

Emotions Interrupted: The Unsettling of Loyalist Expression during the American Revolution

Shane Berry

A thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
American and Canadian Studies

August 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I must acknowledge that this project would not have been possible without the guidance and support of many people over the years, and for that I will be forever thankful. However, I would particularly like to thank both of my PhD supervisors Dr Matthew Pethers, and Dr Robin Vandome, who have made an indelible impression on my development and growth as a researcher and writer. I am eternally grateful for their contribution to this thesis and am mindful of the fact that it would not have been possible without the benefit of their considerable knowledge and experience.

I would also like to thank the University of Nottingham as an institution for supporting my research, particularly for the School of Cultures, Languages and Area Studies PhD Studentship Award in 2019, which was incredibly important financially. Additionally, I would also like to thank the financial assistance I received from the University of Nottingham for my research trip to the Massachusetts History Society in Boston in 2022, which was an invaluable source of information for my investigation. I would be remiss not to recognise the archivists at the Massachusetts Historical Society, who graciously gave their time and assistance to help me during my trip. I would also like to thank the librarians at the University of Nottingham for their help and support over the course of my studies.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my family for their constant backing over the years, especially my wife Michelle, who has been a crucial source of support and encouragement throughout my PhD. The decision to relocate to the UK from New Zealand in 2018 to undertake my PhD was daunting, and I could not have done it without her by my side. Overall, this dissertation would simply not have been possible without her unwavering love and solidarity. In closing, I must mention the vital role of my cat Pippa over the course of my studies, who during times of stress and frustration has been a constant relief. Thank you Pip!

ABSTRACT

This dissertation adopts an emotions history lens to retrieve the emotional lives of Loyalists, analysing the different media forms they used for self-expression, in order to reveal the full complexity of their experiences during and after the American Revolution. It argues that the upheaval wrought by the conflict unsettled the norms and understandings governing emotional expression in late eighteenth-century America. By illustrating the impact of this rupture on the emotional lives of Loyalists, and American society more broadly, this thesis fills an important gap in Revolutionary Era scholarship, which has not adequately addressed the emotional dimensions of the conflict, and their impact on Loyalists specifically. This thesis shows that the destabilising of American society's emotional standards served to undermine the culture of sensibility which until then had dictated emotional life for the American elite. This disturbance is reflected in the new-found prominence placed on emotional authenticity during the conflict, and the extent to which identifying sincere emotion was complicated by the social and political upheaval. Through analysis of both the private and public literary forms Loyalists used for self-expression this thesis demonstrates a clear interconnectivity between form, emotion, and audience, showing how in the late eighteenth-century emotional expression was strongly influenced by the medium used for its articulation. I have sought to redress the gender disparity notable in previous Loyalist research, which has prioritised the experiences of men, adding crucial detail on the emotional experiences of Loyalist women. This focus on Loyalist women has made it possible to show how, through different media forms, they were able to circumvent the social and political factors limiting their expression to achieve a degree of agency and autonomy. Previous researchers have not utilised media forms to investigate the emotional lives of Loyalists as a group, causing our knowledge of their collective emotional experiences to lack depth and nuance. This thesis rectifies this oversight, drawing on the modes of expression Loyalists used, in order to illustrate the similarities and differences of their shared emotional experiences.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Suffering in Silence: How Diaries Functioned as an Emotional Refuge.....	25
Chapter 2: A Desire to Explain: How Sympathy and Anger Shaped Loyalist Memoirs.....	53
Chapter 3: Uneasy Networks: How Fear and Anxiety Shaped Loyalist Letters.....	87
Chapter 4: Public Outrage: Anger and Print Ephemera during the American Revolution....	116
Chapter 5: Loyalism and the Novel: How Sympathy and Grief Influenced Early American Fiction.....	149
Conclusion: Loyalist Emotional Forms in Flux.....	183
Bibliography.....	192

Introduction

In a 1774 letter Loyalist Anne Hulton, describes Boston as a ‘very gloomy place, the Streets almost empty, many families have removed from it, & the Inhabitants are divided into several parties, at variance, & quarrelling with each other, some appear desponding, others full of rage.’¹ In this passage Hulton not only elucidates the discord of the American Revolution, but reveals the depth of feeling awakened by the conflict, with emotions such as anger, fear, and melancholy appearing prevalent. The Revolution conjured a range of feelings in those involved, but how exactly did American colonists understand these different emotional states?

The emotional lives of the conflict’s participants have until now been largely neglected, but this study of Loyalist feeling in this thesis seeks to rectify this oversight. This thesis in particular aims to recover the emotional lives of Loyalists by analysing the literary media they utilised for self-expression. These different forms of writing structure my thesis, with each chapter concentrating on a specific medium: diaries, memoirs, letters, broadsides and pamphlets, and novels. In facilitating the identification of key emotions within each mode of expression this framework provides an extensive overview of the emotional lives of Loyalists, demonstrating the important interrelationship between emotion and medium during the late eighteenth century.

Throughout the conflict many Loyalists were severely mistreated by Patriots because of their continuing allegiance to the Crown, resulting in significant emotional turmoil. Through analysis of their emotional lives this thesis seeks to explicate the complexities associated with this upheaval to better understand the emotional implications of the abuse, dislocation, and disenfranchisement, experienced by Loyalists during the Revolution. My study asserts that the Patriot persecution of Loyalists impacted their emotional expression across multiple textual forms, by disrupting the social and political norms dictating emotional expression within the upper echelons of American society. This disturbance is evident across the spectrum of Loyalist emotional experience and had a particularly pronounced impact on contemporary gender norms concerning appropriate emotional behaviour.

¹ Ann Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady: Being the Letters of Ann Hulton, Sister of Henry Hulton, Commissioner of Customs at Boston* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 1927), 73.
https://archive.org/details/lettersofloyalis0000hult_j3m3/page/72/mode/2up.

Historians have long acknowledged the suffering of Loyalists, and the trials they endured during the conflict.² Ruma Chopra, for example, has explored the violent suppression of Loyalist freedoms of expression, and the confiscation of Loyalist property. But little attention has been given to how they *felt* about their experiences. Within the area of Loyalist research analysis of their emotional lives remains overly simplistic, with discussions of Loyalist persecution during the conflict often simply alluding to the immense suffering they endured. Alan Taylor, for example, has observed how ‘Patriot mobs terrorized Loyalists,’³ while Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan have recognised how a ‘fear of violence’ was central in many Loyalists deciding to leave their homes and relocate elsewhere.⁴ While such descriptions acknowledge Loyalist hardships, they do not go far enough in exploring the depth and complexity of their emotional distress, and consequently do little to advance our knowledge of how the Revolution shaped and was shaped by their emotional lives. A comprehensive investigation of their emotional lives remains missing from the historiography of the American Revolution.

Most scholars simply portray Loyalists as failing to understand the Patriot use and conception of emotion, and the consequences for Loyalists of this failure. What is lacking is an exploration of *how* and *why* Loyalists came to view emotion differently from Patriots, and the meaning of such a divergence. This thesis rectifies that oversight, offering a new perspective which asserts the fundamental influence of emotion on the Loyalist experience. More specifically, through the recovery of their emotional experiences, I reveal the shifting nature of emotional definitions and understandings over the Revolutionary Era. At this time, for example, it was expected that a member of the social elite would remain controlled when publicly expressing anger, but as we will see in subsequent chapters, adherence to such emotional standards became problematic during the conflict’s political debates, with correct

² For information about the persecution of Loyalists see: Bernard Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974); Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America (American Controversies)* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013); Brendan McConville, *The Kings Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Thomas B. Allen, *Tories: Fighting for the King in America’s First Civil War* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2010); Maya Jasonoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: HarperPress, 2011); Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions: A Continental History 1750-1804* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2016).

³ Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions: A Continental History 1750-1804* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2016), 163.

⁴ Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan, *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 168.

expressions of anger becoming a significant point of contention. By analysing Loyalist emotional expression across a range of media such differences can be better explained.

Researching Loyalism's relation to late eighteenth-century emotional dynamics answers several questions fundamental to Loyalist studies, as well as many relevant to investigations of the American Revolution more broadly.⁵ These questions include, how did the Revolution disrupt emotional conventions and definitions in the late eighteenth century? What are the implications of Loyalist emotional expression for understandings of emotional authenticity in late eighteenth-century America? What was the emotional experience of persecution for Loyalists, and how is this reflected across multiple media forms? How did medium of expression, motivation, and emotion interrelate, and what does this mean for an analysis of the emotional lives of Loyalists? How did the intended audience of a given medium impact emotional expression? How significant are gender dynamics for the study of Loyalist emotion, and what does this mean for understanding emotion more broadly in late eighteenth-century America? In answering these questions, my investigation meaningfully contributes to the growing body of literature dedicated to reassessing the role and experience of Loyalists. My thesis uses an emotions history lens, which as Rob Boddice indicates, is a methodology that places 'emotions at the centre of historiographical practice' to uncover the changing nature of emotions in the past, and the role of emotions in influencing historical events.⁶ For this study it enables me to access and retrieve the emotional lives of Loyalists, revealing the impact of the conflict on Loyalist emotional expression, and illustrating the disruption all this caused to the social and political landscape of late eighteenth century America.

⁵ Recent research has demonstrated the varying social and political positions of those who chose Loyalism during the Revolution, showing that Loyalists emanated from different class and ethnic backgrounds, possessing multifarious motivations for remaining loyal. Much of the latest research has emphasised the nature of the conflict as a kind of civil war and looked closely at similarities between Loyalist and Patriot political ideologies. Most work has continued to focus on the struggles Loyalists encountered, and what influenced their decision making, but increasing work has been done to expand the scope of Loyalist research, including challenging entrenched negative perceptions of senior Loyalist figures, and investigating Loyalism beyond the borders of America, into Canada and throughout the British Atlantic world. Robert Calhoon succinctly describes how until now historians have primarily 'asked questions about the location and condition of identifiable groups of loyalists, the thrust of loyalist rebuttals to specific tenets of whig belief, and the political and social conditions which made some colonists unusually dependent on British authority for their security and identity.' For an overview of recent Loyalist research see Jane Errington, "Loyalists and Loyalism in the American Revolution and Beyond," *Acadiensis*, 41, no. 2 (2012): 164-173, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41803357?seq=1>. For an in-depth look at the state of Loyalist studies see: Robert M. Calhoon, Timothy M. Barnes, and Robert S. Davis, *Tory Insurgents: The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays* (University of South Carolina Press, 2010).

⁶ Rob Boddice, *The History of Emotions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 11.

Lorenzo Sabine conducted the first significant study of the Loyalists in 1847, but in the years that followed scholarship about the Loyalists was minimal, due primarily to their ethos contradicting the United States' patriotic narrative emphasising unity. Much of the literature that was produced ignored Loyalist contributions to the conflict, depicting them as a one-dimensional and static group, often used only as a way to explain Patriot motivations.⁷ In 1965 Wallace Brown's *The Kings Friends: The Composition and Motives of the American Loyalist Claimants*, reignited interest in the Loyalists, but it was Mary Beth Norton in 1972 who conducted the first comprehensive study of the Loyalist experience. In *The British Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England 1774-1789*, Norton analyses the experience of Loyalist refugees in England. She successfully captures the diverse range of experiences of exile and carefully explicates the attendant anguish and frustration felt by many following their arrival in England. Drawing attention to the pain of exile Norton observed that 'refugees surrendered themselves to despondency,' in which their 'pessimistic mood contributed to their already endemic homesickness.'⁸ Following in the footsteps of Wallace Brown, Norton also provides important insight into the Loyalist pursuit of compensation, and the British government's handling of this process. Overall, *The British Americans* is a crucial early study of the Loyalist experience, providing important detail regarding the motivations and rationale of those who chose Loyalism. But while bringing into view Loyalist suffering, her research does not provide a thorough exploration of the different emotional states associated with their torment. My investigation goes further, applying an emotions history framework of analysis to illuminate the depth and complexity of their suffering.

In 1973 Robert Calhoon's book *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781*, shifted the focus away from the Loyalist diaspora and back to an American context, providing an extensive examination of the Loyalist experience in the former colonies. Calhoon's painstaking research sought to 'understand the *motivation* — the compelling reasons, influences, predispositions, and dictates of self-interest, temperament, conscience, intellect, fear, and plain confusion — that impelled loyalists to act as they did.'⁹ In this he is largely successful, giving a thorough account of the complexities of Loyalist ideology and reasoning, with his biographical sketches of several leading Loyalist figures offering vital contextual information regarding their decision making. Calhoon classifies Loyalist allegiance into three

⁷ Bannister and Riordan, *The Loyal Atlantic*, 5.

⁸ Mary Beth Norton, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England 1774-1789* (Toronto: Little, Brown & Company Limited, 1972), 122.

⁹ Robert M. Calhoon, *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), xi.

distinct categories, consisting of those who defended imperial authority due to their own position, those who largely refrained from involvement and wished to remain neutral, and those who vigorously defended Tory doctrine.¹⁰

Such a delineation usefully illustrates the different factors which motivated those who became known as Loyalists. It also touches on a distinction that can be drawn between active Loyalists and passive Loyalists. Active Loyalists were those who vigorously rejected Patriot measures and self-identified as Loyalists, while passive Loyalists refused to openly commit to the Loyalist cause, preferring instead to stay out of the contest, and often had the Loyalist label affixed to them by the Patriot authorities due to their failure to support the cause of independence.¹¹ This separation between active and passive Loyalists has implications for my investigation because, as we will see, it was those people actively supporting the Loyalist cause who were generally treated most severely by the Patriots, causing intense feelings of anger, fear, and anxiety to spread through their ranks. It must, however, be noted that both active and passive Loyalists were mistreated during the conflict, resulting in members of both groups experiencing feelings of melancholy, and as will become evident, both groups also sought sympathy for their suffering after the war. While these divisions show a correlation between ideology and emotional states, they also highlight the complexity of allegiance during the conflict, underlining the heterogeneity of Loyalism. However, it must be noted that for the purposes of this study the term Loyalist has usually been applied more broadly to those colonists who remained loyal to the British during the years of colonial resistance, 1765-1783. Similarly, the moniker Patriot has been used to describe colonists who actively engaged in the rebellion against British authority during these same years. The adoption of such descriptors simplifies understanding and avoids any problematic and unhelpful pitfalls or ambiguities which can arise when classifying colonial allegiance during the period.

Picking up on the biographical framework used by Calhoun, Bernard Bailyn adopts a similar approach in his 1974 biography of former Governor of Massachusetts, Thomas Hutchinson, titled *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*. In this largely sympathetic study, Hutchinson functions as an exemplary Loyalist mind, with Bailyn underlining the significant role played by Loyalist belief systems in shaping how they perceived and responded to unfolding events. My research diverges from both Calhoun's and Bailyn's work, by shifting

¹⁰ Ibid., ix-x.

¹¹ Kacy Dowd Tillman, *Stripped and Script: Loyalist Women Writers of the American Revolution* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press: 2019), 23.

the focus specifically onto the interrelationship between ideology and emotion. As we will see in subsequent chapters, a person's ideology did not consist solely of rational arguments, but had a strong emotional component, with the conduct of fervent Loyalists and Patriots being shaped by the relative degree of their commitment to their respective cause. We see the polarising effect of intense emotional attachment to a particular position become clear in the heated pamphlet debates that occurred between Loyalists and Patriots during the conflict. Through these exchanges we see how both sides weaponised emotions, like anger and fear, against the opposing side to galvanise support for their own position.

While Bailyn's sympathetic treatment of Hutchinson appears to contradict his earlier representation of Loyalists in *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (1967), which casts them in a distinctly negative light, in reality his characterisation of Hutchinson is as one of many Loyalists who could not understand the Patriot perspective.¹² As Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan have rightly indicated, Hutchinson is primarily used by Bailyn to explain Patriot motivations. Such usage is symptomatic of much Revolutionary Era research and represents, as they put it, 'a major conceptual barrier to our ability to understand loyalism.'¹³ Bailyn's portrayal of Hutchinson 'defined the general understanding of loyalists until recent times, presenting them as out of touch conservatives, motivated primarily by money and position.'¹⁴ My investigation builds on more recent scholarship which has sought to deconstruct the interpretation put forward by earlier historians like Bailyn, challenge Loyalist stereotypes, and provide a more balanced exploration of their motivations. Maya Jasanoff, for example, has recognised that 'Loyalism cut right across the social, geographical, racial, and ethnic spectrum of early America,' and while Loyalists shared a common allegiance to the king their precise motivations varied enormously, with some choosing Loyalism for intellectual reasons and others because of pragmatic considerations.¹⁵

Jane Kamensky's *A Revolution in Color: The World of John Singleton Copley* (2016) focusing on the artist and Loyalist John Singleton Copley, delves further into the complexities and ambiguities surrounding an individual's choice of Loyalism, accentuating the familial and financial considerations within this process. As she puts it: 'Family ties mattered at least as

¹² Bernard Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974), 14.

¹³ Bannister and Riordan, *The Loyal Atlantic*, 15.

¹⁴ Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, 14.

¹⁵ Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: HarperPress, 2011), 8.

much as political allegiances.’¹⁶ My work builds on this crucial aspect of Loyalism, using different modes of expression to analyse the emotional impact of the conflict on families. For example, their diaries show the private despair of family separation, while their letters reveal the fear that surged through familial epistolary networks. Kamensky’s study of Copley is undoubtedly illuminating, but it also highlights a flaw in Loyalist scholarship, which has been weighted heavily in favour of biography, resulting in Loyalist studies being ‘scattered and particularistic.’¹⁷ My focus on media forms attempts to rectify this issue, in which I adopt a structure consisting of shared modes of personal expression, which offers a more widely applicable account of the Loyalist experience than a study with a more narrow biographical scope.

While contemporary research has expanded our understanding of the Loyalist mind, there has been a tendency to prioritise source material from the social and political elite, which has obscured the voices of Loyalists from lower down the social order. Janice Potter-Mackinnon in *The Liberty We Seek: Colonial Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts* (1983) early on acknowledged this deficiency in Loyalist research. To redress this shortcoming, she uses a variety of source material, including pamphlets, broadsides, and newspapers, to demonstrate that there was ‘an ideology common to Loyalists from different backgrounds and regions.’¹⁸ More recently Ruma Chopra has alluded to the pitfalls of privileging source material stemming from the social elite in her description of the plight of Loyalist refugees in Nova Scotia.¹⁹ Similarly, Maya Jasanoff in *Liberty’s Exiles* (2008) sought to recover ‘the stories of ordinary people whose lives were overturned by extraordinary events.’²⁰ For example, she tells the story of Elizabeth Lichtenstein Johnston, ‘a middle-class loyalist from Georgia’ whose life was irrevocably altered by the conflict.²¹ My study continues this trend toward considering materials drawn from different social strata, offering a view that is more representative of the whole Loyalist population. While the wealth of literary sources available from the social elite inevitably make them a vital source for this

¹⁶ Jane Kamensky, *A Revolution in Color: The World of John Singleton Copley* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2016), 8.

¹⁷ Bannister and Riordan, *The Loyal Atlantic*, 15.

¹⁸ Janice Potter-Mackinnon, *The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1983), viii.

¹⁹ Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 14.

²⁰ Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles*, 14.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 15.

investigation, where possible I have considered materials from outside the upper echelons of American society.

My incorporation of sources from different levels of American society extend to my inclusion of material from African Americans, giving important insight into the emotional experience of Black Loyalists during the Revolution. Much scholarship has emerged in recent decades focusing on the role of African Americans during the conflict, many of whom sided with the British. Most research has concentrated on the Black Loyalist pursuit of freedom, and the resultant hardships they endured. Two separate studies, *The Black Loyalists: The Search for a Promised Land in Nova Scotia and Sierra Leone, 1783-1870* (1976) by James W. St. G Walker, and *The Loyal Blacks* (1976) by Ellen Gibson Wilson, initially investigated the Black Loyalist diaspora, exploring their search for freedom, equality, and prosperity in Canada, England, and Africa after the war. Both studies describe the suffering, and immense challenges, including racism and discrimination, confronted by these Black Loyalists, many of whom were former slaves, as they sought a better life beyond the shores of America. More recent scholarship, including Cassandra Pybus' *Epic Journeys of Freedom: Runaway Slaves of the American Revolution and Their Global Quest for Liberty* (2006) has further clarified the experiences of Black Loyalists, and while her study explores familiar thematic and interpretive lines of enquiry to these earlier studies, Pybus contributes new insight by presenting meticulously researched biographies of individual Black Loyalists, which blend to provide a single narrative of their experiences, elucidating the broad impact of Black Loyalists across the globe.²²

While Pybus' study is thoroughly researched, she acknowledges the problems associated with recovering 'the lives of illiterate people who left no more than a faint trace on the historical record.'²³ Although minimal, documentation concerning Black Loyalists does exist, but it is generally in media forms that I do not focus on in this thesis, as they offer little meaningful evidence of their emotional states. For instance, the 1783 *Book of Negroes* is an

²² For further recent reading about those African American's who fought on the side of the British during the American Revolution see: Mary Louise Clifford, *From Slavery to Freetown: Black Loyalists After the American Revolution* (London: McFarland & Company, Inc. Publishers, 2006); Douglas R. Egerton, *Death or Liberty: African Americans and Revolutionary America* (Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2009); Alan Gilbert, *Black Patriots and Loyalists: Fighting for Emancipation in the War for Independence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012); Christopher Leslie Brown and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Arming Slaves: From Classical Times to the Modern Age* (Yale University Press, 2006); Jim Piecuch, *Three Peoples, One King: Loyalists, Indians, and Slaves in the Revolutionary South, 1775-1782* (University of South Carolina Press, 2008); Simon Schama, *Rough Crossings: Britain, the Slaves and the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 2010).

²³ Cassandra Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom: Runaway Slaves of the American Revolution and Their Global Quest for Liberty* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2007), 17. ProQuest Ebook Central.

invaluable resource for transatlantic historians in providing an ‘archive largely of freed Whig slaves who had become Black Loyalists and requested permission to leave the United States to resettle in Nova Scotia.’²⁴ But while the *Book of Negroes* is essential for tracking the movement of Black Loyalists following the conflict, it offers little in the way of emotional insight.²⁵ Still, while evidence of the emotional lives of Black Loyalists is limited, it is not entirely absent, as evidenced by the memoir of Boston King, an enslaved carpenter from South Carolina, who went on to be a Methodist preacher, and had an account of his life published in 1798, titled *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King, a Black Preacher*.²⁶ In his memoir King gives a meticulous account of his experiences during the Revolution, including his pursuit of freedom, and his life outside America after the conflict. For example he recalls his ‘inexpressible anguish and terror’ at the prospect of being returned to slavery at the war’s conclusion, following the circulation of unsubstantiated rumours suggesting that was a possibility.²⁷ Overall, his account, provides important detail regarding how Black Loyalists felt, and consequently I draw on his memoir in my discussion of Loyalism, slavery, and emotion in chapter four.

Recent research has not only sought to recover the experiences of African Americans but reassessed the role of women during the conflict. For example, G. Patrick O’Brien in his 2019 dissertation titled “‘Unknown and Unlamented’: Loyalist Women in Nova Scotia from Exile to Repatriation, 1775-1800,’ explored how ‘refugee women in Nova Scotia felt about and responded to the “joys” and “miseries” of the Revolutionary Era to more fully understand how women experienced loyalist exile and explain their vital public and private roles.’²⁸ He reveals how Loyalist women actively used their emotions, drawing on shared feelings of despair to cultivate and maintain relationships which transcended class boundaries.²⁹ O’Brien’s research not only applies an emotions history lens to the Loyalist experience, but also confronts another shortcoming in Loyalist studies, namely privileging of the voices of Loyalist men over those of Loyalist women. Kacy Dowd Tillman, similarly, concentrates on

²⁴ Ibid., 123.

²⁵ An example of the types of entries found in the *Book of Negroes*: “Rose Richard, 20, healthy young woman, (Thomas Richard). Property of Thomas Richard, a refugee from Philadelphia.” See *Black Loyalists: Our History, Our People*, Canada’s Digital Collection, “Book One Part One of the Book of Negroes,” <https://blackloyalist.com/cdc/>.

²⁶ Boston King, “Memoirs of the Life of Boston King, a Black Preacher, Written by Himself” (1798): https://www.latinamericanstudies.org/slavery/Boston_King.pdf.

²⁷ Ibid., 8.

²⁸ G. Patrick O’Brien, “Unknown and Unlamented: Loyalist Women in Nova Scotia from Exile to Repatriation, 1775-1800” (PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2019), 9, <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6378&context=etd>.

²⁹ Ibid., 31.

Loyalist women in her study of elite Loyalist women from the Delaware Valley. In *Stripped and Script: Loyalist Women Writers of the American Revolution* (2019), Tillman draws on letters, diaries, and petitions, to reveal the complex nature of audience, identity, and political allegiance in eighteenth century America. An important contribution made by Tillman is to demonstrate the agency of Loyalist women, many of whom ‘used letters and letter-journals as a vehicle for political engagement.’³⁰ Building on the scholarship of researchers such as O’Brien and Tillman, my study too analyses modes of expression utilised by Loyalist women, but unlike these other researchers I apply an emotions history lens to a diverse range of media forms to more fully understand the emotional lives of Loyalist women, explicitly focusing on how the conflict impacted their conformity to the emotional standards of the period across diverse settings.

Much scholarship on Loyalists has tended to take a narrowly regional approach, including that of O’Brien and Tillman, precluding the relevance and application of their findings to the collective experience of Loyalists. My research accords with other studies than these that have broadened the focus to gain insight into the wider Loyalist experience. Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan in *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (2012), for example, highlight the perils of a limited scope, observing that Loyalist studies have historically been unduly influenced by ‘nationalist perspectives,’³¹ which has prevented Loyalism from being understood as a ‘multifaceted international phenomenon’ which spread right across the North Atlantic.³² They rightly argue that as ‘Loyalism in the revolutionary period was primarily an Atlantic...phenomenon,’ a transatlantic perspective is most appropriate for Loyalist studies.³³ I too adopt a transatlantic framework, but I do not trace Loyalists across the British empire, nor focus on the specifics of their experience of exile. Rather my use of a transatlantic framework relates to the discourse of emotion which at that time was distinctly transatlantic in nature, with American emotional conduct strongly influenced by British conventions, making this approach an appropriate basis for assessing critical themes important for this study of Loyalist emotion.

Existing scholarship has largely captured the complex and contested nature of Loyalism but overall, this work remains rooted in studies that predominantly concentrate on ideology and allegiance. This thesis takes a different approach, arguing that to

³⁰ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 21.

³¹ Bannister and Riordan, *The Loyal Atlantic*, 3.

³² *Ibid.*, 6.

³³ *Ibid.*, 22.

comprehensively understand the experiences of Loyalists, recognition and recovery of their emotional lives is integral. Researchers have long recognised the significance of emotion for the study of the American Revolution. Jay Fliegelman, for example, in *Declaring Independence: Jefferson, Natural Language, & the Culture of Performance* (1993) acknowledges the importance of oratory during the Revolution, influentially observing how the Declaration of Independence was intended for public recitation, lending it a performative function, with its structure and language designed to elicit an emotional response from audiences.³⁴ In addition, Philip Gould has explicated the highly emotive nature of Revolutionary Era debates pertaining to literary form and aesthetics regarding Loyalists more specifically. In *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of Politics in British America* (2013), Gould examines the conflicts political writing, focusing primarily on pamphlets and broadsides, revealing the periods political discord to be enmeshed with disagreements over literary style, form and authorship. He correctly asserts that scholars have typically ‘read patriotic discourse as American writing’ to the exclusion of Loyalist contributions.³⁵ By reinstating Loyalist writings into his study of early American political literature he ‘produces a new image of the complex political and cultural dynamics’ of the revolutionary moment.³⁶ While Gould does not specifically investigate Loyalist emotion, he usefully illustrates the profound sense of social and political alienation present in their writing, and the accompanying feelings of anger and frustration. While my enquiry too investigates pamphlets and broadsides, I also concentrate on media that Gould does not, drawing on more personal forms of expression to gain additional insight into the emotional impact of such dislocation. Overall, research by Gould and Fliegelman, to name just two, helpfully draws attention to the emotional side of the conflict, but unlike this investigation, neither study places emotion front and centre.

The recovery of the emotional lives of the conflict’s participants has been hindered by previous studies not widely applying an emotions history lens. As such, the history of emotions serves as the primary foundation for the methodology employed in this thesis, providing key concepts and a wider framework of analysis well suited for understanding the

³⁴ Jay Fliegelman, *Declaring Independence: Jefferson, Natural Language & the Culture of Performance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 2.

³⁵ Phillip Gould, *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of the Politics in British America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 7.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

emotional lives of Loyalists.³⁷ My investigation draws heavily on the important scholarship of Nicole Eustace who in *Passion is the Gale* (2008) recognised that in eighteenth century American society ‘expressions of emotion constituted declarations of status,’ observing that ‘emotional language’ acted as a ‘key form of social communication.’³⁸ By analysing the language deployed to convey emotion, she establishes the unmistakable role of emotional discourse in the negotiation and maintenance of power in the years leading up to the outbreak of war. Her pioneering research masterfully demonstrates how power dynamics shaped emotional exchanges in eighteenth century Pennsylvania. By emphasising the significance of language for the expression of emotion, and the subtle class and status differences contained in different emotional descriptors, her work serves as a framework for this study’s assessment of the period’s emotional norms and understandings.

However, while Eustace predominantly focuses on emotional language, my investigation is more interested in the media forms used to express emotion, and how those different media forms impacted how Loyalists expressed specific emotions. The importance this study places on the distinctiveness of media forms is a clear point of departure from Eustace’s work, as although she draws on a variety of sources in her book, including pamphlets and letters, and collapses the ‘distinctions between the personal and the political, by locating the history of emotion in records of daily expression and philosophical speculation,’ she does not adequately demonstrate the crucial role of media in shaping emotional expression.³⁹ Her analysis of eighteenth century emotional language usefully explicates the nuances associated with different emotional registers and their descriptors. For example, she clearly illustrates how in eighteenth century America different social and political contexts impacted expressions of anger, like rage or resentment, observing that such terms carried ‘a slightly different connotation, implying not only degrees of intensity but also rank.’⁴⁰ But while delineating such differences contributes crucial detail to our understanding of the period’s emotional landscape, by not more explicitly considering the significance of particular media forms in influencing how and why these different emotions were expressed, her investigation misses a fundamental aspect of emotional expression. This thesis corrects

³⁷ On the history of emotions see: Rob Boddice, *The History of Emotions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018); Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns, *Doing Emotions History*, (Chicago: University of Illinois, 2014).

³⁸ Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 7.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 152.

this oversight, showing the important interrelationship that existed between emotions, and the textual form in which they were expressed.

Furthermore, while this thesis places the Revolution at its centre, for Eustace the conflict represents only one part of her larger analysis of emotional dynamics between the 1740s through to the 1770s, in which she is largely concerned with ‘tracing the historical patterns in who expressed what emotions when and to whom’ during these years.⁴¹ The Revolution not serving as the primary focus of her research limits the insight she provides regarding the impact of the rupture on late eighteenth-century emotional expression. Additionally, while the scope of this investigation extends to the end of the Revolution and beyond, her discussion of the conflict essentially concludes with the 1776 Declaration of Independence, further reducing the ability of her study to meaningfully show how the upheaval affected people’s emotional lives. Eustace’s treatment of the Revolution is also mainly interested in how emotion relates to the Patriot cause, and largely ignores the Loyalist perspective, resulting in a one-sided account that fails to convey the full complexity of emotional experience during the conflict. By shifting the focus on to the Loyalist emotional experience this investigation rectifies this omission, adding important new detail to the study of the emotional dynamics of the conflict’s participants.

While many scholars have contributed to the study of the history of emotions, Lucien Febvre, can be credited with making the earliest significant contribution to the field. In his 1941 essay titled ‘Sensibility and History: How to Reconstitute the Affective Life of the Past,’ he emphasises the importance of emotion for historical research, insisting that as emotional norms shift and vary across time, they must be understood within the cultural standards of the period studied.⁴² More recent scholarship has underscored the importance placed on a society’s conventions, observing that each society shapes ‘the expression, repression, and meaning of feelings by giving them names and assigning values to some and not others.’⁴³ Peter N. Stearns and Carol Zisowitz Stearns have described these emotional norms as emotionology – or a set of attitudes and principles regulating emotional expression within a

⁴¹ Ibid., 7.

⁴² Lucien Febvre, “Sensibility and History: How to Reconstitute the Emotional life of the Past,” in *A New Kind of History; The Writings of Febvre*, ed. Peter Burke (London: Routledge, 1973), 14.

⁴³ Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns, *Doing Emotions History* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2014), 2.

defined social group.⁴⁴ In accordance with earlier researchers they recognised that these standards were subject to change across time.⁴⁵ As social historians the Stearns prioritised the emotionology of European and Anglo-American social institutions and groups – including individual families, schools, and armies – in attempting to explicate the emotional norms of the middle classes in the early modern and modern periods.⁴⁶ While my thesis focuses primarily on late eighteenth century American society, it adopts an emotionology lens, in order to better understand the emotional standards present in Revolutionary Era America. By applying such a lens, the emotional standards of the period are brought into view, making it possible to identify instances of deviation from those norms. The insight this affords, builds on, and augments, earlier analyses of emotional standards in the past, and contributes new understanding of the emotional conventions which underpinned late eighteenth-century American society.

The emotional landscape of late eighteenth-century America was complex and multi-layered, consisting of multifarious definitions and conventions. To properly assess meaning, and to comprehend the emotional terrain of the period, it is essential that feelings are viewed through a prism of late eighteenth-century understandings. As Susan J. Matt has argued, ‘writers craft their journals, letters, and memoirs, presenting their feelings with an eye to prevailing conventions or rules about feelings.’⁴⁷ Such rules inform an individual’s cultural script, which operates as a framework guiding social interactions, and is influenced by a society’s norms, customs and traditions.⁴⁸ A cultural script essentially ‘provides a language and a system of meaning.’⁴⁹ As signposted by Matt, the conventions dictating emotional expression, and the language used for its expression, comprise the central core of the methodology employed for this investigation. Theories abound within the field of emotions history concerning emotional expression, but two of the most prominent are the Constructionist theory and the Universalist theory. The Constructionist approach contends that emotions are ‘malleable because [they are] constituted by society, culture, and esp.

