleridge, and 'The Wanderings of Cain'—and in both instances Coleridge worked enthusiastically and Wordsworth eventually withdrew . . . "The Ancient Mariner" quickly grew beyond the limitations of magazine verse. At the end of their tour, they "began to talk of a volume, which was to consist, as Mr. Coleridge has told the world, of Poems chiefly of natural subjects taken from common life, but looked at, as much as might be, through an imaginative medium." Wordsworth thus confirms Coleridge's account of the plan of *Lyrical Ballads*, although the plan was probably not firm until late the following spring. (70)

The fact that *The Rime* emerged from this episode of productive walking and social exchange, but was then derailed as a collaborative project, and gave way to the inception of *Lyrical Ballads*, is oddly performative. The wandering that constitutes *The Rime* becomes the repressed of the walking that constitutes *Lyrical Ballads*. Coleridge and the Wordsworths strike out of the past and strive for new economic and aesthetic mobility in their walking, but there remains a lingering danger that such a break, and such a gamble, might turn out to be aimless and alienated wander. Coleridge's Mariner signifies the other side of this modernity. Their own financial independence, underwritten by their walking and aesthetic work, is the productive antipode to a wander that reifies the rejection of and ejection from traditional life. Walking and

wandering, then, are two sides of the same coin, as each becomes a response to a modernity that is freeing and mobile; or, inherently dispossessing. Wander is the spectre that haunts the more liberal fiction of productive walking. Coleridge's poem dramatizes the stakes of Romanticism, where individual and purposive walking, with its dreams of economic and aesthetic freedom, might very easily, and unintentionally, veer into dejected wander.

Coleridge's own account of the inception of *Lyrical Ballads* also shows how his own poetic production—both *The Rime* and his overall contribution to the collection—stands as a wandering reminder and remainder to the productive and purposive walking of Wordsworth's texts. In *Biographia Literaria*, Coleridge indicates the division of labour behind the planning of *Lyrical Ballads*: “in this idea originated the plan of the ‘Lyrical Ballads’; in which it was agreed, that my endeavours should be directed to persons and characters supernatural, or at least romantic; yet so as to transfer from our inward nature a human interest and a semblance of truth sufficient to procure for these shadows of imagination that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment, which constitutes poetic faith” (314). While Coleridge is to focus on rendering the supernatural palpable and real, Wordsworth's aim is “to give the charm of novelty to things of everyday, and to excite a feeling analogous to the supernatural, by awakening the mind's attention from the lethargy of custom” (314). The difference in their respective poetic scopes is telling. Effectively, Wordsworth is to re-enchant what has become a deadened, rationalized world; Coleridge, in exhuming the supernatural and the romantic, is to make real the enchantment. Wordsworth fictionalizes reality, while

Coleridge realizes fiction. Their respective tasks amount to a difference between ideology and textuality—both will undo the “film of familiarity,” but Wordsworth will do so prescriptively and programmatically, while Coleridge will reveal, in an expository manner, the reality of these social fictions (314). To borrow the language of Lacan, Wordsworth reinforces the imaginary, while Coleridge pulls back the gauze that obfuscates the real. Confronted with a potentially deadening modernity, Wordsworth adopts the heroic stance of the artist who revises the world, while Coleridge sees things as they are. It is no wonder that Coleridge was unable to complete many of his poetic projects: in the wake of the French Revolution, his was an unenviable task, while Wordsworth had his work cut out for him. Wordsworth becomes a poetic machine engaged in purposive aesthetic production; Coleridge, tasked with revealing the textuality of life, does not. Coleridge writes, “with this view I wrote the ‘Ancient Mariner,’ and was preparing among other poems, the ‘Dark Ladie,’ and the ‘Christabel,’ in which I should have more nearly realized my ideal, than I had done in my first attempt. But Mr. Wordsworth’s industry had proven so much more successful, and the number of his poems so much greater, that my compositions, instead of forming a balance, appeared rather an interpolation of heterogeneous matter” (315). While Wordsworth is characterized by industry, Coleridge characterizes himself by marginality and heterogeneity. Wordsworth walks, while Coleridge wanders.

Despite this, Coleridge did walk. His walks put into practice the Romantic theory of reintegration through natural imagination; a cure that William Empson notes Coleridge was in serious need of. Empson writes, “Coleridge found that walks in hilly

scenery could do a good deal to palliate neurotic guilt; and this was the main basis in experience for the doctrine of the healing power of Nature through Imagination” (307). However, these walks were effective primarily in their ability to channel and discipline a more in-born and troublesome wandering. Coleridge was more acutely aware of the line between walking and wander, between resolution and neurotic guilt, than Wordsworth was. Empson recalls how, “in his charity blue-coat gown, [Coleridge] explored London and found a shoemaker willing not only to take him as apprentice but also to come and tell the headmaster. The headmaster threw out the man and beat the child (for being an infidel), and Coleridge in later life amused himself by saying that this was the only just beating of all his beatings at school” (312). In Coleridge’s childhood walking is wandering—it amounts to error, and to going astray. In the opening pages of *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge attests to the erroneousness of his boyhood wanderings. Coleridge writes, “In my friendless wanderings on our leave-days, (for I was an orphan and had scarce any connections in London) highly was I delighted, if any passenger, especially if he were dressed in black, would enter into conversation with me” (164). He goes on to identify his solitary wandering as a “preposterous pursuit” that was “beyond doubt, injurious, both to my natural powers, and to the progress of my education,” and he states that it “would perhaps have been destructive, had it been continued” (164). In Coleridge’s own experience wander carries the connotation of error, and of isolation.

Between Coleridge’s prescribed purview for *Lyrical Ballads*, and his own sense of what wander means, emerges a version of wander aligned more closely with despair than with what Coleridge envisions for the future Hartley in *Frost at Midnight*, or

imagines of his friends in "This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison." This is dramatized in "Christabel," in which the more heroic connotations of wander and romance are unable to attenuate and arrest whatever it is that ails Christabel. All of Christabel's would-be protectors are associated with romance and heroic wander. Christabel's protecting mother, ostensibly espied by Geraldine, is a wanderer: "'Off, wandering mother! Peak and pine! / I have power to bid thee flee'" (205-206). Similarly, Bard Bracy, haunted by a dream that "seems to live upon [his] eye," says to Leoline, "And thence I vowed this self-same day, / With music strong and saintly song / To wander through the forest bare, / Lest aught unholy loiter there" (560-563). Both the mother's and the Bard's would-be heroic wandering are to no avail. This failure of the tropes of romance to protect Christabel is furthered by the impotence and ignorance of her father, Sir Leoline. A former knight-errant, his chivalry ensures that he rallies to Geraldine's defense, by dispatching Bard Bracy "with music sweet and loud," "two steeds with trappings proud," "harp" and "solemn vest" to alert Geraldine's father (485, 486, 488, 489). Sir Leoline also offers a martial, chivalric response to right his perceived wronging of Geraldine, by thrashing Geraldine's assailants in his "tourney court" (441). Sir Leoline's romance modality thus fundamentally misreads the situation, and cannot understand, let alone redress, Christabel's ills (441). Indeed, when Christabel manages to break the spell enough to plead for Geraldine's ejection, Leoline is incensed at her request: "Dishonoured by his only child, / And all his hospitality / To the wrong'd daughter of his friend / By more than woman's jealousy" (643-646). Leoline's feudal and patriarchal code fails to properly comprehend and address what has happened to Christabel.

Because Christabel's problem is internal—a sign of her own individual interiority—it cannot be understood, nor attenuated, by wandering spirits, wandering bards, or wandering knights.

William Empson suggests that the Gothic's strain of anti-Catholicism was simply beyond Coleridge, and, absent that energy, he was unable to complete "Christabel." Empson writes, "the sensational Gothic tradition was derived largely from anti-Catholic propaganda, too sectarian for Coleridge, and after rejecting that (I think) he just could not see any point in his medieval witch" (317). However, I argue that the poem's incompleteness effectively performs its tension: the fundamental incongruence between the feudal world and modernity. This tension, between two mutually exclusive social modes, is unresolvable. The poem's incompleteness, then, is an irresolution that demonstrates the limits of cultural, historical, and epistemic understanding. Karen Swann observes that Coleridge presents "a world stocked with cultural artefacts" (539).

Before Geraldine even appears ["Christabel"] is haunted by the ghosts of old stories: familiar settings and props function as portents, both for the superstitious and the well-read. The wood and the midnight hour are the 'moment's space' where innocence is traditionally put to the test, or when spirits walk abroad; other details—the cock's crow at midnight, the mastiff's unrest, the contracted moon—we know to be art's way of signifying nature's response to human disorder. These so-called 'Gothic trappings' ensnare us because they mean nothing ('Tu-whit, tu-whoo') and too much. (539)

Through its overt artifice “Christabel” stages the limitations of the worldview to which that artifice organically belongs—both its plots and possibilities are circumscribed by its own historical parameters. Swann continues, “although we may think of genres as vessels which successive authors infuse with original content, ‘Christabel’s’ originality is to expose them as the means by which significance is produced and contained” (542). Wander is yet another cultural artefact, one whose very limits are reached when it cannot keep at bay the emerging and nameless danger Christabel finds herself ensnared by. To be sure, the opening lines of the poem mark the epistemic shift thematized throughout: “’Tis the middle of the night by the castle clock, / And the owls have awakened the crowing cock” (1-2). Clock time is already threatening to supplant and subordinate more traditional modes of temporality and authority, as Christabel’s own wandering beyond feudal lines—a “furlong from the castle gate”—is marked by the tolling clock (26).

Tim Fulford sees Coleridge’s supernatural poems as critiques of power that, through their distancing, work to unmask ideologies perpetuated in the name of the British body politic. By setting “Christabel” “in medieval times,” and by writing it “in the style of a courtly romance,” Fulford argues, “the poem seems backward-looking;” however, chivalry “was a burning political issue when Coleridge wrote, as the Gothic novelists also knew” (55). In the wake of the French Revolution, Burke lamented programmatically “the end of a European order, an order sustained by the chivalric code in which the aristocracy, in exchange for their hereditary monopoly of power, governed with courtesy and dutiful paternalism” (Fulford 55). The supernatural medievalism of

“Christabel” allowed Coleridge to take to task the power structures that forged their legitimacy upon deep-seated chivalric tradition, while seemingly writing about the fictional and the fantastic. Coleridge, Fulford argues, “was able to explore the power-relations produced by chivalry without fear of arrest for making political attacks on Britain’s rulers . . . using the Gothic genre, in which superstition and the supernatural were expected, allowed him to locate in the nobility the same kinds of irrational and slavish desires that he had placed, in ‘The Three Graves’ and ‘The Rime,’ amongst the lower classes” (56). “Ostensibly apolitical,” Fulford writes, “‘Christabel’ was in fact one of the eras most profound investigations of the social and sexual relations on which the state was based” (57). Coleridge uses the same distancing of the supernatural in *The Rime* to call out Britain’s sustained participation in the slave trade. *The Rime* harnesses the “popular narrative of exploration,” but subverts and repurposes the form to attack “the imperialism which British voyages of discovery had spread” (49). In so doing, Coleridge reframed Britons as purveyors of the savagery and pestilence that discourses of imperialism used to justify slavery and colonization in the first place. Fulford writes,

In the interests of sustaining its slave colonies, Britain exposed thousands of black Africans and British sailors to yellow fever, small pox, yaws, plague, and other fatal infections. Coleridge had pitied these slaves and sailors in a public lecture on the evils of the slave-trade. In ‘The Rime’ he returns to the images of infection he had used in that lecture: the mariner, like a sailor on a slave-ship bound for the West Indies, enters a zone where all becomes tainted with the diseases of empire. (49-50)

The supernaturalism of *The Rime* smuggles in a critique of the slave-trade, through its presentation of the mariner's experience of the fantastical. The poem eschews an explicit political message, and makes use of the popularity of the "sea story," "to make the supernatural seem so rooted in human psychology that readers would choose, for the space of their reading, to 'suspend their disbelief' in it" (50). Coleridge, by "distancing himself from contemporary events," was able to more directly "find terms which would let readers share the mental state that, he argued, was produced by, and in turn reproduced, those events" (50).

The Rime's critique of slavery and empire speaks to an increasingly rationalized, instrumentalized, and operationalized state. Thomas Pfau argues that *The Rime* responds to the emergence of a regimented world. Pfau claims that modernity is characterized by "the dominance of methodical analysis" emanating from "the scientific revolutions wrought by Bacon, Descartes, and Newton,"—a mode of inquiry and investigation that oversees the "fragmentation of knowledge into so many discrete institutional and disciplinary sub-specializations" (952). This instrumental, rational configuration of knowledge, Pfau argues, troubled writers like "Blake, Coleridge, Goethe, and Schopenhauer," as they marked "the gradual extension of modernity's analytic and methodical conception of science to *all* areas of knowledge," which risked "fragmenting the world as a whole, to the point that the resulting, utterly particular insight is all but certain to have eroded the human and spiritual significance of the knowledge so obtained" (951-952). The powerful methodology of modernity runs the risk of obliterating the universe it claims to render verifiable, by delimiting the possibility

of more local and intuitive modes of understanding. *The Rime*, however, “powerfully throws into relief the ontological indeterminacy of the modern, self-actualizing, and self-realizing individual” (975). Pfau reads the Mariner as a subject of modern, western scientific scepticism and inquiry. “From the very outset the mariner’s seafaring is depicted as a transgressive pursuit,” writes Pfau. The Mariner’s transgression, then, is not an individual affront to nature, but the exercising of the new enterprise of scientific modernity. “What troubles Coleridge,” Pfau claims, “is not the occasional, wayward act of injustice but sin as a systemic, institutional practice—viz., as the very essence of modern instrumental reason” (978). An instrument to this instrumental reason, the Mariner is a “self-authorizing agent, having created himself by a primal act of scepticism,” but proceeds from, and is licensed by, a powerful and mobilized discourse of sceptical, scientific inquiry (983). The poem critiques this modernity through its presentation of a near-Kafkaesque modernity, in which the indeterminable nature of events and their significance becomes nightmarish. Pfau writes, “the killing of the albatross launches the ship of modernity on its journey into what the likewise seafaring young Wordsworth recalls as ‘unknown modes of being’” (983). The Mariner takes on his individual agency through his “act of self-origination,” but in so doing, he “must henceforth inhabit a condition of ethical limbo that this act *prima facie* created” (991, 983).

The indeterminacy of meaning born through the Mariner’s leap into an individuated subjective mode is reflected formally by *The Rime’s* structure. The frame narrative converts the poem from a recounting of the Mariner’s experience at sea, to

the recounting of the recounting of the Mariner's experience at sea. This mediation builds the transmission and communication of the tale into the text itself, so that the meaning of the Mariner's tale is coextensive with, and indistinguishable from, the scene in which it is told. The same structure is deployed by Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, which, in addition to citing *The Rime* directly, was influenced heavily by it. Anne K. Mellor recounts how formative it was for Mary Shelley to hear Coleridge recite the poem: "on Sunday, August 24, 1806, when Coleridge and Charles and Mary Lamb came to tea and supper, [Shelley] heard Coleridge himself recite 'The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,' an event she never forgot. The image of the isolated, tormented old Mariner would haunt her own fiction, even as Coleridge's verses reverberate through *Frankenstein* and *Falkner*" (11). There are several parallels between *The Rime* and *Frankenstein*. Both narrative frames articulate the desire to communicate and transfer experience from one failed, solipsistic individual to another; each having made a transgressive error through instrumental, scientific overreaching; both the Mariner and Victor are early explorers of modernity, intrigued by its possibilities but ignorant of its stakes; and both, through volitional acts, establish themselves as subjects in time, by setting forth a sequential and irreversible chain of events that becomes complex, indeterminable, unstoppable, and, ultimately, ruinous to each of their social groups. The Mariner and Victor have each taken on the Faustian, hubristic burden of modernity through their individual and irreversible acts, and the sole lesson they can each ultimately impart, both to the Wedding Guest and Walton, is to get back in lockstep "with a goodly company" (604). Moreover, the frame narratives of each of these texts

reveal how the experience of modernity is a *fait accompli*. The frame establishes formally a present and a past, as two unbridgeable realms that cannot be organically worked through and resolved—the frame presupposes the fact that the narrative that is to be recounted has already transpired. The frames underline the fact that time is irreversible—that what is done cannot be undone. All that is left is remorse and regret from Victor, and the Mariner’s simplistic lesson: “He prayeth best, who loveth best / All things both great and small” (614-615). Arguably, Victor comes to understand, at last, the burden of modernity; the Mariner, however, remains caught in an endless, repetitive loop: instead of dying he wanders.

The Mariner’s presence in the present of *The Rime*’s frame-narrative disrupts a site of traditional cultural activity, and asserts his own individualism. By hailing and detaining the Wedding Guest, the Mariner impedes upon the traditional communal practice of the wedding. His intervention, in this scene of social continuity, is contrasted sharply by the incredulous Wedding Guest, who is tied directly to this cultural ceremony. The “next of kin” Wedding Guest embodies the call to traditional society, as he re-iterates insistently the occurrence of the event: “The guests are met, the feast is set: / May’st hear the merry din” (8). Indeed, he feels this call almost painfully, as the Mariner continues to detain him: “the Wedding-Guest here beat his breast, / For he heard the loud bassoon” (31-32). However, instead of observing traditional cultural practices, the Mariner disrupts them, by inserting his own individuality over and against the demands of the community. The Mariner detains the Wedding Guest to recount his own narrative, and overwrites and subordinates the communal wedding with his own

individuated experience. The Mariner's first-person narration attests to this—he hijacks the narrative from the more public position of the narrator. The Mariner relegates the narrator to a secondary auditor, and he converts the poem from a ballad narrative into a first-person lyric.

The individuation of the Mariner is apparent from the first line of the poem: "It is an ancient Mariner, / And he stoppeth one of three" (1-2). The declarative, present tense that announces the Mariner's presence underscores the singularization of subjects and objects that characterizes the modernity the Mariner embodies. The Mariner himself who "stoppeth one of three" doubles this singularization. The Mariner engages in the process of selection, distinction, and classification, as he marks the Wedding Guest as a typology different from the others. The singularity and individuation of the Mariner is continued in the assertion of his will: "He holds him with his glittering eye— / The wedding-guest stood still, / And listens like a three years' child: / The Mariner hath his will" (13-16). The Mariner's arresting quality emanates from the exertion of his will, which appears as a form of magic to the Wedding Guest, who is entrenched in a more communal social mode. The Mariner's enchantment lies in his status as a figure of modernity marked by interiority. His will signifies his individuation over and against the desires of the community, which is figured by the infantilizing of the Wedding Guest with his outmoded worldview. The vaguely exotic nature of the Mariner's body further casts him as a figure of modernity. The Mariner's physicality is arresting and mysterious—"he holds him with his skinny hand" and "with his glittering eye"—and the Wedding Guest describes him as "long, and lank, and brown, / As is the

ribbed sea-sand" (9, 13, 226-227). While the latter description signals his foreignness and heterogeneity vis-à-vis the Wedding Guest's more homogenous community, the fragmentation of the Mariner's body in the eyes of the Wedding Guest indicates that the Mariner lies beyond the purview of conventional wisdom. The Mariner's indecipherability fractures the Wedding Guest's notion of personhood.

The Mariner proceeds to recount his experience at sea, and, in so doing, he traces out effectively the origin story of his own modernity. The voyage upon which he embarks is truly pivotal, in so far as its maritime expansion becomes the hinge between the more traditional social world, from which the crew departs and perishes, and the modernity undertaken by the surviving Mariner. The journey commences from a world organized by traditional authority. The Mariner states, "The ship was cheered, the harbour cleared, / Merrily did we drop / Below the Kirk, below the hill, / Below the lighthouse top" (21-24). The ship embarks from a space that is ordered and organized by feudal and Christian power—where kirk and hill, religious and sovereign power respectively, stand above the departing ship, and sanction its voyage. Pfau writes, the ship "leaves a stable and conventional society behind, exemplified most clearly by the Christian values" (984). Despite the "cheered" parting, the "departure is followed by the disintegration of community on the ship" (21; Pfau 984). Their very departure from this space signals the beginning of the end of this worldview. Indeed, the obsolescence and abandonment of traditional society is figured ideationally and technologically through the homogenization of time and space that characterizes their sailing. As soon as the Mariner's "own countree" is cleared, the nascent modernity inherent in the

voyage becomes clear, as the ship's mapping of time and space underlies their very voyage (467). The Mariner states, "The sun came up upon the left, / Out of the sea came he! / And he shone bright, and on the right / Went down into the sea" (25-28). The Mariner's notation of the movement of the sun—"Higher and higher every day, / Till over the mast at noon"—actively inscribes the ship as a temporal centre around which the movement of the sun can be marked and tallied (29-32). The ocean is here denuded of particularity, and refigured as homogenous, mappable space, through which the ship marks and plots its course. Indeed, marine exploration is part and parcel with the ethos of Enlightenment. The development of the marine chronometer, by John Harrison in 1761, brought reliable, standardized timekeeping to marine travel, and made possible more exact determinations of longitude. It also established Greenwich Mean Time and the Greenwich meridian as the gold standard of global temporal and spatial mapping. Captain Cook had a chronometer on board his second voyage (a voyage that also sought the polar seas), which made Cook "the first commander to know very closely where he was for virtually all his time at sea" (Crathorne 239). The connection between maritime exploration and temporal, spatial mapping is in *The Rime's* discursive and historical context, but it is also in Coleridge's own lived experience. Cook's astronomer "became Coleridge's maths teacher," and Cook had become famous in how he "had maintained discipline and subjected unknown coasts to the order of the naval chart" (Fulford 50, 51). From school to his later readings in "the massively popular printed accounts, with their details of Antarctic storms, tropical heat,

strange effects of light, and—shooting albatrosses,” Coleridge encountered a thoroughly cartographical and instrumental view of marine travel (Fulford 50).

Moreover, Coleridge encountered a marine travel that was increasingly indistinguishable from Britain’s slave trade. Debbie Lee situates *The Rime* at the cross-section between the rhetoric of the anti-slavery movement, and discourses of the nation and body politic at the end of the eighteenth-century. Lee argues that the Mariner’s voyage is that of the slaver, and his experience of death and rot at sea emulate the symptoms of yellow fever—a disease that was increasingly regarded as a foul and fetid sign of the corruption of the slave trade. “It was the geographical movement of this disease,” Lee writes, “that determined its interpretive implications . . . yellow fever itself became intimately tied to the physical and philosophical effects of slavery” (676). The slave trade, Lee observes, is aptly figured by yellow fever on a national level, as the analogy emerged between the ruination of the physical body by yellow fever, and the ruination of the political body by the slave trade. Lee writes, “by way of disease the slave trade destroyed the British national body by destroying individual bodies” (685). Coleridge’s text, “heavy with images of disease and nuances of slavery,” thus assists in the symptomization of the slave trade as a corrupting and degenerative social illness, where “the medical” is moved “to the political level by designating slavery a European disease” (694, 687).

The conception of slavery as a disease, via yellow fever, resulted in the figurative reconstitution of the British socio-political body. Lee argues, “together, the medical study of yellow fever and the debate on the abolition of the slave trade and of slavery

kindled a series of specific concerns—especially among British writers—about what happened when ‘foreign’ matter, or ‘foreigners,’ became part of the physical or political body” (676). The cross-section between disease, slavery, and nation, that Lee observes, situates *The Rime* within modern contexts of cultural heterogeneity, colonization, and the nation state. Indeed, the violence and movement of people carried out by the slave trade is central in the breakdown of a pre-modern worldview. Lee writes, “from its beginnings in the fifteenth century to its peak in the early nineteenth century, the slave trade represented the largest migration of people in human history”—a violent displacement that Lee reads Coleridge figure as “the ruination of the universe” (688, 691). The disease of slavery, for Coleridge, has national stakes in the construction of a social world characterized by difference. Lee argues, “like yellow fever, which wiped out fleets and armies by dissolving individual bodies, a realignment of Africans would redefine British identity and thus individual selfhood by dissolving a certain self-construction” (694). The poem then, Lee states, “is a statement about how to relate to what is outside or other than the self,” and ultimately considers “ways in which the British could dissolve their personal and national borders, yet still maintain their identity” (694). By way of its concerns with the implications of a newly geopolitical world, Lee places Coleridge’s text at the centre of late-eighteenth-century considerations of modernity.

The Mariner’s voyage, then, maps onto and corresponds to the “Age of Discovery’s” ethos of science, trade, and colonization. The Mariner’s claim, “We were the first that ever burst / Into that silent sea,” figures succinctly this shift, as both a

violent disruption, and an irreversible singularity (105-106). The lines also reflect a lingering ignorance to the inherent violence of colonization: the triumphalism of discovery, of being first, fails to fully grasp the violent bursting upon which it depended. Cook recounted how “when landing at a place for the first time,” he would “approach the beach in one of the ship’s boats, holding a green branch in his hand to signify friendship. He would then get out of the boat and walk ashore alone;” however, this peaceable approach was not always successful (Crathorne 239). Cook wrote, after having killed four people unreceptive to his crew’s advances, “it is impossible for them to know our real design, we enter their ports and attempt to land in a peaceful manner. If it succeeds all is well, if not, we land nevertheless and maintain our footing by the security of our firearms. In what other light can they first look upon us, but as invaders of their country” (239). Cook’s method intricately links technology, discovery, violence, and colonization as one movement. He also demonstrates the knowing ignorance of the Mariner, in so far as he acknowledges the justness of native resistance, and yet never questions the right or legitimacy of his own colonizing project. William Empson argues that *The Rime* “evokes a major historical event, the maritime expansion of Western Europeans” (298). The torment the Mariner comes to experience resides in the fact that these European colonizers “reek of guilt” (304). Empson recalls how Columbus “lamented that the Caribbeans were so innocent, unsuspecting, and doomed” (304). “The terrible cry, ‘I didn’t know it was wrong when I did it,’” which Empson claims “belongs somehow naturally to the whole setup of the exploring ship,” is seeded in the larger project of modernity, in which science, technology, and commerce obfuscate the

violence of the colonization that underwrites the entire enterprise (305). The European sailing ship, with its spatial and temporal mapping and spirit of colonization, aptly symbolizes the shift from the medieval world to the world of modernity. “The Mariner was . . . medieval,” Empson writes, “and I think we are expected to retain a certain superiority to him;” and yet, he has received a “blinding revelation” of the vast transgression of colonization, even if he does not fully realize it (303).

Warren Stevenson views the Mariner as a hinge between pre-modern and modern society. He observes how *The Rime* associates the Mariner with the Renaissance and its worldview of discovery, by showing how the poem traces out the progression of the Mariner from a more medieval, homogeneous, and Christian world to the globalized, colonized, and rationalized society of modernity. Stevenson writes,

Since the Mariner’s two-hundred shipmates represent his own society, and that society was medieval and Christian, it follows that the Mariner as intellectual and moral rebel against that society represents the Renaissance with its new learning, particularly its new science, which was anathema to the old order. Seen in this light, the poem recapitulates a major aspect of European history from the medieval to the modern period. (52)

The Mariner is singled out from, and placed in distinction to, the otherwise medieval crew, and in this individuation, he becomes a prototype of the modern subject armed with instrumental and methodical science. Stevenson writes, “the Mariner’s sin against the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of Love, is parallel to the displacement of Love by logic as the

raison d'être of the cosmos, a displacement which began during the Renaissance with the discoveries not only of Columbus and Magellan but also those of Galileo and Kepler" (54). Stevenson observes that the Mariner is "not simply an explorer; he is discoverer of the Pacific and, if we are to trust the poem's inner dynamics, the world's first circumnavigator" (52). The Mariner's naval excursion anticipates "all those subsequent voyages of exploration and discovery by means of which Western European society has sought to imprint its imperial and slave-owning image upon the new world" (54). The Mariner's narrative encodes the cultural shift from the pre-modern to modernity.

It is into this context of a latent modernity that the Albatross flies. The Albatross appears at a moment of stasis, as the ship is hemmed in by ice and snow. The ship's temporary immobility signifies a kind of epistemic and semantic break down, wherein the medievalism it transports is stranded, isolated, and flash-frozen. The Mariner states:

And through the drifts the snowy clifts
 Did send a dismal sheen:
 Nor shapes of men nor beasts we ken—
 The ice was all between.
 The ice was here, the ice was there,
 The ice was all around:
 It cracked and growled, and roared and howled,
 Like noises in a swound! (55-62)

The Mariner's description reveals the lingering medievalism of the crew and himself, as evident in his diction ("ken" and "swound"), in his more overt use of the ballad trope of repetition, and in the animism and auguries of nature he refers to. Indeed, the looser, more medieval continuity he presents here between nature and culture—where "men" and "beasts" are placed on the same footing—is what characterizes the ship's encounter with the Albatross. They greet the Albatross with a medieval, Christian hospitality and fellowship: "At length did cross an Albatross, / Thorough the fog it came; / As if it had been a Christian soul, / We hailed it in God's name" (63-66). The bird is met by the crew as a fellow "Christian soul," and as a sign of good fortune that is to be hailed in "God's name." Indeed, the Albatross keeps medieval vespers with the crew—"In mist or cloud, on mast or shroud, / It perched for vespers nine" (75-76)—and dines with the crew as well: "It ate the food it ne'er had eat; / And round and round it flew" (67-68). The crew thus interacts with the Albatross in a decidedly medieval and communal manner. The encounter with the Albatross also evinces their medieval valuation of superstition, fortune, and omenry. The bird's arrival is read by the crew as an omen of good fortune for the ship, which shifts from being fixed in ice to being propelled again by a "good south wind": "The ice did split with a thunder-fit; / The helmsman steered us through!" (71, 69-70). The encounter with the Albatross calls forth the crew's medievalism, which is forged upon the hospitality and fellowship between beasts and men, and the animating magic of omens.

Against the collectivity of the crew and its peaceable communion with the Albatross, "the Ancient Mariner inhospitably killeth the pious bird of good omen," as

The Rime's gloss notes. His transgression against Christian fellowship and hospitality, however, is far greater than a faux pas. The killing of the Albatross enacts the Mariner's definitive leap into modernity. The act performs the production and assertion of subject over object—the dominance and dominion of a Western instrumental science over a blank nature—and anticipates colonial violence. Thomas Pfau writes, “the Mariner's killing of the albatross, I contend, furnished us with a parable for the hubris that is modernity, specifically its founding, purely volitional act whereby the solitary individual turns the cosmos into an object for (inherently sceptical) experimentation” (975). Empson attests to this, by writing “all good explorers try out new sources of food; it is part of their scientific aspect, which gives them the dignity of Faust; and the darker Albatross mentioned in the anecdote of Shelvock, which is just small enough to be hung around a man's neck, does, I am told, make a tolerable soup which would help keep off scurvy” (301). Leslie Brisman states similarly, “we need only the sense that the shooting of the albatross is an act of will, and that this ‘enlightenment’ breaks the spell that bound nature and supernature in mysterious communion” (85). The Mariner's act, therefore, is less about motive than it is about mode: the Mariner kills the Albatross because he undertakes the modality of modernity, which authorizes both the instrumental reason of science and discovery and the extraction and violence of colonization. Indeed, the Mariner's depiction of the arctic seas, before the ship encounters the Albatross, demonstrates this latent modernity: “And now there came both mist and snow, / And it grew wondrous cold: / And ice, mast-high, came floating by, / As green as emerald” (51-54). The repeated “And” of these lines shifts the

Mariner's discourse into a collection of descriptive field notes, complete with measurements, and the prospect of extracting precious gems. His killing of the Albatross makes manifest the modernity already latent in the voyage.

The Mariner's volitional, experimental, colonizing act, however, cuts both ways. Not only does it reify the Albatross' object-hood, it instantiates the Mariner's subject-hood. Just as the Albatross becomes an objectified specimen, the Mariner becomes the executing and experimenting subject. The first time the Mariner refers to himself as an "I" in *The Rime* is the moment at which he reveals to the Wedding Guest what he has done: "With my cross-bow / I shot the albatross" (81-82). The act, and its subsequent recounting, establishes the Mariner as an individual subject with an internal consciousness. "Why look'st thou so?" the Wedding Guest inquires, and he has to ask precisely because the Mariner harbours an internal subjectivity, as an agent of modernity (81). This is underlined by the fact that this transition occurs to the Mariner alone. The crew continue to function as an homogeneous social group, and retain their more medieval belief in omens. "For all averred, I had killed the bird / That made the breeze to blow," the Mariner states; but immediately afterword he reports, "Then all averred, I had killed the bird / That brought the fog and mist / 'Twas right, said they, such birds to slay" (93-94, 99-101). The crew's worldview is applied and adapted on an ad hoc basis, and lacks a comprehensive theory or method to underpin its assertions. The crew's retention of a traditional ethos is underlined by their eventual symbolic excommunication of the Mariner. The Mariner states: "Ah! well a-day! what evil looks / Had I from old and young! / Instead of the cross, the Albatross / About my neck was

hung" (139-142). The crew casts him out by transposing the cross for the sign of his transgression, in an almost-mock sacrificial gesture. Even their Christianity is more literal and medieval. The fact that the crew soon after perish and become ghosts underscores their own incompatibility with the modernity the Mariner conjures forth.

As a prototype of modern subjectivity, the Mariner finds himself freighted with the solitude of individualism. Geoffrey Hartman argues that *The Rime* demonstrates the self-consciousness that accompanies modernity. Hartman writes, "Coleridge's poem traces the 'dim and perilous way' of a soul that has broken with nature and feels the burdensome guilt of selfhood" (45). In his reading of *The Rime*, Hartman claims that the process of individuation is inaugurated by a decisive act—such as that of the Mariner's. "It is a founding gesture, or caesura dividing stages of being," Hartman continues, "it may anticipate the modern 'acte gratuite' or reflect the wilfulness in Original Sin, but only because both are epochal and determining acts of individuation" (45). The assertion and consciousness of the self, Hartman maintains, runs counter to a more communal, integrated, and natural way of life. Hartman states, "consciousness appears as a breach or betrayal of nature" (46). Hartman argues that this assertion of one's autonomy is the source of the weight of modernity. "The *punishment*" writes Hartman, "is simply life itself under the condition of consciousness" (45). Acts of imagination and poetic creation foster the means for re-integration, but in the Mariner Hartman sees a case of arrested development. The Mariner, who continues to wander after his return from sea, is the perennially self-conscious figure of modernity: he is "unable to die, or find release from the experience except in the punctual agony of storytelling" (47).

The self-consciousness and the alienation of the Mariner, however, are also an effect of modernity's schematization and ordering of time. Bruno Latour argues that modernity is forged upon a sequential and irreversible temporality. Latour shows that modernity works through acts of "purification" that are organized and arranged around the central divide between nature and culture (10). Purification, Latour writes, "creates two entirely distinct ontological zones: that of human beings on the one hand; that of nonhumans on the other;" a "partition" that divides a "natural world that has always been there," from "a society with predictable and stable interests and stakes" (10-11, 11). The purification of modernity, however, is constituted by the temporal distinction it draws between past and present. "Modernity," Latour writes, "comes in as many versions as there are thinkers or journalists, yet all its definitions point, in one way or another to the passage of time" (10). Modernity establishes and defines itself by the temporal difference it creates between its own forward motion and its configuration of an outmoded, frozen past. Latour claims, "the adjective 'modern' designates a new regime, and acceleration, a rupture, a revolution in time" (10). To become modern, then, is to place oneself within a larger timeline that is inherently progressive. Modernity situates itself within a teleological and chronological trajectory, and sees itself as emerging from, and standing in distinction to, a limited and outmoded past. Latour states, "when the word 'modern' . . . appears, we are defining, by contrast, an archaic and stable past" (10). Modernity figures itself in terms of "time's irreversible arrow" (10). The flight of the Mariner's arrow dramatizes his own movement into a spatial, external, sequential and irreversible temporality.