⁴⁴ Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, “Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards,” *The American Historical Review* 90, no. 4 (Oct 1985): 813, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1858841>.

⁴⁵ Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2015), 57. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁴⁷ Susan J. Matt, “Recovering the Invisible: Methods for the Historical Study of the Emotions,” in *Doing Emotions History*, eds., Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2014), 44.

⁴⁸ Frank Furedi, *How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018), 15.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 15.

language, rather than pre-existing in an essentialist fashion.⁵⁰ Conversely, the Universalist theory argues for the ‘universal existence of phenomena or patterns in all cultures and all times. Often also associated with determinism, essentialism, hard-wiring, or an unchanging, basic, solid, and hard nature.’⁵¹ Both theories have merit on their own, but I adopt a perspective proffered by William Reddy which combines elements of both theories. Nicole Eustace succinctly describes Reddy’s hybrid theory as positing that ‘feelings are universal; it is their descriptors that vary across time and culture.’⁵² This philosophy shapes my analysis throughout, with particular attention paid to how emotion was understood within a late eighteenth-century context. For example, in the late eighteenth-century resentment was considered a socially acceptable and moderate form of anger.⁵³

Emotions history scholarship demonstrates the importance of a culture of sensibility for illustrating the wider emotional context of late eighteenth-century America. As the Revolution approached in the middle of the 1760s, concepts like sensibility became increasingly important within the upper echelons of American society. Sarah Knott has usefully described sensibility as consisting of a ‘naturally sensitive, briskly responsive, and thoroughly holistic self’ that ‘eschewed traditional dichotomies of reason and feeling, mind and body by means of sensation and perception.’⁵⁴ Essentially, rather than reason and emotion being in direct opposition, they were instead understood to be ‘necessarily entwined and bound together.’⁵⁵ She uses Philadelphia as a case study to explore the close connection between the sensible self and society that emerged in the late eighteenth century. According to Knott the sensible self was ‘simultaneously made and expressed in social interaction by sensations of sympathy and fellow feeling.’⁵⁶ She argues that the Patriots imbued the cause of independence with the rhetoric and morality of sensibility, transforming sensibility into a distinctly American construct by turning it ‘to overtly American – patriot, nationalist – ends in the political and cultural wars of independence and republic.’⁵⁷ Drawing attention to a ‘socially turned self’ she importantly describes the unifying and transformative potential of

⁵⁰ Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 307.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 307.

⁵² Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 11; William M. Reddy, “Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions,” *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (June 1997): 327-351.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/204622?seq=1>.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 197.

⁵⁴ Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009), 5.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 105.

social relations based around sympathetic ideals.⁵⁸ However, while demonstrating sensibility's galvanising potential, she alludes to its eventual breakdown in the partisan political atmosphere of the 1790s, with its lack of inclusiveness and ambiguity making it an inadequate 'basis of individual and social reform.'⁵⁹ Unlike Knott, I would place its testing and breakdown not in the 1790s, but in the years of the Revolution, as evidenced by the intense social and political upheaval that contributed to the upending of American society's emotional norms during this period.

As the conflict progressed it became clear that there was a divergence in the way that Loyalists and Patriots interpreted sensibility. At this time the possession of a perceptively sensible character held important social cache in American society, with implications for public displays of power. However, claims to refined and compassionate feelings were reserved for elite members of society, with 'the ability to bestow compassion...considered one of the most important forms of cultural capital.'⁶⁰ Many Loyalists conformed to this interpretation, believing that sensibility was something that belonged to the elite, as members of the lower classes were not capable of true sensibility. Patriots disagreed, espousing the notion that all people 'had the same propensity for both feeling and passion.'⁶¹ The pretext for such critique was highly political, as many elite Patriots concluded that refined feelings had little value in advancing their agenda. While some Patriots saw the political benefits of drawing on conservative notions of sensibility, a significant number felt it did not sufficiently suit their needs. As a result, ideas relating to sensibility began to shift, with many Patriots emphasising 'the power of popular passions,' arguing that all people 'could lay claim to roughly the same set of universal emotions,' and this belief helped to bind Patriots together emotionally.⁶²

A well-known event which occurred in 1780, involving British Major John Andre, helpfully illustrates the division in how Americans came to understand and apply notions of sensibility. Andre had been captured by the Patriots and found guilty of being a British spy, and the punishment for such an offence was death. As Andre awaited his fate many Patriots noted the dignified way, he conducted himself. As a result, when the sentence was carried out a considerable number of Patriot observers wept and grieved his death. From their perspective

⁵⁸ Ibid., 5.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 19.

⁶⁰ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 265.

⁶¹ Ibid., 263.

⁶² Ibid., 436.

such effusive displays comfortably fit within their developing ideas concerning sensibility. Loyalists, however, adhering to more established forms of emotional expression, viewed such an outpouring of emotion as disingenuous, arguing that their decision to execute Andre departed entirely from the dominant emotional principles of the wider culture of sensibility of the late eighteenth century.

Increasingly, it became evident to Loyalists that it was not just interpretations of sensibility with which they and Patriots disagreed, but rather emotional expression in general. Rigid boundaries dictated Loyalists emotional expression, underpinned by a deeply embedded class prejudice of elites against the lower orders. This contrasts with shifting Patriot understandings, in which they collapsed such class boundaries, believing that a reliance on genteel forms of emotion would not enable them to achieve their ends. Instead, they concluded that they had to brandish the ‘stronger passions of the people,’ and this belief was paramount in the development of Patriot ‘spirit’ which Eustace has aptly described as ‘a vehement brand of emotion that burnished the power of passion with the luster [*sic*] of classical virtue.’⁶³ That Loyalists found this emergent form of emotion disquieting is illustrated by the reaction of Salem born Loyalist Samuel Curwen, who reveals the consequences he believed this new form of Patriot emotion had for Loyalists, stating: ‘Intoxicated by success, under no fear of punishment, they give an unrestrained loose to their angry, malevolent passions, attribute to the worst of causes the opposition to their licentious, mobbish [*sic*] violation of all laws, human and divine.’⁶⁴ Loyalists concluded that the collapsing of social distinctions by Patriots was a strategy employed by the Patriot elite who, recognising the importance of cross-class cooperation, sought to broaden the appeal of independence to those further down the social ladder.

Patriots considered British treatment of the colonists to be ‘cruel and barbarous,’ with its ministers and agents attempting to curtail American freedoms.⁶⁵ From their perspective, this constituted a severely constricting emotional regime, and they refused to conform to its repressive standards. The concept of an emotional regime is important for demonstrating the different emotional norms that defined various groups during the conflict. An emotional regime has been described as ‘the set of normative emotions and the official rituals, practices,

⁶³ Ibid., 387.

⁶⁴ Samuel Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen, Judge of Admiralty, etc., An American Refugee In England from 1775 to 1784*, ed. George Atkinson Ward (New York: C. S. Francis, 1842), 385. <https://archive.org/details/curwensamuelj00curwrch/page/n9>.

⁶⁵ Gordon S. Wood, ed., *The American Revolution: Writings from the Pamphlet Debate 1773-1776* (New York: Library of America E-Book, 2015), 445.

and emotives that express and inculcate them.’⁶⁶ In this system ‘individuals are required to utter these emotives in appropriate circumstances, in the expectation that normative emotions will be enhanced and habituated.’⁶⁷ For Patriots, the emotional suffering that came from living under an emotional regime they disagreed with precipitated the formation of an incipient emotional refuge, as members of the community with shared feelings of outrage coalesced into a collective.⁶⁸ An emotional refuge is best understood as ‘a relationship, ritual, or organization...that provides safe release from prevailing emotional norms...which may shore up or threaten the existing emotional regime.’⁶⁹ What started for Patriots as an emotional refuge, occasioned by a British emotional regime they found constraining, became itself a distinct emotional regime, with a clear emotionology, guiding Patriot behaviour throughout the contest.

The unwillingness of Loyalists to subscribe to the ideology and principles of this emergent Patriot emotional regime made them targets for abuse. As the Patriot leadership supplanted British governance in the colonies Patriot spirit became the dominant emotional regime. This incipient emotional regime was strict in nature and saw a close alignment between emotional regime and political regime. Those within the colonies who refused to adhere emotionally to the ideology and ethos of this political system faced severe repercussions. Rob Boddice has shown that such emotive failure often meets with severe punishment by those belonging to the dominant emotional regime, with many experiencing physical violence or ostracism.⁷⁰ This was the case for Loyalists, who because of rejecting independence were physically accosted by local Patriot mobs and persecuted by others within their community. Barbara Rosenwein has observed that a dominant emotional regime, like that of the Patriots, can also be understood as an ascendant emotional community.⁷¹ She defines an emotional community as a group of people who ‘adhere to the same norms of emotional expression and value – or devalue – the same or related emotions.’⁷² Emotional communities were not just social in nature, but also textual, created and reinforced through shared ideologies, with the vocabularies used determining which emotions were given

⁶⁶ Barbara H. Rosenwein and Riccardo Cristiani, *What Is the History of Emotions?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018), 37.

⁶⁷ Boddice, *The History of Emotions*, 92.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 81.

⁶⁹ Rosenwein and Cristiani, *What Is the History of Emotions?* 37.

⁷⁰ Boddice, *The History of Emotions*, 90.

⁷¹ Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2007), 200.

⁷² Ibid., 2.

preferment.⁷³ Anger was a central feature of the Patriot vocabulary, with those who dissented from the ascendant emotional community being treated with derision. Suggestions of moderation by Loyalists were treated with contempt, as evidenced by a Patriot pamphleteer in 1774 who argued that ‘it is impossible not to suspect them [Loyalists] of sinister designs— They must mean, under the cloak of coolness and moderation, to check the vigour’ of the Patriot cause.⁷⁴ This intolerance explicates the strict nature of the Patriot emotional regime, which required ‘individuals to express normative emotions and to avoid deviant emotions.’⁷⁵

The inability, or outright refusal, of Loyalists to conform to the emotionology of this new regime, created a profound sense of emotional suffering. This resulted in the creation of what this thesis posits as an alternate emotional refuge, defined by a different set of emotional values, set against the nascent Patriot emotional regime. Their social and political marginalisation, however, precluded the full expression of this emotional refuge, with the looming possibility of Patriot reprisals, as we will see, largely confining its expression to textual modes, in which their diaries, letters, and other forms, functioned as spaces where they could articulate their feelings with varying degrees of emotional freedom. At the centre of this Loyalist emotional refuge was an emotional community which adhered to, and prioritised, similar standards of emotional expression.⁷⁶ This emotional refuge consisted of members of the Loyalist community who were just as ‘passionate as their adversaries’ about their beliefs, but were firmly convinced of the need for moderation and caution.⁷⁷ For many this belief in moderation was driven by a ‘deep ideological commitment and a sentimental attachment to the empire.’⁷⁸ This is evidenced by a pamphlet produced in 1774 by a Loyalist using the pseudonym A Freeman, advocating for ‘wisdom’ and ‘prudence’ and insisting that calmness and moderation was the correct course.⁷⁹ As with the Patriots before them, Loyalists employed print to delineate the emotional, philosophical, and ethical boundaries of their emotional refuge. These types of publications enabled Loyalists to outline their position, but whereas the Patriot emotional refuge rose to become dominant in the colonies, the Loyalists

⁷³ Ibid., 25.

⁷⁴ Anglus Americanus. Pseud. *To the citizens of New-York on the present critical situation of affairs. Were I neither a Philadelphian, a New-Yorker, a Bostonian, nor even a native of this continent, as a friend to the rights of mankind, I should interest myself in the fate* (New York, N.p. 1774), <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.1060090a/>.

⁷⁵ Boddice, *The History of Emotions*, 88.

⁷⁶ Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 200.

⁷⁷ Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides*, 14.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 14.

⁷⁹ *Advices from Philadelphia, dated July 23, 1774, "The Committee from the several counties of this Province, met in this City the 15th instant, and have been very busy ever since in framing instructions to the Assembly, with which they were permit* (New York, N.p. 1774). Pdf, <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.1060250a/>.

lacked political authority, meaning that they remained sidelined with diminished emotional freedom, leading to acute emotional suffering.

The Loyalists who comprise the core of this thesis experienced a range of emotions throughout the conflict, but the expression of those diverse emotions was strongly influenced by the chosen form in which they were expressed. As such, I use the clear interrelationship between form and expression in eighteenth-century writing to structure my thesis, with each chapter concentrating on a particular medium and emotional category. The use of different media forms as the basis for organising this thesis is consistent with other works concentrating on the American Revolution. Scholars well versed in the literature of the period will be familiar with the fact that many researchers have used examples of the media I address here as a basis for their investigations. For example, Bernard Bailyn in *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, uses Hutchinson's writings, including letters and diaries, as the foundation for his biography of the former governor of Massachusetts. Similarly, in *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750 -1776*, Bailyn used pamphlets as the central focus of his study of the politics and culture of American pamphleteering. More recently, Kacy Dowd Tillman in *Stripped and Script*, uses the epistolary writings of Loyalist women, to investigate female political identity and engagement during the conflict. Ruma Chopra in *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (2013) draws together different media forms, including letters, diaries, and memoirs, to explicate the complexity of Loyalist ideology and allegiance. Using media forms as a framing device for this study of Loyalist emotion accords with these other writings, which have demonstrated media to be a successful basis for studies of the Revolutionary Era. However, these earlier researchers did not use media forms to investigate the emotional lives of Loyalists, and this is where I differ, systematically surveying these different modes of expression for evidence of how Loyalists felt rather than just what they said.

This thesis draws on public documents such as memoirs, pamphlets, broadsides, and novels, to gain critical insight into the public emotional lives of Loyalists, while also using more private sources, including diaries and letters, which enable important access to their interior emotional worlds. In totality these varied and wide-ranging sources provide a comprehensive depiction of not only the emotional lives of Loyalists, but the emotional landscape of late eighteenth-century America more broadly. To gain insight into the Loyalists as an emotional community, or other emotional communities during the Revolutionary Era, I

draw on a plethora of different genres. Barbara Rosenwein has persuasively shown that specific texts are subject to certain conventions governing that genre, and those conventions are themselves historical constructs. Incorporating several different genres into this analysis avoids genre bias, ensuring that characteristics defining a particular genre are not assumed to be representative of a specific emotional community more generally.⁸⁰

The different forms utilised by Loyalists for emotional expression demonstrate the fundamental temporal differences associated with the record of Loyalist experiences. For example, diaries are imbued with a degree of immediacy due to their entries typically being made close to the time of experience, while memoirs typically record a person's recollection several years after the events described. This distinction is important, as it raises questions about the process of remembering, with clear implications for the expression of emotion within these works. Such differences bring into view questions concerning emotional authenticity. During this period, as Eustace points out, the 'social importance of emotional sincerity collided with the equally important social imperative of emotional regulation,' making authenticity of emotional expression problematic.⁸¹ At the dawn of the Revolution social interactions were conducted 'with all the boundaries of genteel politeness securely intact,' but challenges posed to emotional norms during the tumult complicate the discernment of genuine emotion from insincerity.⁸²

These societal codes and standards further hinder attempts at identifying authentic emotional expression, due to the constraining impact such conventions had on people's emotional lives, potentially obscuring a person's true feelings.⁸³ This is evident in the act of emotional concealment, which was a prominent feature of eighteenth-century emotional expression. Such conscious withholding of genuine emotion demonstrates the impact of emotional discourse in determining wider cultural and social life, with the injunction to conceal one's feelings likely motivated by a sense of conformity to a conservative, deferential class-bound social structure privileged by Loyalism. This type of concealment was more prevalent in the public sphere, while privately people often felt more at ease expressing themselves. We see this in a letter written by Loyalist wife, Christian Barnes, to close friend Elizabeth Smith on 14 October 1769. In the letter Barnes writes:

⁸⁰ Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 26-29.

⁸¹ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 97.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 97.

⁸³ Susan J. Matt, "Recovering the Invisible: Methods for the Historical Study of the Emotions," in *Doing Emotions History* ed. Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2014), 45.

Did you see nothing in my countenance that discovered my inward anguish, or have I (by coppeing [sic] your example) obtained some degree of Fortitude? My Passion struggled for a Vent, tho I only showed the concern of a common acquaintance. 'T is true I did not Dare to Approach you for fear my emotions should burst out into some indecencys [sic].⁸⁴

Here Barnes acknowledges her reluctance to express herself freely in public but clearly does not have the same reservations about expressing herself in private. Her decision to refrain from expressing her true feelings in public was likely the result of societal rules precluding such displays.⁸⁵ This shows how emotional expression is invariably culturally bound, with prescribed ideas pertaining to emotional expression circumscribing correct forms of acceptable emotional responses. As such, it is important to recognise that how Loyalists expressed themselves across different forms does not reflect true lived experience but rather provides insight into how they responded emotionally to a particular set of circumstances and different genres.

The thesis is divided into two separate but complimentary sections, which taken together reveal the full impact of Patriot persecution on the emotional lives of Loyalists. The first three chapters are based around life writings. While the term life writing is somewhat capacious, it is best understood as a 'kind of writing about the 'self' or the 'individual' that favours autobiography, but includes letters, diaries, journals, and...biography.'⁸⁶ Such a term is useful, even if it sometimes risks subsuming these diverse media under a single category and losing each forms distinctiveness. As the overall structure of my thesis indicates one of my goals is to correct this oversight, separately highlighting the unique qualities belonging to different forms of personal writing, including memoirs, diaries, and letters.

Recent research has explicated the entangled nature of life writing and the development of the self in the period of the American Revolution. As life writing increased in the eighteenth century, it coincided with a shift in societal perceptions of the self, which up until the middle of the eighteenth century had been defined largely in communal terms. By the late eighteenth century a more individualised sense of self had begun to crystallise.⁸⁷ Dror Wahrman describes this more autonomous self as 'a very particular understanding of personal

⁸⁴ James Murray, *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist*, ed. by Nina Moore Tiffany and Susan I. Lesley (Boston: n.p., 1901), 121, <https://archive.org/details/lettersofjamesm00murr/page/n157/mode/2up?q=barnes>.

⁸⁵ Rosemarie Zagari, *A Woman's Dilemma: Mercy Otis Warren and the American Revolution* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015), 72.

⁸⁶ Marlene Kadar, ed., *Essays on Life Writing: From Genre to Critical Practice* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 5. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁸⁷ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 12.

identity, one that presupposes an essential core of selfhood characterized by psychological depth, or interiority, which is the bedrock of unique, expressive individual identity.’⁸⁸ The evolution of the modern self fundamentally shaped expression, and this is evident in the richness and depth of feeling apparent in the forms of life writing explored here.

The first of my chapters investigates how Patriot political suppression and societal conventions saw diaries become an emotional refuge for Loyalists, with the form’s inherent privacy heightening the emotional authenticity of its contents. Melancholy is an important emotional register within their diaries, with its expression reflecting clear class and status dynamics. My analysis also discloses subtle gender differences in diary use, with the medium becoming a particularly crucial emotional outlet for Loyalist women. The second chapter focuses on the more public medium of memoir, with Loyalists generally utilising these autobiographical texts to either justify themselves, or to garner sympathy for their plight. Justification memoirs display a distinct sense of anger, while sympathy memoirs typically convey a writer’s distress to stimulate a sympathetic response. Such diverse emotional registers hint at different intended audiences, shaping both composition and emotional tenor. There are also, again, distinct gender differences in memoir use, with those composed by women generally lacking the anger of those written by men and instead show evidence of sadness. The third chapter explores Loyalist letters, here revealing the prevalence of fear and anxiety in their response to the Revolution. It is argued in this section of the thesis that the authenticity of Loyalist emotional expression in their letters was undermined by the possibility that they might be intercepted by the Patriot authorities. Doubts over emotional authenticity also suggest a degree of performance present in Loyalist letters. While the validity of discrete instances of emotion must therefore be questioned, it is nonetheless possible to glean insights into the writers’ emotional lives. For instance, while my analysis reveals that the circulation of stories of Patriot violence against Loyalists caused feelings of fear and anxiety to spread through their epistolary networks, letters written by Loyalists in the colonies show fear to be dominant, due to the writers close proximity to the action, while anxiety is foregrounded in letters written by Loyalists in exile, because of their distance from the conflict.

In contrast to the first section, the second section of this thesis, encompassing chapters four and five, moves away from life writing, and instead focuses on more public forms,

⁸⁸ Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), xi. ProQuest Ebook Central.

including print ephemera and novels. This also represents a shift away from social forms of writing to those of a more political nature. Chapter four examines Loyalist pamphlets and broadsheets, arguing that these forms helped to delimit and solidify the emotional registers of both the Loyalist and Patriot positions, while defining the emotional characteristics of the opposing side in disparaging terms. Both sides used print ephemera to engage in heated political exchanges, of which anger was a primary emotional register. Disagreements often centred on emotional etiquette and emotional authenticity, as both sides sought to present themselves as arbiters of correct emotional expression. The fifth and final chapter investigates late eighteenth and early nineteenth century novels set during the American Revolution. More specifically the chapter focuses on three primary genres of the period, namely the sentimental, the gothic, and the picaresque. Sympathy serves as a principal emotional register for this chapter, due to its centrality within early American fiction. It is contended, however, that the emphasis placed on sympathy, and promulgated initially by sentimental fiction, gives way to a darker emotional substratum, manifesting in the thematic and narrative choices present in early American gothic and picaresque literature. Feelings of unresolved grief and anger were a fundamental component of this shifting focus, reflecting the fractured state of post-war America, and raising important questions about the authenticity of sympathetic display. It is shown that such feelings contributed to the negative depiction of Loyalists in early American fiction, mirroring their mistreatment and marginalisation in America during and after the conflict. The two separate but complimentary sections that structure this thesis, clearly demonstrate the full extent of the disruption caused by the disorder of the American Revolution to Loyalist emotional norms across a diverse range of media forms.

Chapter 1

Suffering in Silence: How Diaries Functioned as an Emotional Refuge

On 21st July 1778 Grace Growden Galloway faced the grim reality of having her family's home in Philadelphia confiscated by the Patriot authorities but proclaimed that she 'wou'd not go out Unless by the force of a bayonet.'¹ Her defiant stand ultimately proved unsuccessful, with her home confiscated towards the end of that year. Like Growden Galloway many Loyalists encountered the confiscation of their family's property, with the majority also sharing her experience of social isolation, and diminished status. Additionally, across the American colonies Loyalists were physically accosted by violent crowds who persecuted anyone perceived as opposing the cause of American independence.² John Sherlock of Virginia, for example, was assaulted by a mob in 1775 and dragged to a nearby liberty pole and forced to sign a statement denouncing his actions after he had privately intimated that all rebels should be hanged. Such acts forced Loyalists to be cautious in how they expressed themselves, and 'the policing of private words and thought' heightened their vigilance, as many worried about the consequences of their writings falling into Patriot hands.³ It was in this tense atmosphere that Loyalists turned to their diaries as a private space for emotional expression.

In this capacity their diaries functioned as an emotional refuge, or a safe space for emotional expression, set apart from the constraining emotional environment created by the Patriot authorities. No episode illustrates the restrictions they were under more than the acquisition and publishing of a collection of letters belonging to the former Governor of Massachusetts, Thomas Hutchinson, by Patriots in 1773. Disclosing the contents of Hutchinson's letters demonstrated a willingness on the part of the Patriot authorities to make the private thoughts and feelings of Loyalists public knowledge. The serious ramifications that befell Hutchinson, both politically and personally, sent a message to other Loyalists about the jeopardy attached to their personal writings being intercepted by Patriots. This episode will be explored in more depth later, but for now it is important to note the inhibiting impact this event had on the emotional lives of Loyalists more generally. They became increasingly

¹ Grace Growden Galloway and Raymond C. Werner, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 55, no. 1 (January 1931): 41, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20086760>.

² Brendan McConville, *The Kings Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 294.

³ *Ibid.*, 294.

circumspect with their personal writing, causing their diaries to become crucial venues for emotional expression, due to this medium's inherent privacy. Such privacy bequeathed their contents with a high degree of emotional authenticity, both for readers today and at the time. The strain that Loyalists were under saw melancholy become a central feature of their interior emotional lives, as many struggled with the emotional demands posed by the conflict. In the late eighteenth-century melancholy was seen as an all-encompassing category for depressive emotions, and consequently this chapter uses this form of classification to describe the depressive emotions that afflicted Loyalists.⁴

The Loyalist diaries utilised for this chapter are exclusively from the upper classes of society, largely due to the paucity of surviving material from those lower down the social ladder. Adherence to traditional standards of emotional expression shaped how these higher status Loyalists perceived, and deployed, emotion in their diaries, with such class underpinnings becoming evident in their treatment and experience of melancholy. As will be further investigated later in the chapter, the observance of established emotional forms influenced how elite Loyalists encountered this complex emotional state. Alongside class, gender is also an important facet of an exploration of Loyalist diaries, as it explicates the different ways men and women utilised diaries for emotional expression. An analysis of Loyalist diaries enables the voices of Loyalist women to be heard, at a time when their use of other media forms was severely reduced. For example, Growden Galloway turned to her diary to lay bare her melancholy, writing on the 30th June 1779 that she saw 'Nothing but Misery before Me.'⁵ At this time, it was generally accepted that it was inappropriate for women to engage in the public or political spheres, curbing their engagement with more public forms of expression, such as pamphlets. It was felt by many that women who dared enter into political matters ran the risk of being described in overtly negative terms.⁶ This perception extended to women themselves, including Loyalist Anna Rawle, who considered women's entry into politics as unnatural and abhorrent, believing that it was antithetical to acceptable notions of

⁴ Allan Ingram et al., *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 3.

⁵ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 88.

⁶ Rosemarie Zagari, *A Woman's Dilemma: Mercy Otis Warren and the American Revolution* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015), 23-24.

femininity.⁷ Contravening these expected gender norms was thought to detrimentally impact a woman's feminine character.⁸

The decision of Loyalists to use their diaries to record their feelings came on the back of the broader development of the form during the eighteenth century which saw diaries become a suitable mode for self-expression. Throughout the early modern period the diary underwent considerable change, initially starting out as a way for people to document thoughts of a spiritual nature, with 'its roots in the spiritual autobiography that charts the progress of the pilgrim's soul toward God.'⁹ During the eighteenth century diary use drastically evolved, coming to be used for a number of purposes, with many diarists writing as family and community historians, ultimately leaving a valuable record of the societies in which they lived.¹⁰ Literacy rates gradually increased throughout the eighteenth century in colonial America, becoming widespread by the time of the Revolution.¹¹ As literacy rates grew, the art of diary keeping also increased, with people utilising the medium to record their feelings. As Margo Culley has asserted, the keeping of a diary 'always begins with a sense of self-worth, a conviction that one's individual experience is somehow *remarkable*.'¹²

For Loyalists, the tumultuous events of the Revolution were a catalyst, prompting many to begin recording their thoughts and feelings in diaries. It can be argued that the processing of difficult emotions contributed to the development of the diary as a medium for private emotional expression during this period. Growden Galloway, for example, exhibits this newfound focus in a disturbing diary entry from the 25th October 1778, in which she dreamed:

That the Vessel in which Mr G [Her husband Joseph Galloway] & My child sail'd in was sunk & that they ware [sic] all lost. I thought I wou'd Not believe it till Tommy Eddy told Me it was Not True: but that there was five or six Men of war taken or lost I then thought the News True & awoke in a fright. I went to sleep again & dream'd my dear child was going home with Me to Trevoise & that it rain'd & she was but poorly & by the Coachman's Not driving right we ware [sic] Obliged to walk to the carriage and the roads was full of water & she got wet in her feet & I was greatly distress'd but a poor fellow took her Up to Carry her to the Carriage but I was afraid

⁷ Kacy Dowd Tillman, *Stripped and Script: Loyalist Women Writers of the American Revolution* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press: 2019), 100-101.

⁸ Zagari, *A Woman's Dilemma*, 72.

⁹ Margo Culley, *A Day at a Time: The Diary Literature of American Women from 1764 to the Present* (New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 1985), 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 9-10.

¹¹ F.W. Grubb, "Growth of Literacy in Colonial America: Longitudinal Patterns, Economic Models, and the Direction of Future Research," *Social Science History* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1990): 475-476, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1171328>.

¹² Culley, *A Day at a Time*, 8.

she had taken her death before: we was afterward plagued about the Carriage & drove into a Narrow place & was in great danger. I awoke in great terror.¹³

This passage encapsulates the despair that Growden Galloway felt because of the turbulence of the American Revolution. As the wife of prominent Loyalist Joseph Galloway, she was on the verge of having her home and property confiscated by the Patriot authorities. Joseph felt strongly that America would be better off remaining closely tied to Great Britain, and opposed the proposition of American independence, clashing with senior Patriot figures like Sam Adams. Because of his views he was forced to seek refuge behind British lines in 1776, with his daughter Elizabeth accompanying him into exile. They both relocated to Great Britain in 1778 following the British evacuation of Philadelphia. Grace remained at her home in Philadelphia, hoping to be able to save her family's property.¹⁴ Thus, as she sat down to write in her diary in early November 1778, not only was she close to losing everything, but her husband and daughter had left the colonies altogether, leaving her feeling abandoned and isolated. She did not know then that she would never see her husband or daughter again, but the suspicion was surely there, as her dream indicates.

Loyalist diaries show that during the American Revolution both men and women used diaries as a means of self-expression. This is evident in a 1777 diary entry by Philadelphian lawyer and Loyalist James Allen, who wrote a moving passage about the mistreatment of fellow Loyalists:

Hard is the fate of those poor people, whose only crime is, thinking differently from their oppressors; for they are not charged with any overt act or intention. Not long ago, Dr Kearsley fell a Martyr to this species of oppression, having dyed [*sic*] at York; his offence was writing a passionate letter to England abusing the Americans long before the commencement of Independency [*sic*].¹⁵

These heartfelt words disclose Allen's clear concern for the welfare of fellow Loyalists, leading to a sense of despondency about the future wellbeing of the American colonies, in which he laments that he felt nothing but 'Melancholly [*sic*] at the state of this wretched Country.'¹⁶ Growden Galloway similarly infuses her diary with strong emotions, writing in 1778 about the pain of exile her daughter Elizabeth was facing. She records: 'What pain I feel

¹³ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 55.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 32-34.

¹⁵ James Allen, "Diary of James Allen, Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778 (Concluded)," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 4 (January 1886): 433, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084727>.

¹⁶ James Allen, "Diary of James Allen, Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778 (Continued)," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 3 (October 1885): 287, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084711>.

to think My dearest child Must be drove from her Native Country.’¹⁷ The diaries of both Growden Galloway and Allen share a common emotional thread, demonstrating a melancholic response to suffering and social upheaval. This reaffirms the notion that diaries acted as a space where difficult emotions could be explored by both men and women.

The prevalent expression of the experience of melancholy in Loyalist diaries makes it essential to succinctly define this multifaceted emotional state. Theories abounded about melancholy in the eighteenth century, giving it an almost indeterminate character, with the myriad explanations and interpretations of its influence ranging from incapacitating to pleasurable. This can be seen in many literary productions of the eighteenth century, as evidenced by the poetry of Anne Finch and Thomas Gray. Finch describes melancholy as being adrift on ‘a dead sea’ while Gray compares melancholy to being in a ‘good easy sort of state.’¹⁸ This positive version of melancholy offered by Gray is a commonality of eighteenth century poetry, with seemingly unsettling occurrences transformed by the ‘language of sublimity’ and the readers own imagination, into something pleasurable.¹⁹ While a more positive view of melancholy is routinely a feature of poetry from this period, this is less the case for diaries, as we see with those of the Loyalists. Their diaries show little evidence that they derived pleasure from their feelings of melancholy, making their experiences dissimilar to those outlined by Gray. Rather, their feelings were more consistent with those described by Finch, often denoting significant misery. But in both cases, we can see the nuanced nature of melancholy, and this helps to explain why the Loyalist experience of melancholy was largely transitory and episodic, a dynamic that reflects the structure of diaries themselves.

Loyalism, Melancholy and the Diary

The incalculable strain experienced by Loyalists during the conflict resulted in regular bouts of low mood, as evidenced by many forlorn diary entries across the period. In the late eighteenth century these types of depressive states were broadly categorised as melancholy; a term that possessed a breadth and diffusiveness not dissimilar to modern applications of the term depression and was commonly used to refer to ‘any state of sorrow, dejection, or

¹⁷ Galloway, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931),” 55.

¹⁸ Ingram et al., *Melancholy Experience*, 19.

¹⁹ Edward Cahill, *Liberty of the Imagination: Aesthetic Theory, Literary Form, and Politics in the Early United States* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 87. ProQuest Ebook Central.

despair.’²⁰ While the term was widely applied in the eighteenth century, circumscribing its precise boundaries has historically proved elusive. This ambiguity has led to varying explanations and designations regarding exactly what constitutes and defines melancholy. In 1755 Samuel Johnson attempted to distil the various meanings of melancholy into concise definitions in his dictionary titled *A Dictionary of the English Language*. In doing so he only reinforced the ambiguousness of melancholy, by referring to the multiplicity of meanings ascribed to the term. He firstly identifies melancholy as an essential component of humoral theory, describing it as a form of disease consisting of an excessive quantity of black bile, which had the propensity to manifest as either epilepsy or apoplexy.²¹ He next observes that melancholy could suggest a type of madness or ‘partial insanity, characterised by delusional thinking about some limited subject matter.’²² Finally, and most pertinently to this chapter, he described someone who was melancholic as possessing a ‘gloomy, pensive “temper” or habitual disposition.’²³ It is this sense of gloom that is prevalent in Loyalist diaries, with their emotional states according with Johnson’s description of ‘lowness of spirits; melancholy; a depression of mind.’²⁴

While defining melancholy has proved challenging, the form of this emotional state experienced by Loyalists can be seen as articulated by the English writer Robert Burton, whose 1621 book *The Anatomy of Melancholy* commanded a ‘small but widespread American audience’ in the eighteenth century.²⁵ In the *Anatomy* Burton described the defining features of melancholy using the terms relating to mood, cognition, and physical symptoms.²⁶ He delineated between momentary and chronic melancholy, determining chronic melancholy to be a serious condition, while momentary melancholy was something many people experienced in their lives. In his description of momentary melancholy, he observed:

In disposition, it is that transitory melancholy which goes and comes upon every small occasion of sorrow, need, sickness, trouble, fear, grief, passion, or perturbation

²⁰ Stanley W. Jackson, *Melancholia and Depression: From Hippocratic Times to Modern Times* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 5.