Thomas Pfau argues that the Mariner's embodiment of modernity's methodical, experimental scepticism refigures him as a perceiving subject cast upon a plane of endlessly unfolding external stimuli. Pfau writes, "the Mariner's act of scepticism/killing, are now sacrificed to a radically new, speculative type of curiosity no longer governed by ingrained norms but permanently and anxiously cathected onto further outcomes" (975). The Mariner takes on a mode of being in which the certainty of meaning is forever deferred, by virtue of the fact that meaning must continuously and provisionally be falsified through an endless flow of external phenomena. Pfau continues,

In its own struggle with a wholly abstract (mathematical) conception of space and time, the modern self (particularly in the work of Galileo, Descartes, Newton, and Kant) once again encounters "infinity," though now not as plentitude but as sublime and terrifying emptiness. It can hardly surprise that eighteenth-century philosophy and science struggle so often to compensate for the unnerving implication of empty, infinite space and time by inferring from it, in a curious bit of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, reasoning, "the infinite extent of divine presence." What such attempt at deducing a divine presence from a material absence (i.e., of limits to space and time) had curiously forgotten was the fact that the alarming "infinity" of historical time and cosmological space had arisen from the non-appearance of the redeeming god to begin with. (993)

Having established a rational and uniform time and space, modernity is subsequently haunted by the void created in that grand act of levelling and homogenization. Indeed, Enlightenment figurations of the Clockwork Universe attest to this, as they place the divine at the origin—the clockmaker—of a mechanical universe that runs otherwise independently and automatically. The terror and angst that arises from the modern condition, mapped out by Pfau, is performed by the Mariner writ large—he not only experiences the burden of consciousness, but he experiences this burden in time. One of the most defining qualities of *The Rime* is the piling on of events that continue to happen to the Mariner. The Albatross, the ghost ship, the death of the crew, the sea snakes, the polar spirits, the resurrection of the crew, the sinking of the ship—moment follows moment, as the sun and moon continue to rise and set, until the Mariner is eventually set adrift like a corpse. Pfau states, “as is evident from its strictly sequential presentation, *The Rime’s* nautical trope proffers a quintessentially modern paradigm of experience whose import the Mariner can distil and legitimate only by appealing to criteria that have yet to be derived from whatever counts as experience” (981).

The irreversibility of the Mariner’s arrow enacts the temporality of clock time, as a spatial and chronological sequence. Time, for the Mariner, has become an external and sequential horizon of being, which changes the Mariner into a mere passive witness to his own experience. Time is no longer embodied or had by the Mariner, but endured as a running sequence. The poem stages this temporal alienation through the ship’s being adrift at sea: “Down dropt the breeze, the sails dropt down / ’Twas sad as sad could be” (107). The inert ship, moreover, drifts upon a seascape that is characterized

by a stifling artificiality. Indeed, the Mariner figures the sun not as a source of life or of temporal fruition, but as an artificial and secondary sign of the Mariner's own temporal alienation. The Mariner states, "All in a hot and copper sky, / The bloody Sun, at noon, / Right up above the mast did stand, / No bigger than the moon" (111-114). Far from being the source of growth and development, the sun is here a removed and lifeless object, but is nonetheless oppressive and stifling. Within this fixed artifice the ship drifts, and the crew now find themselves transfixed in time as nothing other than an abstract and detached tally. "Day after day, day after day, / We stuck, nor breath nor motion; / As idle as a painted ship / Upon a painted ocean," observes the Mariner (115-118). The repeated "day after day" presents time as sheer repetition, as it is reduced to a simple and meaningless chronology. The artificiality of the sun and sky is extended to the ship and ocean, as the world has become synthetic, through the homogenization and quantification of time and space. The Mariner is alienated from his own temporal experience as a result. The Mariner says twice, and in close succession, "There passed a weary time" (143), "A weary time! a weary time!" (145). Time is wearying because it has become something he needs must endure, rather than that which he actively embodies and produces.

The "spectre-bark" makes manifest the Mariner's status as a subject of modernity suspended in sequential time (202). The ghostly ship appears emphatically in time. Its very approach is represented as a successive unfolding of the present, as the Mariner, moment by moment, discerns what it is. The Mariner states, "At first it seemed a little speck, / And then it seemed a mist; / It moved and moved, and took at

last / A certain shape, I wist" (149-152). This is repeated in the Mariner's attempt to determine who is on board, "And is that Woman all her crew? / Is that a Death? and are there two? / Is Death that woman's mate?" (187-189). The shifting interplay between the perceiving subject and the approaching object shows time to be an unfolding sequence, which forever sends subjects scrambling after meaning with the arrival of each successive moment. Also, the arrival of the ghostly ship is indexed by markers of time. The Mariner describes the ghostly ship's approach:

The western wave was all a-flame.
 The day was well nigh done!
 Almost upon the western wave
 Rested the broad bright Sun;
 When that strange shape drove suddenly
 Betwixt us and the Sun. (171-176)

The "strange shape" takes the place of the setting sun, and figures modernity's mediation of time in so doing. As the ghostly ship glides between the sun and the crew it effectively impedes and intervenes upon a more naturalized mode of temporalizing. This substitution, moreover, is figured as a disciplinary encroachment upon a more naturalized temporality. The Mariner states, "And strait the Sun was flecked with bars / . . . / As if through a dungeon-grate he peered" (177, 179). The sun is mediated in a disciplinary manner by the interposition of the ghostly ship. The overtly symbolic stature of the ghostly ship—its ruinous framework, its movement in spite of its lack of

wind, and its crew—underlines the artificiality of this mediating and successive time of modernity.

The ghostly ship's mates "Death" and "The Night-mare Life-in-Death" represent respectively the temporalities of the medieval world and of modernity (193). The skeletal Death represents time in its more classical figuration, as the remorseless scythe. However, Life-in-Death figures the temporality of modern subjectivity, where the organic cessation of life is supplanted by an artificial interminability. Life-in-Death is the modern subject characterized by artificiality: "Her lips were red, her looks were free, / Her locks were yellow as gold: / Her skin was as white as leprosy, / The Night-mare Life-in-death was she, / Who thicks man's blood with cold" (190-194). Life-in-Death, unlike Death, obfuscates and masks mortality through the artifice of her dress. Life-in-Death's defeat of Death, in their "casting dice," performs the victory of the mode of modernity over that of the medieval, where the reckoning and minding of chance wins out over a traditional world bound by an orderly Christian cosmology (196). Life-in-Death's winning of the Mariner's fate recruits him symbolically into the interminability of modern subjectivity. This is highlighted by the fact that as soon as the ghostly ship sails off there is an abrupt shift in time, which again stresses the artifice and automation of modernity. As soon as the Mariner learns his fate the time of day shifts instantly, as if by mechanization: "The Sun's rim dips; the stars rush out: / At one stride comes the dark" (199-200). The immediacy of this time change, which happens instantaneously as one present replaces another, registers a temporality constituted by absolute and successive change.

In taking on the successive temporality of modernity, the Mariner experiences alienation and isolation. The rest of the crew, who espouse a more medieval worldview, perish on board the ship; but the Mariner finds himself suspended within an endless succession of time. The Mariner presents this information through the very language of quantified time: “seven days, seven nights, I saw that curse, / And yet I could not die” (261-262). Devoid of a more organic temporality—the same that ends the lives of the crew—he is left alone to count the days. The Mariner marks his solitude through the void of traditional, Christian consolation. The Mariner states, “Alone, alone, all, all alone, / Alone on a wide wide sea! / And never a saint took pity on / My soul in agony” (232-235). As a subject of modernity, the Mariner can no longer seek solace in the passions of the Saints or in the external, Christian community in which they circulate. Indeed, with the breaking of this modality the Mariner loses the ability to link his feelings and concerns to a divine cosmology through the act of prayer: “I looked to heaven, and tried to pray; / But or ever a prayer had gusht, / A wicked whisper came, and made / My heart as dry as dust” (244-247). The wicked whisper is the Mariner’s own interiority, where self-consciousness has supplanted communal mindedness. Modern subjectivity is individuating and atomizing, which the Mariner’s isolation at sea performs.

To be sure, the Mariner’s becoming modern is indexed by the development of his interiority. Pfau writes, “what happens next is the advent of interiority, of the modern psyche as ‘unhappy consciousness’ (Hegel), as a ‘prison-house’ (Wordsworth), or some other ‘punctual self’ (Charles Taylor) whose isolated nightmare existence is the

stuff of narrative from Coleridge through Kafka" (989). The moment at which the Mariner embodies his own individuation by exercising his interiority is the moment at which he begins to make his way home. The Mariner's encounter with the sea snakes demonstrates his undertaking of the self-consciousness of modernity. The Mariner states,

O happy living things! no tongue

Their beauty might declare:

A spring of love gushed from my heart,

And I blessed them unaware:

Sure my kind saint took pity on me,

And I blessed them unaware. (282-287)

The seeming spontaneity of the Mariner's blessing is, in actuality, the automation of the internal consciousness of subjectivity. A true subject of modernity, he feels and thinks within. Rather than a moment of conversion or salvation, the Mariner's blessing is a moment of iteration, where the Mariner begins to live as a subject of modernity. It is not that the curse is lifted, or that "the spell begins to break," as the gloss reads it, but, rather, his own normalization and internalization of the modernity he has always already taken on. With this same gesture the Mariner sheds the sign of his transgression—the Albatross—because it is now superfluous. "The Albatross fell off, and sank / Like lead into the sea," because as a modern subject the Mariner now wears that act internally as a weight upon his conscience, and as a part of his individual history

(288-291). The Mariner's development of the consciousness of modernity enacts the internalization of his transgression.

The Mariner's voyage home is framed as a form of time travel. He returns within an abstracted and mechanized timeframe that is altogether separate from the natural world. The Mariner again marks the sun's movement by stating, "The sun, right up above the mast, / Had fix'd her to the ocean: / But in a minute she 'gan stir, / With a short uneasy motion— / Backwards and forwards half her length / With a short uneasy motion" (383-388). The ship operates on a separate and distinct plane, free from the particularities of the physical space of nature. This plane is the abstracted and uniform space and time of modernity. Indeed, the Mariner uses the clock's language—"in a minute"—to designate the commencement of his journey. As the ship "drive[s] on so fast," one of the observing voices informs the other that the ship's speed derives from the fact that "the air is cut away before, / And closes from behind" (424-425). The ship moves through the spatial-temporal coordinates of modernity, at a speed "faster than human life can endure," as the gloss observes, because the Mariner is free from the constraints of localized space through this virtual homogenization. Stevenson points out that "the mysterious motion of the ship, while intended to be supernatural in origin, also has technological overtones," and bears a distinctly "aeronautical motion" (55). The strange technology of the ship's return home reveals how "the Mariner's voyage is not only a voyage through space but a voyage through time as well. For better or worse, he emerges as the first modern man" (55). The Mariner becomes a time traveler

because time itself is reconfigured through the lens of modernity as a pure, sequential, and spatial entity divorced from natural phenomena.

William Empson argues that “modern critics” are “evading the real point of the poem when they so eagerly invent proofs” that the Mariner deserves his fate (307). And yet, the poem seems to anticipate and solicit this critical supplementation. However, the impulse to explicate and adjudicate the Mariner’s “crime” is an effect of the very modernity the poem maps out. *The Rime* presents a world in which stable and absolute truth, as underwritten by a divine authority, has been abandoned. Moreover, the text shows how traditional authority has been supplanted by a mode of scientific scepticism wherein the inquiring subject becomes the only means of verification. Accordingly, interpretative and evaluative acts are continuously required to unpack a world that conceals itself from human efforts. The critical supplementation takes its cue from the Mariner himself, who, as a sceptical subject of modernity, is likewise glossing for meaning. Pfau writes, “a condensation of the Cartesian sceptic and the Hobbesian solitary individual whose volitional acts of experimentation and objectification produce an unhinged, radically contingent cosmos, the Mariner can only hope to grasp at and contain the meaning of his self-creating deed through the supplemental practices of symbolic narration, which in the will require further acts of textual exegesis” (987). By mapping out the gaps, fissures, and lacunae that constitute modernity, the poem builds critical inquiry into the text itself, and performs the provisional nature of truth and meaning in the process. Jerome McGann and Frances Ferguson working from distinct critical perspectives each understand the poem along these lines. While the notion that

the poem envisions and accounts for its own interpretability has ideological implications for McGann and deconstructive implications for Ferguson, they both view the text as a performance of the act of interpretation.

Jerome McGann claims that the actual focus of Coleridge's poem is the act of interpretation itself. McGann argues the poem's "symbolic paraphernalia (albatross, mariner, spectre-bark, water snakes, rain, sun, moon, etc.)" appear in the poem as "objects of our analysis, but they are only in the poem *as symbols* . . . as objects-bearing-meaning" (58). Interpretation, and more specifically its own interpretation, is woven into the fabric of the text. Accordingly, the oft-maligned 1817 gloss, McGann argues, is entirely in keeping with, and is even envisioned by, the original 1798 edition, because the act of interpretive glossing is what the poem has always been about.

McGann writes,

The "Rime" imitates or re-presents a process of textual evolution, and the symbolic meaning of that process—which is the poem's dominant symbolic event—is that the process has a symbolic value and meaning, that is, a religious, a Christian, and ultimately a redemptive meaning. In this we can see very clearly the living operation of processive historical events. At the outset of the nineteenth century and in reaction to the revolutionary intellectual developments of the Enlightenment, Christian ideas find a new birth of freedom, not in the fact of Christ's resurrection, which is the traditional Pauline view, but in the symbol of the resurrection, in its meaning. (60)

The gloss appended to the 1817 text simply continues the work that the poem has always done: the formalization of “an evidently *mediated*” or “redacted literary text” (57). McGann argues that the poem stages “Coleridge’s special religious/symbolic theory of interpretation founded upon his own understanding of the Higher Critical analytic” (50). The “meaning” of Coleridge’s text then is less in the decoding of the events that transpire within the narrative, but rather the process and significance of interpretation itself. The poem’s interest in hermeneutics is visible, McGann shows, by the palimpsest of textual “perspective[s]” and interpretive traditions it represents (50). McGann writes, “Coleridge means us to understand that the ballad narrative dates from the sixteenth-century, that the gloss is a late seventeenth-century addition, and, of course, that Coleridge, at the turn of the nineteenth century, has provided yet another . . . perspective” (50). Coleridge envisions interpretation in the very structure of his poem. McGann claims, “Coleridge certainly intended his more perspicuous readers—that is, those read in the theory and practice of the new historical criticism—to see that the ‘Rime’ was an imaginative presentation of a work comprising textual layers” (50-51). The text’s meaning then lies in its performance of interpretive traditions, “as diverse as pagan superstitions, Catholic theology, Aristotelian science, and contemporary philological theory” (51).

Frances Ferguson also asserts that the poem takes interpretation, and, more specifically, the act of reading, as its central preoccupation. Ferguson observes how “the criticism of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* reflects a craving for causes” in its grappling with the multiple and often irreconcilable components of the text (57). As a

result, the criticism tends to depend “upon sorting that experience into a more linear and complete pattern than the poem ever agrees to” (57, 59). This is in part the result of the 1817 gloss, Ferguson argues, which casts a “strange kind of clarity and unity” on the 1798 version—a unity from which subsequent criticism has taken its cue (63). The gloss, Ferguson argues, “in assuming that things must be significant and interpretable, finds significance and interpretability,” and in so doing it underscores how reading the poem necessarily “editorializes” it and establishes a “cause-and-effect pattern that the main text never quite offers” (63). Ferguson locates this impulse to order in Coleridge’s belief that “what you know and what you read are part of a moral dilemma” (72). For Coleridge, Ferguson claims, there lies an inherent transgression in “insufficient knowledge or reading,” which stands as “the cause of moral inadequacy” (72). Hence, “nothing less than all knowledge—everything—will suffice” (72). The poem is about the staging of the process of interpreting and understanding from a necessarily blinkered position. Ferguson states, “for Coleridge [the] original sin was interpretation from a limited perspective that had disproportionate consequences” (72). The poem thus models the limits of hermeneutics, where “a reader can only read the texts that say what he already knows” (72).

Mark L. Barr shows how modernity is staged in Coleridge’s text, by considering how the gloss effectively emulates and performs the literary and juridical containment of radical political dissent. Barr reflects on the unease displayed by authorities during and after the French Revolution surrounding “the radical potential of language to promulgate ideas subversive to the state” (864). These authorities working in “both the

legal and literary realms,” understood how “the influence of ‘publications’ lay at the heart of the revolution,” and that “such revolutionary sentiment was an explicit threat not merely to the laws but the fabric and structure of English society” (866, 864). Barr identifies a literary and legal concern with the radical potentialities of Jacobin publications to undermine traditional authorities. Coleridge, Barr argues, reflects the same concerns with the appending of an explanatory and ultimately curtailing gloss to his 1817 iteration of the poem. Barr writes, “this fear of mass circulation and the Jacobinical effects of unregulated reading Coleridge imports into his 1817 revision of the *Rime*, in particular its marginal gloss” (873). The gloss, Barr argues, reigns in and delimits the more radical possibilities found in the text. Barr writes, “the Mariner produces some kind of revolution in how the Wedding Guest sees himself and the reality around him” (874). Indeed, the near-atheistic Mariner poses, as Barr notes, a revolutionary threat to the communal and traditional society he wanders into. The gloss then, Barr argues, functions as a distancing and deflating layer of officiating rhetoric to neutralize the potentially radical politics of the Mariner. Barr states, “For Coleridge’s reader, the gloss provides a historically-situated interpretation that seeks to limit meaning making from the text of a (somewhat bizarre) case, placing the *Rime* gloss within a contemporary legal institutional movement towards the modern notion of precedent” (876). The gloss co-opts and reroutes the potentially rebellious language of the text and in so doing “becomes an embodiment,” Barr argues, “of the forms of justice” (882). Despite this, Barr shows that the very performance of authoritative, legal containment by the gloss in fact falls victim to the inevitable slippage that occurs

between the authoritative control of meaning and the reality it strives to contain. Accordingly, “the gloss, therefore, enacts the containment of form and precedent on literary and legal reading, and, in its inadequacy, mimics the inevitable failure of any such containment in either the legal or literary spheres” (883). In that slippage, the poem performs the fracturing of traditional authority elicited by modernity. *The Rime* mimes and reflects the pull between a concerted resistance to state power and the complex of legal, juridical, and aesthetic theory mobilized to officiate, regulate, and curtail that dissidence.

The dissonance between the gloss and the movement of the text itself is readily apparent in the final statement of the gloss; a summation that amounts to the moral of the Mariner’s story: “And to teach, by his own example, love and reverence to all things that God made and loveth” (610). On this moral Empson writes, “I would do wrong to belittle the moral ‘Don’t pull poor pussy’s tail,’ which needs to be taught to children; but Coleridge came to feel, like many of his readers, that it forms an inadequate conclusion to so much lightning and despair” (310). One cannot help but register a disconnect between the clichéd, banal moral—a dusting off of the golden rule—and the torment the Mariner has experienced; not to mention the fact that the Mariner seems to lack the grace and understanding such a moral presupposes. But, again, the unsatisfactory and overwrought status of the moral reifies the modernity the text takes on, in which clear and tidy moral statements are no longer tenable or possible. Indeed, the Mariner’s desire for the truth and certainty of a more traditional society, which he conveys at the end of his narrative, is underwritten, ironically, by his status as a modern subject. The

Mariner advocates an antiquated and local way of life over and against the global modernity he has inadvertently wandered into: “to walk together to the kirk, / And all together pray, / While each to his great Father bends, / Old men, and babes, and loving friends, / And youth and maidens gay!” (605-609). Despite this, it is the concept of modernity that establishes and installs the very idea that a traditional, paradisiac society ever existed in the first place. The Mariner’s nostalgia is produced and engendered by modernity as a mode, as that which envisions its own originating rupture—time’s irreversible arrow—after which nothing is ever the same. Indeed, the historicism and antiquarianism that permeates the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century—the resurgence of the medieval, the Gothic, and the ballad—of which *The Rime* is a product, is the result of a modernity that powers and constitutes itself through its own conception of a past, out of which it has emerged and moved away from. The Mariner’s parting words are an ethnography of a pre-modern and pre-Protestant Western Europe; but the value he finds in that imagined space can only be summoned and desired through its very negation. The Mariner is part and parcel of a scientific, methodical mode of inquiry that posits an imagined past as an origin for its own irreversible, progressive temporality. The Mariner thus posits a pre-modern selflessness, “He prayeth well, who loveth well / Both man and bird and beast,” over and against the solipsism of modernity, but this iteration of the *ubi sunt* motif is always already a product of modernity (612-613).

After his voyage the Mariner can no longer claim membership in any local, cultural community, but instead wanders endlessly. As Stevenson observes, “the

repentant Mariner may after all be seen as the first lonely inhabitant of the global village" (56). Upon his return, the Mariner is no longer recognizable. The pilot's boy starts at seeing the strange Mariner climb aboard, and manically claims, "The Devil knows how to row" (569). The Hermit likewise greets the Mariner with suspicion, and fails to recognize not only his person, but what form of person he is. The "Hermit crossed his brow / 'Say quick,' quoth he, 'I bid thee say— / What manner of man art thou?'" (575-577). The Mariner's voyage and the modernity it elicits cancels his membership in traditional society, and he is no longer recognizable there. Indeed, the Mariner is alone in his dispossession. His shipmates, in spite of their deaths, nonetheless experience a form of spiritual homecoming upon the ship's return: "This seraph-band, each waved his hand: / It was a heavenly sight! / They stood as signals to the land, / Each one a lovely light" (492-495). The ghostly crew manages to reaffirm their communal ties, but the Mariner does not. Instead, the Mariner's passage from ship to shore, at his moment of homecoming, is represented as a death. He describes himself "Like one that hath been seven days drowned / My body lay afloat" (552-553). Rather than a communal rescue or retrieval, the Mariner's landing is figured as the collection of a drowned stranger, which stresses his alienation from his native land. The Mariner returns as a newly mobilized member of the wandering citizenry of modernity.

His wander is powered by his compulsion to repeat his "ghastly tale" (584). This repetition is less an act of atonement or redemption, than it is the reification of the modernity he embodies. Pfau writes, "cut adrift from all communal and object relations, the Mariner's emblematic impersonation of the modern condition is above all

defined and circumscribed by his ‘strange power of speech,’” and by the “Sisyphean labour of constantly having to secure ‘uptake’ or ‘acknowledgement’ for strictly virtual, textually mediated *notions* that are no longer referentially anchored in any objective reality or nature” (984). The Mariner’s endless wander and repeated retellings iterate his position as a subject and function of modernity. The poem figures this by stressing the compulsive, mechanistic status of the wandering Mariner. He tells the Wedding Guest, “I pass, like night, from land to land; / I have strange power of speech; / That moment that his face I see, / I know the man that must hear me: / To him my tale I teach” (586-590). The teaching of his tale is figured as compulsory and automated. Like a wound clock the Mariner sounds on cue: “Forthwith this frame of mine was wrenched / With a woeful agony, / Which forced me to begin my tale; / And then it left me free” (578-581). The temporal markers that permeate his characterization of his wandering narration are telling, because they underline how his wander is underwritten by a sequential and ceaseless temporality. The Mariner “pass[es], like night,” remains beholden to the “moment,” and his tale is elicited and recounted “at an uncertain hour” (582). His very repetition of the past continuously reinforces time as a sequence consisting of past, present, and future, and his own temporal alienation is registered in the monotony and homogeneity of his condition.

The Mariner’s ultimate departure from the poem attests to the irreversibility of modernity his voyage has engendered. The Mariner’s departure at the end of the poem tears open a space into which the temporality of clock time floods. The narrator states, “The Mariner, whose eye is bright / Whose beard with age is hoar, / Is gone: and now

the Wedding-Guest / Turned from the bridegroom's door" (618-621). The caesura that follows the description of the Mariner's leaving—"is gone:"—installs a sequential temporality, by demarcating and separating one moment from the next. His departure is marked by a clear punctuation, which is followed by the invocation of a succeeding moment: "Is gone: and now" (620). The "and now" inflects the discourse of the poem with the Mariner's own irreversible modernity, and demonstrates how that modernity now indelibly marks the world. The Mariner has departed, but the successive temporality of modernity endures. The persistence of modernity is continued in the narrator's depiction of the parting Wedding Guest. The final lines of the poem describe the Wedding Guest's departure: "He went like one that hath been stunned, / And is of sense forlorn: / A sadder and a wiser man, / He rose the morrow morn" (622-625). The final image of the Wedding Guest shows how he is likewise marked and affected by modernity. The narrator's use of the future past tense—"He rose the morrow morn"—casts the Wedding Guest within a sequential temporality. Like the Mariner, The Wedding Guest is caught within time as the succession of moments. Moreover, his position within the irreversible, successive time of modernity is shown to be likewise an experience of alienation and dispossession. The Wedding Guest now has a tomorrow, and a yesterday, but the text figures his undertaking of clock time as a loss. It is for this reason that the Wedding Guest is "of sense forlorn." The adjectival "forlorn" carries with it the traces of the early modern noun a "forlorn hope," which, "in early use," referred to "a picked body of men, detached to the front to begin the attack; a body of skirmishers;" and finds its first appearance in English in a military treatise from 1579

(*OED* 1.a.). The English “forlorn hope” is Dutch in origin (deriving from “verloren hoop” or “lost troop”), and the Dutch translation more transparently holds the sense of loss and death signified by the word “forlorn.” *The Rime’s* use of the word “forlorn” carries with it the military, colonial procedures of early modernity. Indeed, its derivation from the Dutch, whose maritime, colonial power preceded that of Britain’s, traces the modernity it carries, right back to the Mariner’s own experience on a colonial vessel. The word “forlorn” reifies modernity itself—the forlorn were those sacrificed and lost to the establishment of the trade, expansion, colonization, and war of early modernity. The forlorn were the first to die for the project of modernity, the implementation of which *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* dramatizes and yet remains deeply troubled by.

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Chapter Five:

The Fall of Wander: *Melmoth the Wanderer* and the Torment of Time

The titular wanderer of Charles Robert Maturin's 1820 Gothic novel *Melmoth the Wanderer* embodies a "bitter and burning irony" (492). Having brokered an infernal deal to extend his life for 150 years, the Wanderer is "permitted to wander" with the "power to tempt men under the pressure of extreme calamity;" and yet, he spends his prolonged life trying and failing to extricate himself from this fate by tempting others to exchange "destinies" (475, 601). The Wanderer is an over-reacher and a tempter at once; he is both "Faust and Mephistopheles," protagonist and antagonist, victim and villain, object and subject (Sage xvi). Indeed, Kathleen Fowler's designation of the Wanderer as a "splendid Gothic hero-villain" "descended from Faust, Mephistopheles, Milton's Satan, Cain, and the Wandering Jew" underlines this division—the Wanderer is just as much the tortured as he is the torturer (522-523). The Wanderer's irony is rooted in his relationship to temporality. His longevity refigures his existence as sheer time, and reduces his life to the simple measure of hours, days, and years. The Wanderer has time, but only in so far as he surrenders that time to its successive quantification. By undertaking a timebound subjectivity, the Wanderer becomes an object of the clock, and is divested of his own organic temporality in the process. The irony of the Wanderer signifies the ironic condition of living within the measured time of modernity, where one is given time as an authorized subject, but alienated from one's own authentic temporal experience by virtue of its schematization. *Melmoth the*

Wanderer is thus a cautionary tale. The novel offers the figure of the Wanderer, and the more general instantiations of listless wander undertaken by those he tempts, to warn against a temporality it finds to be thoroughly dispossessing.

The Wanderer's irony, along with the temporal alienation it registers, is exhibited in the very form of *Melmoth the Wanderer*. The novel upends the traditional conventions of prose narrative, which generally outline central protagonists developing in time, in both the Wanderer's temporal stasis—"time seems to have forborne to touch him from terror," as an English Reverend notes—and by virtue of the fact that he remains a peripheral presence in his own narrative (558). "Contrary to what one might expect," Charlotte Sussman writes, "the Wanderer is hardly the central character in the novel named for him, but rather the pole around which a series of vignettes of suffering is organized" (142). *Melmoth the Wanderer* deploys the Gothic convention of the frame narrative and the found manuscript, but it takes these tropes to baffling and disorienting heights. Fractured and fragmented, the novel is an amalgam of narratives relayed through multiple speakers, which, for the most part, lack resolution, or are in some other way incomplete. The novel adopts, as Sharon Ragaz terms it, a "labyrinthine, infinitely regressive [and] Chinese-box structure" in its presentation of these vignettes (359). *Melmoth the Wanderer* consists of the narration of John Melmoth the younger, on his return to the family seat; of the found, decaying, and fragmented narrative of Stanton, as read by John Melmoth; and of the first-person account of the shipwrecked Moncada, as conveyed to John Melmoth; however, Moncada's narrative contains the lengthy narrative of the *Tale of the Indians*, which

Moncada recalls having transcribed in the secreted apartment of Adonijah; and that narrative itself contains *The Tale of Guzman's Family* and *The Lover's Tale*, both of which have their own distinct narrators. At what amounts to its most dizzying moment, the novel has at least five layers of mediation: *The Tale of Guzman's Family* is told by an unnamed writer, which is contained within the *Tale of the Indians*, which is recorded by Adonijah, which is transcribed by Moncada, which is then recounted by Moncada to John Melmoth in the novel's present. Within this disorienting narrative structure, the Wanderer remains elusive, uncontainable, and almost apocryphal, despite being the novel's namesake. The novel, then, subverts the general conceit of prose narrative of conveying the progression and growth of a central character. Rather than featuring the development of its assumed protagonist, *Melmoth the Wanderer*, as Fred Botting observes, presents an "ironic reversal of romance ideals and their homogenizing effects" (70).

The Wanderer's own irony is demonstrated most palpably in the various historical accounts he delivers to his would-be victims. Throughout the novel the Wanderer baffles his interlocutors with vivid, first-hand accounts of history; however, he presents these accounts through an ironic language that underlines and reaffirms his own distance from that time, in spite of his actual presence. Moncada recalls how the Wanderer "dealt much in anecdotal history," and states that "he constantly eluded to events and personages beyond his possible *memory*, —then he checked himself—then he appeared to go on, with a kind of derisive sneer at his own *absence*" (254). The "derisive sneer" of "*absence*" hints at the Wanderer's absence from his own temporal

experience. Indeed, the Wanderer's historical accounts remain observational and descriptive—a running commentary that hovers above lived and embodied historical understanding. His reporting of the past reads more like an ongoing, discontinuous taking of minutes, than it does an historical narrative, as he abruptly shifts from one event to another, each devoid of contextual, historical insight. In one breath, the Wanderer “spoke of the *Restoration* in England,” and then “of the superb fetes given by Louis Quatorze,” and “then he reverted to the death of the Duchesse d’Orleans,” and then “passed to England” and “spoke of the wretched and well-rebuked pride of the wife of James II” (254, 255). The Wanderer's account of the past amounts to a continuous description that flits from one scene to the next; replete with detail, but lacking in understanding. Moncada recalls how the Wanderer's discourse was characterized by a “minuteness and circumstantiality,” and that his descriptions contained a “minute fidelity somewhat alarming” (255, 256). The “minuteness” of his descriptions is indicative of an automated, total recall of the past—one that is emptied out of authentic historical understanding. The past in the Wanderer's language is a summation of details, and nothing more. The Wanderer ironically remains outside of the very past for which he was present.

The Wanderer further reveals his temporal alienation in the heavily ironized account of European history he provides to Immalee. In presenting Immalee with the violent, “cruel and wicked absurdities” of European society, the Wanderer participates in what Fred Botting identifies as the critical function of the Romantic-Gothic figure; but the “acrid and searing irony” with which he presents his account of history underlines

his distance from that time (339, 343). He criticizes the law in defining it as an “amusement of these people, so ingenious in multiplying the sufferings of their destiny” (340), and he similarly censures war by calling it a “legalized massacre” composed of the “collecting the greatest number of human beings that can be bribed to the task, to cut the throat of a less, equal, or greater number of beings, bribed in the same manner for the same purpose” (338). The Wanderer’s de-familiarizing irony stresses his own separation from the European history of which he is a product. The ironical nature of the Wanderer’s time-bound subjectivity ensures that he remains distanced and alienated from the time he observes.

Baudelaire, one of *Melmoth the Wanderer’s* early champions, claims the “great satanic creation of the Reverend Maturin” derives its power from this irony (139). The Wanderer, Baudelaire writes, exhibits a “contradictory double nature, which is infinitely great in relation to man, and infinitely vile and base in relation to Absolute Truth and Justice” (139). As “the outcast of society, wandering somewhere between the last boundaries of the territory of mankind and the frontiers of the higher life,” the Wanderer “always believes himself to be on the point of freedom from his infernal pact, and longs without ceasing to barter that superhuman power, which is his disaster, for the pure conscience of a simpleton, which is his envy” (142-3). Baudelaire finds the Wanderer’s irony—his status as a “living contradiction”—to be most pronounced in his laughter, which Baudelaire claims to be a uniquely post-lapsarian phenomenon (142). Laughter, he writes, originates in “the idea of one’s own superiority,” which the Wanderer sneeringly and consistently affirms (137). Baudelaire argues that this sense of

self-superiority is thoroughly “Satanic,” and he asserts that the “Romantic school, or, to put it better, the Satanic school,” of which the Wanderer is a significant founding member, demonstrates “a proper understanding” of laughter’s primordial law” (137, 139). The laughter of irony is Satanic, Baudelaire argues, because it originates and registers the theological ejection from the garden, wherein one is subject and object at once. “Human laughter,” Baudelaire writes, “is intimately linked with the accident of an ancient Fall, of a debasement both physical and moral” (135).

In “The Rhetoric of Temporality” Paul De Man develops the connection Baudelaire draws between the fall and irony, in order to indicate the temporal insight that resides in the fact that neither laughter nor tears “make their appearance in the paradise of delights” (Baudelaire 135). De Man responds to Baudelaire’s formulation of irony by showing the temporal implications of irony’s doubled structure. The superiority that arises from watching the fall of another reflects an internal difference located in the watcher. “Superiority and inferiority,” de Man writes, “become merely spatial metaphors to indicate a discontinuity and a plurality of levels within a subject that comes to know itself by an increasing differentiation from what it is not” (213). De Man reads the fall as the movement into self-division that divides an empirical self from a self that is constituted by language. De Man writes,

In Baudelaire’s description the division of the subject into a multiple consciousness takes place in immediate connection with a fall. The element of falling introduces the specifically comical and ultimately ironical ingredient. At the moment that the artistic or philosophical, that

is, the language-determined, man laughs at himself falling, he is laughing at a mistaken, mystified assumption he was making about himself . . . As a being that stands upright . . . man comes to believe that he dominates nature, just as he can, at times, dominate others or watch others dominate him. This is, of course, a major mystification. The Fall, in the literal as well as the theological sense, reminds him of the purely instrumental, reified character of his relationship to nature. (213-214)

The literal fall echoes the theological fall, and reveals a division in consciousness, where “language thus conceived divides the subject into an empirical self, immersed in the world, and a self that becomes like a sign in its attempt at differentiation and self-definition” (213). The fall discloses the ironic condition that sits at the very centre of subjectivity.

De Man goes on to show that irony’s revelation of different selves within the same consciousness is a temporal development. Like allegory, irony reveals a “temporal void” by “always implying an unreachable anteriority” (222). This temporal void is established in the realization of the erroneousness of a past self, at the expense of a future self that might itself be erroneous. De Man writes, “irony divides the flow of temporal experience into a past that is pure mystification and a future that remains harassed forever by a relapse within the inauthentic” (222). The effect of irony is to reveal a temporal predicament it can itself never surmount. Irony “can know this inauthenticity but can never overcome it” (222). And yet, this knowing, de Man continues, is nonetheless insightful. Irony, de Man shows, “comes closer to the pattern

of factual experience and recaptures some of the factitiousness of human existence as a succession of isolated moments lived by a divided self" (226). Irony may disclose the inauthentic, in so far as it demystifies a past self and destabilizes a future self, but that inauthenticity authentically defines consciousness as the successive establishment of multiple selves. Through negation, irony diagnoses the temporality of subjectivity. Irony and allegory, de Man states, are "determined by an authentic experience of temporality which, seen from the point of view of the self engaged in the world, is a negative one" (226).

I argue the Wanderer's "fall" is a fall into the temporality and, hence, the subjectivity of modernity—a fall that gives rise to an irony that authentically diagnoses his own inauthenticity. The Wanderer is cast within an external, sequential timeframe that externalizes him from his own authentic temporality, and yet his undertaking of that temporality imbues him with an ironic language with which he can register and gauge his own temporal dispossession. His irony, then, can only ever refer to and diagnose his temporal dispossession—it can never actively redress it, nor escape it. "Mingling with, yet distinct from all his species," the Wanderer wanders, "like a wearied and uninterested spectator rambling through the various seats of some vast theatre, where he knows none of the audience" (397).

Sussman observes that *Melmoth the Wanderer* is one of many Romantic era narratives that explore subjects with prolonged lifespans. Placing Maturin's novel alongside other Romantic texts like, "John Galt's 1820 novel *The Wandering Jew*, William Godwin's *St. Leon*, and Mary Shelley's "The Mortal Immortal," Sussman shows

that “Romantic-era literature abounds with characters who are immortal or who have lived beyond their allotted years” (140). Sussman finds that the “relationship” between epistemology and temporality “has become more complex in the Romantic-era novel than it had been understood to be in the eighteenth century” (144). “Moral epistemology in the novel,” Sussman argues, “is conventionally connected to the experience of sympathetic witnessing” (141). However, these long-living Romantic figures “alter the terms of that imaginary exchange, suggesting that sympathy has its own temporality, perhaps one tied to the human body” (141). “The prolongation of life,” Sussman writes, “seems to withdraw one from sympathy altogether, so that the instant has no moral effect” (145). Accordingly, Sussman observes that the Romantic-era novel strives to account for configurations of time that exceed biological existence. These novels’ “exploration of long-living individuals is tied up with an interest in the supra-individual scope of historical time—of epochs that cannot be defined by the temporal span of single bodies” (145).