²¹ Jennifer Radden, ed., *The Nature of Melancholy: From Aristotle to Kristeva* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2000), 5. ProQuest Ebook Central.

²² *Ibid.*, 5.

²³ *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁴ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals* (London: J.F. and C. Rivington, 1785), 1:558, <https://publicdomainreview.org/collection/samuel-johnson-s-dictionary-of-the-english-language-1785>.

²⁵ Charles Heventhal Jr., “Robert Burton’s *Anatomy of Melancholy* in Early America,” *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 63, no. 3 (1969): 159, <https://doi.org/10.1086/pbsa.63.3.24301906>.

²⁶ Allan V. Horwitz and Jerome C. Wakefield, *The Loss of Sadness: How Psychiatry Transformed Normal Sorrow into Depressive Disorder* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 63.

of the mind, any manner of care, discontent, or thought, which causeth [sic] anguish, dullness, heaviness, and vexation of spirit.²⁷

It is this type of momentary, or transitory melancholy, that afflicted many Loyalists, with there being little indication that their melancholic feelings were deeply engrained or habitual in nature but were rather the result of deeply affecting events. This form of melancholic feeling was experienced by Samuel Curwen, for instance, who, because of his opposition to American independence, was subjected to constant harassment.²⁸ The escalating abuse became unbearable and because of this he ‘felt unable any longer to bear their undeserved reproaches and menaces hourly denounced against myself and others, I think it a duty I owe myself to withdraw for a while from the storm which to my foreboding mind is approaching.’²⁹ Consequently, he left America in May 1775 seeking exile in Great Britain, and would not return until after the conclusion of the war.³⁰ During his time in exile he experienced regular bouts of low mood, with fear of perpetual banishment a prevalent theme in the latter part of his diary, manifesting in profound feelings of despair. Such doubts weighed heavily on Curwen, who makes reference to the ‘distresses of mind’ he experienced on a regular basis.³¹ In 1777 he wrote in his diary that ‘nothing but the hopes of once more revisiting my native soil, enjoying my old friends within my own little domain, has hitherto supported my drooping courage.’³² At this time such a possibility seemed unlikely, and this proved a considerable emotional burden for Curwen to carry.

The typically episodic and transitory nature of Loyalist melancholy is reflected in their choice of medium with diaries perfectly suited to capture these momentary occurrences. The diary as a form operates as a ‘series of traces,’ presupposing ‘an intention to mark out a period of time by means of reference points.’³³ For figures like Curwen those traces or reference points are instances of melancholy, in which a diary’s chronological and systematic structure facilitates the identification of such occurrences. The inherently cumulative structure of a diary not only enables the detection of melancholic episodes but affords access to the

²⁷ Ibid., 63.

²⁸ Samuel Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen, Judge of Admiralty, etc. An American Refugee In England from 1775 to 1784*, ed. Geroge Atkinson Ward (New York: C. S. Francis, 1842), 254, <https://archive.org/details/curwensamuelj00curwrich/page/n9>.

²⁹ Ibid., 25.

³⁰ Ibid., 256.

³¹ Ibid., 96.

³² Ibid., 161.

³³ Philippe Lejeune and Catherine Bogaert, “The Practice of Writing a Diary,” in *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, ed. Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 28. ProQuest Ebook Central.

emotional lives of Loyalists between those momentary bouts of melancholy they experienced. For many Loyalists occurrences of low mood were generally followed by periods of appearing largely at ease, often due to an improvement in conditions, and the diary structure allows for recognition of such emotional vicissitudes.

These emotional variabilities are evident in the diary of Growden Galloway, evinced by her reaction to a vexatious report in November 1778 that her husband and daughter had been seized by the Patriot authorities. The story proved to be false, but the mere possibility resulted in an overwhelming sense of despair. She recorded in her diary on the 14th November 1778: 'My spirits very low & thought of Nothing but how I cou'd assist them...such thoughts sank Me very low.'³⁴ Growden Galloway promptly recovered from this sense of despondency, writing in her diary soon after that in the main she felt 'very happy.'³⁵ Yet this feeling of contentment was in turn short lived, as a fixation developed regarding the safety of her daughter, who was in the midst of crossing the Atlantic to Great Britain. While awaiting word of her daughters fate, she grew increasingly worried, writing in her diary on the 25th November: 'My dearest child...[I] have such dreadful thoughts of her being dead that I have No peace.'³⁶ She then continued: 'My child is dearer to me than all Nature & if she is not happy or anything shou'd happen to her I am lost... indeed I have no other wish in life than her welfare.'³⁷ Doubts over her daughter's safety profoundly disturbed Growden Galloway, leading her to concede that although 'My child comes often in My Mind...I am Afraid to think of her, it cuts to deep.'³⁸ Her daughter's safe arrival in Britain alleviated her sense of consternation, revivifying her mood as a result. However, this was not to last as word reached her that she had been denied the option of renting her former home following its seizure in August earlier that year. She had expected this request to be granted, so the refusal cut deeply, plunging her yet again into despair. Remarking on the episode in her diary on the 2nd December 1778 she admitted feeling more 'discompossed [*sic*] than usual,' conceding that her 'mind is greatly distress'd.'³⁹ As was usual, these feelings of low mood soon passed, with Growden Galloway then writing on the 6th December 1778 that she was 'in so Merry a humour that I cannot account for it...did nothing but laugh & sing to myself the whole

³⁴ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 58.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 59.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 61.

Day.⁴⁰ When battling feelings of dejection Growden Galloway displayed considerable fortitude, but these episodic occurrences of melancholic feeling continued throughout the conflict, as she constantly struggled with bouts of low mood.

These same mood fluctuations affected Samuel Curwen, who in his diary on October 9th 1782 reflected that:

This day, for sundry reasons, ought to be inserted in the very short list of *dies albi*, (Latin for white days) which I note, that on inspection I may refresh my memory with a pleasing recollection amidst the gloom, that from a constrained absence from my native country but too generally overspreads my grief-laden mind.⁴¹

The melancholy that engulfed the mind of Curwen is interspersed by these so called white or pleasant days, which served as respite from feelings of sadness which gripped his imagination, with his mood often affected by the vagaries and shifting fortunes of war and exile. The English physician Richard Mead had argued in 1751 that transitory melancholy, the type experienced by Loyalists, was to be dreaded, stating that ‘to be sad and dejected, to be daily terrified with vain imaginations’ brought unimaginable sorrow.⁴² In his description of melancholy Mead characterised it as a form of madness, referencing the eighteenth-century belief that mania and melancholy were closely related. He described mania as possessing an ‘audaciousness and fury,’ while melancholy brought ‘sadness and fear.’⁴³ He suggested that left untreated melancholy inevitably progressed towards mania, before the mania eventually receded, leaving the person feeling exceedingly despondent, a dynamic evident in Curwen’s description of his grief-laden mind.⁴⁴

Like Mead, others saw a close relationship between madness and melancholy, including Massachusetts clergyman, Cotton Mather.⁴⁵ In 1724 Mather wrote *The Angel of Bethesda*, a medical manual which paid particular attention to mental illness, including a detailed description of melancholy. Mather considered melancholy to be a serious affliction, observing that sufferers were ‘sad’ and ‘miserable,’ often experiencing a dullness of spirit.⁴⁶ Mather foregrounded spiritual explanations in understandings of melancholy, attributing some

⁴⁰ Ibid., 62.

⁴¹ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 354.

⁴² Richard Mead, *Medical Precepts and Cautions*, trans. Thomas Stack (London: J Brindley, 1751), 74.

⁴³ Ibid., 79.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 79.

⁴⁵ Cotton Mather, *The Angel of Bethesda* (Barre: Barre Publishers, 1972), 47, <https://archive.org/details/angelofbethesda0000unse/page/46/mode/2up?q=mead>.

⁴⁶ Heather H. Vacek, *Madness: American Protestant Responses to Mental Illness* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015), 12. ProQuest Ebook Central.

melancholic episodes to demonic forces.⁴⁷ This deference to religious thought is still reflected in the later writings of Curwen, who when ruminating in his diary about the future for Loyalists conceded that only ‘God knows what is for the best, but I fear our perpetual banishment from America is written in the book of fate.’⁴⁸ Whether spiritual or otherwise, Mather acknowledged the deep distress caused by melancholy, and understood it to be a prevalent affliction within society.⁴⁹ Observing the seriousness of the condition he wrote:

*Melancholicks [sic], do sufficiently Afflict themselves, and are Enough their own Tormentors. As if this present Evil World, would not Really afford Sad Things Enough, they create a World of imaginary ones, and by Mediating Terror, they make themselves as Miserable, as they could be from the most Real Miseries.*⁵⁰

In his description of melancholy Mather accentuates the irrational nature of melancholy, positioning feelings of sadness and despair at the forefront of symptoms experienced by sufferers. In doing so he displays a concurrence with other eighteenth century writers and theorists.

While delimiting the exact nature of melancholy has proved elusive, one of the central features of all definitions of melancholic states is the presence of fear and sadness.⁵¹ These are principal emotions identified in the writing of Growden Galloway. She, like many other Loyalists, was petrified of saying anything that could be viewed as inappropriate by Patriot authorities. Between 1774 and 1776 as Patriot control in the colonies tightened, both politically and socially, any form of dissent became fraught. Patriot use of imprisonment, banishment, confiscation, and the imposition of loyalty oaths created an unbearably tense atmosphere for Loyalists.⁵² For Growden Galloway this fearful preoccupation is evidenced by her account of a conversation she had with a local friend, Sally Zane. During Zane’s visit, Growden Galloway in jest asked whether she was a Patriot, and was surprised to learn that ‘she was a compleat [sic] on[e] by principle.’⁵³ Following this revelation Growden Galloway declared herself to be ‘Much Shocked at being so deceived’ and noted that ‘I am Not easey [sic] for fear I said something that may not be proper and am vexed.’⁵⁴ A week later she remained fearful that she may have said something that would get her in trouble with the

⁴⁷ Ibid., 20.

⁴⁸ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 161.

⁴⁹ Vacek, *Madness*, 12.

⁵⁰ Mather, *The Angel of Bethesda*, 133.

⁵¹ Jackson, *Melancholia and Depression*, 15.

⁵² Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 25.

⁵³ Galloway, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway, (1931),” 71.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 71-72.

Patriot authorities, stating in an entry on the 6th April 1779, that she had ‘awoke early in a fright. Dreamed I was going to be hang’d.’⁵⁵ Not only does this episode reflect the irrational nature of melancholy as described by Cotton Mather, but the fact that she was still terrified about the prospect of punishment a week after the visit of Zane demonstrates the firm grip that fear had on her during this time. Those feelings of dread, coupled with the torment she experienced regarding the welfare of her daughter, and the loss of her wealth and status, contributed significantly to feelings of sadness which often consumed her. The manifestation of this core emotion of melancholy, is elucidated by her admission on the 30th April 1779 that she felt ‘very low spirited’ because of her situation appearing ‘Dark & gloomy.’⁵⁶

Darkness and gloom are salient aspects of melancholy, but this type of negative attribution represented only one side of this complex emotional state, which also possessed inherently positive connotations in the eighteenth century. While it was widely acknowledged that melancholic emotions could be painful, it was also closely associated with notions of genius, and in other instances believed to have the potential to be valuable and productive.⁵⁷ It was thought that a melancholic person felt more deeply than others, such that ‘the depression and despair of mental disorder were followed by phases of enlivened mood, energy, and creativity.’⁵⁸ The debilitating effects of melancholy were understood in this way to be often followed by increased ‘application to any sort of Study or Labor.’⁵⁹ Growden Galloway exhibits this aspect of melancholy through her commitment to her diary, which she immersed herself in throughout 1778 and 1779. Even during times of ill health and profound stress the application she demonstrates to her diary writing was largely undiminished, only stopping between January and March 1779 due to a serious decline in her physical health.⁶⁰ This type of devotion also acted as a remedy to any sense of idleness, which was considered by American medical writers such as Benjamin Rush to be a contributing cause in feelings of melancholy.⁶¹ Growden Galloway often experienced periods of poor health, deteriorating to the point that she wrote in her diary on the 28th December 1778 that she feared ‘I shall not weather this Storm.’⁶² Physical ailments are prevalent within explanations of melancholy, and

⁵⁵ Ibid., 72.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 77.

⁵⁷ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 15.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 15.

⁵⁹ Herman Boerhaave, *Boerhaave’s Aphorisms: Concerning the Knowledge and Cure of Diseases* (London: Printed for B. Cowse, and W. Innys, 1715), 293.

<https://archive.org/details/b30539201/page/292/mode/2up?q=Application>

⁶⁰ Galloway, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway, (1931),” 66.

⁶¹ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 18.

⁶² Galloway, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway, (1931),” 65.

it is likely that the ill health she experienced was related to the mental distress she suffered due to the pain and anguish she regularly endured.⁶³ During this time she was often confined to her bed, but her diary offered an important outlet for her feelings.

The impact that such emotional turmoil had on the physical health of Loyalists is captured elsewhere in their diaries, which not only provide insight into the transitory nature of their melancholic episodes but also allows for the identification of the more chronic aspects of emotional suffering. This saw irregular and transitory bouts of despair, as well as progress into an all-consuming sense of misery and hopelessness, as many confronted the challenges of displacement and powerlessness in a Patriot dominated society. The linear nature of a diary makes it possible to track the decline in their mental and physical states, as periodic occurrences of melancholy developed into more persistent health issues. By the late eighteenth century it was widely accepted that unwelcome emotions had the potential to lead to bodily sickness, as frequently ‘people linked emotional distress to physical disease.’⁶⁴ Such a connection is not only evident in the diary of Growden Galloway, but is notable in other Loyalist diaries, including that of James Allen, who experienced significant health problems due to the emotional strain wrought by the conflict. Incessant persecution became intolerable for Allen, prompting him to write in his diary ‘misery begins to wear her ghastliest form; it is impossible to endure it.’⁶⁵ He observed the physical toll that resulted from persistent emotional distress, attributing his deteriorating physical health to ‘the uneasiness of my mind at the state of public affairs and the distress of my family.’⁶⁶ The ongoing weight of the conflict saw his health further decline until he finally succumbed, dying in September 1778. In the final months before his death, he despaired at the fragmenting of his family due to the conflict, writing: ‘Our family, linked together by the purest & most disinterested affection is totally unhinged.’⁶⁷ His anguish was compounded by an insistence that he take a loyalty oath, pledging his support to the Patriot cause, which out of fear he agreed to take. But his loyalty was still doubted, and he was called by ‘proclamation of the executive Council to surrender myself & stand a trial for high Treason.’⁶⁸ The emotional toll was too much to bear, as the

⁶³ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 120.

⁶⁴ Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 98.

⁶⁵ James Allen, “Diary of James Allen Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778 (Continued),” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 3 (October 1885): 295, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084711>.

⁶⁶ James Allen, “Diary of James Allen, Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778.” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 2 (July 1885): 190, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084701>.

⁶⁷ Allen, “Diary of James Allen, (Concluded),” 440.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 440.

conflict he had hoped would ‘be soon over’ dragged on, prolonging his and his families suffering.⁶⁹ Allen’s diary provides a chronicle of his emotional life, encapsulating both momentary and chronic occurrences of painful emotion, as it factors into his somatic life.

It was not only Patriot persecution that caused feelings of despair to spread through Loyalists ranks, but the reality of living under a Patriot emotional regime that subscribed to a different set of emotional standards. As already observed Loyalists adhered to traditional emotional standards of the culture of sensibility, while the newly dominant Patriot emotional regime was built on a foundation of passionate emotions. Not only did Loyalists have to contend with the constricting nature of this new Patriot emotional regime, but they also had to consider the broader emotional rules dictating the expression of melancholy. As such, these rules ‘set the terms for emotional life,’ and Loyalists were forced to manage their emotional lives within these various conventions.⁷⁰ However, their diaries acted as ‘a “place” where the prescriptions for emotional style [applied] only in their absence.’⁷¹ In this way Loyalists used their diaries as an emotional refuge away from the Patriot emotional regime, and other rules impinging on the expression of melancholy.

The Diary as an Emotional Refuge

Loyalist diaries provide vital evidence of a textual manifestation of an emotional refuge, defined by an emotional register set apart from the severely constricting emotional regime inculcated by the Patriots. Turning to their diaries in this capacity enabled Loyalists to explore their feelings of melancholy away from the social and political realities governing its expression. But it was not only Patriot repression that they needed to worry about, as for the social elite there were rigid boundaries impacting the expression of melancholy, within which publicly displaying one’s despair was considered improper.⁷² Due to such constraints Loyalists publicly suppressed such feelings, opting to project an image of contentedness and composure. This sort of facade has been described by G. Patrick O’Brien, in relation to

⁶⁹ Allen, “Diary of James Allen,” 185.

⁷⁰ Susan J. Matt, “Recovering the Invisible: Methods for the Historical Study of the Emotions,” in *Doing Emotions History*, ed. Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns (Champaign: University of Illinois, 2014), 45.

⁷¹ Rob Boddice, *The History of Emotions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 94.

⁷² Ingram, *Melancholy Experience*, 6.

Loyalist exiles in Nova Scotia, as ‘gilded misery,’ a form of concealment that acted as a ‘thin veil to cover the harsh realities’ of their lives in the midst of the conflict.⁷³

O’Brien draws on a comment made by Massachusetts born Mary Robie, who had fled to Canada with her family because of the upheaval caused by the Revolution. In her diary, kept between May 1783 and June 1784, Robie records closely watching others within the new Loyalist community in Nova Scotia, who she commends for putting on a brave face in the middle of so much wretchedness and gloom. But she cautions that ‘I never dare to draw back the curtain to look what is behind all this apparent happiness.’⁷⁴ She explains that if she were to look closer, she would likely see ‘only gilded misery.’⁷⁵ This suggests sadness as a commonality of the Loyalist experience. The act of emotional concealment will be dealt with in more depth in chapter three, but for now it is enough to note that the mask worn by those in exile was shared by Loyalists who remained in the colonies. Meanwhile, for those who remained, such concealment was not only due to the constraints governing elite emotional expression, but because of the added threat of Patriot reprisals for emotional non-conformity. Thus, with the public sphere off limits, their diaries became a vital venue for the expression of such difficult emotions.

Away from prying eyes Loyalists were free to observe the emotional standards to which they subscribed. Inside this private space aspects of how Loyalists understood emotional propriety are clear. Fundamental to this outlook were ideas relating to class, in which they felt that those lower down the social order should know their place. But they were constantly frustrated that the chaos of the Revolution had seemingly disrupted such norms. Nicole Eustace has affirmed the ‘centrality of hierarchical notions of rank and authority to eighteenth century understandings of society’ while recognising the fragility of such divisions.⁷⁶ Salem lawyer and Loyalist William Pynchon, alludes to such instability during the conflict, suggesting that ‘many, as in the year past, are grown and are growing less by elevation, like little statues placed on high pedestals, and yet these little lofty animals may do us a world of mischief.’⁷⁷ Growden Galloway concurred, blaming the rising influence of the

⁷³ G. Patrick O’Brien, “‘Gilded Misery:’ The Robie Women in Loyalist Exile and Repatriation, 1775-1792,” *Acadiensis* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2020): 50, <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/Acadiensis/article/view/31314>.

⁷⁴ Mary Robie, Diary Entry, 11 December 1783, Robie-Sewall Family Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 15.

⁷⁷ William Pynchon, *The Diary of William Pynchon of Salem: A Picture of Salem Life, Social and Political, A Century Ago*, ed. Fitch Edward Oliver (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890), 48. <https://archive.org/details/diaryofwilliampy00pync/page/2>.

lower sort for the confiscation of her family's property, contemptuously writing in her diary that 'they rob[b]ed Me & others to support a Set of Low people to the disgrace of their State.'⁷⁸ For Loyalists, the tenuous nature of class and status distinctions became increasingly clear, as they witnessed Patriots tear down the boundaries dictating emotional expression.⁷⁹

The changing emotional landscape was reinforced by the shifting dynamics governing emotional conduct in social life. For Growden Galloway an interaction with a local Patriot man made this evident, as he acted 'exceedingly cold & disrespectful.'⁸⁰ This was inconsistent with the emotional norms that dictated the genteel forms of expression to which she subscribed. Such slights created a sense of dislocation, which was exacerbated by feelings of social isolation, as she felt abandoned by her former acquaintances, writing in her diary on the 16th July 1778 that 'friendship is decreasing fast.'⁸¹ She accordingly grew increasingly resentful of those within her social milieu too, and contemplated dissociating herself from her circle 'unless these people will treat Me as My station in life requires.'⁸² The shift in the emotional tenor within her social network was made abundantly clear in the months leading up to the confiscation of her house. On 1st August 1778, Growden Galloway was on the verge of having her house seized by Patriot authorities and sought legal advice from the husband of a friend, who declined the meeting due to her Loyalist leanings. After the refusal Growden Galloway felt ostracised by her friends, sullenly writing in her diary that her 'heart was ready to burst at the mean figure I must cut in begging to go to another person's house and be told I cou'd not.'⁸³ As a result she 'was so Mortified & Troubled that I cou'd not sleep all Night.'⁸⁴ Such social affronts were an unfortunate reality, but her assertion that 'Everybody keeps Me at a distance' is somewhat misleading, as conducting social visits continued to be commonplace for her.⁸⁵ Thus, as Beverley Baxter has observed, the social isolation of which she regularly lamented appears somewhat 'irrational.'⁸⁶ This type of unreasoned thinking is prevalent among people suffering from melancholy, who as Allen Ingram and Stuart Sim point out have a 'tendency to imagine the worst in any given situation, to build, perhaps, upon

⁷⁸ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 70.

⁷⁹ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 387-388.

⁸⁰ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 41.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 75.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁸⁶ Beverley Baxter, "Grace Growden Galloway: Survival of a Loyalist, 1778-79," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 64, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345995>.

trifles – fancies, [or] the merest suggestions.’⁸⁷ It is certainly true that she did encounter some hostility from members of her social circle, but the extent of the alienation she alludes to can be more firmly connected to her distressed emotional state, as a result of the pain and anguish she experienced.

For Growden Galloway her diary became a haven at a time when her ability to freely express herself within her own social circle had become constrained. That she felt this limitation is evident in the plethora of references she makes in her diary concerning the need for self-censorship. For example, after a visit from a friend of her husbands whom she knew to be a Patriot, she worried that she ‘talked to Much as he is a wig,’ before observing ‘I shou’d have been More on My guard.’⁸⁸ The need for this degree of caution was likely a consequence of the increasing dominance of the Patriot emotional regime throughout the colonies. The strictures placed on Loyalists with respect to their emotional lives not only affected how they acted but also had the potential to impact how they interpreted their own feelings. Essentially, as Eustace suggests, if they ‘sought to ensure the propriety *and* sincerity of their emotional expression by inhibiting any feelings they could not comfortably voice, they could begin to lose the capacity to identify what their feelings actually were.’⁸⁹ However, while Eustace claims emotional suppression in the name of propriety prevented contemporaries from identifying their own feelings, my focus on diaries and letters shows that Loyalists still had an important literary medium for giving those feelings expression.

While I will focus on letters properly elsewhere in this dissertation what follows is an important, but brief, comparative point to deepen my analysis of diaries. The epistolary networks of the Loyalist elite had also traditionally acted as space where they could express themselves with a degree of openness, communicating with others who subscribed to a similar emotional register. These networks acted as a support system for Loyalists, functioning as a model of emotional community. This can be seen through analysis of the epistolary networks of Elizabeth Inman, when, for example, in a letter to Christian Barnes in 1775, Inman displays the strength of her emotional capacity through her concern for Barnes’ welfare during a time of strife. Inman had learned that the Patriot authorities had discovered that the Barnes family had been providing fellow Loyalists with aid and warned them that if further evidence of such behaviour surfaced that the repercussions would be severe. Upon learning this, Inman became

⁸⁷ Ingram, *Melancholy Experience*, 9.

⁸⁸ Galloway, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931),” 75.

⁸⁹ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 97.

gravely concerned for Barnes and pleaded with her to temporarily vacate her home and move in with her. She wrote: ‘The Governor I do not doubt will do everything in his power to protect [you], but he cannot prevent fears. Therefore, I beg the favor of you to fly to Cambridge, where I shall be happy to see you.’⁹⁰ This kind of statement reflects the centrality of sympathy within these emotional communities, as participants in the network provided support for the suffering and hardships of others. These networks will be explored further in chapter three, but for now we can see the vital role these networks played in offering a Loyalist emotional refuge.

While letter writing enabled a degree of emotional support for Loyalists, their diaries provided a more private emotional outlet, acting as a mechanism for dealing with the powerlessness they subsequently felt in their lives.⁹¹ As we will see, this was particularly important for Loyalist women suffering from melancholy because of societal rules restricting its public expression. While both Loyalist men and women remained in the colonies during the conflict, the situation was particularly precarious for Loyalist women, many of whom stayed to protect and secure their families property after their husbands or fathers had gone into exile or been arrested by the Patriot authorities.⁹² These women were often ostracised by their local communities, creating a strong sense of loneliness and despair. Mary Beth Norton has delineated the emotional toll this wrought, observing that ‘evidence of extreme mental stress permeates’ their writings.⁹³ But as will become evident, there were also clear gender differences in how melancholy was understood, with respect to intensity, authenticity, and susceptibility to the condition. The following section investigates the perception of melancholy, showing how both men and women were affected by wider interpretations of this emotional state.

Gender and Melancholy

The emotional refuge afforded by their diaries was particularly important for Loyalist women suffering from melancholy due to societal perceptions of the condition. In the eighteenth

⁹⁰ James Murray, *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist*, ed. Nina Moore Tiffany and Susan I. Lesley (Boston, 1901), 181-182, <https://archive.org/details/lettersofjamesm00murr/page/n157/mode/2up?q=barnes>.

⁹¹ Steven E. Kagle and Lorenza Gramegna, “Rewriting Her Life: Fictionalization and the Use of Fictional Models in Early American Women’s Diaries,” in *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women’s Diaries*, ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia Anne Huffs (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 42-43.

⁹² Chopra, *Choosing Sides*, 46.

⁹³ Mary Beth Norton, “Eighteenth-Century American Women in Peace and War: The Case of the Loyalists,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 1976): 403, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1921540>.

century people presenting as melancholic were often mocked, and throughout the century derision remained a ‘powerful response to melancholy.’⁹⁴ This negative reaction was in part due to what people viewed as ‘counterfeit’ melancholy, in which people feigned feelings of melancholy to gain attention.⁹⁵ Counterfeit melancholy was largely associated with the female social elite, with depressive emotions supposedly ‘used for their own ends and acknowledged by their "Lordly" husbands only to humor [sic] them.’⁹⁶ This association with the upper echelons is suggestive of an emerging class bias concerning perceptions of melancholy, which Robert Burton had already alluded to in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. As a consequence melancholy became ‘a sign of refinement, a fashionable condition to be afflicted by, and was thus embraced by the middle and upper classes.’⁹⁷ Precisely because it had become a somewhat fashionable affectation, sceptical attitudes to melancholic displays were common, raising the possibility that any woman presenting as melancholic could be treated with scorn.⁹⁸ Alexander Pope’s satirical 1751 poem *The Rape of the Lock* neatly illustrates the contempt that existed towards female sufferers of melancholy in eighteenth century society, as he disparagingly writes:

There *Affectation*, with a sickly mein [sic],
 Shews in her cheek the roses of eighteen,
 Practis’d to lisp, and hang the head aside,
 Faints into airs, and languishes with pride,
 On the rich quilt sinks the becoming woe,
 Wrapt [sic] in a gown for sickness and for show,
 The fair ones feel such maladies as these,
 When each new night-dress gives a new disease.⁹⁹

Such a dismissive view of melancholy highlights the complexities of this emotional state, in which an awareness of the potentially serious nature of the affliction such as that I have already outlined clashed with notions of disingenuous episodes of melancholy.

Loyalist women, like Growden Galloway, were not only forced to contend with the distinctly negative public perception of melancholy, but the isolation many felt due to being excluded socially, which saw their diaries take on an increasing importance as a medium of self-expression. Growden Galloway lost everything because of her and her family’s Loyalist

⁹⁴ Ingram, *Melancholy Experience*, 6.

⁹⁵ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 169.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 168.

⁹⁷ Ingram, *Melancholy Experience*, 19.

⁹⁸ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 168.

⁹⁹ Alexander Pope, *The Rape of the Lock: An Heroi-Comical Poem in Five Canto's* (Edinburgh: James Reid Leith, 1751), 19-20.

leanings, but from her perspective the worst part was the damage caused to her social standing in the community. Coming from a well-respected Maryland family she had been accustomed to a high standard of living, but by the end of 1778 the life she once knew had gone. In a 1778 diary entry she laments her loss of social status, describing walking home one evening and encountering a horse and carriage she had previously owned, which had been seized by the Patriot authorities. When reflecting on the episode later in her diary she despondently questions what her daughter ‘wou’d say to see her Mamma walking 5 squares in the rain at Night like a common Woman.’¹⁰⁰ After recounting the upsetting scene she tries to maintain some hope that ‘all will be right yet & I shall ride when these Harpies walk as they Use to do before they Plunder’d me & others.’¹⁰¹ She, like many other Loyalists, blamed the lower section of society for her diminished social standing. Seeing her former carriage, which in her mind now belonged to a member of the lower sort, was a reminder of this loss and that greatly embittered her.

While Growden Galloway’s feelings of melancholy provide insight into the impact of the Revolution on the mental well-being of Loyalist women, this represents just one half of the Loyalist experience. Many Loyalist men were also stricken with this difficult emotional affliction, including Thomas Vernon, who was overcome with despair after being placed under house arrest in Glocester, Rhode Island in 1776. Vernon was from Newport, Rhode Island, and had a very successful career, becoming Postmaster of Newport in 1745, a position he held until 1775. Vernon declined to take a loyalty test put forward to him by the local assembly and was subsequently judged to be inimical to the Patriot cause. As a result of his refusal, it was resolved by the assembly that he should be placed under house arrest where he remained for four months from June until October 1776.¹⁰² In his diary he chronicled the emotional turmoil he experienced because of the four-month period he spent in captivity. At a time when he was physically prevented from entering the public sphere, his diary takes on increasing importance as a mode of self-expression, offering Vernon a way of expressing himself privately when other more public forms were closed off. In his diary he articulates the uneasiness he felt, writing on 20th September 1776 that ‘my mind is greatly agitated with regard to my situation.’¹⁰³ The suffering experienced by Vernon would not have appeared

¹⁰⁰ Galloway, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931),” 57.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 61.

¹⁰² Thomas Vernon, *The Diary of Thomas Vernon: a loyalist, banished from Newport by the Rhode Island general assembly in 1776*, ed. Sidney S. Rider (Providence: Sidney S. Rider, 1881), 1-2.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 109.

atypical, with melancholy considered to be a state regularly experienced by men in eighteenth century society.

Men were frequent sufferers of the condition, and in fact were considered more susceptible to melancholy than women. However, it was thought that women who did suffer from this infirmity generally felt it more severely than men.¹⁰⁴ This was because of a common understanding which assumed that women felt emotions more intensely than men. At this time ‘the affective life of emotions, moods, and feelings was deemed unruly, unreliable, capricious, and beyond voluntary control; it was irrational and disordered, it was associated with the bodily, with subjectivity, and with the feminine.’¹⁰⁵ Eighteenth century writer and women’s rights advocate Mary Wollstonecraft in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: With Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects* (1796) observed that it was considered ‘masculine for a woman to be melancholy.’¹⁰⁶ Yet while she acknowledges that melancholy has largely masculine overtones, she outright rejects this attribution, and insists that women are equally capable of experiencing melancholy.¹⁰⁷ This assertion is supported by the emotional tenor of Growden Galloway’s diary, as she regularly presents as a woman suffering from this affliction.

Her melancholy represents the blurring of male and female traits, which was part of a much broader pattern of gender blurring that transpired.¹⁰⁸ This is demonstrated by Loyalist women occupying traditionally male roles within the household following their husband’s exile, as evidenced by Growden Galloway who took charge of her family’s estate after her husband Joseph Galloway went into exile in England.¹⁰⁹ Thrust into an overtly masculine role within her household, she felt overwhelmed, confiding in her dairy that ‘Melancholy & dismay reigns in my soul.’¹¹⁰ In these trying circumstances she sought to publicly project an image of self-assurance to hide her suffering. In doing so, her emotional behaviour echoes the gilded misery experienced by Marie Robie, concealing true feelings behind a composed

¹⁰⁴ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 39.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 40.

¹⁰⁶ Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: With Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects* (Dublin: J. Stockdale, 1793), 36.

¹⁰⁷ Radden, *The Nature of Melancholy*, 40.

¹⁰⁸ Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty’s Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980), 225.

¹⁰⁹ Mark E. Kann, *A Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 10. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹¹⁰ Grace Growden Galloway and Raymond C. Werner, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway, Kept at Philadelphia, July 1, to September 30, 1779,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 58, no. 2 (1934): 180. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20086864.pdf>.

exterior. While publicly attempting not to project feelings of melancholy this had clear repercussions for her overall emotional propriety, as evidenced by a diary entry she made on the 20th April 1779. She describes how during a visit to a friend's house she stood up in front of everyone and 'laughed at the whole wig party,' defiantly proclaiming:

I was the happiest [*sic*] women in twown [town] for I had been strip[p]ed and Turn'd out of Doors yet I was still the same & must be Joseph Galloways Wife and Lawrence Growdons daughter & that it was Not in their power to humble Me for I shou'd be Grace Growdon Galloway to the last & as I had now suffer'd all that they can inflict Upon Me I shou'd now act as on the rock to look on the wrack [*sic*] of others & see them tost [*sic*] by the Tempestuous billows while I was safe ashore.¹¹¹

Through this type of outburst, she sought to present a veneer of confidence to convince people that she was unaffected by the hardships she had endured. However, concealing her despair in this manner only served to contravene the broader rules of acceptable female conduct, which dictated that women should behave in a manner which upholds their 'distinctive feminine traits, such as delicacy, modesty, and restraint.'¹¹² Aware she had overstepped the mark Growden Galloway admitted afterwards that she was 'sorry I spoke so free.'¹¹³ This episode suggests that the inner turmoil she had been wrestling with had become unbearable, prompting the emotional flareup. While her diary provided a refuge for emotional expression, the fact that this was the only place she could truly express herself was clearly frustrating.