Melmoth the Wanderer presents just such an epoch, as the Wanderer’s prolonged life stretches alongside the historical turn of modernity. The dates of his lifespan are never specified explicitly in the novel, but the portrait John Melmoth finds of his ancestor depicts “a man of middle age” with “the words of the border of the painting” reading “Jno. Melmoth, anno 1646” (20). The portrait dates the Wanderer’s birth as sometime in the early years of the seventeenth-century, and thus, with the addition of his own life to middle age, plus his extended 150 years, roughly aligns his time of death with the novel’s present of 1816. The Wanderer’s lifespan, running as it

does from the early-seventeenth to the early-nineteenth-century, covers the apex years of early-modernity. The major historical changes that engender this epoch include, the English Civil War, the beheading of Charles the First, the rise of Protestantism, the rise of European colonization—all of which are explicitly referenced in the novel—as well as the onset of the Enlightenment, the Scientific Revolution, the French Revolution, and the early phases of the Industrial Revolution. Jack Null notes the historical and cultural significance of the Wanderer's timeline by stating, "if Melmoth made the pact 150 years earlier, he negotiated it in 1666-7," and so "perhaps Maturin intended the pact to coincide with other cataclysmic events of this *annus mirabilis*" (137). Null also observes how the novel focuses upon two particularly fractious "timespans:" the first, "1660-86, which may include the pact and certainly includes the tales of Stanton, Walberg, the Mortimers, Immalee-Isidora," and the second, "1799-1816, which includes the adventures of Moncada and the final appearances and end of Melmoth" (144). Both of these periods are particularly turbulent in the narrative of modernity—the first covering the English political turmoil of the seventeenth-century, and the second the Revolutionary, political, and social debates of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century. Furthermore, these two periods bookend, roughly, the trajectory of early modernity, and both witness modernity's more violent flashpoints. Null writes, "in these periods, Maturin finds similar conditions of political turbulence, bigotry, and the uncertainty of events on a grand scale;" they each represent "a turning-away from the doctrine of universal love in favour of schisms that threaten to splinter" (144).

Ashley Marshall attests to how the Wanderer's life coincides with the onset of modernity, by observing how his existence maps onto the major historical-cultural shifts that take place in Western European thought over the course of the Enlightenment. Marshall states, "Melmoth's exchange of his soul for paranormal longevity coincides with the cultural transition from metaphysical to empirical understanding" (135). "Melmoth," Marshall writes, "always fills the space from which God has been expelled by an empirically oriented society, preoccupied with things visible and countable" (137). Indeed, the Reverend of *The Lover's Tale* describes seeing the Wanderer's "room filled with an astrological apparatus, books and implements of science [the Reverend] did not understand" (557). The Wanderer's strange science displaces and replaces traditional religious and classical modes of authority with a new empirical science. Furthermore, the time over which the Wanderer's life is extended is the time in which time itself, along with space, becomes the means through which the world is contended with and understood. The Wanderer's extended life oversees and signifies the emergence of an instrumental rationalism, wherein subjects and objects are constituted and organized by empirical observation and method. The Wanderer's alienated wander, then, dramatizes the condition of modern subjectivity that his extended life has witnessed—a condition underwritten by and predicated upon the abstraction and quantification of time and space.

The modernity of the Wanderer, moreover, is indivisible from his status as an agent of colonization, as Laura Doyle shows. Developing what she terms the "geostructure of the Gothic," Doyle argues that the Gothic arises from the point at

which colonialism and modernity intersect and constitute one another so as to make their distinction impossible (515). “The Gothic,” Doyle writes, “is best read not strictly as a representation of the ‘dark side’ of the enlightenment republic but rather as a symbolic form generated by the slash that both divides and joins” colonialism to modernity (516). This formulation is articulated through a newly emergent “anxious global consciousness via wanderers/Jews who bring troubles and rumblings of colonies to capitals” (516). Doyle shows how both England and Spain depended upon Gothicized national narratives in order to underwrite their respective colonial endeavours.

At the turn into the seventeenth century, England entered a shifting colonial/modern world as recently unified nations in the west sought to compete with established empires in the East. Ideologically England did so (as had Spain) in significant part by fashioning itself as a Gothic nation in the republican, racial, and violent (or conquering) senses. In England’s case this discourse found well developed expression as a myth of Anglo-Saxonism claiming that the English descended from the fierce Gothic (or Germanic) Saxons, a populace of strong, “free born” men who had displaced the Rome-weakened Britons and brought with them from the woods of Germany a tradition of participatory government and zealous protection of land and rights. (522-523)

The Gothic authorizes and empowers colonial modernity through a discourse it elevates to a mythology. Indeed, Doyle shows how discourses of Gothic freedom were instrumental in the political engagements that led to the beheading of Charles the First

(523). The Wanderer, Doyle maintains, is a colonial/modern subject, whose “unspeakable knowledge” is none other than his “witnessing of the radical injustice and unevenness of the world’s imperial order” (535). *Melmoth the Wanderer*, Doyle argues, “explicitly surveys the conditions, causes and violent effects of colonial modernity” (529).

Terry Eagleton also outlines the novel’s colonial underpinnings. Eagleton claims that the “satanic pact” of the Wanderer mirrors the act of Anglo-Irish colonization, and the Wanderer’s suspension in time reflects the temporal and historical stasis this act of colonization has elicited (190). Eagleton reads the Wanderer’s infernal deal as a “metaphor of the original crime of forcible settlement and expulsion, which belongs to the period in which Melmoth’s bargain with the devil takes place” (190). As “the brother of a Cromwellian planter,” the Wanderer “has survived over the centuries, and what other human subject has a continuous existence over time than a social group or class?” (190). The “Protestant-Gothic,” character of the novel, Eagleton writes, “might be dubbed the political unconscious of Anglo-Irish society, the place where its fears and fantasies most definitively emerge,” and is showcased by a “decaying gentry in their crumbling houses, isolated and sincerely eccentric, haunted by the sins of the past” (188). Eagleton argues that the novel demonstrates how colonization has halted historical development. Time, Eagleton writes, “has been suspended since the first trespass, freezing Melmoth in an eternal present” (190). “Maturin’s astonishing novel,” then, becomes “an allegory of this strange condition in which exploiters and victims are

both strangers and comrades, and indeed, in the person of Melmoth himself, inhabit the same personality" (190).

The estrangement and alienation that characterize the modernity of the Wanderer are hallmarks of what Fred Botting identifies as the Romantic-Gothic. Botting writes, "in the period dominated by Romanticism, Gothic writing began to move inside, disturbing conventional social limits and notions of interiority and individuality" (59). Botting observes how "the gloom and darkness of sublime landscapes" of the Romantic-Gothic become "external markers of inner mental and emotional states" (59). The Wanderer most assuredly maintains an "independence of thought" that casts him outside the "acquired habitudes of society" (483). *Melmoth the Wanderer*, often cited as the end of the High Gothic mode, revisions the Walpole-Radcliffe-Lewis Gothic by rerouting its conventions into the more immediate consciousness of contemporary Britain. Indeed, as Joseph Lew point out, "Maturin's opening narration breaks" with the Gothic's convention of presenting a found manuscript that relays a medieval narrative in a southern and Catholic locale (176). Instead, the novel is set "in a past so recent (to 1820) as to be almost present," and "places it in England's back yard, Ireland" (176-177). Maturin's updating and domestication of the Gothic more directly figures current cultural and historical concerns. Lew argues that, in the novel, "the Inquisition, allegorically suggests the repression of civil liberties during the struggles against Revolutionary France, finding echoes in the Suppression of Habeas Corpus, the Sedition Acts, and Pitt's spy-system" (186). Botting sees this more immediate sounding of the present as endemic to the Romantic-Gothic. "In political terms," Botting writes, "the

failure of the French Revolution to realize hopes for human progress and equality contributed to the inward and darkening turn of Romantic speculations” (60). “Romantic-Gothic heroes” feel “the effects of this disillusion,” and are, as a result, “alienated from society and themselves” (69). The Romantic-Gothic presents figures caught in limiting and corrupting social modes, where “evil has a banal, human existence, produced from accidents and circumstance that escalate beyond human control;” and the effects of which engender “alienation, desperation and mental deterioration” (70).

Maturin’s Wanderer is an iteration of the trope of the Wandering Jew. The figure of the Wandering Jew has circulated Western Europe since the medieval period, but it became a full-blown stock literary convention by the end of the eighteenth-century (Anderson, 78). The hinge point between the more apocryphal medieval accounts of the Wandering Jew, and the “building up of the Wandering Jew into a universal European romantic creature,” as facilitated by “the careful nurturing of the English Gothicists and Byronic Romanticists,” was the publication of a German chapbook at the start of the seventeenth-century (Anderson 95). R. Edelman observes that the publication of this “small pamphlet,” entitled *Kurtze Beschreibung und Erzählung con einem Juden mit Namen Ahasuerus* in 1602, marked “a turning point in the old traditions that had been known throughout the Middle Ages” (5, 3). The narrative of the Wandering Jew changed drastically, after the publication of this pamphlet, both in significance and prominence (Edelman). G.K. Anderson writes, the publication of the “Ahasuerus-Book” became responsible for “the anti-Semitism (which is not at all a

feature of the medieval treatment of the protagonist) and the varied symbolisms of the Jew as a representative of sin, omniscience, political liberty, social unconventionality, and Jewish nationalism," all of which come to "characterize the art-form of the legend of the Wandering Jew in later years" (78). "In the pamphlet," Edelmann writes,

the pseudonymous author relates that Paul von Eitzen had told him that, when he was a student and happened to be on holiday with his parents in Hamburg in 1542, on the first Sunday he attended the service in the church. During the sermon he perceived a man of very strange appearance. This man proved to be born in Jerusalem, was called Ahasuerus and was a shoemaker by profession. He was a contemporary of Jesus and had been present when Jesus was taken to be executed. On his way to Golgotha Jesus had leaned against his house, but he had driven him away, whereupon Jesus said to him: "I will stay and rest, but you shall go." Since then Ahasuerus had had to give up his home and his family and roam the world. (6)

Edelmann argues that the German pamphlet shifted the focus of the narrative away from the figure's immortality, and onto his status as a penitent, guilty, and Sisyphean wanderer. "The Jew is punished with eternal wandering ('I will stay and rest, but you shall go')," writes Edelmann, "his continued life serves, as is expressly stated in the pamphlet, as a testimony of Jesus' sufferings and death and as a warning for the godless people and the unbelievers," "his fate is a punishment" (7). Edelmann sees the pamphlet's presentation of the narrative of the Wandering Jew as constitutive of, and

responsive to, a growing anti-Semitism. The pamphlet ties the encounter with the Wandering Jew to Martin Luther through its reference to Paul von Eitzen, who “had studied with Luther during the period when he was at the peak of his anti-Semitic stage” (it was in 1543 that “Luther’s poisonous book, *Concerning the Jews and their lives*, appeared”) (7). The pamphlet asserted as gospel the notion that “the Jew had been doomed, allegedly by Jesus himself, to be deprived of a permanent dwelling, and whom it therefore was a good Christian deed to chase away” (8). And, Edelman continues, “one year after the appearance of the pamphlet, citizens of Hamburg, backed by the clergy, demanded that the Senate of the city banish the Jews living there” (8). In addition to harnessing the myth for decidedly anti-Semitic purposes, the German pamphlet also made “the legend about the Wandering Jew common property for the broad masses all over Europe” becoming, “like the Faustus legend and others,” “one of the most oft-treated motives of European art and literature” (8).

The Ahasuerus-Book converted the Wandering Jew into a figure of modernity. In its anti-Semitism, its galvanizing of social and political desires, its ties to Martin Luther and the Faust-book (likewise published as a German chapbook around the turn of the seventeenth-century), the Ahasuerus-Book modernized the myth of the Wandering Jew. Like the Faust-book, the pamphlet of the Wandering Jew becomes a proto-mass media object, and, also like the Faust-book, it presents a solitary and solipsistic figure whose own willful act of over-reaching—in his insult to Christ—leads to perpetual torment. The Wandering Jew of the pamphlet performs the spiritual and communal exile of a modernity engaged in producing and disseminating a new, individualistic subjective

mode. Reborn in the early-seventeenth-century, the Wandering Jew becomes a harbinger of modernity. Maturin imbues his Wanderer with this nascent modernity, by harnessing the narrative of the Wandering Jew and, moreover, by placing his Wanderer's moment of transgression also in the seventeenth-century.

The Wandering Jew that is featured throughout Romanticism—explicitly in Shelley, Wordsworth, and Mathew Lewis, and implicitly in Coleridge and Byron—is precisely this modern figure of itinerant alienation and ennui. Jay Salisbury argues that Romanticism draws upon the trope of the Wandering Jew as a means of reflecting its own suspension between two distinct epistemic modes. Salisbury argues that the Wandering Jew, and his inheritors, “is anything born of the dreadful moment between two epistemological systems and before the wandering assumes a direction through structures of meaning productive of what Foucault calls *jeux de verité*” (46). The Romantic wanderer reifies epistemic and modal uncertainty, in which signification is untethered and consensus is in flux. Salisbury writes, the wanderer “haunts Romanticism as it attempts to move away from and foreclose this moment . . . its uncanny presence always threatens the collapse of the certain subject,” and “ungrounds its structures of meaning and reveals the desperate nature of its games of truth” (46). Salisbury observes that in “Matthew Lewis’s *The Monk* and Charles Maturin’s *Melmoth the Wanderer*, this figure appears at moments when belief is suspended or has collapsed into despair,” and challenges and complicates moments at which “Romanticism risks becoming entangled in the same systems of values it seeks to repudiate and transcend” (46). However, Salisbury mistakes the effect for the cause.

The Wandering Jew *is* a sign of indeterminacy, but not as an essential disruption of epistemic certainty. Instead, the Wandering Jew harkens a new modality, and specifically a new modernity, of which he is a prototype. The Wandering Jew reifies modernity, the stakes and significance of which remain uncertain and unknowable to the figures he encounters.

Within the tradition of the Wandering Jew, Maturin's Wanderer is most immediately responsive to the iteration found in *The Monk*. Heavily influenced by Lewis' landmark Gothic novel, especially in its anti-papist sentiments, *Melmoth the Wanderer* makes an explicit reference to the scene in *The Monk* into which the Wandering Jew enters. The citation appears in the opening pages of *Melmoth the Wanderer*, where on returning to the family estate to attend his uncle's deathbed, the young John Melmoth remembers "his school-boy years, when at Christmas and Easter, the ragged pony, the jest of the school, was dispatched to bring the reluctant visitor to the Lodge, —where his pastime was to sit vis-à-vis to his uncle, without speaking or moving, till the pair resembled Don Raymond and the ghost of Beatrice in the Monk" (10). The reference positions *Melmoth the Wanderer* as an inheritor of Lewis' strain of Gothicism, but it also finds and develops a through-line established by *The Monk* between the Wandering Jew and clock time. Don Raymond's nightly haunting by the ghostly Bleeding Nun is presented through the language of clock time. Every night when the clock strikes one the Bleeding Nun visits Raymond, and remains "for the whole long hour" until "the Clock struck two" (160). "Every night," Raymond recounts, "was this repeated" (163). And, as Raymond learns from the Wandering Jew, "though to [him]

only visible for one hour in the twenty-four, neither day or night does she ever quit [his side]" (169). Seemingly from nowhere—"some supposed him to be an Arabian Astrologer, others to be a Travelling Mountebank, and many declared that He was Doctor Faustus, whom the Devil had sent back to Germany"—the Wandering Jew steps into this mechanized and repetitious performance of clock time to assist Raymond in exorcising this ghost (163, 167). The Wandering Jew alone possesses "the power of releasing" Raymond from his "nightly Visitor," and he alone can discern her presence (168). In his exorcism, the Wandering Jew bears witness to the Bleeding Nun's narrative to allow Raymond to learn that he is, in fact, related to her; and the Wandering Jew shows Raymond what he must do to right the Bleeding Nun's historical wronging: he must exhume the Bleeding Nun's "mouldering bones" and bury them "in the family vault of his Andalusian Castle" (172). Accordingly, the Wandering Jew's insight breaks the temporal monotony of the clock-bound haunting Raymond experiences, and reconnects Raymond to his own authentic, historical temporality. The Wandering Jew sees time beyond measure—time as an intensity, or as a permutation—and he frees Raymond from the clock's homogenous leveling and sequencing of time. After this freeing, the "celebrated Character of the Wandering Jew," with the "burning Cross impressed upon his fore-head," disappears from the novel as suddenly as he came, "his not being permitted to pass more than fourteen days on the same spot;" however, he goes only after he has attenuated Raymond's experience of the repetitive, monotony of clock time (177).

Maturin's Gothic Wanderer follows that of Lewis, but it is a repetition with a difference. While Lewis' Wandering Jew is a marginal and tangential figure who works to reconnect and reintegrate Raymond to his own temporality, and to the larger narrative, Maturin's Wanderer is a central figure of disintegration, whose attempts to find candidates with whom to exchange destinies performs the inverse of Lewis' Wandering Jew. The Wanderer seeks to reestablish his own organic temporality, by transferring his contracted, sentenced duration of years to another. Unlike Lewis' Wandering Jew, the Wanderer is not a penitent immortal; rather, he has extended his life for the prescribed period of 150 years. In this extension, the Wanderer has transposed an organic and contingent life for the quantified temporality of modernity. Divorced from organic corporeal limitations, the Wanderer is an uprooted and free-floating subject of Newtonian mechanics. His infernal deal, then, is less the stuff of infernal supernaturalism, than it is a figure for a rational, instrumental, and homogenizing modernity. The origins of the Wanderer's power are never represented in the novel, but come directly from the mouth of the Wanderer himself: "it has been reported of me, that I obtained from the enemy of souls a range of existence beyond the period allotted to mortality—a power to pass over space without disturbance or delay, and visit remote regions with the swiftness of thought" (601). The veracity of this account aside, the Wanderer's powers are authorized and underwritten by a quantified measure of time and space—he can move freely within them, because he iterates a modernity that has reconfigured time and space as mathematized coordinates. The Wanderer is not immortal or beyond time; rather, he is entirely timebound (50). As a

subject of modernity, the Wanderer reflects the experience of time *as* time and space *as* space. Far from being timeless, he is cast within a timeframe that functions like a sentence.