Essentially, for Loyalist women like Growden Galloway 'their diaries became the only world in which they could fully live.'¹¹⁴ But Loyalist women were not alone in this regard, as the political climate of the Revolution meant that this was also the reality for Loyalist men. However, this imbues the diaries of both Loyalist men and women with an increased sense of emotional sincerity, supporting the notion of a diary's inherent privacy lending the form a higher degree of emotional authenticity than other modes of personal expression.¹¹⁵ Thus, we need to consider the intersection between diaries and developing notions of privacy in the eighteenth century, showing the impact this had on Loyalist emotional expression. When investigating a diary's privacy, it is important to assess its distinctive traits, and how they helped make a diary a safe space for Loyalists.

¹¹¹ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 75-76.

¹¹² Zagarri, *A Woman's Dilemma*, 72.

¹¹³ Galloway, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway (1931)," 76.

¹¹⁴ Thomas Mallon, *A Book of One's Own: People and Their Diaries* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1984), xvii.

¹¹⁵ Marilyn Ferris Motz, "Sharing Secrets in Nineteenth-Century America," in *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, ed. Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 266. ProQuest Ebook Central.

The Significance of Audience

The intended audience of a diary carries implications for how and why it was written. The ostensible privacy of a diary was built on notions of personal intimacy that developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with the diary functioning as part of a writer's 'private sphere.'¹¹⁶ At the outset of the conflict an increase in print production had facilitated an upturn in public textual discourse, contributing to the development of the public sphere in the eighteenth century, which as Jurgen Habermas has shown, was characterised by 'the emergence of an independent political space for critical public opinion formation.'¹¹⁷ Increasing access to print resources aided in the development of a set of institutions which Habermas refers to as the 'bourgeois public sphere,' marked by the rise of a democratic press, and the proliferation in publishing enterprises and newspapers, which led to the advent of a separate 'public sphere' defined by political discourse and debate.¹¹⁸ This saw a growing separation between the private and public spheres, with the private sphere coming to represent a more personal space. The public sphere will be investigated further in chapter four in relation to Revolutionary Era broadsides and pamphlets, but it is necessary here to note the separation of these spheres and its relevance for more private forms of expression.

Diaries in the eighteenth century were not usually meant for a wide audience, but that is not to say that they were not intended to be read by others, as many were shared with the writers close circle.¹¹⁹ Their mutual exchange within a tight-knit collective, mirrors the exchange of letters within a chosen epistolary network, with their diary's contents transmitted and shared between nodes within the group. Nevertheless, the diary as a medium was an essentially private mode of expression, enabling the writer to control access to their innermost thoughts and feelings.¹²⁰ It has been argued by Lynn Z. Bloom that truly private diaries are typically 'those bare-bones works written primarily to keep records of receipts and expenditures, the weather, visits to and from neighbours, or public occurrences of both the

¹¹⁶ Julie Rak, "The Diary Among Other Forms of Life Writing," in *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, ed. Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 60. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹¹⁷ David Ingram, *Habermas: Introduction and Analysis* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2010), 153. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹¹⁸ Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1990), x.

¹¹⁹ Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos, introduction to *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 3. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹²⁰ Motz, "Sharing Secrets," 262.

institutional and the sensational sort.’¹²¹ For Thatcher Ulrich too, an exclusively private diary has a predominantly chronological structure, and exhibits ‘no foreshadowing and scarcely a retrospective glance.’¹²² The diaries of Loyalists contain many of these characteristics, imbuing them with a sense of privacy. For example, the diary of Thomas Vernon is filled with mundane details, such as the food he ate and the walks he took.¹²³ During the Revolutionary Era, however, many private diaries, including Vernon’s, begin showing evidence of more descriptive and emotional entries.¹²⁴ Other Loyalist diaries, including those of Thomas Hutchinson and Grace Growden Galloway, more fully reveal evidence of this shift as diaries evolved into modes of emotional expression, with the unrest of the Revolution accelerating this process in America. In this context Loyalist diaries acted ‘as a way of maintaining private and confidential space during times that threaten one’s physical and psychological survival.’¹²⁵

While such privacy lends a diary a high degree of emotional sincerity the process of selectivity unavoidably impacts on its level of authenticity. Annie Dillard has described how such a process of selectivity works, explaining that ‘often what is recorded can replace the truth of what happened, making it unlikely that diary entries accurately reflect someone’s true experience.’¹²⁶ Steven E. Kagle and Lorenza Gramegna concur, arguing that the events depicted in life writing are almost certainly coloured by the writers own perceptions.¹²⁷ Thomas Hutchinson’s account of the Patriot disclosure of a collection of his private letters explicates the problems associated with the process of selectivity. The bias present in the account he gives in his diary and letters makes its reliability questionable, as his memory will have been influenced ‘by the subjective impressions and conceptions of the moment.’¹²⁸ However, while the natural process of selectivity raises questions about the accuracy of his story, it is his emotional responses that are most important here, and the release of his letters severely impacted Hutchinson emotionally.

¹²¹ Lynn Z. Bloom, “‘I Write for Myself and Strangers’: Private Diaries as Public Documents,” in *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women’s Diaries*, ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia Anne Huff (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 25.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 26.

¹²³ Vernon, *The Diary of Thomas Vernon*, 6.

¹²⁴ Bloom, “‘I Write for Myself and Strangers,’” 33.

¹²⁵ Batsheva, *The Diary*, 5.

¹²⁶ Annie Dillard, “To Fashion a Text,” in *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir*, ed. William Zinsser (Boston: Cengage Learning, Inc, 1998), 71.

¹²⁷ Kagle, “Rewriting Her Life,” 38-39.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 39.

In the months prior to their release, Hutchinson was anxious and plagued by the ‘fear that his enemies would attempt to destroy him by some revelation of his private thoughts.’¹²⁹ It would turn out that Hutchinson’s fears were well founded as the Patriots managed to surreptitiously procure several of his letters and proceeded to then publish them to discredit him. In the process of releasing Hutchinson’s letters, which among other things touched on issues relating to colonial rights and governance, the Patriots demonstrated their willingness to take an individual’s private thoughts and make them public. The letters affair witnessed the convergence of multiple modes of expression, as the letters themselves took on a life beyond their intended private audience, being reprinted in newspapers, pamphlets and broadsides, expanding their readership, and impacting public perception. In contrast, Hutchinson’s diary provides insight into his thoughts on the matter that remained private, enabling the reader to ascertain the emotional fallout of the episode.

Hutchinson had been appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Massachusetts in 1758, and following a two-year period as acting Governor, he assumed the Governorship permanently in 1771. Earlier in his career he had been controversially appointed as Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Superior Court of Judicature, and this decision brought him into conflict with future Patriot leaders and socio-political groups including the Sons of Liberty, who emerged following the Stamp Act Crisis of 1765, as local coteries along the North American seaboard knitted together into a larger confederation of associated groups.¹³⁰ Initially they had conducted themselves in a genteel manner, and their protests were generally peaceable, but over time their actions became increasingly militant, leading to them being referred to by Loyalists as the ‘handmaidens of tyranny.’¹³¹ These Patriot groups questioned many decisions made by Hutchinson, and criticised his family for monopolising positions of power, accusing him of placing their interests above that of the colonies. He was denounced for his involvement in the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765, and heavily criticised for his role in significant events such as the Boston Massacre in 1770.¹³² It was in this atmosphere of suspicion and paranoia that the episode relating to the disclosure of his private epistles took centre stage.

¹²⁹ Bernard Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974), 221.

¹³⁰ Jane Kamensky, *A Revolution in Color: The World of John Singleton Copley* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2016), 116.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 207.

¹³² Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, 9-30.

The whole affair began on 2nd June 1773 with a revelation made by Samuel Adams during a closed session of the Massachusetts Assembly, indicating that a collection of letters had been obtained that once released would prove to be incendiary and revelatory. A short time after this thirteen letters written principally to Thomas Whately at the end of the 1760s by Hutchinson and four relatives and friends were published as a pamphlet.¹³³ In the pamphlet readers were informed that the contents would reveal what the source of much of the confusion was between the American colonies and the British government; namely that Hutchinson was a principal agent in acting against the liberties of the American colonies. Hutchinson insisted that the claims made in the pamphlet were entirely erroneous, but the episode proved to be pivotal, turning many people against him, and reinforcing the Patriot assertion that Hutchinson did not have America's best interests at heart.¹³⁴ The consequences of the release of his private letters had a lasting impression on Hutchinson, profoundly and irrevocably altering the course of his life.

The irreparable damage caused by the disclosure of Hutchinson's letters was something he would obsess over in his diary. In an ultimately fruitless pursuit, he embarked on a lengthy investigation to try to establish who had been responsible for the release. The reports and information he obtained proved unreliable and unverifiable making it impossible for him to determine precisely what had occurred. His fixation betrays the emotional impact of the affair, resulting in episodes of momentary melancholy, or as Bernard Bailyn put it, regular 'fits of depression.'¹³⁵ The periods of low mood Hutchinson experienced caused him to long 'for escape and for the peace of private life.'¹³⁶ Of all the difficulties he faced it was exile which hurt most, as he felt 'a prisoner in England, "with my heart and affections in New England" he...utterly sunk into despair.'¹³⁷ The leading eighteenth-century physician Benjamin Rush described despair as the 'most awful symptom' of melancholy, and for Hutchinson, being afflicted with such lowness of spirits was undoubtedly a struggle.¹³⁸ His despondency was at times intolerable, prompting frequent rumination over the events that had forced him to leave America and seek sanctuary in Great Britain. He often worried he would not see his home again, writing: 'I see my contemporaries dying away so fast, that I am more

¹³³ Ibid., 223.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 223.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 138.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 138.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 333.

¹³⁸ Benjamin Rush, *Medical Inquiries and Observations, Upon the Diseases of the Mind* (Philadelphia: Kimber & Richardson, 1812), 95. <https://archive.org/details/DKC0034/page/n91/mode/2up?q=despair>.

anxious than ever to hasten home, lest I should die here, which I dread above all things.’¹³⁹ Sadly for Hutchinson, he would indeed never return to the shores of America, dying in Britain on 3rd June 1780.

The significance for other Loyalists of the Hutchinson letters affair was that it sent a message that they had to be cautious regarding what they wrote in case it fell into Patriot hands. Early in the Revolution, the Patriots had improved their communication networks, realising that if harnessed properly they could be an effective tool for spreading information.¹⁴⁰ These networks will be explored more fully in chapter three, but here it is important to emphasise how they allowed Patriots to widely distribute Hutchinson’s letters, taking ‘innocuous private reflections’ on colonial governance and transforming them into ‘a public liability when retransmitted and propagated across correspondence networks.’¹⁴¹ As Russ Castronovo states, in their dispersion:

Governor Hutchinson’s handwritten epistles changed form – and meaning – when they were typeset in newspaper columns and later circulated as a pamphlet. In the eyes of American radicals, the publication of the governor’s correspondence revealed evidence of the attack on colonial liberties that British authorities had been covertly planning all along.¹⁴²

The contents of Hutchinson’s letters were not overly inflammatory, but it was their dissemination which truly mattered.¹⁴³ The ability of the Patriots to effectively use their information networks to denigrate a leading Loyalist figure, told Loyalists that committing even semi-private thoughts to paper was dangerous. This saw a conspicuous reduction in open communication between Loyalists, constraining the space available for sincere expression. The privacy of a diary provided a refuge, but nonetheless they still needed to be mindful of their diary not falling into Patriot hands, as the Hutchinson affair made the likely consequences all too clear.

¹³⁹ Peter Orlando Hutchinson, *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson: Captain-General and Governor-In-Chief of His Late Majesty’s Province of Massachusetts Bay in North America* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886), 174.

¹⁴⁰ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty: Communication Innovation & the American Revolution* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013), 17.

¹⁴¹ Russ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776: Secrets, Leaks, and Revolutionary Communications in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 45.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 45.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 46.

As we have seen in this chapter the American Revolution witnessed the use of diaries to document Loyalists' feelings, with the upheaval eliciting strong emotional responses. This hastened a shift towards an internalised sense of emotional self-exploration, reflective of the burgeoning sense of an individual self which developed towards the end of the eighteenth century. The diaries of Loyalists lay bare their innermost feelings, with these intrinsically private writings suggesting a pervasive sense of despair, understood as melancholy in the emotional discourses of the eighteenth-century Atlantic world. The type of melancholy that afflicted the diarists studied here is best understood as momentary melancholy, with instances of low mood triggered by a downturn in their individual circumstances, underpinned by profound feelings of fear and sadness. The chronological and systematic structure of the diary form facilitates the identification of such episodic occurrences, revealing their frequency and intensity.

Loyalist diaries reveal an intensely personal form of expression, unencumbered by the constraining forces that impeded their ability to freely emote. Their emotional lives were affected by a myriad of factors, including the standards governing emotional behaviour, and the repressiveness of the Patriot regime. While such restrictions caused considerable suffering, their diaries provided an emotional outlet. In this context diaries functioned as a sanctuary, serving as a textual demonstration of a Loyalist emotional refuge, defined by an adherence to traditional forms of emotional expression. Such a refuge proved especially vital for Loyalist women who remained in the colonies during the contest, embracing the diary as an escape from the daily stresses and hardships they encountered, including social exclusion, financial ruin, and persecution. Their diaries enabled Loyalist women to speak for themselves, allowing for the retrieval of the private emotional lives of this often marginalised, but significant section of society.

The implicitly private nature of the diary form imbues it with a high level of emotional authenticity, albeit impacted by the process of selectivity evident in its composition. This had the potential to skew the emotional tenor of the writing, as evidenced through the diary of Thomas Hutchinson, and his fixation on the release of a collection of his letters. The insight they give regarding the inner emotional lives of Loyalists represents a single facet of a much broader emotional community. Diaries can be distinguished as a personal and authentic mode, conducive to inherently private emotions such as melancholy, while other forms of emotional expression lent themselves to different media. This is exemplified by the more public modes

of expression chosen by Loyalists to convey anger, including memoirs, which are the focus of the following chapter

Chapter 2

A Desire to Explain: How Sympathy and Anger Shaped Loyalist Memoirs

Early in his 1781 memoir, *Origin and Progress of the American Revolution*, Loyalist and former Chief Justice of Massachusetts, Peter Oliver, contended that:

There is a publick [sic] Confidence due from us to our Legislators. If they err, for to err is human, & they err ignorantly, all just Allowances ought be given to them, untill [sic] we can convince them, by Reason, of what is right. If they err wilfully, it will soon be in our Power to remove them; but it is not probable, that so large a Body of the Community shou'd unite in pulling down the Building, because they must know, that on the Destruction of it, they, like Samson, must be buried in its Ruins.¹

Oliver found the American Revolution unfathomable, and as his comments suggest, he did not initially believe that the American people would be foolish enough to rebel against the British Government. For Oliver, ‘the sudden Transition made, from Obedience to Rebellion, [was] but to gratifye [sic] the Pride, Ambition & Resentment, of a few abandoned Demagogues, who were lost to all Sense of Shame & of Humanity.’² He felt the American public had been deceived by a Patriot leadership, who he claimed had sought independence from Britain to pursue their own selfish ends. In contrast to the diary form, which primarily functions as a mode of private reflection, memoirs act as an ‘individual’s public record,’ as indicated by Oliver examining the Patriot leadership at length and characterising it as acting disgracefully; framing their behaviour in this way serves to justify his opposition to the Revolution.³ The purpose of Oliver’s memoir was to offer an account which contradicted the narrative put forward by Patriots of God’s providence in the face of British tyranny. A key feature of Oliver’s memoir, common among those produced by Loyalists, is the desire to explain his conduct during the conflict. I categorise such narratives as justification memoirs, which usefully differentiates them from another prominent type of Loyalist memoir explored in this chapter, namely the sympathy memoir.

The sympathy and justification classifications distinguish the main purposes of the Loyalist memoirs. While justification contributed significantly to the composition of many memoirs, others – especially those written during or immediately after the Revolution – were a response to economic hardship, and social dislocation, with those Loyalists writing their

¹ Peter Oliver, *Origin and Progress of the American Rebellion: A Tory View*, ed. Douglas Adair and John A. Schutz (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1961), 9.

² *Ibid.*, 144.

³ Ruth A. Banes, “The Exemplary Self: Autobiography in Eighteenth Century America,” *Biography* 5, no. 3 (Summer 1982): 226, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23539239>.

narrative as an appeal to the British government for assistance. Within this designation there is some crossover, as many memoirs written in pursuit of compensation also attempt to explain the writer's actions, but nevertheless the overriding purpose of these later accounts was an appeal for help. The memoir of John Connolly titled *A Narrative of the Transactions, Imprisonment, and Sufferings of John Connolly, an American Loyalist, and Lieutenant-Colonel in His Majesty's Service* (1783) is a representative example of a sympathy memoir that exhibits this dual purpose, containing a clear explanatory function relating to his actions, but with a primary objective of obtaining British aid.

The motivation behind a memoir's creation influences the emotional registers and tenor present in its pages. Sympathy was not only central in shaping those Loyalist memoirs asking for British help but is notable in those that were written to elicit emotional responses from ordinary readers over the plight of Loyalists. This is particularly evident in narratives highlighting the devastating effect of the conflict on families, represented as microcosms of society at large. These memoirs show an awareness regarding the importance of the historical memory of the Revolution, and a desire that the Loyalist perspective not be excluded from the overall narrative of recent events. Memoirs composed by Loyalist women meanwhile reveal an additional, and more specific purpose, which was to ensure that their particular suffering was not ignored. While these different sorts of memoirs reveal diverse uses of sympathy, overall, they show the need for sympathy to be a common feature of the emotional lives of Loyalists. It is observable that while a desire for a sympathetic response is evident across a range of Loyalist memoirs, particularly those with a familial focus, its use is most pronounced in those written seeking compensation from the British, and consequently they are a primary focus of this investigation.

Sympathy memoirs were complex texts, potentially evoking pity or mercy in their readers. While diaries were essentially inward in nature, memoirs directed emotion to an external receiver, in this case the British government. The fact that sympathy memoirs were designed to provoke an emotional reaction from the British imbues them with a high degree of immediacy. Indeed, they were typically written not long after the war's end, and their writers hoped for a swift display of sympathy to relieve their suffering. In the eighteenth-century subtle differences accompanied different expressions of sympathy. Loyalists sought a merciful British response, as mercy promised intervention without further tainting the appellants' reputations, which in many cases had already been tarnished due to a loss of property and social status. Mercy can be contrasted with pity, as unlike mercy, pity was

viewed in the eighteenth century as an amalgam of sympathy and scorn, typically ‘offered to those considered blameworthy and deserving of condemnation.’⁴ Such judgmental subtext diminished the responsibility of an individual to assist another, allowing people to maintain an emotional distance between themselves and the subject of their pity.⁵ As such, British pity promised neither financial redress, nor the preservation of their Loyalist honour. Loyalists felt that their financial woes were not their fault, so any disdain accompanying a display of sympathy was entirely unjustified in their eyes. Accordingly, mercy was the preferred response, enabling Loyalists to obtain financial restitution while maintaining their honour.

Loyalist justification memoirs, on the other hand, are infused with profound feelings of anger, stemming from a sense of injustice. They utilise an array of negative emotions, including resentment and rage, to condemn Patriot behaviour. Justification memoirs share the immediacy of sympathy memoirs but reveal a more nuanced and shifting attitude to emotion. Those written close to the events described contain a high degree of impassioned anger, often expressed as rage, while those composed many years after the events depicted typically display a more measured form of anger, usually conveyed as resentment. Different forms of anger carried clear status implications, which in turn shaped how and why they were used. Across all levels of society, but more pronouncedly among the social elite, there was an understanding that impassioned forms of anger were appropriate only during times of urgency, including warfare, while outside of such times displays of anger should demonstrate restraint.⁶ In addition, as with the Loyalist use of sympathy, these expressions of anger became enmeshed with concepts of moral virtue, in which notions of honour were consistently invoked to explicate Patriot immorality.

The Memoir Form

Memoirs as a form can be differentiated from other kinds of life writing, such as autobiography and biography. They consist of personal observation and experience, and although closely related to autobiographies, as William Zinsser has observed, they differ primarily in the emphasis placed on external historical events. In memoirs, describing or interpreting those events is the main reason for composition. This contrasts with

⁴ Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 270.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 269-270.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 188-189.

autobiography which positions the writer themselves as the dominant subject. Indeed, while autobiographies typically cover the author's entire life, memoirs tend to concentrate on a chosen period.⁷ However, the formal differences between these genres have not always been reflected in scholarship, which has often treated them as indistinguishable. This ambiguity owes something to the slow historical evolution of terms like autobiography and biography which were not in consistent use in the late eighteenth century. Connolly, in his book, often refers to his account simply as a narrative. For example, when discussing his loyalty to the Crown he states, 'the sole end and purport of this narrative is to show, that I was, from the commencement to the last moment, firm and active in my loyalty.'⁸ Indeed the majority of Loyalist memoirs were described as narratives by the author and titled as such when first published. Nevertheless, the greater specificity of memoir makes it a better classificatory term than the contemporary narrative.

Loyalists wrote memoirs for diverse reasons, but central to many was the aim of refuting key Patriot arguments, including the suggestion that the British sought to enslave the colonies. These accounts highlight how the metaphor of slavery and its emotional usage became highly contested, having implications for Revolutionary Era political rhetoric. These allusions are important for understanding the role of sympathy during the period, as slavery became a focal point in the contest between the two sides to stimulate support. As already mentioned, sympathy was a core focus of many Loyalist memoirs, as writers sought to elicit emotional compensation for their position. But sympathy also operated differently across genders as those memoirs composed by Loyalists demonstrate.

Gender and Sympathy

In late eighteenth century America memoir composition was dominated by men due primarily to the link between their production and 'those prominent in public life.'⁹ This gender bias is reflected in published memoirs from the period, which as Rachel McLennan has rightly pointed out were almost exclusively written by men.¹⁰ The Loyalist memoirs assessed in this chapter accord with this perspective, in which not only were the majority male authored, but

⁷ William Zinsser, ed., *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998), 15.

⁸ John Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions, Imprisonment, and Sufferings of John Connolly, an American Loyalist, and Lieutenant-Colonel in His Majesty's Service* (New York: Charles L. Woodward, 1889), 43.

⁹ Thomas G. Couser, *Memoir: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 109.

¹⁰ Rachael McLennan, *American Autobiography* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 7.

the only examples of published memoirs from the late eighteenth century were composed by men, namely James Moody (1782) and Peter Oliver (1781). However, some Loyalist women did engage in memoir composition, ignoring the gendered nature of the medium, suggesting that they saw their contribution to the historical record as meaningful. Some of these women utilised memoirs to provide commentary about the Revolution, as evident in the narrative produced by Julia Bernard-Smith, who gives critical insight into key moments during the conflict. Thus, following the Boston Massacre in March 1770, she speaks of conducting a ‘minute enquiry’ into the episode, and determining that the British soldiers who had fired upon the crowd, had done so by mistake, suggesting that the officer in charge, Captain Preston, had said ‘Don’t fire’ rather than ‘fire, fire.’¹¹ While such an account is designed to absolve the soldiers of wrongdoing, it also offers a valuable perspective about a much contested event in the early years of the Revolution which she likely considered future readers might draw on.

In addition to commentary about the larger events of the conflict, the memoirs of female Loyalists also provide more intimate and personal details about the experience of women. One such memoirist is Hannah Ingraham, who was born in 1772 in New Concord, twenty miles from Albany, New York. Her life started out in an undramatic fashion, growing up on a quiet farm, but all that changed when she was four following her family’s decision to side with the British, with her father joining the King’s Own Regiment in 1776. This caused the family to be harassed and for the Patriot authorities to confiscate their farm, taking ‘it all away and [selling] the things, ploughs and all.’¹² Ingraham’s memoir was not written by Ingraham herself, but was instead recounted in the mid-nineteenth century to Cornelia Tippet, her neighbour and the wife of a local Anglican rector in New Brunswick, who then proceeded to transcribe the narrative for posterity.¹³ It is unclear why Ingraham told her story at this time, but the process her narrative went through reflects the role of women as mediators in

¹¹ Julia Bernard Smith, *Julia Bernard Smith Memoir* (Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1900), 96.

¹² Hannah Ingraham, *The Narrative of Hannah Ingraham* (1783), ed. R.P. Gorham.
<https://preserve.lib.unb.ca/wayback/20141205151334/http://atlanticportal.hil.unb.ca/acva/loyalistwomen/en/documents/ingraham/>.

¹³ Early in the twentieth century, Mary Tippet (Cornelia Tippet’s mother) read her mother’s transcription of Hannah’s story to the Women’s Historical Society in Toronto, and it was subsequently published in the society’s transactions. The original transcript was deposited in the Dominion Archives (now Library and Archives Canada) but has since been lost. Mary Tippet’s published version, “Story of U.E. Loyalist,” *Women’s Canadian Historical Society Transactions* 2 (1912): 24-31, can be found in the Provincial Archives of New Brunswick, MC 300, MS22/22 and has been re-published as “Reminiscences of Hannah Ingraham, 1772-1868,” *Generations: The Journal of the New Brunswick Genealogical Society* 19, no. 4 (1997): 26-29. In the early 1930s, R.P. Gorham transcribed the version of Hannah’s narrative used here from the original manuscript for publication in the Saint John Telegraph, 23, 26-29 December 1933. It differs only in small details from the earlier published version.

early American society, and marks out women as gatekeepers of family and community knowledge. This is consistent with other female authored memoirs, including that of Bernard-Smith, whose narrative documents her family's story, as well as the broader history of the period. While Ingraham did not compose the narrative herself, giving an account of her experiences during the Revolution served to project and preserve her voice in a largely male centred society, enabling her to record the distressing scenes she witnessed as a young girl.

In doing so Ingraham drew on elements consistent with captivity narratives, which had become highly popular in early America. Many of these autobiographical texts were composed by women to make sense of periods of confinement within Native American tribes. The dramatic appeal of this genre and the need for those who had been held captive to publicly assert their continuing physical and moral purity allowed, more consistently than memoirs, for 'women to write their lives – at least, short, traumatic episodes of them.'¹⁴ Traces of this form are evident in Ingraham's narrative when she describes the emotional distress, she and her family endured following the imprisonment of her father by the Patriot authorities. As she relates:

My father was taken prisoner once, but he escaped. The girl who was sent to take him his supper one night told him she would leave the door unfastened and he got off to the woods, but was wandering most two months before he found the army again. Mother was four years without hearing of or from father, whether he was alive or dead; anyone would be hanged right up if they were caught bringing letters. Oh! Those were terrible times.¹⁵

The anguish evident in this scene illustrates the oppressive reality that Ingraham and her family were confronted with due to their Loyalist allegiance. G. Thomas Couser astutely describes a narrative such as Ingraham's as being 'a form of scriptotherapy, an attempt to come to terms with a traumatic event by representing, and interpreting, it in writing.'¹⁶ In essence, her memoir served as a way for her to work through and process the pain she experienced as a young girl during the conflict. By referring to the hardships she and her family endured, her narrative operates similarly to other Loyalist sympathy memoirs, in eliciting a sympathetic reaction from the reader. However, unlike other sympathy memoirs considered in this chapter, it was not written in pursuit of financial remuneration. Rather, the descriptive and heartfelt tone of the text suggests that her concern relates more to how the Revolution is remembered and is intended to intervene in the public record more broadly.

¹⁴ Couser, *Memoir*, 114.

¹⁵ Ingraham, *The Narrative of Hannah Ingraham*, 2.

¹⁶ Couser, *Memoir*, 113.

Contrary to the memoirs of male Loyalists, who angrily denounced Patriot actions, female memoirists like Ingraham chose to focus on the pain and suffering experienced by Loyalist families. Ingraham's decision to concentrate on how severely affected she and her family were by the persecution they faced further amplifies the sympathy her narrative generates. By casting herself and her family as victims, and placing the Patriots in the position of persecutor, her account serves to increase the reader's sense of fellow feeling towards Ingraham, and Loyalists more generally. While she does not explicitly condemn Patriot behaviour, her memoir does provide insight into the sense of violation felt by many Loyalist women during the Revolution. Such infringements not only include physical abuse, but also Patriot intrusion into Loyalist physical spaces, as evident when Ingraham describes an episode in which an unwelcome group of Patriots ventured onto her family's property and:

Took grandfather prisoner and sent him on board a prison ship. Mother rode fifty miles on horseback in one day when she heard of it, to see him and to take him some money to buy comforts. He had a paralytic stroke when he was there and never recovered. Poor grandfather.¹⁷

By alluding to the cruelty her grandfather experienced Ingraham sought to characterise the Patriots as unjust and ruthless. The encroachment of Patriots into Loyalist homes and properties was a commonality of the Loyalist experience, as is also apparent in the diary of Grace Growden Galloway, who in her diary recounts a Patriot violation of her family's home.¹⁸ Indeed, Kacy Dowd Tillmann has observed that Loyalist women employed 'a rhetoric of rape – of the violated house and of the people in it – to frame the rebels, their supporters, and their cause as dishonourable, dangerous, and immoral.'¹⁹ But whereas Growden Galloway lamented such an intrusion privately in her diary, Ingraham wanted her discontent to be a matter of public record, suggesting she believed that the suffering experienced by Loyalist women should be a part of the conflicts overall narrative.

Previously, the violation of female virtue had been used as a rhetorical device by Patriot men to denigrate the British. By recounting disparaging tales of British soldiers and using metaphors of rape they attempted to cast the British as tyrannical abusers of power.

¹⁷ Ingraham, *The Narrative of Hannah Ingraham*, 2.

¹⁸ In her diary Growden Galloway recounts Patriot authorities forcibly removing her from her home following its confiscation, recalling that as she was being dragged from the house she held on to the door frame and cried out 'I do not leave my house of My own accord or with my own inclination but by force and Nothing but force shou'd have Made me give up possession.' (51-52), in Grace Growden Galloway and Raymond C. Werner, "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 55, no. 1 (1931): 32-94. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20086760>.

¹⁹ Kacy Dowd Tillman, *Stripped and Script: Loyalist Women Writers of the American Revolution* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019), 3.

Patriots, in this way, connected ‘the virtue of the female body with the virtue of the republic,’ suggesting that it was imperative for both to be protected.²⁰ Loyalist women reversed this narrative, however, referring to Patriot violations as evidence that they were guilty of the very actions they accused the British of committing. By alluding to this sense of violation Loyalist women like Ingraham, in the words of Tillman, highlighted ‘their inability to consent, neither to the people who entered their homes nor to the loyalties they or their families were assumed to hold.’²¹ By illustrating the powerlessness of Loyalist women, memoirs like those by Ingraham or Bernard-Smith, function not only to arouse sympathy in general for Loyalists, but to elicit a specifically gendered sympathy for Loyalist women.²² It was not only Loyalist women, however, who experienced a sense of powerlessness, as many Loyalist families more broadly felt helpless. There was a crucial interaction between sympathy and family within some Loyalist memoirs.

Family and Sympathy

To enhance the impact of their narratives, Loyalists often used mournful and evocative language to illustrate the divisiveness of the Revolution. John Connolly, for example, uses highly expressive language, not unlike that found in novels to convey the harm caused by the rupture to colonial families. In doing so he offers support for Couser’s claim that eighteenth-century memoirs share ‘many narrative techniques and devices with the novel.’²³ The interrelated nature of life writing genres and fiction will be explored in more depth in chapter five, but for now it is enough to note the potential influence of the novel on memoir composition in Connolly’s case. He uses dramatic narrative flourishes in his description of the events that followed his imprisonment in 1775 by Patriot authorities in Hagerstown, Maryland, due to his Loyalist principles, for example. After his initial arrest he was conveyed to Philadelphia, and on the journey encountered his brother at Wrights-Ferry, Pennsylvania, discovering him to be a devoted Patriot, with no sympathy for his predicament. This type of characterisation portrays the Patriots as inhumane, devoid of positive emotions even for

²⁰ Ibid., 111.

²¹ Ibid., 3.

²² Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 48.

²³ Couser, *Memoir*, 9.

members of their own family. The coldness of his brother's actions is reflected in Connolly's description of the landscape, as he despondently recounts that at his brother's behest he was:

Suffered to walk upon the ice, across the Susquehanna, in his company, with the guard following in the rear. The painful remembrance of the blessing of peace, and of the ravages of that dissention that could make brother war against the brother, and the son against the father, gave sensations, better to be imagined than expressed.²⁴

This passage reinforces the notion of the rupture being as much a fraternal civil war as a legalistic conflict between Britain and her colonies, while echoing themes of familial contention found in fiction of the period. His narrative functions primarily as a justification memoir, due to its strong explanatory intent, but the presence of tropes found in sentimental novels, lends some parts of his account an appearance closer to that of a sympathy memoir, reinforcing the way that many narratives do not fall seamlessly into one category or another.

Connolly's framing of the conflict as a civil war certainly mirrors Samuel Pratt's novel *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War* (1780), which depicts in vivid detail the disintegration of familial bonds during the conflict. *Emma Corbett* will be explored in more depth in chapter five, but here we can note the attention the novel pays to the negative impact of the Revolution for families. In Pratt's fiction, Charles Corbett, an American residing in Britain, sees his son Edward, join the Patriot cause, while close family friend Henry Hammond sides with the British, and both travel to the colonies to actively participate in the war. Corbett's daughter Emma falls in love with Henry, and in the story, she leaves Britain for America to find Henry. As the story unfolds, Edward, Henry, and Emma all die because of the conflict, leaving Charles inconsolable. After seeing his daughters' dead bodies Charles is 'bereft of all' and exclaims, 'behold what CIVIL WAR has done for me.'²⁵ Connolly's own experience resembles that of Charles, and he notes the difficulties he faced in recording similarly painful experiences, observing that the whole episode 'conjured up a train of melancholy ideas; my own example gave me a strong picture of the horrors of civil discord, that was too dismal to behold without a shudder.'²⁶

By blending poignant language with negative emotion, Connolly shows the scale of despair caused by the war for American families, increasing his narrative's ability to provoke feelings of sympathy. In recalling such a traumatic episode in his life he was overcome with momentary feelings of melancholy, not unlike those experienced by other Loyalists discussed

²⁴ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 28.