The Wanderer's seeming immunity to the progression of time, then, is not an indication of his immortality, but a demonstration of his transfixed-ness within sequential and homogenous time. As a running, tallying sequence of past, present, and future, clock time in itself does not elicit actual temporal change; it demarcates a virtual and changeless horizon of time qua time. Clock time is the constant, regulated, homogenous horizon that monitors and records the interpretation of time as a spatial and irreversible celestial movement. The Wanderer's alignment with clock time places him within this changeless sphere of change, where time and space are equivalent coordinates, devoid of any locality or particularity, and independent of actual "space and time" (75). Biddy Brannigan, the Irish sage who provides the first narrative account of the Wanderer, affirms his more virtual characteristics. She notes how the Wanderer "was never heard to speak, seen to partake of food, or known to enter any dwelling but that of his family" (30). Throughout the text he remains parallel to, but distanced from, organic life—only before his death does he request a glass of water as his final taste "of earth's produce" (600). The Wanderer's ability to enter and exit prisons at will—to "defy the power in whose grasp he appeared to be enclosed"—and his capacity to be in two places at once—"to be active in his purposes of mischief in the remotest parts of Europe at the moment he was supposed to be expiating them in others"—reflects the

detached, artificial, and homogeneous time and space he inhabits and manipulates (362).

Throughout *Melmoth the Wanderer*, the Wanderer is associated with clocks. The English Reverend's account of the Wanderer's temporary death, in *The Lovers' Tale*, is presented like clockwork. The Reverend had witnessed the Wanderer dying in Germany only to see him alive, years later, in Yorkshire; and he describes the Wanderer's death in language that resembles the winding down of a clock. The Wanderer had said to the Reverend, "tarry but an hour, and you yourself will behold me dead!" (558); and soon after the Reverend observes:

As the hand of the clock approached the hour of twelve his countenance changed—his eyes became dim—his speech inarticulate—his jaw dropped—his respiration ceased. I applied a glass to his lips—but there was not a breath to stain it. I felt his wrist—but there was no pulse. I placed my hand on his heart—there was not the slightest vibration. In a few minutes his body was perfectly cold. I did not quit the room till nearly an hour after—the body gave no signs of returning animation.

(558)

The death of the Wanderer is couched in the language of clock time. It occurs on the hour, and the cessation of his organic functions is framed as the slowing down and stoppage of a mechanical timepiece. The clock-bound nature of the Wanderer is reified by the Reverend's observation of the Wanderer's death *in* time. The very life processes

of the Wanderer are reduced to an occurrence within a quantified sequence of minutes and hours.

The novel further develops an association between the Wanderer and the modality of clock time in Moncada's tale. As Moncada recounts breaking free from the burning prison of the Inquisition, he recalls seeing the Wanderer illuminated by fire, perched aloft the church's great clock:

I could see the spire blazing, from the reflected lustre, like a meteor. The hands of the clock were as visible as if a torch was held before them; and this calm and silent progress of time, amid the tumultuous confusion of midnight horrors, —this scene of the physical and mental world in an agony of fruitless and incessant motion, might have suggested a profound and singular image, had not my whole attention been riveted to a human figure placed on a pinnacle of the spire, and surveying the scene in perfect tranquility. It was a figure not to be mistaken. (269-270)

The Wanderer's contiguity to the clock aligns him with its temporal mode. The passive recording of both the clock, with its "silent progress of time," and the Wanderer, with his "perfect tranquility," amidst the chaotic scene below, place the two in conjunction with one another, and, moreover, underline how this sequential time passively monitors and surveys from above, a temporality it remains disconnected from. The Wanderer and the clock are detached witnesses hovering over, but entirely divorced from, temporalities they can only ever measure and gauge.

The image of the Wanderer alongside a great clock is presented again at the novel's conclusion. After returning to his family seat and confronting John Melmoth and Moncada, the Wanderer requests isolation for his final repose, wherein novel offers a glimpse of his unconsciousness, in *The Wanderer's Dream*. The dream recounts, what appears to be, the final expiration of the Wanderer's extended life at the hands of a satanic figure.

He stood, in his dream, tottering on a crag midway down the precipice—he looked upward, but the upper air (for there was no heaven) showed only blackness, unshadowed and impenetrable—but, blacker than that blackness, he could distinguish a gigantic outstretched arm, that held him as in sport on the ridge of that infernal precipice, while another, that seemed in its motions to hold fearful and invisible conjunction with the arm that grasped him, as if both belonged to some being too vast and horrible even for the imagery of a dream to shape, pointed upwards to a dial-plate fixed on the top of that precipice, and which the flashes of that ocean of fire made fearfully conspicuous. He saw the mysterious single hand revolve—he saw it reach the appointed period of 150 years—(for in this mystic plate centuries were marked, not hours)—he shrieked in his dream, and, with that strong impulse often felt in sleep, burst from the arm that held him, to arrest the motion of the hand. (602-603)

The Wanderer's life is represented as a timed sentence, one that is kept and powered by a giant, demonic clock. The mechanical arbitrariness of the number that determines

his death shows the Wanderer's fundamental estrangement from his own organic temporality. Clock time is presented here as an external and demonic cooption of temporality; one that severs the Wanderer from his own time, where his only recourse is to struggle in vain to "arrest [its] motion." *The Wanderer's Dream* makes manifest the latent experience of the subjectivity of modernity. The dream's paralleling and equivalency of the giant hands of the clock with the giant arms of the being that holds the Wanderer uses the Satanic "fall" to figure a temporal "fall." Undertaking the mantle of modernity, the novel shows, is akin to a Satanic fall, where obedience and collectivity are eschewed for an Enlightenment individualism and instrumentalism, à la Blake's painting of Newton.

The Wanderer is a sign of modernity and of its temporality, but he is not alone in heralding its rise. The Wanderer's alienation from his own temporality—his status as a "disinherited child of nature"—also figures a more general encroachment of clock time staged throughout the novel (355). The Wanderer's own extended life, and the suffering of those he encounters, are indicative of time as a social and disciplinary structure, as it was increasingly experienced in the early-nineteenth-century. In the novel, time as an unfolding sequence effects consciousness to the point of madness, and produces a solipsistic individualism disconnected from more organic and cultural life. *Melmoth the Wanderer* is populated and punctuated by ticking and tolling clocks that underscore the ways in which clock time comes to impede upon and structure lives. As John Melmoth the younger travels as the "solitary passenger" in "the mail" to the family estate, at the outset of the novel, he "consulted his watch" to "repel" his "many

painful thoughts . . . from the past, and more from the future” (9). Later, John Melmoth sits down to read Stanton’s “discoloured, obliterated and mutilated” manuscript, and is roused by “the sound of the clock striking twelve . . . it was the only sound he had heard for some hours,” and had “at such an hour an effect indescribably awful” (32, 31).

Similarly, Stanton, in his narrative, reports hearing a “clock [strike] audibly” with “no voice of mirth or of occupation to drown its sound; time told his awful lesson to silence alone” (36). In the same house, Stanton hears the cries of an “unhappy maniac,” who “at midnight always exclaims, in a voice frightfully piercing, and hardly human, ‘They are coming! they are coming!’ and relapses into a profound silence” (40). Stanton also encounters, in the insane asylum in which he is later confined, a “maniac who had lost her husband, children, subsistence, and finally her reason, in the dreadful fire of London” (58). Whenever the woman hears “the cry of fire” it causes her to relive the experience with “terrible punctuality” (58). Her trauma recurs like clockwork.

The structuring nature of clock time is detailed in Moncada’s narrative as well. Moncada recounts the clock-bound and “monotonous existence” of life in a monastery, which at one point is given over to a debate surrounding “the proper hour of matins, which the Superior wants to have restored to the original hour” consisting of a difference of a “*Full five minutes*” (111, 113). While at the convent, Moncada sees a monk “with an habitual motion, (it could not have been more), make the sign of the cross, as a clock in some distant passage struck” (246), and later, upon attending an old monk on his deathbed, Moncada recalls the monk’s dying remarks: “I am a clock that has struck the same minutes and hours for sixty years. Is it not time for the machine to

long for its winding up?" (123). Clock time in the novel is an increasingly pervasive force that is not only omnipresent, but disciplinary as well, as it organizes bodies in time.

The Wanderer, then, is only the most glaring sign of an ascendant clock time that is present everywhere else, which the novel demonstrates to be a looming danger. The figures the Wanderer encounters and tempts are each threatened by the same mechanized and monotonous subjectivity that the Wanderer embodies. The Wanderer "[visits] those who teeter at the border between wealth and poverty, sanity and insanity, or innocence and corruption," as Laura Doyle observes; however, they are also figures who teeter on the brink of embodying a new temporality (532). In this light, the Wanderer is less an infernal figure of menace than he is a transparent iteration of this new subjective mode, which his would-be victims risk falling into. The Wanderer becomes an objective correlative, by making manifest this larger cultural and historical shift. This is evidenced by the fact that the Wanderer is a decidedly unsuccessful tempter. Kathleen Fowler argues that "it is not that Melmoth is remarkably stupid in selecting his targets," for "Don Inez, Fra Jose, the parricide" would all "make easy victims for Melmoth, but they have already bargained away their souls" (527-528). Instead, continues Fowler, "Melmoth's task is to seek out those who, like Job, have maintained their integrity in prosperity and then to test their steadfastness in the face of adversity" (528). These Jobs are each confronted with the subjectivity of clock time, and the Wanderer's appearance works to fully expound and develop that subjectivity for them. The automatic and ineffectual nature of his temptations is rooted in the fact that his function in the novel is not to win over souls, but to reify and render

transparent the modality of clock time that those souls approach. As Amy Elizabeth Smith notes, based on the “the perfunctory fashion in which several of the supposedly crucial temptations and refusals are skimmed over in this novel, it seems that Maturin's interest in his original plan had subsided in favour of other concerns” (529). These other concerns, I argue, consist of revealing the nature of modern subjectivity for those who stand upon its threshold.

The figures the Wanderer encounters are all on the verge of becoming uprooted and detached wanderers through their own temporal alienation. Either through character or circumstance, these figures find themselves cut off from their own organic and cultural temporalities, and they each skirt the edges of an alienated solipsism. The first of these is Stanton, who first sees the Wanderer on the “plains of Valencia,” and who is a member of the class of “scholars and literati, the intelligent, the idle, and the curious” who “wandered over the Continent” (33, 32). Stanton displays the detached, modern itinerancy of an Enlightenment subjectivity. Educated and solitary, he wanders the Continent to engage in his own individual aesthetic and historical contemplation. Indeed, he displays a proto-Hegelian historical, aesthetic insight, when he marks “the difference between the architecture of the Roman and Moorish ruins,” and notes that “among the former are the remains of a theatre, and something like a public place; the latter present only the remains of fortresses” with “not a loop-hole for pleasure to get in by” (33). He also partakes in the solitary aesthetic “contemplating” of the sublime, as he observes the “glorious and awful scenery before him—light struggling with darkness—and darkness menacing a light still more terrible, and announcing its menace

in the blue and livid mass of cloud that hovered like a destroying angel in the air” (34). Despite the fact that he lives during the seventeenth-century, Stanton is a late-Enlightenment or even Romantic figure. He is the quintessential educated, Protestant individual musing in solitude, whose intellectual pursuits remove him from the rest of society. Indeed, his “singular turn of mind” “suggested to some prudent people the idea he was deranged (50-51). It is, moreover, this singularity that leads to him being duped into imprisonment in the insane asylum, where the Wanderer appears to tempt him. When he arrives at the insane asylum, under false and misleading circumstances, he immediately becomes preoccupied by “[seizing] the first book near him,” “as usual,” instead of actively perceiving where he is (52). By diving directly into this solitary study, he prevents himself from realizing his own confinement; as the narrator notes “it is singular that Stanton read on without suspicion of his own danger . . . without ever reflecting on the place where he was” (52, 53). His confinement—a confinement that places him within the disciplinary repetition and monotony of life in the asylum—is thus the full realization and completion of the detached individualism he already displays. His eventual encounter with the Wanderer in the asylum, then, is, in a way, presaged by his own fall into an individualism that is always in danger of sliding into solipsism.

Moncada also experiences the ennui and disciplinary individuation of an institution, which he outlines in his narrative of “monastic life” (86). Like in other Gothic texts, the monastery in which Moncada is forced to live is represented as a menacing, disciplinary structure; however, *Melmoth the Wanderer* ties the disciplinarity of conventual life to the “endless monotony,” instrumentalization, and madness of

protocol that characterizes institutions (86). The novel thus connects Moncada's experience of the "frozen and hopeless monotony of a cloister" to the more bureaucratic and deadening facets of modernity, not least of which is the convent's reliance upon time (89). Moncada observes how the monastery is time-bound in its very functioning: "how well religious persons understand the secret of making every event of the present world operate on the future, while they pretend to make the future predominate over the present" (99). Time in the monastery is neither had nor experienced, but rather endlessly surrendered and deferred, which engenders an alienation and monotony in which "day followed day for many a month, of which" Moncada had "no recollections" (110). Indeed, the institutional temporality of monastic life transforms Moncada into an "abstraction" with "mechanical movements," and makes him an "automaton figure" with "meaningless words" (112). Moncada recalls how "the bell did not toll for service with more mechanical punctuality than [he] obeyed the summons," and that he functioned like an "automaton, constructed on the most exquisite principles of mechanism, and obeying those principles with a punctuality almost miraculous" (111). Later, when Moncada is punished for his unwillingness to take his vows by being locked in a dungeon of the cloister, he recalls,

I began to think I could keep time as accurately as any clock in a convent, and measure the hours of my confinement . . . so I sat and counted sixty; a doubt always occurred to me, that I *was counting them faster than the clock*. Then I wished to be the clock that, that I might have no feeling, no *motive for hurrying on the approach of time*. (162)

Finally, at the news of his brother's plan of escape Moncada again figures himself as "a clock whose hands are pushed forward," and who "struck the hours" he "was impelled to strike" (200). Clock time in the monastery transforms Moncada into an automated, regulated subject. When Moncada is visited by the Wanderer in the dungeons of the Inquisition they are on the same footing—he, like the Wanderer, experiences an alienation where he "neither thought, nor felt, nor lived" (111).

Immalee, the third figure to encounter the Wanderer, begins in a Rousseau-like state of nature; however, her education at the hands of the Wanderer, and her re-entry into European society, ultimately engender her temporal alienation. Immalee, while still on her isle, "took 'no note of time;' and the tale of yesterday or the record of past centuries, were synchronized in a mind to which facts and dates were alike unknown" (331). Despite this, soon after the Wanderer commences his visits to Immalee she is cast into a sequential temporality that frames time as external and irreversible loss. Upon waiting for the Wanderer, "she changed her drapery of flowers every day, and never thought them fresh after the first hour," and she "wept over the withered fruit" when "the time . . . passed over without the arrival of the stranger" (321). While still on the island, time has become an irreversible movement that confounds individual efforts. Later, after Immalee has been restored to her Spanish family and plans to escape with the Wanderer, she is entrenched more completely in the temporality of modernity. The escape is indexed in the language of clock time: "twelve was the hour at which Melmoth had promised to meet her, and by the clock, which was placed over the door of the hall, she saw it wanted but a quarter to twelve. The hand moved on—it arrived at the

hour—the clock struck” (581). However, it is Immalee’s eventual confinement in the disciplinary dungeons of the Inquisition, where she finds herself after she gives birth to her and the Wanderer’s daughter, that truly interpolates her into a structured temporality. In the Inquisition Immalee finds a world governed by clocks and administrative procedure. The “hour” of her examination is announced by a tolling bell, and an “account” of her infant’s death is demanded by the Inquisitors in “four-and-twenty hours” (589). Additionally, the Inquisitors are “automaton like,” and “their movements appeared the result of mere mechanism” (593). Entombed in the dungeon, where the Wanderer appears to Immalee for the last time, Immalee is thus removed from her own temporality and cast into an administrative temporal monotony, wherein the approach of “midnight” is “unknown in that place, where day and night are the same” (594).

The fourth narrative of the Wanderer, found in *The Tale of Guzman’s Family*, centers upon Walberg and his family, whose own Protestant modernity, when beleaguered by hardship, converts their quasi-spiritual and productive timekeeping into an alienating structure, and recasts the family as uprooted wanderers. The German Protestant Walbergs maintain a life structured by time. Upon hearing “the clock strike the hour at which [Walberg] had been always accustomed, in prosperity or adversity, to summon his family to prayer” he makes “a signal which all his children understood” (451-452). But this time-bound Protestantism shifts for the Walbergs, after finding themselves disinherited by Walberg’s brother-in-law Guzman. While awaiting news of their expected inheritance, “the family returned to their apartment, and for some hours

sat in profound silence, interrupted only by the ticking of the clock, which was distinctly and solely heard, and which seemed too loud to their quickened ears, amid that deep stillness on which it broke incessantly” (456). The family moves from striving for the productive use of time, to simply passing time as a measured sequence—they move from being subjects of clock time to objects. The poverty that besets the family after they are fraudulently denied Guzman’s estate casts the family into “a withering monotony in the diary of misery,” where “one day telleth another” (464). Their poverty forces the children to embark on “wretched precarious errands,” and converts the children into “young wanderers” (471). Each canvasses the city searching for sustenance, and at the end of each day as “night came on,” “the wanderers returned slowly one by one” (472). Indeed, it is Walberg’s own wander that leads him to encounter the “enemy of man” with “two burning eyes” that is the Wanderer (474). “Every night since our late distresses,” Walberg confesses to his wife Ines, “I have wandered out in search of some relief” (473). The Walbergs are ultimately saved when Guzman’s will is revealed a forgery, but Walberg “shudders with horror when he recalls the fearful temptations of the stranger, whom he met in his nightly wanderings in the hour of his adversity” (482-3).