²⁵ Samuel Jackson Pratt, *Emma Corbett: In Two Volumes* (London: R. Baldwin, 1783), 2: 244.

²⁶ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 27-28.

in the previous chapter, including Samuel Curwen. But while Curwen kept such feelings private, Connolly wanted his feelings about the corrosive impact of the conflict committed to public record. This suggests a concern on his behalf that such an unsavoury aspect of the war was being minimised in a post-war republican America that prioritised unity. Such an emphasis on unity is attested to by the 1787 United States Constitution, which was presented by its supporters as being created by ‘a united, homogeneous, and sovereign American people,’ but which critics argued favoured the social elite, dangerously centralised power, and ultimately ‘threatened liberty.’²⁷ Such discord shows that the unity the new republican government portrayed was a fiction, with the new United States reflecting many of the same social and political divisions which had been present before and during the Revolution, as Loyalists were keen to note.

It should be emphasised that the pain wrought by the conflict affected not only Loyalists, but American families more generally, irrespective of political leanings. One of the best-known breakdowns in familial relations during the period is that between Benjamin Franklin and his son William. The two irrevocably fell out due to taking different sides over the conflict, with William remaining loyal to the British, while his father was firmly committed to the Patriot cause. The tragic disintegration of their relationship shaped the very form of Benjamin’s famous memoir. In an echo of the epistolary fiction I will examine in chapter five, Franklin – who praised Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740) in his Autobiography for its ‘very engaging’ blend of ‘narration and dialogue’ – began writing his memoir as a letter to his son William, but later abandoned the epistolary framework following their estrangement.²⁸ As a result, Couser points out, ‘instead of casting his story as a family chronicle, [Franklin] explicitly linked it to the destiny of the rising nation.’²⁹ For Connolly, Patriots like Franklin were rewriting history, with their fate in the destiny Franklin wrote of far from certain. He instead shows that the ‘tyranny and insolence of republican faction,’³⁰ led to ‘unrelenting persecution’ of Loyalists and a society broken by the ravages of war.³¹ Connolly thus suggests that this so-called rising nation was built on a foundation of ruined families, which Franklin sought to disguise in his memoir by editing out his estrangement

²⁷ Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions: A Continental History 1750-1804* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2016), 385.

²⁸ Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin: 1706-1757* (Auckland: The Floating Press, 2009), 38.

²⁹ Couser, *Memoir*, 118.

³⁰ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 29.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 27.

from his son. Connolly, like other Loyalist memoirists who experienced familial splits, countered Franklin's narrative promoting the inevitability of the new American nation, by conveying the dangers of civil war, and of revolution more broadly.

Not all Patriot memoirs had the grand designs of Franklin's, as evidenced by that composed by John Adams, who intended his record for his family only, and justified its creation by arguing it was written in defence of his personal reputation. As he put it:

Having been the Object of much Misrepresentation, some of my Posterity may probably wish to see in my own hand Writing a proof of the falsehood of that Mass of odious Abuse of my Character, with which News Papers, private Letters and public Pamphlets and Histories have been disgraced for thirty Years. It is not for the Public but for my Children that I commit these Memoirs to writing: and to them and their Posterity I recommend, not the public Course.³²

Here, Adams is concerned with not appearing narcissistic, admitting that 'as the Lives of Phylosophers [*sic*], Statesmen or Historians written by them selves [*sic*] have generally been suspected of Vanity, and therefore few People have been able to read them without disgust.'³³ But his need for justification overrode any moral objections he had, an explanatory motivation shared by many Loyalist memoirs. A key point of difference though is that while Loyalists intended the contents of their memoirs to be a matter of public record, Adams' account was meant only for private circulation. While seemingly at odds with his often-spikey public defence of his reputation, the narrative given in his unfinished memoir is more personal in nature, imbuing the text with a more episodic, uncensored tone, which lends his memoir a similar guise to that of a diary. Family was important to Adams, and like Connolly he makes allusions to the ruinous consequences of the conflict for families, mournfully noting the death of his brother Elihu Adams, who succumbed to dysentery in 1775, as a 'Sacrifice to the Cause of his Country.'³⁴ However, while both Connolly and Adams reference the impact the Revolution had on families, they diverge with respect to interpretation, in that Adams casts the death of his brother as a noble loss in the pursuit of a worthy cause, while for Connolly the damage caused was completely senseless.

While both Franklin's and Adams' narratives lean towards the justification category, elements of their memoirs nonetheless evoke a sense of sympathy, particularly Adams' discussion of his brother's death. In addition, readers with knowledge of Franklin's

³² John Adams, "John Adams (From the Autobiography of John Adams)," Founders Online, National Archives. <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/01-03-02-0016-0001>.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

estrangement from his son would likely be struck with a degree of sorrow when reading his narrative. In this way these two memoirs strike some of the same chords as many Loyalist memoirs, which in their description of family breakdown and turmoil, work to generate feelings of sympathy in the reader. However, while sympathy is a common theme across these diverse narratives, those produced by Franklin and Adams lack the scope of many Loyalist memoirs, some of which can be considered as part of a broader struggle to elicit sympathy for the collective suffering of Loyalists. The memoirs composed by these former Patriots also differ with respect to intent and lack the same conscious attempt to generate a sympathetic response in the reader. Nowhere is this clearer than in those memoirs written by Loyalists in pursuit of financial restitution from the British due to losses sustained during the war. As we will see this goal lends these sympathy memoirs a distinct emotional tone and tenor, in which they were carefully crafted to stimulate a sympathetic response.

Loyalist Sympathy Memoirs

As Loyalist sympathy memoirs were largely composed because the writer sought financial assistance from the British government, explanations given concerning the conduct of the author were driven by this paramount objective, in which an unwavering loyalty to the British was foregrounded. For example, James Moody's memoir *Lieut. James Moody's Narrative of His Exertions and Sufferings in the Cause of Government* (1783) places his commitment to the British front and centre. Moody grew up in New Jersey and at the commencement of the war considered himself to be a 'plain, contented farmer, settled on a large, fertile, pleasant, and well improved farm of his own.'³⁵ However, in March 1777, his peace was disturbed by a Patriot militia attempting to arrest him for refusing to swear an oath of loyalty to the United States. Moody was deeply affected by the episode and consequently joined the New Jersey Volunteers in support of the British. He went on to engage in significant espionage activities for the British, with his memoir eventually becoming essentially a narrative of his experiences as a spy.³⁶ In the text Moody clearly signalled the purpose behind his memoir's composition, writing that 'he has hitherto received but a very trifling compensation for his services and sufferings; and he looks for no more than will free him from indigence, and enable him [to]

³⁵ James Moody, *Lieut. James Moody's Narrative of His Exertions and Sufferings in the Cause of Government, Since the Year 1776* (London: Richardson and Urquhart, 1783), 1.
https://archive.org/details/cihm_56778/page/n7/mode/2up.

³⁶ Susan Burgess Shenstone, *So ObstinateLY Loyal, James Moody, 1744-1809* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), 3.

more effectually serve his country.’³⁷ His comment about wanting to ‘effectually serve his country’ suggests his ongoing loyalty to the Crown following the war, which likely included a willingness to engage in further espionage activities for the British.

However, as he states plainly that without financial assistance, he will not be able to carry out his duties effectively, the sincerity of his sentiments is questionable. Moody’s pursuit of compensation raises questions not only about the credibility of his account, but the authenticity of the emotions expressed.³⁸ While it is important to recognise this fact, it is likely that his claims of unimpeachable loyalty, which represent a prominent theme within his narrative, are also genuine as evidenced by the findings of the Loyalist Claims Commission, created by the British government to compensate Loyalists for their losses.³⁹ After assessing the validity of his case in 1784, they determined that there was overwhelming evidence attesting to his service, noting that he ‘was always enterprising and would engage in services which others thought impossible, but in which he would nevertheless be successful.’⁴⁰ Thus, while he undoubtedly emphasised his loyalty to stimulate a sympathetic response from the British, his claims of an enduring commitment to the British cause do appear to reflect his true feelings.

Sympathy memoirs like Moody’s relied heavily on instigating a compassionate response to their plight from the British government. While memoirs of this type were composed by people from varying social orders, many were written by people who came from a notable social rank, including Connolly, who had been a Lieutenant-Colonel during the conflict. Connolly was born in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in 1741 and as a youth he elected to join the British army, proceeding to distinguish himself in two campaigns fighting Native Americans during Pontiacs Rebellion (1763-1765), a conflict between the British and Algonquian, Iroquoian, Muskogean, and Siouan-speaking Native peoples, over a perceived threat posed by British actions to Native lands and way of life.⁴¹ After peace had been established with the Native tribes, he spent considerable time with them learning their manners and customs. He eventually moved to West Augusta County where he was at the

³⁷ Moody, *Lieut. James Moody’s Narrative*, 56-57.

³⁸ Stephen Carl Arch, *After Franklin: The Emergence of Autobiography in Post-Revolutionary America 1780-1830* (Lebanon: University Press of New England, 2001), 38.

³⁹ Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: HarperPress, 2011), 17.

⁴⁰ Shenstone, *So Obstinate Loyal*, 157.

⁴¹ Taylor, *American Revolutions*, 57-61.

forefront of a new settlement in the region.⁴² During the Revolution he suffered greatly for his loyalty to the British, and his narrative is a hopeful plea for help. Connolly was counting on the fact that at this time sympathy was understood to have the potential to ‘act as a kind of buffer, softening the most extreme effects of wild swings of fortune.’⁴³ It was such a catastrophic swing of fortune that befell memoirists such as Connolly, who in turn relied on the sympathy of the British government as expressed through the offer of financial relief. Towards the end of his memoir Connolly explains that his loyalty to the British saw him ‘excluded from the privileges of the community’ and ‘deprived of his property as a mark of its displeasure and disapprobation of his conduct.’⁴⁴ He observed that his Loyalism was the sole ‘source of his misfortunes’ and as a result the British had a duty of honour to help him in his time of distress.⁴⁵ Like many Loyalist memoirists, Connolly crafted a version of himself that emphasised his exemplary conduct during conflict. To that end he claimed that he ‘acted with good intentions, and from principles which he believed were descriptive of a loyal subject, an honest man, and a man of honour.’⁴⁶

To elicit a sympathetic response Loyalists such as Connolly often foregrounded the hopelessness of their situations, but they were careful not to present themselves as exceedingly desperate, due to the premium placed on emotional control in the late eighteenth-century transatlantic world. The need to ‘maintain a constant guard on emotion’ was especially important for preserving existing power structures, as a lack of emotional control had the potential to destabilise well established social relationships.⁴⁷ This was particularly relevant at a time when Loyalists were seeking compensation, as they had to defer to the superior status of the British government, conscious that any demonstration of unguarded emotion could potentially violate pre-existing strictures pertaining to social deference. Connolly makes the reality of this dynamic clear, admitting in his memoir that he could receive ‘no adequate recompense through any other channel.’⁴⁸ Loyalists like Connolly sought to convey their suffering in a way that would avoid pity, and instead prompt a merciful reaction from the British government. This form of sympathetic response was preferable due to mercy being viewed as more respectable and less judgemental than pity. Mercy, as Nicole

⁴² Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 1-3.

⁴³ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 272.

⁴⁴ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 61.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁴⁷ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 77.

⁴⁸ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 62.

Eustace notes, ‘carried extreme power connotations and implied an ability to exercise immediate control over another person’s fate.’⁴⁹ It was considered ‘the favored form of feeling offered to others in situations where lines of authority were well established and needed only to be upheld.’⁵⁰ For Loyalists, the superior cultural status of the British meant that they were in an optimal position to assist them in their time of crisis, and the cultivation of sympathy in their memoirs increased the likelihood that such assistance would be forthcoming. As such they framed themselves as victims of persecution due to their commitment to the Crown. James Moody, for example, suggests that he remained loyal despite the ‘torrent of reproach, insult, and injury, which he was sure to draw down on himself and his family.’⁵¹ In his narrative Moody consistently casts himself as a victim, reluctant to become embroiled in the conflict, claiming that prior to the war it was unthinkable that:

He should ever beat his plough-share into a sword, and commence a *soldier*. Nor was it less improbable that he should ever become a *writer*, and be called upon to print a *narrative* of his own adventures. Yet necessity and a sense of duty, contrary to his natural inclination, soon forced him to appear in the former of these characters; and the importunity of friends has now prevailed with him to assume the latter.⁵²

His allusion to his non-combative temperament underlines his sacrifice for the British, in that he elected to take up arms irrespective of his natural inclinations.

Sympathy memoirs such as Moody’s were written predominantly around the time of the 1783 Treaty of Paris. Many in Britain felt the Treaty had betrayed Loyalists, including former British Prime Minister Lord North, who declared that ‘never was the honour of the nation so grossly abused as in the desertion of those men, who are now exposed to every punishment that desertion and poverty can inflict.’⁵³ Indeed, two British negotiators were so outraged they resigned from the peace commission in protest.⁵⁴ Edmund Burke too, was contemptuous of the Treaty, arguing that it ‘was a gross libel on the national character’ and ‘in one flagitious article plunged the dagger into the hearts of the loyalists.’⁵⁵ While much of the criticism of the Treaty was undoubtedly driven by political motives, many others from the

⁴⁹ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 268.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 268.

⁵¹ Moody, *Lieut. James Moody’s Narrative*, 2-3.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 1-2.

⁵³ Debate of February 17, 1783, *Cobbett’s Parliamentary History of England from the Norman Conquest in 1066, to the Year 1803*, vol. 23 (London: T.C. Hansard, 1814), 452-453.

⁵⁴ Rebecca Brannon, “America’s Revolutionary Experience with Transitional Justice,” in *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, ed. Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2019) 194.

⁵⁵ *Cobbett’s Parliamentary History of England*, 468.

upper echelons from British society felt similarly. The then British Commander-in-Chief in America, Sir Henry Clinton, upon seeing the provisional treaty in 1782, reported of the widespread despair that he observed on Loyalist faces, conceding that 'I am often obliged to retire to my room to avoid hearing aspersions against my country too justly founded.'⁵⁶ It was into this sympathetic atmosphere that several Loyalist memoirs inserted themselves, hopeful of capitalising on British guilt in order to secure financial redress for losses sustained during the conflict.

In the transatlantic world to display grief for one's own hardships was perceived as selfish and evidence of a lack of emotional control, while to grieve for the plight of others was laudable.⁵⁷ As such, Loyalist memoirists avoided using language that suggested a strong sense of despair over one's own privations, aware that it could 'take the guise of selfish feeling.'⁵⁸ For instance, Connolly carefully avoids placing any emphasis on being grievously wronged during the conflict, simply noting his regret that his narrative 'is a tale of sickness and misfortunes, rather than a history of glorious actions and essential services.'⁵⁹ Instead, such accounts sought to stimulate public grief by directly associating their support of the British with their present hardships, such that the political aspects of Loyalism acted as a device to stir up public feeling. Connolly is unequivocal with regards to his depleted circumstances being a result of his loyalty, and asks 'how can he be more honourably or equitably treated in the society to which he is now attached, than by a provision in that line by which he became a sufferer?'⁶⁰ To increase the likelihood of assistance he also resorts to flattery, imploring the British to use 'full scope given to the exercise of that generosity of disposition and liberality of sentiment, for which I hope this nation will forever appear as the fairest candidate.'⁶¹ By not appearing selfish, and alluding to notions of honour and fairness, Connolly hoped to tap into feelings of public grief for the plight of Loyalists, in which the ensuing public pressure would result in the British government displaying mercy.

Notably, Loyalist sympathy memoirs functioned as part of a larger campaign initiated by Loyalists and their supporters to ensure that Loyalists were recompensed for losses sustained during the conflict. In early 1783, for example, Loyalist refugees appointed a board of agents to represent each colony, mandated to argue on behalf of the colonists for restitution

⁵⁶ Clinton Memo, August 7, 1782, Vol. 195, Clinton Papers, Clements Library, Ann Arbor.

⁵⁷ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 396.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 291.

⁵⁹ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 59-60.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 61.

from the British government. Print was a key feature of this public campaign for compensation, and the Loyalist agents produced a pamphlet later that year outlining their rationale, titled *The Case and Claim of the American Loyalists, Impartially Stated and Considered*. In this pamphlet the Loyalists argued that as ‘the British government had decided to acknowledge American independence “without securing *any restitution whatsoever* to the Loyalists,” then “natural justice” dictated that British taxpayers should assume the costs.’⁶² The lobbying proved successful and in July 1783, parliament appointed a commission to enquire into Loyalist losses, with the resulting compensation given being then unmatched in British history.⁶³

However, while such generosity was unprecedented, and clearly embodied British feelings of sympathy, many were still left disappointed, feeling they had not been adequately compensated. Alan Taylor has noted: ‘By 1788, the commissioners had accepted 4,118 claims for more than £10 million in losses, but the claimants received only about £3 million.’⁶⁴ One Loyalist who was aggrieved was Benjamin Marston, who in a letter to close friend Ward Chipman in March 1789, states: ‘My expectations from the compensation made me by the Commissioners of America claims are totally overthrown,’ describing the £105 he received as a ‘pittance.’⁶⁵ Such private admonition stands in stark contrast with the more public expressions of unfaltering loyalty seen in Loyalist memoirs. While not everyone was satisfied, however, the British government felt they had come to the aid of the Loyalists, observing that they had acted to preserve ‘the honour of the nation,’ protect the ‘national character,’ and fend off ‘national disgrace.’⁶⁶ As this indicates, the ability to demonstrate sympathy for another’s difficulties was essential for those in power in the late eighteenth century and the British were keen to maintain emotional allegiance.⁶⁷ If the king and parliament had not responded to the public grief expressed for Loyalists they risked, In Eustace’s words, ‘calling into serious question their fitness to reign.’⁶⁸ By the 1790s the Loyalist Claims Commission had concluded their work, which coincided with the cessation of those Loyalist sympathy memoirs tasked with obtaining financial compensation. Not all Loyalists were content with

⁶² Jasonoff, *Liberty’s Exiles*, 121.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁶⁴ Taylor, *American Revolutions*, 325.

⁶⁵ W.O. Raymond, ed., *Winslow Papers: AD 1776-1826* (St John, The Sun Printing Company Ltd, 1901), 367, <https://archive.org/details/winslowpapersad100raymuoft/page/367/mode/2up>.

⁶⁶ Jasonoff, *Liberty’s Exiles*, 122.

⁶⁷ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 396.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 396.

the eventual outcome, but by and large these memoirs served their purpose, contributing to the successful fight to win financial restitution for many Loyalists.

Loyalist Justification Memoirs

While financial reparations were at the core of Loyalist sympathy memoirs, justification memoirs reveal an overwhelming desire to explain their conduct during the Revolution, typically by juxtaposing the appropriateness of Loyalist actions with the injustices committed by Patriots. This is evident in the memoir of Jonathan Boucher, who describes his unwillingness to adhere to various Patriot policies due to what he sees as their illogical nature. For example, he rejected the Continental Association, the 1774 trade boycott against Great Britain, introduced as a reaction to the Intolerable Acts implemented by the British to punish the American colonies in the wake of the 1773 Boston Tea Party, as economically dangerous.⁶⁹ Boucher was defiant, writing that the Association was:

In my estimation, very unnecessary, unwise, and unjust. In consequence of which I soon became a marked man; and though I endeavoured to conduct myself with all possible temper and even caution, I daily met with insults, indignities, and injuries.⁷⁰

In this passage Boucher characteristically contrasts the correctness of his behaviour with the cruelty shown by Patriots, by whom he was abused daily.

Boucher had grown up in Cumberland in Northwest England and relocated to America in 1759 to work as a tutor for a private family in Virginia. He returned to Great Britain in 1762, and after being ordained, he came back to America where he functioned as rector at a succession of Anglican parishes across Virginia and Maryland. He also carried on a successful private school, and it was through this enterprise that he first met the future first President of the United States of America, George Washington, as the latter's stepson was one of his pupils. Boucher and Washington became close friends in the 1760s, but Boucher's fervent Loyalism eventually resulted in a split, and Boucher left America for good.⁷¹ It was after his arrival in Britain in the autumn of 1775 that Boucher wrote his memoir, but it was not until 1925 that it was finally edited and published by his great-grandson, Jonathan Bouchier, under the title *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist, 1738-1789: being the*

⁶⁹ Taylor, *American Revolutions*, 123-26.

⁷⁰ Jonathan Bouchier, ed., *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist, 1738-1789: being the Autobiography of Reverend Jonathan Boucher* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925), 105.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, vii-ix.

Autobiography of Reverend Jonathan Boucher. Whether Boucher intended his narrative to be published is unclear, as is the precise reason for its composition. Such ambiguity has resulted in a variety of theories being proposed, including a financial motivation. However, its creation was almost certainly prompted in part by the death of his wife in March 1774, who actively encouraged Boucher to write an account of his life, and it is unlikely to be a coincidence that he commenced its writing on the anniversary of her death in 1776 when the shift of colonies toward independence became decisive. From this perspective, as Ann Young Zimmer has suggested, its composition would have functioned as a mechanism for processing his grief in the wake of such profound personal loss.⁷²

While sympathy memoirs exploited the widespread currents of emotional sensitivity within the upper echelons of British society, justification memoirs strategically drew on anger to make their case. In doing so they tapped into a significant emotional category of the period, with the potential to test the boundaries of sensibility prevalent on both sides of the Atlantic. In the eighteenth century, as Eustace has argued: ‘Anger was, quite simply, the most passionate and problematic of all the emotions.’⁷³ While sympathy offered a means of binding a society together, anger threatened to undo such unity. At this time anger was judged according to a multitude of societal standards, which allowed ‘observers...to comment on the status of the person expressing the anger.’⁷⁴ The social elite considered lower class forms of anger to be unbridled and fuelled by passion, whereas that expressed by the upper echelons was tempered by reason and more productive. This moderated type of anger was often described as resentment and resulted from ‘a man’s rational appraisal that the words or actions of another menaced his honor and social standing.’⁷⁵ The Loyalist elite felt that the Patriotic movement was carried along by a tide of lower-class passions and suggested that the Patriot leadership actively encouraged these base forms of emotion. They argued that the Patriot elite stood by as they were being mistreated, and prospered from their misfortunes, which prompted strong feelings of resentment, as Loyalists saw both their social standing and economic position severely weakened. It was from within a context of disenfranchisement and ostracism that most Loyalist justification memoirs were composed, as Loyalists sought to salvage their tarnished reputations following the war.

⁷² Anne Young Zimmer, “Jonathan Boucher: Moderate Loyalist and Public Man,” PhD diss., (Wayne State University, 1966), 455-456, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/56683867.pdf>.

⁷³ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 152.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 152.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 160.

In his memoir Boucher infuses the text with feelings of resentment common among justification memoirs, regularly expressing his anger over the cruel treatment he experienced. Washington is a particularly important focus of Boucher's resentment, with an encounter between the two not long before the outbreak of hostilities dramatizing the root of Boucher's anger towards him. Boucher was on his way to Alexandria, and while crossing the Potomac River he encountered Washington heading in the opposite direction. Boucher claims that he said to Washington that there would be 'a civil war, and that the Americans would soon declare for independency,' and Washington replied that 'if ever I heard of his joining in any such measures I had his leave to set him down for everything wicked.'⁷⁶ When Washington subsequently took a leading role on the Patriot side, Boucher felt deceived, believing that his friend had lied about his true intentions. When reflecting on the episode, and what he viewed as Washington's moral failings, he pondered 'if an instance can be named when a man, having made one false step, made but one. When once a man goes one mile from the strict line of rectitude, he soon sees, or fancies he sees, reasons compelling him to go *twain*.'⁷⁷ Boucher's anger is here measured, and thus consistent with eighteenth century concepts of resentment, with its demonstration understood to have the ability to rebuild a person's damaged reputation.⁷⁸ From this perspective Boucher's noticeably restrained expression of anger can be seen as an attempt to retain some of his dented social standing.

For Loyalists like Boucher, who had by the point of their memoir's composition lost all social and political authority, it became important to establish the authority of their own accounts, to restore their tainted reputations. Use of corroborating evidence, such as certificates and letters, was a trope employed by many Loyalists to reinforce the rationality of their emotional expression and the overall validity of their accounts. The frequent inclusion of additional documents, served a dual purpose, not only establishing the authority of their narratives, but also undermining the validity of the Patriot cause, by casting them in an unflattering light. In September 1774, for instance, Connolly had been involved in an ongoing campaign against the Native Americans west of Pittsburgh and consequently had not paid much attention to the political events unfolding across the colonies. On his return 'the intimations of my friends, and the proceedings of the disaffected, gave me the first unhappy presages of the ensuing commotions.'⁷⁹ He cites a letter that he received from Washington

⁷⁶ Bouchier, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist*, 109.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 110.

⁷⁸ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 160.

⁷⁹ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 4.

after his return which confirmed his growing suspicions about Patriot motives. The men had earlier met over dinner in November 1770 at Semples Inn, Fort Pitt, Pittsburgh, following an invitation from Washington. The two established a close connection and engaged in regular correspondence with one another.⁸⁰ In the letter Washington is unspecific regarding Patriot plans, simply saying ‘things wear a disagreeable aspect; and the minds of men are exceedingly disturbed at the measures of the British government.’⁸¹ Connolly interprets Washington’s vague words as indicative of the nefarious designs of Patriot factions and proceeds to contrast his own intentions with those of the Patriots. He states that the letter allowed him to reflect:

That my loyalty to my Prince, and respect for the established form of government, were too confirmed to admit of the least doubt which party I should espouse; I decided instantly and resolved to exert every faculty in defence of the royal cause.⁸²

The inclusion of documents such as that written by Washington not only served to lend weight to Connolly’s account but also act as a device by which he could contrast the dissembling nature of Patriot expression with the sincerity of Loyalist emotion.

Connolly sought to present himself as a virtuous Loyalist, set against the immoral Patriots. Such a desire to project a particular version of oneself ties in with the models of character construction evident in many early American memoirs. Stephen Carl Arch has recognised that eighteenth-century memoirs increasingly impacted the development of personal identity, which was thought to be ‘an innate or fixed entity,’⁸³ inextricably tied to a person’s social and economic standing, and thought to shape all aspects of their identity, including their emotional capabilities.⁸⁴ The characters that emerge from early memoirs represent a shift in thinking, Arch argues, refashioning identity into ‘something to be shaped or molded according to need.’⁸⁵ This type of character construction is evident in the memoir of David Fanning, which was originally written in 1799 but not published until 1861 under the title *The Narrative of Colonel David Fanning (A Tory In The Revolutionary War with Great Britain): Giving An Account of His Adventures In North Carolina From 1775-1783*. In his memoir Fanning presents a much more favourable version of himself than that cultivated

⁸⁰ Percy B. Caley, “The Life Adventures of Lieutenant-Colonel John Connolly: The Story of a Tory (I, II),” *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 11, no. 1 (January 1928): 19, <https://journals.psu.edu/wph/article/view/1451/1299>.

⁸¹ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 5.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 6.

⁸³ Arch, *After Franklin*, 39.

⁸⁴ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 158-159.

⁸⁵ Arch, *After Franklin*, 39.

by Patriots, who described him as a ruthless enemy. He was born in 1755 in Raeburn Creek, North Carolina, a centre for Loyalist activity producing prominent anti-Patriot leaders such as Moses Kirkland.⁸⁶ Fanning himself became a committed Loyalist and acquired a reputation amongst Patriots for being ruthless. This negative view of Fanning had become so deeply embedded in the American consciousness that by the time John H. Wheeler was writing in 1861 he could assert that Fanning was indelibly ‘linked with all that is cruel and rapacious in war,’⁸⁷ and was responsible for ‘deeds of desperate daring, rapine, and cruelty.’⁸⁸ Such an unflattering portrait was further reinforced by another later commentator, the biographer Samuel A’Court Ashe, who in 1906 described Fanning as being inherently cruel and malevolent, possessing a notably despicable nature.⁸⁹ There was some basis for these claims. In 1781, for example, Fanning raided settlements along Deep River, North Carolina, before proceeding to burn the plantations of prominent local Patriots in Bladen County, North Carolina.⁹⁰ Indeed, in his narrative Fanning does not attempt to deny the violence attributed to him but rather seeks to explain his behaviour.

Fanning argued that his actions were in response to Patriot breaches of the rules relating to honour. In early American society, honour, as Sarah Knott has explained, consisted of ‘a set of rigid principles by which men of property ordered and defended their personal reputations.’⁹¹ In addition, honour had implications for military conduct, in which army officers sought to avoid ‘the tainting of honor by public reprimand or discharge.’⁹² From Fanning’s perspective such concerns did not influence Patriot actions. His belief that their conduct was dishonourable hints at anger tempered by the justification of honour, as being a primary driver behind his decision making. This is consistent with a refashioned definition of rage instituted by the social elite in the mid-eighteenth century to allow for the demonstration of such passionate forms of emotion in defence of honour. Rather than a submission to base forms of expression, its use in such circumstances showed a mastery of anger, as rage became

⁸⁶ Robert M. Calhoon, Timothy M. Barnes and Robert S Davis, eds., *Tory Insurgents: The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 250. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁸⁷ David Fanning, *The Narrative of Colonel David Fanning (A Tory in the Revolutionary War with Great Britain): Giving an Account of his Adventures in North Carolina from 1775 to 1783* (New York: Yale University, 1865), 2. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=yale.39002016217557;view=1up;seq=1>.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, xv.

⁸⁹ Samuel A’Court Ashe, ‘David Fanning,’ in *Biographical History of North Carolina from Colonial Times to the Present*, ed. Samuel A. Ashe, Stephen B. Weeks and Charles C. Van Noppen (Greensboro, NC: C. L. Van Noppen, 1906), 93-97.

⁹⁰ Gregory De Van Massey, ‘The British Expedition to Wilmington, January-November, 1781,’ *The North Carolina Historical Review* 66, no. 4 (October 1989): 405-406, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23520938>.

⁹¹ Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009), 164.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 165.

an emotion possessing virtue and strength.⁹³ Fanning's anger certainly affected his handling of peace treaty negotiations in North Carolina in 1781 and 1782, which had the potential to bring about a cessation of hostilities between Fanning's Loyalist militia and Patriot forces in the region. His deep contempt for Patriot conduct caused Fanning to have serious misgivings about their intentions, as evidenced by his description of the events surrounding negotiations.

Following the British defeat at Yorktown in October 1781, Fanning found himself facing the prospect of being disconnected from future British support for his local militia, effectively putting Loyalists at the mercy of Patriots in North Carolina.⁹⁴ In response Fanning put forward a peace proposal, in which Matthew Ramsey, a captain in the Continental Army, intimated that the Patriots would be prepared to acquiesce to his demands. Ramsey then sought to arrange a meeting with Fanning to discuss the details of any agreement, but Fanning was suspicious about Patriot motives and decided not to attend.⁹⁵ As Fanning explains:

In the course of this correspondence, endeavouring to make peace, I had reason to believe they did not intend to be as good as their words; as three of their people followed Capt. Linley [Loyalist militia leader]; and cut him to pieces with their swords. I was immediately informed of, it, and kept a look out for them. Five days after their return, I took two [of] them and hung them, by way of retaliation, both on the limb of the same tree; the third made his escape.⁹⁶

While Fanning's memory of what occurred is indicative of lingering feelings of resentment, the severity with which he dealt with perceived Patriot duplicity suggests that much of his behaviour was more actively driven by rage. This supports the wider evidence from Loyalist memoirs that negative emotion expressed close to the time of experience is typically more passionate than that expressed later.

When describing such ruthlessness Fanning displays a degree of emotional detachment, as evident in the above passage, which can be interpreted as an attempt to maintain a degree of emotional distance between himself and the distressing scenes he depicts. While he could draw on aspects of justifiable anger to defend his conduct, the presence of such emotional detachment suggests an unwillingness on his part to fully confront the brutality of war and his role in it. In addition, by more explicitly relating the bloodshed committed by Patriots than his own, Fanning was able to represent himself as an agent 'of

⁹³ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 181-183.

⁹⁴ Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, eds., *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry during the American Revolution* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1985), 172.

⁹⁵ Wayne E. Lee, *Crowds and Soldiers in Revolutionary North Carolina: The Culture of Violence in Riot and War* (Florida: University Press of Florida, 2001), 193.

⁹⁶ Fanning, *The Narrative of Colonel David Fanning*, 46.

justice for the oppressed and targets of barbarity,' further justifying his own acts of violence, while also absolving himself of any feelings of guilt.⁹⁷ Essentially, in his memoir Fanning manufactures an image of an honourable man who only engages in what could be interpreted by others as dishonourable behaviour in support of a righteous cause.

Overall, justification memoirs like Fanning's reveal how Loyalists utilised the medium to explain their conduct during the Revolution, constructing positive versions of themselves to counter the scathing depictions provided by Patriots, often motivated by a desire to repair their damaged reputations. Anger emerges as a more central emotional register within their pages than in sympathy memoirs, suggesting that they considered it an appropriate and effective form of emotional self-defence. Its use was complex and layered, marked by different status, temporal, and situational factors, as explicated by the already discussed differences between grief and rage. But its presence in their narratives elucidates the cathartic potential of memoir composition, in which a writer could gain emotional relief from channelling their feelings into their account.

Slavery and Memoir

Loyalist justification memoirs not only provide insight into the expansion of the elite's emotional repertoire during the Revolution but offer a lens for analysing prevalent tropes and imagery pertaining to the idea of political debate, and their emotional implications. Loyalists challenged fundamental Patriot arguments, insisting that they deliberately misrepresented the truth. One key assertion Loyalists refuted was that the British sought to reduce the colonies to slavery. In their rebuttals, chattel slavery becomes conflated with slavery's rhetorical invocation pertaining to the deprivation of colonial liberties. As such, Loyalist condemnation of slavery was both an attempt to seize the moral high ground in the public debate about the practice of slavery, and to deflate Patriot arguments alleging British enslavement of the colonies due to a loss of political freedom. At the outset of the conflict Loyalists as well as Patriots held slaves, but as Peter A. Dorsey has observed, the revolutionary rhetoric of the time prompted many Loyalists, 'anxious to demonstrate the justice of their cause,' to come out in opposition to the practice.⁹⁸ For example, Boucher who had held many slaves in

⁹⁷ Calhoun, Barnes, and Davis, eds., *Tory Insurgents*, 358.