Finally, in *The Lovers’ Tale*, Elinor like the others, also falls prey to an excess of individualism that aligns her to the Wanderer. Her meeting with the Wanderer is prefigured by her own experience of dejection. Elinor is consumed by a “mortal disease,” and lives “like those sufferers in eastern prisons, who are not allowed to taste food unless mixed with poison” after she find herself jilted at the altar (543). The

experience untethers Elinor, and “a year after” Elinor returns to her Puritanical aunt in Yorkshire to live the life of an austere Protestantism structured by clock. Her Puritanical aunt “rose at a fixed hour, —at a fixed hour she prayed, —at a fixed hour received the godly friends who visited her, and whose existence was as monotonous and apathetic as her own, —at a fixed hour she dined, —and at a fixed hour she prayed again, and then retired” (529). The sustained repetition of “fixed” stresses the routinized and regimented existence of Puritanical life. Indeed, this life of “mere mechanism” converts Elinor into a dispossessed wanderer, as the “two figures were seen to walk, or rather wander almost every evening” (529, 526). Structure and regiment have replaced meaning and significance for Elinor, and her wander indexes her disconnection from a more organic, intuitive existence. Upon later returning to Mortimer castle, Elinor continues to “wander among the woods” (544). Indeed, Elinor’s depressive state is presented as an erroneous act of wander, that has led her astray from her own particular path: “when life and passion have thus rejected us, the backward steps we are compelled to tread towards the path we have wandered from, are ten thousand times more torturing and arduous” (531-2). When Elinor eventually encounters the Wanderer she is in a state of “deep dejection,” as the caretaker of a now senseless Sandal; and soon after their encounter, she and the Wanderer wander together “inseparable in their evening walks” (554). The Wanderer finds in Elinor a member of his tribe—they are each hidebound, chronological subjects.

The refusal of Stanton, Moncada, Immalee, Walberg, and Elinor to succumb to the Wanderer carries out the novel’s critique of this temporal mode and the itinerant

wander it gives rise to. Botting suggests that the universal resistance to the Wanderer's offer reflects a naturalized, unmovable Protestantism. Botting writes, "Melmoth is a particularly unsuccessful tempter, a victory perhaps for the personal faith engendered by the Reformation" (70). Similarly, Ashley Marshall finds in the victims' refusal to give in to temptation the novel's commitment to an unshakable Protestantism. Marshall states, "each plot features a righteous but tormented individual who, after Melmoth's appearance, affirms the inadequacy of institutional religion . . . and the primacy of a faith which supersedes all temporal bounds" (123). In "refusing Melmoth," Marshall continues, "the protagonists all embrace private spiritual conviction" (125). The novel does espouse a natural Protestantism in its sustained critique of organized religion, but the very language of the Wanderer's offer moves beyond the realm of spiritual salvation. The Wanderer's bargain reads more like the language of bourgeois contract law, than it does a satanic pact. The Wanderer explains to John Melmoth and Moncada, near the novel's end, "it has been said that this power was accorded to me, that I might be enabled to tempt wretches in their fearful hour of extremity, with the promise of deliverance and immunity, on condition of their exchanging situations with me" (601). The terms and conditions that pervade his power echo the language of contract law. This is furthered by the Wanderer's emphasis upon the willing consent of his victims. The Wanderer states "none can participate in my destiny but with his own consent—*none have consented*—none can be involved in its tremendous penalties, but by participation. I alone must sustain the penalty" (601). The emphasis upon consent and penalization figures the Wanderer and his bargain as signs of a bourgeois modernity, in

which rational parties contractually determine their fates. The Wanderer's deal in itself makes manifest the movement into modernity his victims are each about to make.

If the Wanderer "exposes rather than embodies the threats to humanity" (126) as Marshall claims, then *Melmoth the Wanderer* stands as a cautionary tale against an encroaching modernity that carries with it the risk of dispossession and alienation. Jack Null observes how "the disjunction of the chronology and the fragmentation of the plot into tales reflect a world in great upheaval, a world become madhouse in which the characters search, aimlessly and unsuccessfully, for selfhood, sanity, and salvation" (137). The novel's breakdown of a cohesive narrative structure underscores this fragmenting worldview, wherein sustaining narratives of nation, religion, and history are less and less tenable. Indeed, Null finds this breakdown of social relations to be taking place in the novel at the most immediate level. Null argues that "each tale explores the motif of the disintegration of the family unit" where "the ties that bind have frizzled and been replaced by chains of greed, sadism, revenge, and perverted religious doctrines" (140, 141). The "real enemy of man," Null argues, is not a satanic figure of evil but the "monotonous and unquestioned habits of thought and the state of psychological despair brought on by such vacant habit" that "produces apathy and an insensitivity of the heart" (147). The Wanderer reveals the detachment and estrangement of just such a life. Mark Hennelly similarly demonstrates how the novel functions as a warning against a mechanized existence by claiming that it stands as a "prefiguration of modern existentialism" (669). Hennelly shows how "social and religious role-playing and overreaching monomania" function in the novel to "strangle

personal freedom and authenticity" (677). Hennelly asserts that the victims' commitment to their fates signals the novel's own commitment to a more local and immediate life. The fact that "all the existential sufferers whom the Wanderer tempts say no to him and yes to the pain of their existence," Hennelly writes, reflects a "humanistic commitment . . . to the problematic nature of existence" (678). The novel thus stands as a "warning against the life of empty routine and listlessness" (Null 147).

Melmoth the Wanderer presents this warning in large part through the formal critique it makes of history as a sweeping and developmental narrative. Victor Sage argues that the novel radically presents history as a collection of discontinuous and disparate socio-cultural contexts in its heterogeneous and multitudinous form. Sage shows how Maturin's account of history is directly opposed to Walter Scott's, who had supported Maturin as "both patron and agent" (x). Scott's mode of historical romance "creates the fiction of an even, panoptical survey of its materials," and makes use of an "Enlightenment narrative persona" to provide an "informed and rational overview" (xi). History in Scott's hands is a contained, coherent and "steadily cumulative process with linear narrative as its point of overlap" (xix). *Melmoth the Wanderer*, however, presents history as that which is constituted by contextual difference, which the novel's fractured and fragmented form demonstrates. In colonized Ireland, "there is no life in this history, only slaughter and famine, only another version of the omnipresent 'ruins of empire'" (121). David Punter argues similarly that Maturin repurposes the Gothic to counteract hegemonic historical narratives, and to articulate the consciousness of colonization. Punter claims that "the dehumanizing force in Gothic . . . is brought into alignment,

direct or indirect, with that power which reduces or dismembers the national narrative of a people operating under a sign of subjugation" (122). Although the "Gothic began as a mode of dealing with the past . . . in the contexts of Scotland and Ireland . . . that past looks all too often as though it has already been appropriated by another, as though the story of one's own nation has already ceased to be one's own to tell" (122). The novel's "sense of temporal complication," and its "looping of time," thus offset the totalizing historical narrative that colonialism depends upon (113, 114). "The larger dehumanizing forces of history, religion, and ideology," Punter argues, "menace human authenticity with a different story, a narrative of conquest and subjugation within which individuals are mere puppets" (121).

In counteracting hegemonic historical narrative, the novel's form strives to carve out a space for "human authenticity." Kathleen Fowler argues that the novel's "labyrinth" structure—its "unanswered questions and unexplained contradictions"—and its narratives "left disturbingly incomplete," represent a formal call for an active, moral reader engagement (525). Fowler asserts that the novel anticipates and encourages the reader's reassembly of its fractured and fragmented narratives forged upon the reader's willing and Christian faith. Fowler states, "Maturin, in effect, asks us to create the novel with him, or even, for him," an act which reveals how "we cannot reconstruct a coherent novel for Maturin . . . unless we bond all of the pieces together with a faith in God which can re-unify the world and the novel" (538).

Laura Doyle similarly finds in *Melmoth the Wanderer* a call to reassert human connection and understanding over and against a totalizing, hegemonic historical

narrative. Doyle argues that the novel attempts to offset and attenuate the “traumatized geostructure” of colonial modernity through its very form (530). Doyle states, “its narrative form” represents “a phenomenology of collectively lived and told history that establishes principles for the repair of history” (530). The novel’s form, “in which one story contains another, and that contains one another still, is on closer look the structure of a pained dialectic of telling and listening, of seeking witness and giving witness,” which effectively critiques dominant and dominating narratives of history as they underwrite and authorize modernity (530). “The whole of Maturin’s novel,” Doyle observes, “issues from those who have witnessed the traumas endemic to coloniality/modernity” (542). The act of conveying what one has witnessed, which the novel formalizes, revalues individual and particular experience across hegemonic lines. Doyle writes,

Just as the Catholic Moncada’s escape requires that he record the stories that the Jewish Adonijah has harbored and carried all his life, waiting for one who could translate them for a European audience, so too does Anglo-Irish Protestant John Melmoth’s future depend upon listening to Moncada the Catholic Spaniard. And so perhaps might Maturin have felt that his readers’ futures depended on their listening to the Wanderer’s story. (545)

This kind of cross-cultural listening disrupts the coherence of dominating historical narratives as they strive to encode a colonial modernity forged upon a singular, teleological history.

I argue the novel's critique of hegemonic history extends to a critique of the external, quantified, and sequential temporality of modernity. The universal refusal of the Wanderer's pact signifies the rejection of this alienating time frame. Marshall Brown observes how each victim shifts from being "literally chained to a point in space and figuratively chained to the weary succession of hours," to being "released into a limbo, uprooted and driven out into a world seemingly beyond space and time" through their meeting with the Wanderer (285). Brown goes on to argue that each of the victims can respond to this "disorientation" either by opting for "madness," by following "Melmoth into sin," or by selecting the third response, "which is the only valid one" (285). Brown writes,

That is, to regenerate from within, even in the absence of any objects of experience, what Kant calls the pure forms of apperception that make experience possible. Just as for Kant and his followers the beginning of experience is the inner sense, the sense of time, so, too, time is the foundation and the saving limit of the gothic victim's experience when all else is lost. (286)

Only through reconnecting and reclaiming temporality as it is individually and organically constituted and embodied can the Wanderer and the dominating, singular version of history he represents be counteracted. I argue the novel does posit a form of temporal renewal; however, it does not advocate this renewal as an individuated process. Instead, the novel advances a kind of collective temporal reclamation that posits the finding of time beyond the confines of the singular subject. As Doyle states,

the novel prescribes a “listening across political, religious, and cultural boundaries”—a kind of listening that “contains a promise, but no guarantee, of recovery from the nightmare of global history” (545).

Melmoth the Wanderer's conclusion stages exactly this kind of inter-subjective listening, but it does so through a movement that is akin to anti-wandering. The end of the novel follows John Melmoth and Moncada as they themselves follow the Wanderer's tracks out of the family estate—out of the prescribed demarcations of colonized space—and effectively out of the limits of the Gothic novel itself. The Wanderer, having returned to the family estate, announces to John Melmoth and Moncada that “his wanderings are over,” and requests solitude “for the few last hours of [his] mortal existence” (601, 605). Upon entering the apartment the Wanderer had retired to, and finding “not a vestige of its last inhabitant,” John Melmoth and Moncada notice a “small door” that “communicated with a back staircase,” on which “they discovered the traces of footsteps that appeared to those of a person who had been walking in damp sand or clay” (606). The two follow the Wanderer's tracks out of the confines of the estate, and, indeed, out of the confines of the state itself, as “they traced the footmarks distinctly through the narrow gravel walk, which was terminated by a broken fence, and opened on a heathy field which spread half-way up a rock whose summit overlooked the sea” (606). The Wanderer is, in the end, a series of demarcations in the physical landscape—a residue of history itself. The two observe that, “there was a kind of tract as if a person had dragged, or been dragged, his way through it” (606). The word “tract” is telling, as it stresses the Wanderer's own

textuality and discursivity, which the two now read in the land. Unlike wander, John Melmoth and Moncada's joint act of following the Wanderer's tracks is a movement that reconnects them to the politicized and historicized space that runs from the ocean, through the land, and up to the colonial estate. It is a movement that is at once a repetition and a revelation of how this space is politically and historically structured. Moreover, their act of anti-wander works to reconnect them to their own temporality. The "last trace of the Wanderer" the two discern is "the handkerchief which the Wanderer had worn about his neck the preceding night," which they find "on a crag beneath them" "hung as floating to the blast," and which John Melmoth "clambered down and caught" (607, 606-607). This final act of retrieval figures an overcoming of historical and spatial limitations. The retrieval of the hanging handkerchief—suspended as it is between time and space—halts the pursuit of the Wanderer and of his significance. By catching the handkerchief John Melmoth and Moncada bring an end to the ceaseless wandering that has affected its owner and threatened those he has encountered. The final lines of the novel, in which "Melmoth and Moncada exchanged looks of silent and unutterable horror, and returned slowly home," attest to this (607). After the "horror" is the slow return home, a return that oversees a reconnection to time as it might be more locally and collectively understood.

Romanticism and the Temporality of Wander

Chapter Six:

Conclusion: The Warning of Wander

As an unstructured and unguided movement wander becomes the means through which Romanticism paces the unsteady ground of modernity. The rational, instrumental, and bureaucratic element of modernity, that which interpolates subjects into the Blakean “mind-forg’d manacles,” is represented through the experience of aimless, displaced, and uprooted wander. However, modernity as the deliverer of transformation and liberation, as that which frees up bodies from traditional, stifling modes of being, be they cultural, economic, political, or spiritual, is figured as an open, unregulated, and joyous wander. I have argued that this duality of wander is a reflection of the historical shift towards the temporality of modernity, which occurred with pronounced acuity in Great Britain over the course of the eighteenth-century. The increasingly time-bound Britain supplanted more traditional reckonings of time (seasonal, cultural, and economical) with the more singular, authority of the clock. Such a shift, as shown above, at once freed time, as a discrete and autonomous space available for fulfillment, but also reconfigured time as a new frame of being in and of itself, wherein one remains beholden to, and hanging upon, an endless chain of sequential, homogeneous moments. The two versions of Romantic wander, wander as freeing and wander as alienating, each perform a valence of this temporality, and moreover, a valence of modernity itself.

The bifurcation of wander I identify reduces down to a rhetoric, in the case of free and open wander, and a praxis or an embodied experience, in the case of alienated wander. Free wander exists, more often than not, as an assertion or desire, if not an injunction. Positive, free wander, as it is asserted in *The Excursion* and as it is tried briefly in *The Wanderer*, is more rhetorical than it is attainable. *The Excursion* advances wander not only as the movement of a free and virtuous life, but as the antidote to the upheavals of modernity. Despite this, *The Excursion* reveals wander to be a rarified endeavor, and, moreover, lets slip the work the rhetoric of wander does towards the promotion of the disciplinary directive to engage in the productive expenditure of time. The rhetorical promotion of free wander undertaken, chiefly, by the Poet and the Wanderer aims to keep modernity at bay, whether it is the spectre of industrialization looming on the horizon of the poem's pastoral space, or the crippling solipsism already infecting those at its core. However, as I have argued, the rhetoric of wander in *The Excursion* is difficult to maintain. The Solitary returns home without having been unequivocally won over, and the sad wandering of Robert and Margaret leave a rift in *The Excursion* too deep for the Poet and the Wanderer's assertions to paper over.

Burney's *The Wanderer* pivots away from the asserted rhetorical positioning of wander as freeing, to reveal the class and gender privilege that underpins such a rhetoric, in its detailing of Juliet's experience. Without name or connection Juliet strives to sustain herself in a provincial Britain that is suspended between an aristocratic economy of patronage and a rising bourgeois capitalism. Juliet's rational economic practices are continuously upended by this tension, and by the pronounced patriarchal

double standards that condition both aristocratic and bourgeois modes of economic exchange. As a result, she is forced ultimately to seek anonymity as she wanders to and through the New Forest. Wander for Juliet is neither bucolic nor freeing, but a forced, rough, dangerous, and isolating endeavour. Furthermore, nature, and the rural way of life, is far more inhospitable and predatory than it is a restorative balm. Indeed, Juliet's experience of rustic wander leads her to question and rebuke the urban fictions that praise rural life. Juliet's experience of alienated wander, as both a pejorative designation she endures while attempting to sustain herself economically, and as the actual state she comes to assume as she flees detection, calls attention to how the rhetoric of free wander is necessarily contingent upon class and gender privilege. To be sure, when Juliet's name and history are eventually disclosed, and the protection of the patriarchal aristocratic establishment has been secured, Juliet is afforded the space and time to wander; but this space is, of course, heavily circumscribed, and narrows further at the novel's end to the confines of Harleigh Hall.

The Rime of the Ancient Mariner recounts an historical shift into modernity and details the resulting experience as that of isolated and monotonous wander. The voyage inaugurates the transition from the medieval and premodern world of the Mariner and his crew greeting the Albatross in Christian fellowship, to the singularized, schematized, and rationalized world of modernity that glides into view with the irreversible arrow of the Mariner's crossbow. The Mariner's abrupt and singular act of volition seems a shock, and yet it is commensurate with the project of naval expedition and colonization his voyage signifies. The Mariner's irreversible act oversees his

transition into modernity, a shift that converts his crew, who necessarily remain collective, into ghosts of the past. Alone, the Mariner experiences the world through a quantified domain of time and space—overwrought and mechanistic. The Mariner's return recasts him as a similarly automated subject; one who circulates endlessly, marked by an irreversible historical narrative he is compelled to recount. His ceaseless, punctuated and punctual wander performs his membership in the temporality and subjectivity of modernity.

Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer* similarly outlines the experience of alienated and uprooted wander; however, there is less pathos for the Wanderer than there is for Coleridge's Mariner. More knowing and Faustian than the Mariner, the Wanderer has brokered an infernal deal to extend his life for a period of 150 years, and has, in effect, transposed his own organic life for a purely sequential span of years. The Wanderer, brother of a Cromwellian colonist, and a product of the turbulent early modernity of the mid- to late-seventeenth century, freely circulates time and space—a detached, wandering spectator of history. Despite the powers that attend this virtual subject of modernity, the Wanderer spends his time searching out other would-be transgressors with whom he might exchange fates. The figures he finds are all somewhat of his tribe, as they each teeter on the brink of modernity themselves. Stanton, the Enlightenment observer on a grand tour; Moncada, who resists the monastic order and recounts the madness and violence of its proto-bureaucratic logic; Immalee, the Rousseauian, paradisaic figure, whom the Wanderer schools in the impure history of the world, and who later also bears witness to the bureaucratic torturous-ness of the Inquisition;

Walberg, the methodical German Protestant; and Elinor, the solipsistic Calvinist, are all proto-modern subjects who likewise experience the isolation and atomization of modernity. The Wanderer's wander signifies a local, cultural and historical displacement, the trauma and menace of which is enough to halt the tentative steps of those who would follow.