⁹⁸ Peter A. Dorsey, "To 'Corroborate Our Own Claims': Public Positioning and the Slavery Metaphor in Revolutionary America," *American Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (September 2003): 364, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30041981>.

America before the conflict began, eventually criticised his former country for being a land where there is ‘absolute property in, and unbounded power over, human beings.’⁹⁹ Patricia Bradley has observed that for the Patriots slavery became a powerful metaphor due to a prevalent belief that a lack of ‘vigilance and virtue’ could lead to a society becoming enslaved.¹⁰⁰ The efficacy of the term was strengthened by ‘an ongoing colonial preoccupation with the use of blackness and darkness to represent betrayal and evil.’¹⁰¹ As a metaphor slavery clearly resonated with an American population who daily saw its reality. In the 1760s alone, during which the roots of the Revolution were being sown, ‘colonists imported 365,000 slaves: more than in any preceding ten-year period.’¹⁰² Such proximity to slavery would have made apparent the consequences that would befall those who lost their freedom.¹⁰³ However, to many British critics Patriot accusations of British enslavement were perplexing, as they noted the hypocrisy in inveighing against slavery, when they themselves owned slaves. As Samuel Johnson famously asked, ‘how is it that we hear the loudest yelps for liberty among the drivers of negroes?’¹⁰⁴ Patriot writers failed to see, or ignored, such inconsistencies in their arguments, according to Loyalists, latching onto the political utility of the metaphor to represent a loss of political rights without understanding its irony.

While slavery was a highly visible part of life in the colonies, Patriot invocation of the metaphor of slavery suggests not only that they saw a notable difference between actual chattel slavery, and slavery as envisaged via the more abstract denial of political rights, but that sympathy operated differently in each of these contexts. The fact that efforts were made, and arguments proffered, about the need to preserve the institution of slavery, indicates that genuine sympathy for the plight of Black slaves was thin on the ground. The lengths slave owners went to in order to recapture runaway slaves at the end of the war supports this view, with Cassandra Pybus observing how slave owners ‘tried desperately’ to ‘retrieve their property,’ attempting all manner of strategies to affect their return.¹⁰⁵ One such slave was

⁹⁹ Jonathan Boucher, *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution; In Thirteen Discourses, Preached in North America between the Years 1763 and 1775* (London: G.G and J. Robinson, 1797), 553. https://archive.org/details/bim_eighteenth-century_a-view-of-the-causes-and_boucher-jonathan_1797/page/n1/mode/2up.

¹⁰⁰ Patricia Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999), 20.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁰² Taylor, *American Revolutions*, 115.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 115.

¹⁰⁴ Gordon S. Wood, *The American Revolution: Writings from the Pamphlet Debate 1773-1776* (New York: Library of America E-Book, 2015), 588.

¹⁰⁵ Cassandra Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom: Runaway Slaves of the American Revolution and Their Global Quest for Liberty* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2007), 77. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Boston King, an enslaved carpenter from South Carolina, who due to the constant cruelty of his master, determined in 1780 to extricate himself from the bonds of slavery, and to ‘throw myself into the hands of the British.’¹⁰⁶ In 1796 King wrote an account of his experiences titled *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King*, published in instalments in the *Methodist Magazine* in 1798, in which he specifically describes the brutality and trials he endured as a slave. In his narrative, one of very few formal narratives produced by a Black Loyalist, he recalls an episode in which he was falsely accused of stealing a batch of nails, and as a result was ‘beat and tortured most cruelly, and was laid up three weeks before I was able to do any work.’¹⁰⁷ It was episodes such as this that prompted King to flee from slavery, and take refuge with the British, which caused him to ‘feel the happiness of liberty.’¹⁰⁸ At one point he was recaptured by the Continental Army and again ‘reduced to slavery,’ before managing to escape and regain his freedom.¹⁰⁹ While he refrains from consistently portraying the Patriots in overtly negative terms, his narrative reveals a pattern equating his time in Patriot hands with slavery, and his time with the British with liberty. King states that ‘gratitude to Almighty GOD’ and encouragement from ‘many respectable friends’ compelled him to record an account of his life, but he likely had backing from religious white patrons.¹¹⁰

Reflecting this moralistic intention and focus on a white audience, King’s narrative lacks the anger found in many Loyalists justification memoirs and instead has an emotional tenor more in keeping with sympathy memoirs. However, unlike those other sympathy memoirs his narrative does not attempt to cultivate sympathy for Loyalist families, nor is it written in pursuit of financial compensation, but is instead designed to elicit a sympathetic reaction to the different and more extensive forms of violence suffered by Black Loyalists. This is evident in the often-anxious tone of his writing, for example, as when, following the end of the conflict King observes how a:

Dreadful rumour filled us all with inexpressible anguish and terror, especially when we saw our masters coming from Virginia, North-Carolina, and other parts, and seizing upon their slaves in the streets of New-York, or even dragging them out of their beds. Many of the slaves had very cruel masters, so that the thoughts of returning home with them embittered life to us.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁶ King *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King*, 107.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 106.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 107.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 109.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 105.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 157.

Article VII of the 1783 Treaty of Paris had precluded the British from freeing Black slaves, but senior British officers, including Sir Guy Carleton, fought to ensure that those slaves who had sought sanctuary behind British lines received their freedom.¹¹² It was actions such as this that prompted King to gratefully declare that the ‘English had compassion upon us in [our] day of distress.’¹¹³ This stood in stark contrast to what he had said earlier about the possibility of falling into Patriot hands, who he ‘well knew would shew [sic] me no mercy.’¹¹⁴

The implication is that the British were more sympathetic to the plight of Black slaves in the colonies; a position reinforced by the Dunmore proclamation of 14th November 1775, which freed ‘all indented Servants, Negroes, or others...that are able and willing to bear Arms.’¹¹⁵ The precise reasons behind the proclamation are heavily contested, and it appears that an abolitionist motivation is unlikely, as slaves owned by Loyalists were not offered their freedom. But regardless of its original intention, the result was that ‘a host of fleeing bondsmen made their way to the haven of imperial liberty,’ with estimates suggesting that upwards of one hundred thousand slaves managed to reach the safety of the British lines.¹¹⁶ As for King, after taking refuge with the British, he joined the British military, acting as a batman to the captain of a Loyalist regiment.¹¹⁷ That King describes the British, and by extension Loyalist supporters, with more sympathy than the Patriots is apparent in his description of an episode in which he had been stricken with smallpox and consequently removed from the main army camp. King often went:

Without any thing to eat or drink; but Providence sent a man, who belonged to the York volunteers [a British Loyalist provincial regiment] whom I was acquainted with, to my relief. He brought me such things as I stood in need of; and by the blessing of the Lord I began to recover.¹¹⁸

Later, King was able to return the favour, when the man who had helped King was wounded and taken to a nearby hospital. In his memoir King states: ‘As soon as I heard of his misfortune, I went to see him, and tarried with him in the hospital six weeks, till he recovered; rejoicing that it was in my power to return him the kindness he had shewed [sic].’¹¹⁹ The

¹¹² Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom*, 77-84.

¹¹³ King, *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King*, 157.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 109.

¹¹⁵ *By his Excellency the Right Honourable John Earl of Dunmore, his Majesty's Lieutenant and Governour-General of the Colony and Dominion of Virginia, and Vice-admiral of the same. A proclamation Declaring martial law and to cause the same to be* (Norfolk, 1775), <https://www.loc.gov/item/2020769135/>.

¹¹⁶ James W. St. G. Walker, *The Black Loyalists: The Search for the Promised Land in Nova Scotia and Sierra Leone 1783-1870* (London: Longman & Dalhousie University Press, 1976), 3.

¹¹⁷ Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom*, 60-61.

¹¹⁸ King, *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King*, 107.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 107.

sympathy shown by both men during their respective periods of suffering not only demonstrates that such emotional displays could transcend racial bounds, but that they could be reciprocal in nature, with both men capable of showing sympathy for the other.

Patriots largely ignored such attestations of sympathy shown by Black members of society. However, this was not unusual, as the positive emotional capacity of Black people was rarely considered.¹²⁰ This is evident in Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1785), in which he describes African Americans as having an 'immovable veil of black which covers all [their] emotions,'¹²¹ and generally being 'inferior in the faculties of reason and imagination.'¹²² When leading Patriots such as George Washington warned of the British intending to 'fix the Shackles of Slavery upon us,' such cautions would have been given added weight by such adverse racial feeling, and the association of the Black population with slavery.¹²³ Thus, when the Patriots used the term slavery in relation to a perceived abjuration of political rights, it was bolstered by the context of actual slavery, which they hoped would generate more sympathy for their position. John Adams drew on the metaphor of slavery to defend the entire revolutionary movement, for instance, attempting to cultivate sympathy for their cause, by suggesting that colonists had been routinely subjected to unjust treatment by the British. He argued that 'slaves they would have been, if they had not resisted. So that nothing is lost. If they die, they cannot be said to lose, for death is better than slavery.'¹²⁴ Adams used these words in a public address on the 23rd January 1775, trying to justify Patriot resistance by characterising British intentions as being akin to slavery. In doing so, he drew on the deeply negative connotations underpinning slavery as a mechanism to instil fear in the American people, hopeful it would encourage further support for the Revolutionary cause.

What ensued was in essence a war over sympathy, as both sides sought to cast themselves in a favourable light and elicit emotional approval for their position. This is evident in how Loyalists sought to refute suggestions of British enslavement, baulking at such

¹²⁰ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 41-42.

¹²¹ Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (Boston: Lilly and Wait, 1832), 145.
<https://archive.org/details/notesonstateofvir00jeff/page/144/mode/2up>.

¹²² Ibid., 150.

¹²³ George Washington, "From George Washington to George William Fairfax, 10–15 June 1774," Founders Online, National Archives.
<https://founders.archives.gov/?q=shackles%20Author%3A%22Washington%2C%20George%22&s=1111311111&r=1&sr>.

¹²⁴ John Adams, "To the Inhabitants of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay, 23 January 1775," Founders Online, National Archives.
<https://founders.archives.gov/?q=slavery%20Author%3A%22Adams%2C%20John%22&s=1111311111&r=26&sr>.

arguments, and contrarily claiming that it was in fact the Patriots who sought to enslave the inhabitants of America. As Ruma Chopra has demonstrated, ‘if the rebels defended the colonies from the threat of British enslavement, the loyalists considered “American slavery and American independence synonymous terms.”’¹²⁵ In his memoir Peter Oliver thus castigates Patriot supporters for being seduced by the nefarious designs of the Patriot leadership, suggesting that they could:

Look forward then to the fatal consequences of your conquest: you will be conquered by an army of your own raising, and then your dreaded slavery is fixed; the ambition and desperation of your leaders will then demand the fruit of all their toils.¹²⁶

As with Patriot use of the slavery metaphor, Oliver would have counted on public familiarity with the institution of slavery to drive home what could be expected under Patriot leadership. He shrewdly casts the Patriot elite in the role of the slave owner, and the American public in the role of the enslaved, suggesting that those very leaders would treat people like slaves and ‘demand the fruit of all their toils.’¹²⁷

Memory and Memoir

While Loyalist memoirs reveal debates over slavery to be significant in shaping both their language and imagery, it is important to note that the reflective nature of the medium implies a reliance on a writer’s memory, and as Ben Yagoda has observed in his study of the memoir genre ‘memory is by nature untrustworthy.’¹²⁸ How people conceptualised memory at the time of the conflict was strongly influenced by the Enlightenment.¹²⁹ Central to this intellectual movement was John Locke who described memory as being constitutive of identity, such that the extent of an individual’s identity was dependent on their ‘ability to recall historic thoughts and actions.’¹³⁰ In his 1689 *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke wrote that ‘as far as this consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action

¹²⁵ John Dyke Ackland, Letter to Richard Howe, January 6, 1778, Sir Henry Clinton Papers, Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan, quoted in Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 37.

¹²⁶ Oliver, *Origin and Progress of the American Rebellion*, 167.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 167.

¹²⁸ Ben Yagoda, *Memoir: A History* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2009), 103.

¹²⁹ James Ward, *Memory and Enlightenment: Cultural Afterlives of the Long Eighteenth Century* (Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018), 8.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 8.

or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person.¹³¹ Locke emphasises the unreliability of memory, observing how ideas decay over time, suggesting ‘our minds represent to us those tombs to which we are approaching; where, though the brass and marble remain, yet the inscriptions are effaced by time, and the imagery moulders away.’¹³²

Instigating early attempts at historicising the conflict in their memoirs, Loyalists display an understanding of the process of memory decay described by Locke. This emergent Loyalist historicism is evident in their grave concerns that the negative actions of leading Patriots will not be represented accurately in the historical record, and their belief that the truth will be effaced by time and be replaced by a skewed version proffered by the new republican government. For example, Jonathan Boucher, to his chagrin, describes how George Washington ‘will probably be handed down to posterity as one of the first characters of his age.’¹³³ This likelihood confounded Boucher who observes that the ‘so celebrated General Washington’ was someone he knew well, and as a result he ‘cannot conceive how he could, otherwise than through the interested representation of party, have ever been spoken of as a great man.’¹³⁴ Even before the end of the conflict Loyalists were expressing such anxiety, among them Oliver, whose unease prompted him to record his impressions of senior Patriot figures. In his narrative he betrays an awareness that his words could be important historically, acknowledging his ethical obligation to portray people accurately.¹³⁵ He states, for instance, that he will provide a sketch:

Of those who were the principal Agitators in projecting & pursuing it [American independence] to its present Form; & here I shall avoid suffering my Pencil to throw one Shade, either to add a Beauty or strike out a Deformity.¹³⁶

In his aforementioned tirade against senior Patriots he claims to provide an exact rendering of such figures, suggesting that he ‘will adhere most sacredly to Truth, & endeavour to steer as clear as possible from Exaggeration.’¹³⁷ However, such claims must be treated with caution, as it is likely that his descriptions are an attempt by Oliver to position Patriots on the wrong side of history, while placing Loyalists on the right side.

¹³¹ John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Alexander Campbell Fraser (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), 449.

¹³² <https://archive.org/details/concerninghumanu01lockuoft/page/448/mode/2up?q=as+far+as+this+consciousness>.

¹³³ Ibid., 196.

¹³⁴ Boucher, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist*, 110.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 50.

¹³⁶ Couser, *Memoir*, 80.

¹³⁷ Oliver, *Origin and Progress of the American Rebellion*, 10.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 34.

What is evident in the renderings given by Oliver and Boucher is their dissimilar emotional valence, which is likely the product of when the two accounts were written. Oliver's was composed before the end of the conflict, while Boucher's was not written until many years later. Their memoirs lend support to the conclusion that Loyalist expressions of anger were modulated by time. Oliver's emotional register was fuelled by still alive rage, as evinced by his description of Samuel Adams as consistently 'employing his Abilities to the vilest Purposes,' where the malice in his words is palpable.¹³⁸ Conversely, Boucher's expression of anger towards Washington is more restrained. In fact, the contrast between rage and resentment is discernible within Boucher's memoir itself. He includes a 1775 letter written to Washington, in which Boucher excoriates Washington for not preventing the persecution of Loyalists.¹³⁹ Here Boucher states that:

You cannot say that I deserved to be run down, vilified, and injured in the manner which you know has fallen to my lot, merely because I cannot bring myself to think on some political points just as you and your party would have me think.¹⁴⁰

Boucher concludes the letter by stating that 'you are no longer worthy of my friendship; a man of honour can no longer without dishonour be connected with you.'¹⁴¹ The raw anger present in these words suggests a strong sense of fury and differs from the more tempered anger that is observable in the later composed sections of his memoir.

In *An Essay*, Locke recognised that memories with strong emotional underpinnings are most likely to endure.¹⁴² He understood, in this regard, that memories relating to traumatic events are indelibly imprinted on an individual's mind. Loyalist memoirs show how the passage of time can deepen emotions associated with difficult memories, often manifesting in a high level of narrative creativity. For instance, while Oliver wrote his memoir several years after many of the events he describes, a highly charged tone is apparent in the florid language used. For example, he states that his narrative contains:

Detail of Villainy in all its Forms, that it will require some Fortitude to meet the Shock. You will see Religion dressed up into a Stalkinghorse [*sic*], to be skulked behind, that Vice might perpetrate its most atrocious Crimes, whilst it bore fair a Front to mislead & deceive the World around.¹⁴³

¹³⁸ Ibid., 39.

¹³⁹ Bouchier, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist*, 140.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 140.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 141.

¹⁴² Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 194.

¹⁴³ Oliver, *Origin and Progress of the American Rebellion*, 26.

Such elaborate language shares similarities with that employed by novelists. Indeed, many novels written in the eighteenth and nineteenth century imitated the memoir form, including Daniel Defoe's 1719 classic *Robinson Crusoe*, which Benjamin Franklin also mentions as a model for the style of his *Autobiography*.¹⁴⁴ However, a distinction is evident between the two media, as unlike novels, memoirs operate, as Couser notes, 'in a highly constricted range: its scenarios must correspond to that which is, or recently has been; its characters, to actual people known to the narrator.'¹⁴⁵ As such, Oliver had to operate within the factual constraints imposed by the memoir form no matter how dramatic his tone. When recounting the character of James Otis he notes that 'he studied the Law, under his Preceptor, with great Attention; he made great Progress in it, & would have been of distinguishing Figure in it had he not mistaken a contemptuous Pride for a laudable Ambition.'¹⁴⁶ Here, Oliver is bound by the facts regarding Otis' profession, but is still able to use this information to disparage Otis' character. In doing so Oliver deftly accepts the confines of the memoir form and uses them to his advantage to express his anger at a senior Patriot figure.

Some Loyalists though, chose to subordinate historical detail in favour of projecting their anger at what they perceived was unjust Patriot treatment. This suggests that at times the desire for emotional expression overrode the need for historical accuracy. For example, John Connolly when recounting episodes of imprisonment at Patriot hands carefully organised his narrative to emphasise Loyalist outrage. His description of a hazardous operation he undertook in 1775 illustrates this. In April of that year Lord Dunmore had ordered a party of Royal Marines to seize several barrels of gunpowder from the powder magazine in Williamsburg, Virginia. Under immense pressure Dunmore was obliged to return the gunpowder, and in an atmosphere of escalating rebellious activity he was forced to retreat to the safety of HMS *Fowey*. Dunmore sought to mobilise Loyalists to regain royal control of the ship, and Connolly responded enthusiastically to the call.¹⁴⁷ Connolly's journey to reach the *Fowey* was perilous, as he was arrested and imprisoned twice, before being rescued on both occasions.

In his memoir Connolly's own anger is less measured in this episode than elsewhere, connecting with his recollection of the more general rage that fuelled much Loyalist conduct.

¹⁴⁴ Ward, *Memory and Enlightenment*, 10.

¹⁴⁵ Couser, *Memoir*, 55.

¹⁴⁶ Oliver, *Origin and Progress of the American Rebellion*, 36.

¹⁴⁷ Thomas B. Allen, *Tories: Fighting for the King in America's First Civil War* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2010), 151-154.

Like Fanning, Connolly demonstrates how the Loyalist elite embraced a remodelled, more positive, definition of rage, which they viewed as a morally and socially legitimate response to unprecedented treatment. On his journey, Connolly was first arrested after being ‘suspected of an intention to raise a body of men to act against the liberties of America.’¹⁴⁸ He was rescued by friends, who had vowed ‘to put every man to the sword whom they should find guarding me, and afterwards to burn down the house of the principal, in revenge for such a lawless outrage.’¹⁴⁹ Following this he again found himself imprisoned. This second arrest was effected by three magistrates from Pennsylvania for grievances relating to an earlier affair, in which Connolly had contentiously detained three men for executing ‘their magisterial functions beyond the limits of their own province and county.’¹⁵⁰ After hearing of the arrest Connolly’s friends were ‘greatly enraged’ and immediately sent a letter ‘written in a firm but proper tone, demanding my release.’¹⁵¹ At this time the expression of rage was used sparingly, and typically reserved for extreme cases of insult or injury.¹⁵² That Connolly invokes rage to describe the emotional tenor of his friends can be interpreted as his attempt to explicate the degree of Loyalist outrage.

Memoir as a form served as an important mode of self-expression, enabling Loyalists to create and project a preferred image of themselves, while also capturing their reflections on the conflict. While the precise reasons for their narratives’ composition varied, their primary motivations were either to justify their conduct during the conflict, or their pursuit of compensation in its wake. Those memoirists who appealed to the British for assistance used highly emotive language to elicit British sympathy, projecting an image of themselves that conveyed the depths of their suffering, and hoping to capitalise on feelings of national guilt that permeated the upper echelons of British society after the war. They also tapped into rules pertaining to sympathetic expression to arouse public grief for their plight, anticipating that national feelings of honour would lead to a merciful British response, allowing Loyalists to obtain financial redress while preserving their integrity.

Those Loyalists who composed their memoirs to defend or explain their actions during the conflict turned to anger to express their outrage at their mistreatment by Patriots.

¹⁴⁸ Connolly, *A Narrative of the Transactions*, 9.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁵² Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 186-188.

Other media used by Loyalists show evidence of the use of anger, including pamphlets, which will be explored later in chapter four, but for now we can simply note the temporal differences that are evident between memoirs and pamphlets, in which pamphlets have a higher degree of immediacy, while memoirs are more reflective. Although more ruminative in nature, memoirs show a modulated use of anger across time, with that expressed close to the time of experience being more passionate, suggestive of rage, while that expressed later is more tempered, consistent with resentment. By embracing both rage and resentment Loyalists could draw on the redeeming aspects of these varying forms of angry expression, to seize the moral high ground, and distinguish their own conduct from Patriot impropriety. It is possible to see their use of anger as a rhetorical device employed not only to reprimand Patriots for their misconduct, but also to try to restore their tarnished reputations. That Loyalists felt this necessary not only reveals the scale of their outrage but illustrates the desperateness of their circumstances following the war. While their memoirs reveal the public use of emotions such as sympathy and anger, the epistolary networks of Loyalists' elucidate a different side of their emotional lives, demonstrating how privately, as well collectively, feelings of fear and anxiety gripped their minds during the conflict. The next chapter investigates how these negative emotions impacted both why and how they expressed themselves through the medium of letter writing.

Chapter 3

Uneasy Networks: How Fear and Anxiety Shaped Loyalist Letters

In March 1777 the Loyalist Samuel Sewall, wrote a letter to his cousin Thomas Robie, stating:

I hope my letter to Mrs Higginson [Mehitable Higginson] will not fall into the hands of the rebels, for I should be loth their malice should be gratified [*sic*], as I know it would be, by reading, & perhaps printing the heart-felt pangs which in the bitterness of soul I penned for the perusal of a sympathizing friend.¹

The possibility of letters falling into Patriot hands troubled all Loyalists, and the seriousness of such an occurrence was laid bare by the already mentioned procurement of Thomas Hutchinson's letters in 1773. Episodes like this elucidate how the perils of interception had a constraining effect on Loyalist letter writing. Many struggled with this possibility, with their letters revealing a tension between a need for caution and a desire for sincere expression. To circumvent the strictures placed on their writing some Loyalists employed the use of ciphers and codes. Such measures reflect a widely held belief within Loyalist circles about the likelihood of severe Patriot reprisals. This chapter reveals how this mentality saw fear and anxiety permeate their epistolary networks.

These emotional states possess an inherently negative valence and are elicited by a belief that a given stimulus represents an imminent threat. Fear is often associated with a specific prompt and accompanied by feelings of apprehension or dread. Conversely, anxiety is a state of unease brought about by a possible negative outcome that is essentially uncertain. Anxiety can be differentiated from fear in that it is oriented more to the future than present and exerts an influence over a longer period. Fear can evolve into longer term anxiety if the cause of those initial feelings of fear is not successfully resolved. However, feelings of fear do not necessarily lead to feelings of anxiety, and anxiety can be maintained by many factors such as frequent rumination or abstraction. For Loyalists, as we will see, the circulation of stories of Patriot violence and intimidation served to further increase feelings of fear and anxiety. It will be possible, however, to show a distinction between the two emotions, in that the letters of Loyalists remaining in America principally show evidence of fear, due to the ever-present threat of Patriot reprisals, while those written in exile disclose strong feelings of

¹ Samuel A. Green, et al., "January Meeting, 1896. Tribute to Robert C. Winthrop; Letters of Jonathan Sewall; Letter of George Whitefield; Letter of Jonathan Edwards; McClellan's Peninsular Campaign," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 10 (1895-1896): 417, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25079785>.

anxiety, due to their uncertain futures, and concern for friends and family left in the colonies. These varying emotional states are detectable explicitly, through outward recognition of those specific emotions, and implicitly, in which feelings of fear and anxiety are not directly acknowledged, but the tone of their letters is suggestive of these emotional registers. As we will see, the epistolary networks of Loyalist men were more capacious than those of Loyalist women. The networks of Loyalist women comprised primarily of family and friends, while those of Loyalist men often consisted of ephemeral contacts from outside their familiar group. Loyalist women used their epistolary networks as a means of resistance, often functioning as a nexus within their family support networks. This was part of a wider process of defiance instituted by Loyalist women to obviate the social and political confines placed on their ability to express themselves, using various forms of expression, including diaries as we have already seen, as a subtle way of circumventing such limits.

Early in the eighteenth century the pursuit of economic interests and a desire to maintain family connections in an ever-expanding world resulted in the proliferation of letter writing and the establishment of an increasingly improved communications infrastructure throughout the Atlantic world.² The first post office in the American colonies was introduced by the British in 1639, permitting contact between individual colonies and Great Britain. It was not until later in the seventeenth century, however, that contact was made possible throughout the colonies, and people could seize on the new communication opportunities this presented.³ As the eighteenth century progressed transatlantic epistolary networks flourished, consequently letter writing became a forum for shaping emotional attitudes and behaviour. Letters developed into an important medium for outlining social standards pertaining to emotional expression, as their propagation became entwined with widespread cultural expectations.⁴ Before the turn of the eighteenth century letter writing was almost the exclusive domain of men from the upper echelons of society, but gradually throughout the subsequent decades the practice became increasingly prevalent across society, becoming a critical element of emotional expression among the higher social ranks.⁵ By the time of the Revolution letter writing permeated all aspects of social and political life for these groups.⁶

² Konstantin Dierks, *In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 1.

³ Kacy Dowd Tillman, *Stripped and Script: Loyalist Women Writers of the American Revolution* (Boston: University of Massachusetts, 2019), 16.

⁴ Dierks, *In My Power*, 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 160-161.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

Both Loyalists and Patriots understood the critical role that letters would have during the conflict, helping to shape public opinion and political discourse, and as such gaining control of the communication networks proved vital.

Before the Revolution the British had established a complete monopoly over the postal service in the American colonies,⁷ but as the Patriots gained political dominance they were able to exert increasing control over the postal service, which proved advantageous to their cause, allowing them to ‘coordinate and sustain such a war effort the length of the continent.’⁸ The Patriots understood that British dominance represented an obstacle to their ambitions, preventing an unfettered communications infrastructure that would allow them to communicate outside of British control.⁹ As a result they rejected the British system outright and replaced it with a new Patriot controlled postal service in 1775, installing Benjamin Franklin as the new Postmaster General. This did not just have military implications, enabling faster communication between fighting units, but also impacted on the domestic sphere as the exchange of letters had the potential to enable families to remain connected following separation because of the conflict.¹⁰ At a time of instability the writing of ‘letters served as a coping mechanism, a sanctuary from war, even an anemic [sic] refusal of it. They amounted to small claims of personal agency within the grand dictates of a historic event,’ Konstantin Dierks explains.¹¹ However, for Loyalists the ability to openly engage in correspondence was complicated by the inception of the new Patriot controlled postal service. The reality they were confronted with was the ever-present threat of interception, and this had a demonstrable effect on how they expressed themselves in their letters.¹²

Public vs Private Letters

During the Revolution many letters were composed for a public audience and possess a different tone to those written for private consumption. However, even supposed private epistles were often ‘intended for a select, rather than a singular, reading audience.’¹³ Those

⁷ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 16.

⁸ Dierks, *In My Power*, 191.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 196.

¹⁰ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 16.

¹¹ Dierks, *In My Power*, 191.

¹² Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 16.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 20.

letters that were meant to be read publicly, were often published as essays or pamphlets.¹⁴ Both Loyalists and Patriots utilised the letter form in their published writing, often using the medium of newspapers to engage in serious debate about the cause of independence. The use and readership of newspapers in the colonies had risen markedly throughout the eighteenth century, and both sides latched on to this increasingly popular mode of expression to articulate their perspectives on various political issues.¹⁵ While both sides often vehemently disagreed with one another, early in the conflict public debate typically remained emotionally stable, with a healthy exchange of ideas considered preferable to hostile provocation, but as the Revolution wore on many Patriots enlisted the reach provided by newspapers to publish letters of a more forceful nature.

Early in the revolutionary period many critics of British policy published letters in newspapers, but the tone of their letters tended not to be incendiary or seditious. One such moderate writer was a Pennsylvania solicitor, John Dickinson, who would go on to be a leading Patriot during the conflict. In late 1767 and early 1768, Dickinson published a series of letters titled *Letters from a Farmer to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies*, objecting to the repressive Townshend Duties, branding them unconstitutional.¹⁶ For writers such as Dickinson newspapers offered a wide audience, enabling them to reach a multitude of people across the colonies.¹⁷ In the second of his letters he surmised:

The single question is, whether the parliament can legally impose duties to be paid *by the people of these colonies only* FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF RAISING A REVENUE, *on commodities which she obliges us to take from her alone*; or, in other words, whether the parliament can legally take money out of our pockets, without our consent.¹⁸

Dickinson postulated that if parliament possessed that right, then American ‘liberty is but...a sound and nothing else.’¹⁹ While he is forthright in his views his manner is consistently fair and even throughout the series of letters, demonstrating his clear restraint when confronting those who disagreed with his position.

¹⁴ Russ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776: Secrets, Leaks, and Revolutionary Communications in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 111.

¹⁵ Dierks, *In My Power*, 144.

¹⁶ Taylor, *American Revolutions*, 107.

¹⁷ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 13.

¹⁸ J. Dickinson and R. T. Haines Halsey, *Letters from a farmer in Pennsylvania, to the inhabitants of the British Colonies* (New York: The Outlook Company, 1903), 26.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=loc.ark:/13960/t48p6fz4d&view=1up&seq=100>.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 100.

As the conflict evolved the published letters of Patriots, however, took on an increasingly frustrated and intolerant tone, as they became impatient with those that vacillated or were openly opposed to American independence. Many Patriots began to see the inflammatory potential public letters offered and exploited the medium to assail those who opposed them.²⁰ In 1776 ardent Patriot Thomas Paine, published the first of his letters comprising *American Crisis*, a series of essays fiercely rebuking the British and their Loyalist allies for their conduct.²¹ In *Crisis*, Paine capitalises on the growing use of persuasive rhetoric in public writing, which can be ‘understood as the active art of moving and influencing men, of galvanizing their passions, interests, biases, and temperaments.’²² Jay Fliegelman has shown that by the time of the Revolution rhetoric was imbued with high emotionality, in which the way something was said, was as important as the argument itself. This placed a greater emphasis on writers wanting to appear genuine in their sentiments, but such a ‘spectacle of sincerity’ often led to ‘greater theatricalization’ in public writing, creating doubts about authenticity of emotional expression.²³ As Fliegelman suggests, it became difficult to ‘distinguish between calculated and theatrical attempts to arouse passion and the power of the spontaneous and wounded’ writer.²⁴ Essentially, ‘the tension between the natural and the theatrical was the central problem,’ as ‘one man’s theatricality was another’s voice of nature.’²⁵ While Patriots would likely have seen arguments in *American Crisis* as ‘heartfelt discourse,’ Loyalists would have seen them as ‘calculated rabble-rousing.’²⁶

The *Crisis* series consists of thirteen separate letters and was published in pamphlet form in newspapers throughout the colonies.²⁷ Early in the Revolution newspapers had provided a forum for the open exchange of views, with printers not wanting to be seen as being overtly partisan, as it could negatively impact business.²⁸ But as the conflict intensified there was a shift as newspapers increasingly became more partisan in nature. By the time of Paine’s *American Crisis*, newspapers in the colonies were overwhelmingly Patriot. As Carol Humphrey has shown, by this point ‘anyone strongly opposed to independence no longer had

²⁰ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 26.

²¹ Thomas Paine, *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip S. Foner, vol. 2 (New York: Citadel Press, 1945), 48.

²² Jay Fliegelman, *Declaring Independence: Jefferson, Natural Language & the Culture of Performance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 29.

²³ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 75.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 79.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 79.

²⁷ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 110.

²⁸ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty: Communication Innovation & the American Revolution* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013), 129.

much of a voice in the press because most of the newspapers that would have previously published opposing viewpoints had gone out of business.²⁹ Paine's pamphlet output will be investigated further in chapter four, but for now it is important to note how in *American Crisis* he adopts the epistolary template, conflating private and public modes. He draws on the inherent intimacy of a private letter, enabling him to establish a sympathetic connection with the reading public. He enjoins the characteristics of personal correspondence with the public visibility of a newspaper essay, turning an ostensibly private mode of writing into a piece of effective political propaganda.³⁰

This decision reflects a broader pattern in Patriot behaviour of blurring the private and public spheres, which we have already seen with their public disclosure of Thomas Hutchinson's private letters. As Jurgen Habermas has shown, the late eighteenth century was a time when these two distinct spheres were still being properly defined, and thus it is possible to see Patriot actions as resisting this apparent separation, with their conduct more closely fitting with earlier understandings, which did not recognise a clear division between the two spaces. In the second of his *Crisis* letters, Paine contends that he had in vain tried to show those still loyal to the British the error of their ways, lamenting that 'I have been tender in raising the cry against these men, and used numberless arguments to show them their danger.'³¹ He surmises that their aversion to independence stemmed largely from their 'folly or their baseness,' claiming that they were guided by selfishness and trepidation of the likely consequences.³² In uncompromising terms he angrily suggests that those who oppose independence 'must expect the more rigid fate of the gaol and the gibbet.'³³ Paine shows that while newspapers had previously provided a forum for people to publish letters, rationally debating the merit of their position, as the conflict progressed this open forum was commandeered by Patriots who utilised public letters instead as an instrument for instilling fear.