I have argued that free wander and alienated wander each perform a response to a different valence of the temporality of modernity; however, both iterations of wander, in both of their responses to the temporality of modernity, strive to offset and attenuate the displacement and anomie modernity threatens to usher in. *The Excursion*, *The Wanderer*, *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, and *Melmoth the Wanderer* each display abject and solitary wanderers—figures who have been displaced by the torrent of history, like Robert and Margaret and the Solitary and Juliet, as well as those who have embodied and subsequently rued the Faustian spirit of the age, like the Mariner and the Wanderer. In *The Excursion* free wander is advanced over and against the dangers of displacement, enclosure, industrialization, and a crippling solipsism. To wander is to oppose the regimentation and instrumentalism that threatens long-held freedoms. In *The Wanderer* wander becomes an abject movement; or, rather, the movement of the abject, as Juliet, washed ashore by the turbulence of the French Revolution, is neither capable of establishing herself in the confines of a traditional society rigorously policing its boundaries, or in the nascent bourgeois economy. Her wander performs the burden of this disjunction and displacement. *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* and *Melmoth the Wanderer* demonstrate how alienated and

monotonous wander is the result of the seizure of the stance of modernity. The Mariner and the Wanderer fall headlong into a schematized and isolating world through their respective acts of individualism (as the Wanderer's near victims almost do), and their near-interminable wander becomes the deadening march of a virtual, modern subjectivity, disjointed from organic life. Wander is used, whether positively or negatively, as a means of redressing the trauma of modernity. Whether asserted as a rhetoric, even a rhetoric that dovetails into a programmatic liberalism, or exhibited as a privileged rhetoric with diminishing returns, or displayed as a painful and isolating residue, wander becomes the means through which the perceived dangers of modernity might be articulated and overcome.

Bibliography

Abrams, M.H. *Natural Supernaturalism*. New York: Norton, 1958. Print.

Anderson, Emily Hodgson. "Staged Insensibility in Burney's *Cecilia*, *Camilla*, and *The Wanderer*: How a Playwright Writes Novels." *Eighteenth Century Fiction*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2005, pp. 628-648. Print.

Anderson, George K. "Popular Survivals of the Wandering Jew in England." *The Wandering Jew: Essays in the Interpretation of a Christian Legend*, edited by Galit Hasan-Rokem and Alan Dundes, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986, pp. 76 – 104. Print.

Bailey, Quentin. *Wordsworth's Vagrants*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011. Print.

Balfour, Ian. "History against Historicism, Formal Matters, and the Event of the Text: De Man with Benjamin." *Romantic Circles*. Online.
<https://www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/deman/balfour/balfour.html>

---. *The Rhetoric of Romantic Prophecy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002. Print.

Barr, Mark L. "The Forms of Justice: Precedent and Gloss in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*." *ELH*, vol. 78, no. 4, 2011, pp. 863-899. Print.

Baudelaire, Charles. "On the Essence of Laughter." *The Mirror of Art*. Translated and edited by Jonathan Mayne, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956, pp. 131-153. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*. Translated by Harry Zohn. London: Verso, 1973. Print.

---. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, pp. 253-264. Print.

---. "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire." *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, pp. 155-200. Print.

Blake, William. "London." *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: The Romantics and their Contemporaries*, edited by Susan Wolfson and Peter Manning, New York: Longman, 2003, p. 132. Print.

Bloom, Harold. "The Internalization of the Quest Romance." *Romanticism and Consciousness*, edited by Harold Bloom, New York: Norton, 1970, pp. 3-23. Print.

---. "Introduction." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"* edited by Harold Bloom, Philadelphia, Chelsea House Publishers, 1986, pp.1-6. Print.

Botting, Fred. *Gothic*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Brisman, Leslie. "Coleridge and the Ancestral Voices." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,"* edited by Harold Bloom, Philadelphia, Chelsea House Publishers, 1986, pp. 83-98. Print.

Brown, Marshall. "A Philosophical View of the Gothic Novel." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1987, pp. 275-301. Print.

Burgess, Miranda J. "Courting Ruin: The Economic Romances of Frances Burney." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1995, pp. 131-153. Print.

Burney, Frances. *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*. Oxford: Oxford University

- Press, 1991. Print.
- Bushell, Sally, Butler, James A., and Jaye, Michael C. "Introduction." *The Excursion*, by William Wordsworth, edited by Sally Bushell, James A. Butler, and Michael C. Jaye, Cornell University Press: Ithaca, pp. 3-24 2007. Print.
- Byron, George Gordon. *Don Juan*. London: Penguin, 2004. Print.
- Canales, Jimena. "Clock/Lived." *Time: A Vocabulary of the Present*, edited by Amy Elias and Joel Burges, New York: New York University Press, 2016, pp.113-128. Print.
- Casarino, Cesare. "Time Matters: Marx, Negri, Agamben, and the Corporeal." *In Praise of the Common: a Conversation on Philosophy and Politics*, edited by Cesare Casarino and Antonio Negri, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, pp. 219-245. Print.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "The Frost at Midnight." *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works*, edited by H.J. Jackson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985, pp. 87-89. Print.
- . *Biographia Literaria. Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works*, edited by H. J. Jackson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 155-482. Print.
- . "Christabel." *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works*, edited by H. J. Jackson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 68-87. Print.
- . *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner. Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works*, edited by H. J. Jackson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp.48-68. Print.
- Crandall, Joshua. "'The Great Measur'd by the Less': The Ethnological Turn in Eighteenth-Century Pastoral." *ELH*, vol. 81, no. 3, 2014, pp. 955-982. Print.

- Crathorne, Lord. "Captain Cook's Spirit of Adventure." *RSA Journal*, vol. 137, no. 5392, 1989, pp. 232-242. Print.
- Czechowski, Tara. "'Black, Patched, and Penniless:': Race and Crime in Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 25, no. 4, 2013, pp. 677-700. Print.
- Deleuze, Gilles. "On Four Poetic Formulas That Might Summarize the Kantian Philosophy." *Essays Critical and Clinical*, translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997, pp. 27-35. Print.
- De Man, Paul. "The Rhetoric of Temporality." *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983, pp. 187 -228. Print.
- . "Time and History in Wordsworth." *Diacritics*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1987, pp. 4-17. Print.
- Dimock, Wai Chee. "Nonbiological Clock: Literary History Against Newtonian Mechanics." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 102, no. 1, 2003, pp. 153-177. Print.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. Introduction. *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*, by Frances Burney, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. vii-xxxvii. Print.
- . *Frances Burney the Life in the Works*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988. Print.
- Doyle, Laura. "At World's Edge: Post/Coloniality, Charles Maturin, and the Gothic Wanderer." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 65, no. 4, 2011, pp. 513-547. Print.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger*. London: Verso, 1995. Print.

- Edelmann, R. "Ahasuerus, The Wandering Jew: Origin and Background." *The Wandering Jew: Essays in the Interpretation of a Christian Legend*, edited by Galit Hasan-Rokem and Alan Dundes, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986, pp. 1 -10. Print.
- Empson, William. "The Ancient Mariner." *Critical Quarterly*, vol. 6, 1964, pp. 298-319. Print.
- Epstein, Julia. "The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing." Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989. Print.
- Ferguson, Frances. "Coleridge and the Deluded Reader: *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,"* edited by Harold Bloom, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986, pp.57-74. Print.
- Ferguson, Frances. *Wordsworth: Language as Counter-Spirit*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1977. Print.
- "Forlorn Hope, 1.a." *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 1989, <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/view/Entry/73414#eid3799889>. Online.
- Fowler, Kathleen. "Hieroglyphics in Fire: *Melmoth the Wanderer*." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 25, no. 4, 1986, pp. 521-539. Print.
- Frank, Catherine. "Wandering Narratives and Wavering Conclusions: Irreconciliation in Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* and Walter Scott's *Waverly*." *European Romantic Review*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 429-456. Print.

- Frank, Marcie. "Frances Burney's Theatricality." *ELH*, vol. 82., no. 2, pp. 615-635. Print.
- Fry, Paul. *Wordsworth and the Poetry of What We Are*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. Print.
- . *A Study of English Romanticism*. New York: Random House, 1968. Print.
- Fuchs, Barbara. *Romance*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Fulford, Tim. "Slavery and Superstition in the Supernatural Poems." *The Cambridge Companion to Coleridge*, edited by Lucy Newlyn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 45-58. Print.
- Fulmer, O. Bryan. "The Ancient Mariner and the Wandering Jew." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 66, no. 5, 1969, pp. 797-815. Print.
- Galperin, William. *Revision and Authority in Wordsworth*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989. Print.
- . "'Then . . . the Voice was Silent': The Wanderer vs. *The Ruined Cottage*." *ELH*, vol.51, no. 2, 1984, pp. 343-363. Print.
- . "What Happens When Jane Austen and Frances Burney Enter the Romantic Canon?" *Lessons of Romanticism*, edited by Thomas Pfau and Robert F. Gleckner, Durham: Duke University Press, 1998, pp. 376 -391. Print.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. "On Alternative Modernities." *Alternative Modernities*, edited by Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, Durham: Duke University Press, 2001, pp. 1 -23. Print.
- Goodman, Kevis. *Georgic Modernity and British Romanticism: Poetry and the Mediation of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.

- . "Making Time for History." *The Wordsworthian Enlightenment*, edited by Helen Regueiro Elam and Frances Ferguson, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005, pp. 158 -171. Print.
- Gravil, Richard. "Is *The Excursion* a Metrical Novel?" *Wordsworth Circle*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2011, pp. 144-152. Print.
- Haggerty, George E. "Male Privilege in Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Women Constructing Men: Female Novelists and their Male Characters 1750-2000*, edited by Sarah S.G. Frantz and Katherine Rennhak, Lanhan: Lexington Books, 2010, pp. 31-43. Print.
- Hartman, Geoffrey. "Representation in *The Ancient Mariner*." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,"* edited by Harold Bloom, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986, pp. 45-50. Print.
- . "Romanticism and 'Anti-Self-Consciousness.'" *Romanticism and Consciousness*, edited by Harold Bloom, New York: W.W. Norton, 1970, pp. 46 -56. Print.
- . *Wordsworth's Poetry, 1787-1814*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1964. Print.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh, Albany: State University of New York, 1996. Print.
- . *The Concept of Time*. Translated by William McNeill, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992. Print.
- Henderson, Andrea. "Burney's *The Wanderer* and Early-Nineteenth Century Commodity Fetishism." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2002, pp. 1-30. Print.

- Hennelly Jr., Mark M. *Melmoth the Wanderer* and Gothic Existentialism. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1981, pp. 665-679. Print.
- Hickey, Alison. *Impure Conceits: Rhetoric and Ideology in Wordsworth's 'Excursion.'* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997, Print.
- Hodgson, John A. *Wordsworth's Philosophical Poetry, 1797-1814*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980. Print.
- Horrocks, Ingrid. "'Circling Eye' and 'Houseless Stranger': the New Eighteenth-Century Wanderer (Thomson to Goldsmith)." *ELH*, vol. 77, no. 3, 2010, pp. 665-687. Print.
- . *Women Wanderers and the Writing of Mobility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Print.
- House, Humphrey. "The Ancient Mariner." *English Romantic Poets*. Ed. M.H. Abrams. London: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 214-239. Print.
- Howard, William. "Narrative Irony in *The Excursion*." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1985, pp. 511-530. Print.
- Hubbell, Andrew J. "Wordsworth's Excursion in Romantic Philanthropy." *European Romantic Review*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2007, pp. 43-68. Print.
- Jameson, Frederic. "Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre." *New Literary History*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1975, pp. 135-163. Print.
- Jerinic, Maria. "Challenging Englishness: Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Rebellious Hearts: British Women Writers and the French Revolution*, edited by Adrian Craciun and Kari E. Lokke, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001, pp. 63 -84. Print.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Inaugural Dissertation of 1770*. Translated by William J. Eckoff. New York: Columbia College, 1894. Print.
- Keats, John. "Ode to Psyche." *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: The Romantics and their Contemporaries*, edited by Susan Wolfson and Peter Manning, New York: Longman, 2003, pp. 877-879. Print.
- Kennedy, Deborah. "Responding to the French Revolution: William's *Julia* and Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Jane Austen and Mary Shelley and Their Sisters*, edited by Laura Dabundo, Lanham: University Press of America, 2000, pp. 5-18. Print.
- Landes, David S. *Revolution in Time: Clocks and the Making of the Modern World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000. Print.
- Langan, Celeste. *Romantic Vagrancy: Wordsworth and the Simulation of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.
- Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993. Print.
- Lee, Debbie. "Yellow Fever and the Slave Trade: Coleridge's 'The Rime of the Ancient Mariner.'" *ELH*, vol. 65, no. 3, 1998, pp. 675-700. Print.
- Lew, Joseph. "'Unprepared for Sudden Transformations:' Identity and Politics in *Melmoth the Wanderer*." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1996, pp. 173-195. Print.
- Lewis, Mathew. *The Monk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973. Print.
- Magnuson, Paul. *Coleridge and Wordsworth: a Lyrical Dialogue*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. Print.

Marshall, Ashley. "Melmoth Affirmed: Maturin's Defense of Sacred History." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 47, no. 2, 2008, pp. 121-145. Print.

Maturin, Charles Robert. *Melmoth the Wanderer*. London: Penguin, 2000. Print.

McGann, Jerome. "The Meaning of the Ancient Mariner." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1981, pp. 35-67. Print.

Mellor, Anne K. *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fiction, Her Monsters*. New York: Methuen, 1988. Print.

Mitchell, Robert. "Suspended Animation, Slow Time, and the Poetics of Trance." *PMLA*, vol. 126, no. 1, 2011, pp. 107-122. Print.

Murphy, Carmel. "'The Stormy Sea of Politics': The French Revolution and Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Women's Writing*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2015, pp. 485-504. Print.

Null, Jack. "Structure and Theme in *Melmoth the Wanderer*." *Papers on Language and Literature*, vol. 13, 1977, pp. 136-147. Print.

Park, Suzie Asha. "All Agog to Find Her Out': Compulsory Narration in *The Wanderer*." *Recognizing the Romantic Novel: New Histories of British Fiction, 1780-1830*, edited by Jillian Heydt-Stevenson and Charlotte Sussman, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008, pp. 126-154. Print.

Parker, Patricia. *Inescapable Romance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979. Print.

Perkins, Pam. "Private Men and Public Women: Social Criticism in Fanny Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Essays in Literature*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1996, pp. 69-83. Print.

- Pfau, Thomas. "The Philosophy of Shipwreck: Gnosticism, Skepticism, and Coleridge's Catastrophic Modernity." *MLN*, vol. 122, no. 5, 2007, pp. 949-1004. Print.
- Punter, David. "Scottish and Irish Gothic." *Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, edited by Jerrold E. Hogle, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 105-124. Print.
- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1998. Print.
- Ragaz, Sharon. "Maturin, Archibald Constable, and the Publication of *Melmoth the Wanderer*." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 57, no. 230, 2006, pp. 358-373. Print.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Narrative Time." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1980, pp.169-190. Print.
- Robinson, Mary. "To the Poet Coleridge." *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: The Romantics and their Contemporaries*, edited by Susan Wolfson and Peter Manning, New York: Longman, 2003, pp. 225-227. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Reveries of a Solitary Walker*. London: Penguin, 2004. Print.
- Sachs, Jonathan. *The Poetics of Decline in British Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Print.
- Sage, Victor. Introduction. *Melmoth the Wanderer*, by Charles Robert Maturin, London: Penguin, 2000, pp. vii-xxix. Print.
- Salih, Sara. "'Her Blacks, Her Whites and Her Double Face!': Altering Alterity in *The Wanderer*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1999, pp. 301-315. Print.
- Salisbury, Jay. "Gothic and Romantic Wandering: the Epistemology of Oscillation." *Gothic Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2001, pp. 45-60. Print.

- Sherman, Stuart. *Telling Time: Clocks, Diaries, and English Diurnal Form 1660-1785*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996. Print.
- Silverman, Debra. "Reading Frances Burney's *The Wanderer; Or, Female Difficulties*: The Politics of Women's Independence." *Pacific Coast Philology*, vol. 26, no. 1-2, 1991, pp. 68-77. Print.
- Simmons, Clare A. "Medievalism in *The Excursion*." *Wordsworth Circle*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2014, pp. 131-137. Print.
- Simpson, David. *Wordsworth's Historical Imagination*. New York: Methuen, 1987. Print.
- Smith, Amy Elizabeth. "Experimentation and 'Horrid Curiosity' in Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer*." *English Studies*, vol. 74, no. 6, 1993, pp. 524-535. Print.
- Stafford, Fiona. "Plain Living and Ungarnish'd Stories: Wordsworth and the Survival of the Pastoral." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 59, no. 238, 2008, pp. 118-133. Print.
- Stevenson, Warren. "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner as Epic Symbol." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,"* edited by Harold Bloom, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986, pp. 51-56. Print.
- Sussman, Charlotte. "Time Wandering: Problems of Witnessing in the Romantic-Era Novel." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2010, pp. 140-147. Print.
- Swann, Karen. "'Christabel': The Wandering Mother and the Enigma of Form." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1984, pp. 533-553. Print.

- Thompson, E.P. "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism." *Past and Present*, no. 38, 1967, pp. 59-67. Print.
- Thompson, Helen. "How *The Wanderer* Works: Reading Burney and Bourdieu." *ELH*, vol. 68, no. 4, 2001, 965-989. Print.
- Wallace, Anne D. *Walking, Literature, and English Culture: the Origins and Uses of Peripatetic in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.
- Wallace, Tara Ghoshal. "Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2012, pp. 487-508. Print.
- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, Fielding*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964. Print.
- Whitrow, G.J. *Time in History: The Evolution of Our General Awareness of Time and Temporal Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print.
- Wolfson, Susan. "The Romantics and Their Contemporaries." *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: The Romantics and their Contemporaries*, edited by Susan Wolfson and Peter Manning, New York: Longman, 2003, pp. 2-29. Print.
- Wordsworth, William. *The Excursion*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, 2007. Print.
- . *The Fenwick Notes of William Wordsworth*. Ed. Jared Curtis. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2008. Ebook.
- . "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud." *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: The Romantics and their Contemporaries*, edited by Susan Wolfson and Peter Manning, New York: Longman, 2003, pp. 453-454. Print.

- . *The Prelude*. Eds. Jonathan Wordsworth, M.H. Abrams & Stephen Gill. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1979. Print.
- . "The Song for the Wandering Jew." *Lyrical Ballads*, edited by R.L. Brett and A.R. Jones, New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 178. Print.