Loyalists recognised this shift in how the public exchange of views was being conducted by Patriots, and it caused considerable consternation. The Philadelphian clergyman

²⁹ Carol Sue Humphrey, *The American Revolution and the Press: The Promise of Independence* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2013), 117. ProQuest Ebook Central.

³⁰ Theresa Strouth Gaul and Sharon M. Harris, eds., *Letters and Cultural Transformations in the United States, 1760-1860* (New York: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 31.

³¹ Thomas Paine, *The American Crisis* (London: R. Carlile, 1819), 14.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.hxj2jt&view=1up&seq=22>.

³² *Ibid.*, 14.

³³ *Ibid.*, 51.

William Smith, bemoaned the fact that it had formerly been ‘a good and salutary custom among us, freely to discuss and examine all publick [sic] affairs, in conversation as well as writing,’ but the ‘deviation from it has but added to the affliction of many real friends of America.’³⁴ By ‘real friends’ Smith meant those that abhorred the possibility of American independence, namely Loyalists, and he felt that it was those in favour of separating from the parent state who were responsible for stifling public debate. Smith’s Loyalism was complex, as he was deeply critical of British policy, and early in the Revolution he earnestly supported many Patriot actions, including opposition to the Stamp Act in 1765. But he was vehemently opposed to independence, and following the outbreak of war, he argued strongly for ‘reconciliation with Great Britain upon constitutional principles.’³⁵ Smith was a moderate and as Ian Margeson has explored, he worried that ‘the move toward independence would undermine the economic and cultural prosperity of the colonies.’³⁶

Smith considered Patriots such as Paine dangerous, and throughout March and April 1776 he published in newspapers across Philadelphia and Annapolis a series of letters under the pseudonym Cato, challenging many radical Patriot assertions.³⁷ At the time of the conflict letters were considered a medium of relatively sincere expression, but they could also be ‘a vehicle for artifice and emotional counterfeiting,’ as Theresa Strouth Gaul has observed.³⁸ It was this murkier side of letter writing that Loyalists such as Smith felt that Patriot writers exploited. He believed that Patriot arguments were based on ‘misrepresentations, ungrounded suggestions, and delusive arguments, too evidently proceeding from prejudice or predetermination of a question.’³⁹ Smith reserves the brunt of his criticism for Paine, and in a scathing attack on the author of *American Crisis* he alludes to growing public intolerance of the Patriot position. Smith writes that if:

He possessed of the least reverence for the judgement or feelings of a great and enlightened people, whom he has thought himself fit to address, his performance would have been of a different nature. It would at least have worn the semblance of argument, and contained something which had a chance to meet the reason of wise

³⁴ Peter Force, *American Archives: A Documentary History of the English Colonies in North America from the King’s Message to Parliament, of March 7, 1774, to The Declaration of Independence by The United States*, vol. 5 (Washington DC: M. St Clair Clarke and Peter Force, 1844), 125.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015010552027&view=1up&seq=123>.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 125.

³⁶ Ian Margeson, “Defender of the Atlantic Empire: Reverend William Smith and His Miranian Vision,” *Utopian Studies* 3, no. 16 (2005): 365, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20718761>.

³⁷ Christophe A. Hunter, “William Smith’s Catonian Loyalism, Race, and the Politics of Language,” *Early American Literature* 3, no. 52 (2017): 532, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90014915>.

³⁸ Gaul, *Letters and Cultural Transformations*, 79.

³⁹ Force, *American Archives*, 1051.

men, and to stand their candid examination. He would have listened patiently to their remarks upon his production, and would have coolly replied to their objections. He would not have dared to offer such an indignity to the publick [*sic*], as to throw out impotent threats, instead of answer, against the meanest of his fellow-citizens (if fellow-citizens he has in this place,) merely for endeavouring, in a country yet free, to detect his misrepresentations, to supply his defect of materials, and thereby enable a people to judge fairly of their weighty concerns.⁴⁰

Referring to Paine's *Crisis* letters as a mere performance suggests that Smith saw Paine's arguments as disingenuous. He felt that by trying to silence public debate Patriots were exacerbating an already troubling situation for Loyalists. He was frustrated that the Patriots could publish their thoughts freely, arguing that 'it cannot but be judged reasonable that it should be equally free on the other side also, especially where charges are to be answered and innocence defended.'⁴¹ Sadly though he understood that this was not the case, lamenting in a letter to the Secretary of the Propagation Society in 1775 that 'much hurt has happened to individuals in this Country from letters.'⁴² As such, Smith nervously requested that the contents of the letter not be made public, asking for the recipient of the letter to 'excuse these little anxieties.'⁴³ His anxiety clearly stemming from the harsh treatment that had befallen other Loyalists whose letters had been intercepted by the Patriot authorities and made public, including those of Thomas Hutchinson whose letters had been made public only two years earlier.

Fear and Anxiety in Eighteenth Century America

The possible repercussions for people who were deemed to be acting against the cause of independence is captured in the letters of many Loyalists, with Patriot violence and intimidation common themes in their writing. In a letter to a close friend Anne Hulton describes how her brother, British Customs Officer, Henry Hulton, and his family had been driven from his house due to Patriot violence. She wrote that prior to the event they already felt they were 'in a dangerous situation' due to the 'want of protection, the perversion of the Laws, & the spirit of the People, inflamed by designing men.'⁴⁴ However, she did not

⁴⁰ Ibid., 1049.

⁴¹ Ibid., 125.

⁴² H. W. Smith, *Life and Correspondence of the Rev. William Smith, D. D.: With Copious Extracts from his Writings* (Philadelphia: S. A. George, 1879-1880), 531.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293007963519&view=1up&seq=547>.

⁴³ Ibid., 531.

⁴⁴ Ann Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady: Being the Letters of Ann Hulton, Sister of Henry Hulton, Commissioner of Customs at Boston* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 1927), 22.

https://archive.org/details/lettersofloyalis0000hult_j3m3/page/72/mode/2up.

perceive them to be in imminent danger as her brother's house was a considerable distance from the centre of Boston where many recent disturbances had taken place. Then on 19th June 1770:

Between 12 & 1 o'Clock [*sic*] he was wake'd by a knocking at the Door, he got up, enquired the person's name and business, who said he had a letter to deliver to him, which came Express from New York. My Brother puts on his Cloaths, [*sic*] takes his drawn Sword in one hand, & open'd the Parlor window with the other. The Man ask'd for a Lodging – said he, I'll not open my door, but give me the letter. The man then put his hand, attempting to push up the window, upon which my Brother hastily clap'd it down, instantly with a bludgeon several violent blows were struck which broke the Sash, Glass & frame to pieces. The first blow aimed at my Brothers Head, he Providentially [*sic*] escaped, by its resting on the middle frame, being double, at same time altho' before then, no noise or appearance of more Person's than one) the lower windows, all round the House (excepting two) were broke in like manner. My Brother stood in amazement for a minute or 2, & having no doubt that a number of Men had broke in on several sides of the House, he retired Upstairs.⁴⁵

As the episode escalated further, Anne indicates that she awoke to terrible shrieking emanating from the house. She was petrified and 'cou'd imagine nothing less than that the House was beating down, after many violent blows on the Walls & windows, most hideous Shouting, dreadful imprecations, & threats ensued. Struck with terror & astonishment, what to do I knew not.'⁴⁶ Eventually the intruders left, warning the occupants of the house that they would return. The next morning the family left the house and did not return for a considerable period.⁴⁷

The Hulton's unsettling experience discloses intrinsically defensive emotions such as fear and anxiety as a prevalent aspect of the Loyalist experience. It is important to recognise the gender specific connotations of these emotional states. Carmen McLean and Emily Anderson have observed that 'substantial evidence points to...women demonstrating greater fear and anxiety than men.'⁴⁸ These emotional categories were certainly gendered in the eighteenth century. In a 1776 letter from Elizabeth Forbes to her aunt Christian Barnes, she references the unusual resilience of close family friend Elizabeth Inman, writing: 'No (other) woman could do as she does with impunity, for she is above the little fears and weaknesses

⁴⁵ Ibid., 22-23.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 23.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 24.

⁴⁸ Carmen P. McLean and Emily R. Anderson, "Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender differences in fear and anxiety," *Clinical Psychology Review* 29, no. 6 (2009): 502, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.05.003>.

which are the inseparable companions of most of our sex.’⁴⁹ The implication was clear. The fortitude that Inman displayed in confronting the perils of the conflict was deemed uncommon for her gender.

The precise relationship between fear and anxiety is complex, and much debate has centred on whether they are innate or socially constructed states.⁵⁰ I am persuaded that while both likely have an innate component they can only be properly understood within a particular cultural framework.⁵¹ Norbert Elias usefully encapsulates this position:

The strength, kind and structure of the fears and anxieties that smoulder or flare in the individual never depend solely on his or her own “nature” nor, at least in more complex societies, on the “nature” in the midst of which he or she lives.’ They are always determined, finally, by the history and the actual structure of his or her relations to other people, by the structure of society; and they change with it.⁵²

Thus, a society’s collective understanding provides the cultural context for the expression of emotions such as fear and anxiety. Social definitions of these specific emotions in the eighteenth century were informed by various writers, theorists and philosophers, including Thomas Hobbes who had influentially outlined the significance of the elite in determining social understandings of fear. He emphasises fear’s political and moral constituents, demonstrating how it could aid in establishing a society’s moral language.⁵³ Similarly, Baron d’Holbach, who criticised the use of superstitious fear, conceded that fear through firm government and strict laws, was needed to enforce morality.⁵⁴ At this time a commonly held view of human nature was that many people prioritised their own desires, and maliciously engaged in acts of cruelty against others. The more generous Enlightenment perspective aligned with Common Sense philosophy suggested that such cruelty was wrong because it was immoral, and immorality suggested something was askew with a person’s feelings. Essentially, a sense of morality ‘was a person’s guide through civilised life. Cruelty was not a

⁴⁹ James Murray, *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist*, ed. Nina Moore Tiffany and Susan I. Lesley (Boston: n.p., 1901), 246.

⁵⁰ For more information on the historical debates concerning the relationship between fear and anxiety see: Joanna Bourke, “Fear and Anxiety: Writing about Emotion in Modern History,” *History Workshop Journal*, no. 55 (2003): 111–33. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4289830>.

⁵¹ Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 32.

⁵² Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, ed. Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell, trans. Edward Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 442.

⁵³ Corey Robin, *Fear: The History of a Political Idea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 28. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁵⁴ Michael Laffan and Max Weiss, eds., *Facing Fear: The History of an Emotion in Global Perspective* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 51–52. ProQuest E Book Central.

deadening of the moral sense, but a wilful practice of ignoring it.’⁵⁵ Nonetheless, many political thinkers influential on the Patriots, including French philosopher Montesquieu, were concerned about a perceived decline of morality within society. He reaffirmed fear’s association with social order, delineating fear as an instrument of control for those in power. However, he anticipated that this type of fear would ‘serve as the catalyst of political and moral awakening’ and help to restore a society’s dissipating morality.⁵⁶

Like Montesquieu, Edmund Burke, who established the appeal of the concept of the sublime for eighteenth-century Americans, alludes to fear’s potentially positive qualities, arguing that being afraid could produce ‘the strongest emotion which the mind is capable of feeling.’⁵⁷ But he also warns of the misuse of fear by those in power, suggesting that ‘those despotic governments, which are founded on...the passion of fear, keep their chief as much as may be from the public eye.’⁵⁸ It was this use of deception to obscure their true aims, and inflame the public through lies and obfuscation that Loyalists felt lay behind the Patriot cause. This caused considerable unease to spread among Loyalists, who were uncertain as to what their futures held. The deleterious impact of such uncertainty on someone’s emotional well-being is succinctly described by Burke, who observes:

To make any thing [*sic*] very terrible, obscurity seems in general to be necessary. When we know the full extent of any danger, when we can accustom our eyes to it, a great deal of apprehension vanishes. Every one [*sic*] will be sensible to this, who considers how greatly night adds to our dread, in all cases of danger, and how much of the notions of ghosts and goblins, of which none can form clear ideas, affect minds, which give credit to the popular tales concerning such sorts of beings.’⁵⁹

Loyalists saw their futures engulfed by the night described by Burke, as their paths ahead lay shrouded in darkness. They saw the ghosts and goblins as Patriot groups such as the Sons of Liberty, with many feeling that they could be the victims of Patriot violence at any moment.

While fear and anxiety are ever-present within the letters of Loyalists, their epistolary networks also reveal a conscious effort to project an air of confidence in the face of Patriot mistreatment. They filled their letters with tales of Patriot hostility, not only to draw attention to Patriot immorality, but to illustrate their bravery when confronting such real and

⁵⁵ Rob Boddice, *A History of Feelings* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2019), 133.

⁵⁶ Robin, *Fear*, 29.

⁵⁷ Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry Into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1757), 13.

<https://archive.org/details/enqphilosophical00burkrich/page/13/mode/1up?q=capable>.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 43.

pervasive fear.⁶⁰ This strategy is evident in an epistolary account of Henry Barnes' decision not to comply with the 1768 non-importation agreement, irrespective of Patriot coercion and hostility. In a letter to a friend Barnes' wife describes what transpired:

The 10th of June the unqualified voters had a meeting, and the next day an effigy was hung upon a hill in sight of the House, with a paper pinned to the breast whereon was wrote, "Henry Barnes," as infamous importer. This hung up all day, and at night they burnt it. A few nights after they stole the covering from the wagon, which was tarred to secure the goods from the weather, and the same night stole a man's horse from a neighboring [sic] stable. They dressed an image in this wagon covering, tarred the horse, saddle and bridle, placed the image upon his back, and set him loose about the town, with an infamous paper pinned to the breast, which was summed up with wishing of us all in hell. But still finding that their malace [sic] had no effect, they made a bold push and dropped an incendiary letter... It is not possible for me to express what I suffered upon the perusal of this letter. I could not recollect any one person that we had ever injured or even wished ill to, nor could I imagine such villany [sic] ever entered into the heart of man.⁶¹

The fear that the Barnes family experienced because of the event is almost palpable, but even in the face of such callousness they refused to give in to Patriot measures.

Hiding their true feelings like this was an act of emotional concealment which, as already noted, is prevalent within Loyalist writings. The expression of an outward emotional pose that contradicted how they felt internally does not make their emotions inauthentic but rather demonstrates that they were conforming to a particular standard of emotional expression. In the late eighteenth century, it was thought that if someone had a strong sense of morality then they were less likely to be fearful. As Loyalists believed they occupied the moral high ground between the two sides, presenting an appearance of calm in their letters became a guiding principle, and shaped how they reacted to fear.⁶² This form of emotional concealment is captured in another letter, this one written by James Murray to his sister Elizabeth Inman on 23rd May 1775. The Patriot siege of Boston had begun, which left many Loyalists such as Murray holed up in the city, as they decided to stay due to the safety offered by the British army.⁶³ Loyalists feared that Boston would be 'set on fire by the Wigs within,' but Murray claimed that 'for my own part, I am as tranquil, as much at my ease as ever you knew me, from an entire Resignation to Providence and a firm persuasion that all will end for

⁶⁰ Boddice, *A History of Feelings*, 57.

⁶¹ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 177.

⁶² Robin, *Fear*, 64.

⁶³ Thomas B. Allen, *Tories: Fighting for the King in America's First Civil War* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2010), 76.

the General good.’⁶⁴ Projecting this veneer of positivity was common early in the conflict as Loyalists tried to assuage the concerns of others in their epistolary networks.

The capacity to maintain such positive ideals weakened as the Revolution wore on, however, with Loyalist epistolary networks increasingly becoming flooded with disturbing stories of Patriot violence. As Frank Furedi has shown, the spread of negativity through a communication network can undermine the collective confidence of the group, reducing their ability to deal with future fearful situations.⁶⁵ This was the impact of the circulation of disturbing accounts of Patriot cruelty, as it saw a once positive outlook frequently replaced by a deep sense of concern. For example, following the break in at Henry Hulton’s house in June 1770, news of the incident reached Christian Barnes. In a letter to Elizabeth Smith, she discloses how affected she was by the incident, writing:

A gentleman arrived from Boston in the evening and told us that Mr. Hulton's windows had been broke and the family had fled to the castle for protection. You may judge what sleep I had that night, and, indeed, ever since we have slept [*sic*] in such a manner that it can hardly be called rest. It is the business of the evening to see the firearnes [*sic*] loaded, and lights properly placed in the store and house; and this precaution we have taken ever since we received the letter.⁶⁶

For some Loyalists these reports eroded their confidence about their future safety in America, showing that it was not only their own personal experiences that caused such anxieties, but the stories of violence against others. This contributed to many going into exile to, as Anne Hulton put it, ‘extricate themselves from the difficulties, & distress.’⁶⁷

Samuel Curwen, like other Loyalists, sought to externally project a degree of positivity in his letters, but it is notable that his diary lacks much of this positive veneer, and instead suggests that he was overwhelmed by anxiety over the future. This supports my earlier argument for diaries being a medium of high emotional sincerity, while letters are subject to the same emotional conventions governing everyday physical interactions. This dichotomy in the emotional tenor of diaries and letters is made evident by comparing the two through Curwen. In a letter Curwen wrote to a friend after receiving reports of mounting violence against Loyalists, he contends: ‘Let us endeavor [*sic*] to fortify our minds against

⁶⁴ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 203.

⁶⁵ Frank Furedi, *How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018), 100.

⁶⁶ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 178.

⁶⁷ Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady*, 73.

despondency; perhaps our prospects will brighten.’⁶⁸ But such optimism is largely absent from his diary, replaced by an overwhelming sense of frustration, in which he bitterly questions why ‘thousands of useful innocents must be sacrificed to the wickedness, pride and folly of unprincipled men.’⁶⁹ The tension between a desire for sincere expression, and the pressure exerted by emotional conventions, is further illustrated by analysing the different epistolary networks utilised by Loyalists. In the following section these networks are examined in more depth, specifically looking at how gender shaped the varying networks available to men and women, and the influence of emotional standards on their letters emotional tone and contents.

Gender and Letters

The eighteenth century saw the advent of letter manuals which strongly shaped the format of these texts, and guided readers with respect to ‘certain rules of communication and styles of expression.’⁷⁰ These pedagogical materials became increasingly prevalent within the upper and middle strata of American society, and explicitly include instruction for both men and women.⁷¹ In 1759, for example, Samuel Richardson, already well known for his epistolary novels featuring sentimental heroines, published a letter-writing manual which helped to ‘popularize a new ideal of letter writing, the “familiar letter,” meant to foster emotional intimacy rather than business efficiency or aristocratic formality.’⁷² Such manuals created ‘a cultural atmosphere in which certain styles of expression were broadly valued...in the very fabric of social networks and personal letters.’⁷³ However, while these instructional works were undoubtedly influential, with respect to emotional expression they were often vague, lumping feelings together in discussions of overall emotional propriety.⁷⁴ Still, some socially contingent feelings were prioritised, with a particular focus on the need for modesty, reserve,

⁶⁸ Samuel Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen, Judge of Admiralty, etc., An American Refugee In England from 1775 to 1784*, ed. George Atkinson Ward (New York: C. S. Francis, 1842), 70. <https://archive.org/details/curwensamuelj00curwrch/page/n9>.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 55.

⁷⁰ Dierks, *In My Power*, 142.

⁷¹ Ibid., 155.

⁷² Ibid., 144.

⁷³ Ibid., 162.

⁷⁴ Carol Zisowitz Stearns and Peter N. Stearns, *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1986), 35.

and self-possession.⁷⁵ It was these sorts of ideals that people in the late eighteenth century tried to uphold during their correspondence.

For Loyalists, the standards outlined in familiar letter manuals became hard to adhere to due to the everyday realities presented by the conflict, and the splintering of family groups at this time. During this period many Americans ignored expectations pertaining to letter writing, as ‘most people yearned for stolen moments in which to write, for a small measure of autonomy that might enable them to meet their obligations and desires to be sociable.’⁷⁶ Since the Revolution witnessed significant human dispersal, letter writing served as the ‘connective tissue’ that held together extensive social networks across capacious geographic expanses.⁷⁷ Lindsay O’Neill has highlighted two primary networks that functioned in the eighteenth century, consisting of ‘constant networks that were made up of epistolary connections maintained over time,’ and ‘ephemeral networks that manifested themselves only when writers needed to solve a specific problem.’⁷⁸ The constituents of these communication grids constantly shifted and evolved, but their nature remained constant. The connections between family and friends represented a ‘constant network,’ with links between them often ‘woven into a stable web of support.’⁷⁹ These networks were largely facilitated and maintained through correspondence, consequently reaffirming ties between family members.⁸⁰ These communications were often intermittent, but the fact that contact was maintained across both time and distance demonstrates the considerable effort exercised by people to stay connected.⁸¹ Sarah Pearsall has shown that letter writing between family members prevented family bonds ‘from loosening in times and places when they seemed most in peril.’⁸² While the conflict meant separation and exile for many Loyalists, letter writing offered a means of sustaining connections with those closest to them.

Those Loyalists remaining in the colonies were powerless to take any meaningful action against tightening Patriot control.⁸³ Both Loyalist men and women were limited as to how they could resist, though Loyalist men could exert some influence over affairs by tapping

⁷⁵ Ibid., 35.

⁷⁶ Dierks, *In My Power*, 142.

⁷⁷ Lindsay O’Neill, *The Opened Letter: Networking in the Early Modern British World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 78.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 78-79.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 80.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 87.

⁸¹ Dierks, *In My Power*, 105-106.

⁸² Sarah M. S. Pearsall, *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 18.

⁸³ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 113.

into more ephemeral networks which consisted of members of the social and political elite. James Murray regularly exploited these evanescent networks, including in the wake of the Boston Massacre on 5th March 1770. Murray had been concerned that the accused British soldiers were going to be attacked by an angry mob, and exhorted Colonel William Dalrymple, who had been placed in charge of two regiments sent to Boston, to provide the accused with a personal guard. Dalrymple declined the request, but their correspondence illustrates the wide-reaching contacts men like Murray possessed.⁸⁴ Accessing such networks was not an option for Loyalist women because of their reduced public presence, which saw their narrower social networks curtailing their epistolary reach.⁸⁵

With women's political participation severely restricted, their close-knit familial epistolary networks provided them 'with a medium through which they might craft and broadcast their own political voice.'⁸⁶ However, tightening Patriot control meant that letter writing became increasingly risky for Loyalist women too. Christian Barnes in a letter to Elizabeth Smith, describes the actions of the Sons of Liberty as 'equal to high treason,' claiming that eventually the 'deluded multitude will see they have been led astray by false maxims.'⁸⁷ While open with her political views, she also betrays an awareness of the need not to overstep social conventions with respect to a woman's involvement in politics, adding that 'this is my private opinion,' as 'Politicks [sic] is a puddle I never choose to dabble in.'⁸⁸ She understood the importance of keeping her political opinions within their epistolary networks, but even then she knew she had to tread carefully.⁸⁹ The former American colonies expanded their treason laws after 1776 to incorporate the activities of women, primarily to guard against women lending support to the British during the war, meaning that Loyalist women who had felt comfortable using letters to express their own political ideas, often brazenly denouncing Patriot conduct, became more cautious.⁹⁰ This is evidenced by the restraint shown in a letter from Elizabeth Murray to her father James Murray in October 1777. Elizabeth, who remained in Boston after her father went into exile in 1776, admits feeling significant 'anxiety' because of a recent event, but was hesitant to discuss the details of what occurred.⁹¹ She simply writes

⁸⁴ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 211.

⁸⁵ O'Neill, *The Opened Letter*, 108.

⁸⁶ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 113.

⁸⁷ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 122.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁸⁹ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 67.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 98.

⁹¹ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 267.

‘as to...the late event of a public Nature. Silence upon that subject is necessary.’⁹² Such guarded words suggest a reluctance to discuss the matter because of the possible consequences of doing so.

Within many familiar epistolary networks Loyalist women acted as the fulcrum through which most correspondence flowed. Maintaining these networks was an attempt to rebuff Patriot attempts to isolate them during the conflict, enabling Loyalist women to pursue a strategy that not only prioritised family survival, but also consisted of a subtle form of political resistance.⁹³ Deprived of a voice during the conflict, they attained a degree of agency by defying Patriot strictures placed on correspondence.⁹⁴ While their epistolary networks were invariably limited to family and friends, they nonetheless provided an emotional space in which they could act, allowing them to be the constant core of a familiar network, albeit a much constrained one.⁹⁵ Women went to great lengths to preserve these connections, often hiding ‘their missives in quills, shoes, or hollow bullets.’⁹⁶ Even with their epistles under intense scrutiny Loyalist women understood the importance of reaffirming familiar emotional bonds.⁹⁷ The preservation of these networks was particularly important for women who had been left alone by their husbands to confront the enmity of their local community.

During such times many women felt ostracised and isolated, but the epistolary connections they maintained offered some comfort. Within these networks, smaller networks of support emerged, comprised solely of female correspondents. These networks allowed women to converse with close female relatives and friends, many of whom were in similar situations. This gave these women a common emotional bond which offered some comfort during times of distress.⁹⁸ Christian Barnes relied on this network of support, for example, after her husband, Henry Barnes, had been arrested due to suspected Loyalist sympathies. His arrest left his wife at home alone, and while alone she was thrown into the ‘greatest terror’ after an intruder broke into her house.⁹⁹ In a letter to close friend Elizabeth Inman, she intimates that she ‘did not recover from my fright for several days’ but letters from friends such as Inman helped to ease her mind.¹⁰⁰ Barnes describes her correspondence with Inman as

⁹² Ibid., 267.

⁹³ Dierks, *In My Power*, 222.

⁹⁴ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 112-113.

⁹⁵ O'Neill, *The Opened Letter*, 110.

⁹⁶ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 95.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 99.

⁹⁸ Dierks, *In My Power*, 161.

⁹⁹ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 187.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 188.

a relief from ‘the heaviest affliction that I ever encountered. Your first letter was as a cordial to a dying person. Your second gave me still greater relief.’¹⁰¹ By comparing her position to that of a dying person she reveals the scale of mental anguish she experienced. Inman, when reflecting on her epistolary exchange with Barnes refers to a pervasive unease in Barnes’ letters, writing that the ‘stress of the time is felt in every one of her letters, even when she pauses to note her blossoming thorn.’¹⁰²

While letter writing provided some solace for Loyalists, establishing the sincerity of the emotions expressed is complicated by the need for caution that impinged on their writing because of the threat that their letters could be intercepted. Letters were seen as possessing a strong sense of truthfulness, opening ‘a window into the private recesses lurking behind any public façade,’ as Dierks puts it.¹⁰³ But during the conflict Loyalists worried that if their letters fell into Patriot hands they would be interpreted unfavourably. These fears were amplified by Congress’ delineation of treason in 1776, in which they stated that anyone aiding Great Britain, could expect to receive the death penalty. Letter writing was considered particularly dangerous, and ‘there was even talk of banning all correspondence, regardless of content.’¹⁰⁴ Ultimately, a ban on letter writing would not come to pass but the stakes had been raised, and the consequences of any perceived disloyalty were clear.

The Threat of Interception

The risk of interception was felt most acutely by those Loyalists who remained in the colonies. For example, Anne Hulton, writing from just outside Boston claimed, ‘there is more risqué [sic] in giving a true Account of Matters & Events, than ones friends in England can easily imagine.’¹⁰⁵ In this climate Loyalists were reluctant to disclose specific details about the repressive Patriot measures. The guarded nature of the writing of those Loyalists who stayed in America is further apparent in the letters of Anne’s brother, Henry Hulton. He was a member of the Board of Customs Commissioners and consequently was well placed to comment on crucial events during the conflict. However, he is silent on many significant occurrences, including the Boston Tea Party and the departure of Thomas Hutchinson for

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 186.

¹⁰² Ibid., 191.

¹⁰³ Dierks, *In My Power*, 144.

¹⁰⁴ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 98.

¹⁰⁵ Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady*, 20.

England in 1774. It may be that some letters he wrote pertaining to these episodes have been lost, but his failure to comment in those that do survive is glaring. The details omitted from accounts such as Hulton's speak as powerfully as a complete record could, revealing an atmosphere of fear that had enveloped the epistolary networks of those in America loyal to the British cause.

Although Loyalists tried to refrain from overtly criticising Patriot policy due to a fear of reprisals, as the persecution intensified, they often failed in this endeavour. The constant need for circumspection and self-censorship due to possible interception was stressful, and caused bitter frustration.¹⁰⁶ In her correspondence, Hulton made repeated remarks about the need for caution, but her letters show that whenever a traumatic event occurred in her life that careful approach dissipates. During these brief moments her letters offer a fleeting insight into her true feelings. She, like other eighteenth century women, understood the need to present a genteel emotional appearance in her letters.¹⁰⁷ However, feelings of fear compromised her ability to adhere to such model behaviour, leading to a loss of control and the abandonment of societal norms relating to emotional expression. Because of this disjuncture, feelings that should have remained hidden were projected outward into the world. The disruption caused to normative behaviour by the Revolution is evident in Hulton's reaction to the earlier mentioned break-in at her brother's house in 1770. Following this event terror overwhelmed the entire family, but Hulton's fear increased exponentially after witnesses who had come forward to give their accounts received threats from Patriot groups. She was horrified to learn of the threats, writing to close friend Elizabeth Lightbody in a letter on 25th July 1770:

You may judge how much any further discovery is likely to be made, or justice to be obtained in this Country, when I tell you that the persons who were thus active to bring the dark deed to light, were immediately stop'd & silenced, being given to understand (as I'm well informd) [sic] that if they made any further stir about the matter, they might expect to be treated in the same manner as Mr H [Hulton].¹⁰⁸

Being openly critical was risky, but the outrage she felt compelled her to record her true feelings and denounce 'the virulence of Lying Tongues' as her fears were overcome by her considerable anger.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Dierks, *In My Power*. 221.

¹⁰⁷ Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009), 159-160.

¹⁰⁸ Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady*, 25.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 24.

Stories of Patriot violence pervaded Loyalist epistolary networks, as their letters unwittingly disseminated feelings of dread through Loyalist circles. The transmission itself was as important as the contents of the stories, as their factual basis was subsumed by the mode of conveyance.¹¹⁰ Edward Winslow in a letter to John Wentworth on the 22nd June 1778 claimed that he ‘had perhaps as fortunate an escape as any man in this world can boast of.’¹¹¹ He describes how:

On the 13th inst. about 12 at night a party of rebels (supposed to be about 25) landed directly below my house, marched up to the street, reconnoitered [*sic*] and as we imagine satisfy'd themselves that I was at home, but as their principal object was Flat Bush and an alarm might be the consequence of an attempt on me, they passed on to the houses of Major Moncreiffe and Mr. Bache, both of whom they made prisoners and carried off.¹¹²

He then continues:

On their return a small party were detached from their road, which was about 200 yards from my house. Most happily I had a number of n.-y [New York] friends about me, Daniel Murray, Mr. Upham, Parson Panton, Mr. Chipman and myself were very socially sitting round my table with the windows open. Whether our appearance was too formidable or whether they suspected from our being up at so late an hour that we were ready for 'em – or what was the cause, God knows, the fact is that they civilly omitted calling.¹¹³

After hearing of the episode a friend, Benning Wentworth, wrote to Winslow congratulating him on his narrow ‘escape from the hands of tyranny.’¹¹⁴ Another friend, Jonathan Sewall, wrote that he ‘read and wept’ upon reading ‘such serious heart rending truths.’¹¹⁵ Terrifying experiences such as that endured by Winslow thus circulated through Loyalist epistolary networks, triggering fear even in those who had not been involved in the original incidents.

Concerns about interception caused many Loyalists to go to great lengths to protect their identity and the contents of their letter, adopting ciphers and other codes to cover their tracks in ways that veiled the direct emotional response of Sewall to Winslow.¹¹⁶ Some families, such as the Rawles of Philadelphia used an epistolary code, assuming pseudonyms to hide their identities. Anna Rawle went by Fanny, for example, while her brother used the name Horatio.¹¹⁷ But while the use of such codes increased the level of security, they could

¹¹⁰ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty*, 19-20.

¹¹¹ W. O. Raymond, ed., *Winslow Papers: AD 1776-1826* (St. John: The Sun Printing Company Ltd, 1901), 28.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 28-29.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹¹⁶ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 95.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 92-93.

also cause confusion if the reader was unable to decipher their meaning. For instance, Samuel Curwen, in a 1780 letter to Jonathan Sewall, questioned him regarding a report he had received describing a ‘miraculous darkness in Boston.’¹¹⁸ The account stated:

On the 19th of May, the moon being just then beyond the full, the sky clear and unclouded at sunrise, and to all appearance promising a fine bright day, continuing some time in this state, when all at once a sudden darkness overspread the face of the heavens, and so palpably thick was it, that candles were lighted in the houses during its continuance till three o clock in the afternoon, to conduct the common concerns and intercourse of life. A short interval of light or twilight ensued, but was succeeded by a tenfold darker night than was ever known.¹¹⁹

Curwen was perplexed by the story, but Sewall felt the whole account had been allegorical in nature, so as to hide the truth in what had been written. Sewall wrote that ‘under the present tyranny in America, no man there dares write upon political subjects in *plain English*; if he writes at all, it must be in *dark enigmas*.’¹²⁰ He told Curwen to interpret the information thus:

The writer wished to let his friend here know what effect the news of the reduction of Charleston had upon the minds of the Boston rebels...but he dared not communicate his intelligence in a language intelligible to all, and therefore chose to give it in an allegory, trusting to the sagacity of his friend...he doubted not was well enough versed in Old Testament allegories, to translate it into literal English.¹²¹

Curwen was satisfied by his explanation, but the episode testifies to the fact that the added precautions Loyalists took at times created problems for the letter’s recipient in interpreting the emotional response required.

To reduce the likelihood of interception many Loyalists sent fewer letters overall, but incorporated a diary structure into their composition, allowing their letters to extend over a longer period.¹²² By blending the diary and epistolary form writers bent the very form of letter writing in new directions, blurring the boundaries between these different modes of expression.¹²³ Some writers utilised this structure during long absences caused by the Revolution, enabling them to sustain the illusion of a relationship with someone they had been apart from for long periods.¹²⁴ This can be seen in a missive composed by Elizabeth Forbes, a niece of Christian Barnes, between April and September of 1776. She wrote individual letters at different intervals during this period and then put them together as a type

¹¹⁸ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 265.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 262.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 265.

¹²¹ Ibid., 266.

¹²² Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 13.

¹²³ Ibid., 12.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 12.

of diary before sending the dispatch to her aunt. In the final entry in September she confirmed the disruption wrought by the conflict as the reason for her employing the diary format, stating ‘my dearest aunt the *long wished* for moment has arrived that presents an opportunity for sending my letters.’¹²⁵ While the diary format was often necessitated by circumstance, the linear progression inherent to this structure meant that writers could develop their narrative unimpeded by the time-lapse typically seen in the exchange of letters, delving into more emotional detail about the events they described.¹²⁶ However, a temporal difference is evident between epistolary-diaries and standard letters, as while epistolary-diaries retain much of the emotional immediacy of letters, they also have a reflective valence more commonly associated with diaries.

The use of a diary format nonetheless allowed the receiver of the letter to experience the same emotions as the writer, albeit vicariously. Barnes’ niece chooses to take her aunt through the emotional ups and downs both she and her close friends had experienced. She could have written one brief letter summarising events, but decided instead to send the ‘epistolary-diary’ she had composed over many months to more fully reveal her shifting emotions.¹²⁷ In the first entry Forbes describes how the ‘wanton destruction that presents itself to my view wherever I turn my eyes’ had left her ‘driven from the Society of the world and every social pleasure into a wilderness surrounded not by wild beasts, but savage men, and destitute of the conveniences of life.’¹²⁸ The tumult had left her feeling disoriented and terrified, living in a world filled with men who acted like wild animals. She was deeply troubled, living in ‘constant fear that some outrage will be committed’ against her.¹²⁹ The visceral quality of her words allowed her aunt to almost experience the hardships with her. Those troubles continue throughout the series, as the vicissitudes of the conflict caused her to move regularly, leaving her feeling ‘hunted from one retreat to another.’¹³⁰

Staying with friends in Cambridge gave her some relief, writing on the 7th May: ‘Notwithstanding all the calamities that surround us, we have great reason to be thankful that the seat of war is removed.’¹³¹ But this respite was short lived as a change in fortunes meant

¹²⁵ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 253.

¹²⁶ Tillman, *Stripped and Script*, 13-14.

¹²⁷ Ronald J. Zboray and Mary Saracino Zboray, *Everyday Ideas: Socioliterary Experience Among Antebellum New Englanders* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2006), 20.

¹²⁸ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 245.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 245.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 249.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 248.

that she again had to relocate, this time to the home of James Murray at Brush Hill, near Cambridge. Once there the vexations did not abate, though her concerns were more for her hosts than for herself. She was deeply worried about reports suggesting that Patriot authorities were intending to seize the Murray property. In an entry on the 17th May she explains her concerns:

This amiable family are going to be involved in new troubles. Did I fear for myself alone, I should be happy compared with what I now suffer, for I have nothing to fear from the malevolence of man, and Physical evils must be patiently submitted to; but when I see the few but valuable friends I have remaining upon the point of becoming destitute like myself, my heart sinks.¹³²

Christian Barnes was also a close friend of the Murrays so would have been disturbed by reports of the possible seizure of their home, underlining again how letters acted as conduits for negative emotions to spread. Fortunately for Barnes her concerns would have been short-lived as in a further entry on the 16th June her niece informs her that Patriot attempts to take their home had failed. She writes: ‘Rejoice with me, my dear Aunt, this infernal crew cannot succeed in taking the farm from this amiable family.’¹³³ The final entry in the epistolary-diary discloses the intentionality of her decision to take her aunt through such emotional upheaval, writing ‘I have perused what I wrote at different times, and think I have been...as particular as I can be in everything I thought you would wish to know.’¹³⁴ It was this immediacy that Barnes’ niece wanted her missive to capture, ensuring that her aunt could share emotionally in her trials and tribulations.

The precautions guiding the letter writing of Loyalists in America were also observed by those in exile, as they too contended with the severe restrictions placed on correspondence. Curwen, writing from England, demonstrates his awareness of the perilous state of letter writing, observing:

I am restrained from writing what might prove amusing, perhaps informing; should it fall short of its intended destination, and get into the hands of the provincials, though containing nothing prejudicial to the interests of America, even in their own view, nor reflecting on the character of any individual, the most innocent expressions, by the force of party prejudice, might be construed into a sense entirely foreign to one's intention, and render one obnoxious or ridiculous.¹³⁵

¹³² Ibid., 248.

¹³³ Ibid., 251.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 254.

¹³⁵ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 41.

He bemoaned these constraints, writing that ‘it is a sad and mortifying restraint on distant friends, and prevents that agreeable intercourse, which supports friendship and adds to the enjoyments of life.’¹³⁶ Many exiles wished to remain in contact with their friends and family in America, but their efforts were often thwarted by the interception of their letters. The next section explores this experience of exile and how it impacted Loyalist correspondence, looking at the various factors that created and increased feelings of anxiety.

Letters and the Reality of Exile

Epistolary networks functioned to alleviate some of the anxieties created by exile, offering Loyalists a means of staying connected with people in America, as well as those who had relocated elsewhere. In this way their epistolary networks offered a type of catharsis, a necessary psychological and emotional release, from their daily anxieties, where they could express themselves to a receptive audience. Samuel Curwen expounds on the importance of preserving those connections, writing that ‘to communicate with a friend is almost the only relief from distracting thoughts.’¹³⁷ He confides in a letter to another correspondent that his preoccupation was the welfare of family and friends in America, writing that ‘distress and anxiety for my friends and countrymen embitter every hour.’¹³⁸ Such concerns had him questioning his decision to go into exile, suggesting that he could have stayed if he had been able to tolerate the ‘insults, reproaches, and perhaps a dress of tar and feathers.’¹³⁹ William Pynchon, a close friend who remained in Salem throughout the Revolution, sought to alleviate Curwen’s doubts by reassuring him that:

If you knew half the inconveniences your continuance here would have occasioned, it would surely lessen your discontent; had you lost your business, all your debts, the fruits of many years' labor [*sic*]; been driven to sell your house and lands for payment of your debts and expenses; and thus reduced, you still would not freely nor safely walk the streets, by reason of party rage and malevolence and the uncontrolled rancor [*sic*] of some men.¹⁴⁰

Letters like this acted as a mechanism of emotional relief for Loyalist exiles, but while providing some comfort, they were not enough to remove their anxieties completely.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 230.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 58.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 33.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 96.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 227.

Their concerns were exacerbated by the interminable delays awaiting a reply. The long wait was a consequence of the transatlantic postal service which could be very slow, leaving people anxiously waiting weeks for an answer.¹⁴¹ In 1775 Jonathan Sewall left the colonies for Great Britain, separating him from the people closest to him. As he had personally experienced the tumult, he was patently aware of the hardships facing Loyalists in the colonies. As such, he was desperate for news about the safety of his dear friend Edward Winslow, with his letters explicating the stress caused by the wait for news. He wrote to Winslow on January 10th 1776, that he was out of ‘all patience at hearing...the accounts of your Sufferings.’¹⁴² Waiting for news was a common experience for other Loyalists in exile, including Anne Hulton who left America in 1775. Like Sewall, she had witnessed the brutality of the conflict, and this gave her grave concerns for those still in America. She was regularly consumed by worry while waiting for reports of their safety. In a letter to a friend on the 17th January 1776 she wrote of ‘the uncertain & anxious state I am in on acct. of my Dear friends & Connections in America.’¹⁴³

For Loyalist exiles, maintaining contact with people in the colonies was further complicated by Patriot interference in their epistolary networks, resulting in many letters not reaching their intended destination, which often created a sense of deepened isolation. During times of separation, as Dierks points out, ‘family and kin letters focused on the most basic of concerns. Where was a loved one in the world? Were they still alive? Had they been sending letters? Had they been receiving letters?’¹⁴⁴ But war exacerbated this dynamic, and these concerns are omnipresent in exiled Loyalist’s letters, filling them with both an intense practical and emotional meaning.¹⁴⁵ Curwen tried desperately to stay connected with people back in America, but he typically received few replies, which left him feeling abandoned. In a letter to William Pynchon, Curwen describes the distress this caused, writing:

You are one of the very few, to whom in the epistolary way I owe any debts. Ten letters from Salem are all I can boast in the course of almost five years...My complaints on this head have proved fruitless and vain, and have more than half determined me to suffer myself to be forgotten abroad, with a very few exceptions; and render measure for measure, and repay silence by contempt.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty*, 128.

¹⁴² Raymond, *Winslow Papers*, 13.

¹⁴³ Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady*, 81.

¹⁴⁴ Dierks, *In My Power*, 106.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 106.

¹⁴⁶ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 231.

His wish to return to America following the war amplified his anxiety, with the belief he had been forgotten suggesting that if he were to do so many of his pre-existing connections would be gone. Curwen's misery was somewhat ameliorated by learning the reason why he had received so few letters. Richard Ward, his brother-in-law, who had remained in Salem intimated that he had sent several letters to Curwen over the years but that they had been seized by the Patriot authorities. Ward's explanation temporarily put his mind at ease, as Curwen wrote: 'I find, greatly to my satisfaction, that other causes than those I suggested to myself have prevented my receiving those instances of notice and regard which your relation to me demanded.'¹⁴⁷ But while Ward's letter explained the lack of communication it did not diminish his feeling of isolation, or the concerns he had about his future prospects.

Curwen tried to use his epistolary networks to obtain information about the political situation in the colonies to assuage his concerns. His letters show that his anxiety about whether he would be able to return to America after the war increased exponentially as the conflict progressed. His quest for information was hindered by his belief that newspapers were 'vehicles of falsehood and sedition,' and so he preferred to receive reports from friends and acquaintances.¹⁴⁸ Unfortunately, news transmitted through letters was no more reliable since, as O'Neill observes, 'letters and newspapers usually carried the same news, and all of them could carry false news.'¹⁴⁹ In spite of this Curwen hoped that his contacts in America had access to intelligence that was otherwise unavailable to him. Writing to a close friend in July 1778 he asked whether he had:

Received any late advices from Boston or New England, by which you are informed of the situation of the country, respecting its political, civil, or religious condition; the temper and disposition of its inhabitants respecting those who have left the country; their inclinations or ability to continue the war. Would that the execrable spirit of persecution might abate, they be restored to reason, and I to my native country; an event I ardently long for.¹⁵⁰

He initially turned to well-established contacts, but his desire for information prompted the creation of new connections too, as he tapped into more ephemeral networks of mere acquaintances. One of these contacts was a Dr Daubent, who Curwen had known prior to the war, but was not particularly close to. In a letter to Daubent, who had recently arrived in Britain from America, Curwen questioned him about the overall condition of Massachusetts

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 238.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 175.

¹⁴⁹ O'Neill, *The Opened Letter*, 180.

¹⁵⁰ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 199-200.

‘with respect to order, trade, religion — the state of our society and the situation of our friends.’¹⁵¹ It was desperation that precipitated the creation of new epistolary connections like this, as Loyalists like Curwen sought out information about the state of play in America to reduce their feelings of anxiety.

Their concerns were exacerbated by the fact that many reports emanated from second or third hand accounts. Stories of Patriot atrocities circulated widely through Loyalist epistolary networks, but their unconfirmed nature only increased people’s unease. Anne Hulton wrote extensively of Patriot depredations, noting in one letter that she had heard a Patriot committee ‘had sentenced a Man to be buried alive, for wishing success to the Kings Troops, & that the sentence had been executed upon him.’¹⁵² The unsubstantiated nature of many reports was further compounded by exaggeration, as evidenced by another letter composed by Hulton in April 1775 documenting the Battles of Lexington and Concord. Her embellished account notes that the British troops, ‘on their return found two or three of their people Lying in the Agonies of Death, scalp’d & their Noses and & ears cut off & Eyes bored out.’¹⁵³ Terrifying stories like this eventually reached people in exile, such as Curwen, further deepening their worries. In a letter to his friend, Reverend Isaac Smith, he references a letter someone had read to him that they themselves had received from a contact in America. The letter painted a disturbing picture, describing ‘the sufferings of people late in comfortable circumstances, and many in a condition truly pitiable.’¹⁵⁴

Curwen’s worries regarding the integrity of communication pushed him to draw together multiple sources to corroborate reports. He sought out various strands of intelligence to substantiate claims that Loyalists would be shown no mercy following the war by the Patriot authorities. In the eighteenth century reliable news was elusive, and transmitted in varied media, as people ‘passed on news through letters, printed epistolary news, and sent printed news back through oral and epistolary channels.’¹⁵⁵ Loyalists were familiar with the different threads available to them, and depended on trusted epistolary networks to communicate trustworthy information.¹⁵⁶ For Curwen, the Revolution subverted his confidence in the information flowing through networks he had previously considered robust, but relying on multiple forms of evidence reassured him. In a letter to George Russell,

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 162.

¹⁵² Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady*, 85.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 77.

¹⁵⁴ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 225.

¹⁵⁵ O'Neill, *The Opened Letter*, 184.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 184.

Curwen intimated that the bleak future awaiting Loyalists had been reported ‘in my own town newspaper, called the Salem Gazette, nor does it want confirmation from verbal testimony, and a multitude of letters from friends and foes corroborate the same.’¹⁵⁷ In Curwen’s mind stating several sources enhanced the reliability of the information, but ultimately the reports were speculative, and only caused further emotional uncertainty. The spread of groundless information across Loyalist communication networks disconcerted Loyalists, underscoring the fact that while these networks were an effective way of disseminating information, the unconfirmed nature of many of the reports served only to increase Loyalist angst.

Such letters reveal fear and anxiety to be prevalent within Loyalist epistolary networks, with the expression of these concerns typically dictated by late eighteenth-century emotional standards. Those letters written by Loyalists in America show feelings of fear to be common, while anxiety predominated in those composed outside of the colonies. The interpersonal dynamics of letter writing meant that letters were subject to more overt forms of emotional compliance than more private modes of expression like diaries. Loyalist letters thus reveal a tension between a desire for sincere expression and the need to conform to societal standards. These emotional rules determined that it was improper to exhibit feelings of unease, suggesting that any acts of concealment they engaged in do not so much undermine the authenticity of expression but rather demonstrate conformity to expected standards. The ability to adhere to these emotional conventions was at times challenged by the everyday realities of the conflict, and their exposure to frequent reports of Patriot violence. Such stories created a need for constant vigilance, placing an enormous emotional strain on Loyalists. The impact of these stories largely stemmed from their circulation rather than the factual content, underscoring the importance of transmission in propagating feelings of fear.

Loyalist exiles used letter writing to maintain a vital support network, but severely disrupted connections served to intensify people’s anxieties, while also increasing a sense of isolation. This explicates the remoteness of exile, with feelings of detachment fuelling uncertainty. Many Loyalists utilised their epistolary networks to obtain information about the political climate in the colonies, not only drawing on pre-existing networks, but established new contacts from outside their familiar networks. However, much of the information they

¹⁵⁷ Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen*, 383.

received was unreliable which only further heightened their concerns. Determining the fidelity of reports was important and a constant source of anxiety for Loyalist exiles.

While feelings of fear and anxiety are predominant across the epistolary networks of Loyalists, the next chapter shifts the focus to the emotional aspects of Loyalist pamphlets and broadsides, revealing anger to be a central emotional register within these productions. Russ Castronovo recognises the centrality of ephemeral print in creating a consensus of feeling during the Revolution, by ‘making emotion common.’¹⁵⁸ Building on such ideas, the following chapter argues that pamphlets and broadsides assisted in delineating the emotional registers of both Loyalists and Patriots. The wide audience anticipated for such print ephemera made them well suited to Loyalist displays of public anger, in contrast to letters, which typically had a more limited audience, making them an ideal space for expressing their more private fears and anxieties.

¹⁵⁸ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 20.

Chapter 4

Public Outrage: Anger and Print Ephemera during the American Revolution

During the revolutionary furore William Smith asked:

Who then are the real enemies of America, if not *they* who have perverted the *virtuous aims* of the *main body* of the people for the defence of their rights and priviledges [sic], into a war for dominion? And *seduced* some, *terrified* many, and driven more, to assist in this extravagant enterprize [sic].¹

These words come from his 1780 pamphlet, *The Candid Retrospect: or, The American War Examined, by Whig Principles*, and are demonstrative of the outrage felt by Loyalists towards the perceived instigators of the rift between Great Britain and her colonies. They illustrate the centrality of anger in revolutionary print ephemera. While during the eighteenth-century print ephemera encompassed a range of printed materials, including newspapers, for the purposes of this study it will be specifically considered in relation to broadsides and pamphlets. Chris E. Makepeace usefully defines print ephemera as ‘a transient document produced for a specific purpose and not intended to survive the topicality of its message or event to which it relates.’² This was the case with the broadsides and pamphlets investigated here, which largely had an implicit political function, and were ‘intended to exert an influence only in that fleeting moment of [their] intervention.’³ The outrage common to these productions was central within the works of both Loyalists and Patriots, suggesting the presence of emotional mirroring between the two sides. However, they diverged with respect to what prompted those feelings, with Patriot anger stemming from what they considered to be the mishandling of colonial matters by the British, while Loyalist anger was caused by what they perceived as objectionable Patriot conduct. An emotional parallel, and distinction, is also evident with respect to the way their expressions of outrage are closely tied to feelings of anxiety. But while Loyalist anxiety was precipitated by a belief that the Patriot cause destabilised colonial society, Patriot anxiety was the result of deep-seated concerns about British policy in the colonies.

¹ William Smith, *The Candid Retrospect: or, The American War Examined, by Whig Principles* (Charlestown: John Wells, 1780), 12.

² Chris E. Makepeace, *Ephemera: A Book on Its Collection, Conservation, and Use* (Aldershot: Gower, 1985), quoted in Kevin Murphy and Sally O’Driscoll, eds., *Studies in Ephemera: Text and Image in Eighteenth-Century Print* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2013), 35. ProQuest Ebook Central.

³ Kevin Murphy and Sally O’Driscoll, eds., *Studies in Ephemera: Text and Image in Eighteenth-Century Print* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2013), 3. ProQuest Ebook Central.

While the print ephemera on both sides discloses emotional similarities, what is apparent is that both sides also traded on the presumption of their own emotional and ethical superiority. The differing emotional delineations proffered by the two sides became entrenched and augmented through the production of print, with writers trying to shape public comportment and definition of acceptable conduct. These were public contestations regarding emotional propriety, with both sides using pejorative terms to rhetorically define the emotionology of the other side, while describing their own emotional register in wholly positive language. Among all the media investigated in this thesis, this is distinctive to print ephemera, and is especially observable within pamphlets, suggesting that their intrinsic oppositional character, combined with their public nature made them a suitable forum for such disputes. It is therefore possible to say that both sides employed pamphlets as a vehicle to invalidate their opponents' emotional attitudes and standards, and to establish themselves as the purveyors of correct emotional expression.

The emerging public sphere, as described in chapter one, resulted in an increase in public political debate in the late eighteenth century. This expansion in political engagement is reflected in the pamphlet production relating to the American crisis, which saw over four hundred of these texts printed in the American colonies by the end of 1776.⁴ That figure climbed to over fifteen hundred by the end of 1783.⁵ The enhanced opportunities this presented for the lower sections of society enabled them to more readily engage in public debate, explicating the democratising effects of this proliferation in print. Within the ephemeral print produced during the Revolution, broadsides and pamphlets were prominent. These publications were often polemical in nature and reveal print as a space for intense invective. It is important to note that the functioning of the public sphere present in this chapter complicates the model outlined by Habermas and the centrality he places on rational debate, as the prevalence of anger within Revolutionary Era print ephemera testifies to the fact that this new public sphere was often far from a site of calm reasoned discussion and was instead an environment of highly charged emotional exchanges.⁶

⁴ Bernard Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776: 1750-1765* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965) vii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁶ For scholarship on the challenges posed to Habermas' public sphere model see: Margaret Kohn, "Language, Power, and Persuasion: Toward a Critique of Deliberative Democracy," *Constellations* 7, no. 3 (2008): 408–429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.00197>; Jane Mansbridge et al., "A Systemic Approach to Deliberative Democracy," in *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*, ed. John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, 1–26 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Chantal Mouffe, "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism?" *Social Research* 66, no. 3 (1999): 744–758.

Both broadsides and pamphlets were generally targeted at local audiences and usually directed at a particular person or group. Through these ephemeral materials they sought to persuade readers and shape their views on current social and political issues. The intent to convince people in this way had the potential to conflict with notions of authentic emotional expression which, as already observed, was a key ideal of eighteenth-century emotional expression. As such Loyalists strove to prove the sincerity of their sentiments, deploying this sincerity as a riposte to allegedly debased Patriot emotions. In this way they established themselves as arbiters of genuine feeling, contrary to what they considered to be the artful and false emotions proffered by Patriot pamphleteers. Revolutionary Era print ephemera thus shows the ambiguous nature of political identity and allegiance during the conflict. Broad­sides and pamphlets concentrated primarily on, and were triggered by, specific issues – for instance, there was fierce debate about what constituted a true Patriot – and both sides argued vociferously about the meaning and definition of key concepts such as liberty and freedom. As we will see later, the adversarial nature of many of these exchanges lend the texts discussed here a different, and more public form of emotional coercion compared to the more private media investigated in earlier chapters. Both sides shared a similar ideology with respect to the basic principles of good governance but departed markedly in how this should work in practice, and this was central to the pamphlet exchanges. Among Loyalists ranks there was considerable antipathy regarding impassioned Patriot political discourse, and they sought to explicate the detrimental consequences of partisan discord for the colonies.

As the conflict progressed Patriots tightened their control of print production throughout the colonies. The committees of inspection and committees of safety instituted by Patriots functioned to intimidate possible dissenters.⁷ This created a constrained environment for Loyalists, who experienced serious emotional suffering due to their inability to fully express themselves. In this tense atmosphere anonymous authorship became necessary, with many Loyalists employing the commonly used method of pseudonyms within their political writing, as they felt it would permit more freedom of expression. Such a constricting environment was also the reality of those who remained neutral, finding themselves caught in

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40971349?seq=1>; Zizi Papacharissi, *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, "Questioning the Ideal of the Public Sphere: The Emotional Turn," *Social Media + Society*, 5, no. 3 (2019).

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119852175>; Iris Marion Young, "Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy," in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib, 120–136 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

⁷ Phillip Gould, *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of the Politics in British America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 11.

a tug of war between the two sides. Both Loyalist and Patriot writers publicly placed pressure on those occupying the middle ground, showing neutrality to be a fraught concept during the Revolution. Loyalists begged anyone wavering to publicly show their support for the British, and as we will see, the emotional implications of their pleas underscore the tenuous position in which they found themselves. Conversely, Patriots did not feel the need to beg but rather insisted that people support the cause of independence. Such a distinction not only usefully illustrates the contrasting emotional tenor of both sides but also highlights disparities between them.

Broadsides and pamphlets were the product of both individual and collective authorship, and as will become evident, these different forms of composition impacted on the emotional tone of these productions. The presence of collective authorship differentiates them from other media used for this study which were predominantly the result of solitary writers. These forms of print ephemera share the same temporal space as letters and diaries, as both were written close to the time of the events depicted. However, neither of these other modes of expression were explicitly public forms of communication and consequently lack the inherent immediacy of pamphlets and broadsides. Both of the latter were rapid forms of communication, which can be contrasted temporally with the retrospective nature of other forms investigated in this thesis, in particular memoirs. The production of print ephemera was dominated by men from the social elite, as were most of the forms of public engagement I discuss, since it was felt that women were unsuited to the political and public spheres, meaning female involvement was significantly limited.

Broadside and Pamphlet Forms

Print profoundly impacted political thinking during the Revolution, often acting as a mediating force for a plethora of different groups.⁸ In the eighteenth century ephemeral literature, including broadsides and pamphlets, became increasingly prominent, largely due to developments in the printing trade making them increasingly inexpensive and easy to produce.⁹ Broadsides were a rapid form of broadcast, benefitting from qualities commonly

⁸ Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson and David Waldstreicher, eds., *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 12. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁹ Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 59-60.

associated with the printed word, including reliable reproduction, portability, and legibility. These properties gave broadsides the ability to be widely distributed throughout communities, infusing them with a high degree of immediacy.¹⁰ Broadsides also had a more visible public presence than pamphlets, often being posted in public spaces like taverns and shop windows. They were a highly visible feature of attempts by different political factions to shape attitudes in the rapidly expanding public of the late eighteenth century, with collective public opinion becoming increasingly contested.¹¹ Many were the production of revolutionary political groups, including the Boston Committee of Correspondence, who published the proceedings of a meeting which occurred on the 19th July 1774. In this broadside they harness the power of collective emotion to display their mutual outrage, issuing a series of resolves objecting to British taxation, and contending ‘that all Acts of the British Parliament imposing Taxes on the Colonies, are unjust and unconstitutional.’¹² The Committee observed that as the resolves ‘contain *our* Sentiments...they [should] be immediately published.’¹³ The social elite had long understood the potent potential of collective emotion, and the Patriot leadership tapped into this to project their anger towards British policy.¹⁴

A key feature of how these Patriot political groups utilised collective emotion, was publishing broadsides that aided with shoring up their own position, while isolating those in the community who did not subscribe to their principles. The use of legalistic frameworks and tropes in their publications inculcated them with a semblance of legitimacy, lending important weight to their contents.¹⁵ This format combined with the immediacy with which their broadsides were circulated made them an effective means of influencing public opinion. The deployment of broadsides by Patriot political groups troubled Loyalists due to the subversive quality of much of their contents. To deflate the impact of these publications, Loyalists printed their own broadsides parodying the formal structure utilised by Patriots. Satire was prevalent within transatlantic print culture, and became a standard trope used by eighteenth century pamphleteers.¹⁶ Loyalist satire often drew on familiar British literary models,

¹⁰ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty*, 242.

¹¹ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 363-364.

¹² New York City. Committee Of Correspondence. *Committee-Chamber, Proceedings of the Committee of correspondence. The resolves proposed by the Board to the inhabitants of this City, having been published and dispersed through the town several days previous to this meeting*, (New York, N.p. 1774). Pdf. <https://www.loc.gov/item/2020768579/>.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Andreea Marculescu, and Charles-Louis Morand Métivier, eds., *Affective and Emotional Economies in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cham: Springer International Publishing AG, 2017), 37.

¹⁵ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty*, 94-95.

¹⁶ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, 9.

including Alexander Pope, as a vehicle to undermine Patriot arguments, and turned more frequently to ‘invective and mockery’ as the crisis worsened, with their attacks ‘appealing less to logic or legal precedent and more to imaginative displays of irony and wit.’¹⁷ This exposes the deep-seated anxiety of Loyalists due to the growing popularity of the Patriot movement, with their increasing sense of outrage and desperation leading to an abandonment of emotional propriety in their print production.¹⁸ Their willingness to forgo the usual conventions dictating their emotional lives reinforces the fragility of such emotional standards during times of social unrest. In a 1774 broadside titled *At a Meeting of the TRUE Sons of Liberty*, for instance, an anonymous Loyalist writer satirically wrote:

RESOLVED, That every Man, Woman, or Child, who doth not agree with our Sentiments, whether he, she, or they, understand them or not, is an Enemy to his Country, wherefoever [sic] he was born, and a Jacobite in Principle, whatever he may think of it; and that he ought at least to be tarred and feathered, if not hanged, drawn and quartered; all Statutes, Laws and Ordinances whatsoever to the contrary notwithstanding.¹⁹

The placement of resolved in the text takes a trope common to legal documents, and suggestive of committee discussion and accord, to undermine various resolutions being distributed by quasi-official Patriot bodies at that time. Such parodies were one facet of a broader use of satire employed by Loyalist writers to express their indignation towards the Patriot authorities, anticipating that it would diminish the impact of Patriot publications.²⁰ Indignation, as Nicole Eustace has observed, was a similar brand of anger to resentment, but had more virtuous connotations and lacked the personal bitterness common in expressions of resentment. It often stemmed from a sense of moral injustice, typically implying ‘one treated to unmerited contempt.’²¹ It was this sense of moral injustice that Loyalists like Jonathan Boucher felt, believing that the actions of Patriot authorities towards those opposing independence were unjust.

While broadsides were commonly produced by political groups, thus subsuming their individual feelings within a collective, many broadsides were also printed by individual writers. An anonymous Loyalist writer using the pseudonym Poplicola, for example, employs

¹⁷ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 84.

¹⁸ Ibid., 13.

¹⁹ *At a meeting of the True Sons of Liberty, in the City of New-York, properly convened; present, John Calvin, John Know, Roger Rumpus, &c. &c. Uc. 15 resolves By order of the meeting Ebenezer Snuffle, Secretary New York, 1774* (New York, 1774). <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.10602600/>.

²⁰ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 22.

²¹ Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 342.

the medium of a broadside in 1773 to illustrate the corruption of leading Patriot figures, alluding to the ‘insidious arts which have been used to bias your minds.’²² He warns that ‘every step they [the Patriots] have hitherto taken has been introductive of the most fatal tyranny; a tyranny of so high a nature as not to permit a fellow citizen even to think differently from them without danger.’²³ His negative depiction of Patriot conduct was intended to elicit outrage in readers against the instigators of such oppressive measures.²⁴ He urges caution, writing ‘while we are watchful against *external* attacks on our freedom, let us be on our guard, lest we become *enslaved* by *dangerous* tyrants within.’²⁵ The use of the alias Poplicola evokes classical ideals and values closely tied to classical republicanism, revealing the powerful influence of ancient Rome among the educated elite in American society. For eighteenth century writers like Poplicola classical republican Rome became the means by which they ‘could distance themselves from their own society and achieve the perspective from which to criticise it.’²⁶ In this case, the figure referred to was Publius Valerius Poplicola, a Roman aristocrat who helped to overthrow the monarchy leading to the creation of the Roman republic in the 5th Century BC. However, in deposing the monarchy Valerius Poplicola was also seen as taking a stand against tyranny, and it is this that the Loyalist pamphleteer wanted to emulate.²⁷ The author of this pamphlet thus cast the radical Patriot faction as being analogous to the despotic monarchy of ancient Rome, hoping that the public would concur and decline to align themselves with the Patriot cause.

While broadsides were a useful means of spreading invective and conveying outrage, pamphlets were the preferred medium for political engagement, profoundly influencing the tone and course of public discussion across the Revolutionary Era.²⁸ They became a forum for heated polemical exchanges. The highly charged emotional exchanges that took place demonstrate the increasing centrality of unchecked feeling in eighteenth century public debate. As a medium they have been described by Bernard Bailyn as a mode of communication without any specific prescribed pattern, taking many different forms,

²² Poplicola Pseud, *To the worthy inhabitants of the City of New York. Every good citizen will be inclined from duty as well as interest, to love his country, and to be zealous in advancing its welfare Arguing in favor of the purchase of tea shipped by the British* (New York, 1773). <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.10500100/>.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Marculescu and Métivier, eds., *Affective and Emotional Economies*, 56-57.

²⁵ Poplicola Pseud, *To the worthy inhabitants*.

²⁶ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 101.

²⁷ Plutarch, “Poplicola,” trans. John Dryden, The Internet Classics Archive, MIT.

<http://classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/poplicol.html>.

²⁸ Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic*, 59-60.

including essays, letters, stories, and poems.²⁹ Flexible in size, they allowed for short, sharp rebuttals, as well as lengthier, more explanatory writings. Most pamphlets were polemical in nature, ‘aimed at immediate and rapidly shifting targets: at suddenly developing problems, unanticipated arguments, and swiftly rising, controversial figures.’³⁰ Many were a reaction to significant events such as the 1765 Stamp Act, or were the result of ‘chain-reacting personal polemics: strings of individual exchanges – arguments, replies, rebuttals, and counter-rebuttals,’ often ending in ‘bitter personal vituperation.’³¹ By publicly declaring their personal position writers bound themselves to a wider emotional community which, as already explained, is defined by a group who conform to the same emotional standards. The Revolution saw the capacity for emotion to become entwined with notions of liberty, as emotional freedom became closely tied to political autonomy.³²

Like broadsides, some pamphlets were the product of group authorship, and often official in nature. These publications reveal how groups used this medium to publicly express collective emotion.³³ This can be seen in a 1772 pamphlet titled *The Votes and Proceedings of the Town of Boston* which was produced by the Boston Committee of Correspondence. Their use of varying forms of anger is indicative of the complicated relationship colonists had with anger in the eighteenth century. While advocating restraint they also embrace more excessive forms of emotion which were considered acceptable under certain circumstances. The pamphlet combines two traditional aspects of a petition, acting as a statement of rights, while also describing a list of grievances.³⁴ It contains considerable fiery rhetoric, shifting from the ‘calm certitude of a statement of rights, to the indignation of the list of infringements of those rights, to the rousing letter of correspondence.’³⁵ By expressing their collective outrage like this the committee underlined the wider emphasis placed on emotional restraint at that time.³⁶ But they also sought to draw on older traditions of popular protest which ‘supported periodic expressions of moral indignation,’ demonstrating a form of anger that was considered socially legitimate.³⁷ Loyalists, however, viewed *The Votes and Proceedings* as seditious, feeling that

²⁹ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, vii.

³⁰ Ibid., 5.

³¹ Ibid., 5.

³² Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 8.

³³ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, 7.

³⁴ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty*, 53.

³⁵ Ibid., 54.

³⁶ Carol Zisowitz Stearns and Peter Stearns, *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1986), 30-31.

³⁷ Ibid., 24.

it set a precedent for other colonies who contemplated revolting against the British.³⁸ They also rejected Patriot claims of justifiable outrage, arguing that Patriot political groups were instruments of ‘*injustice and oppression*,’ undercutting any sense of propriety in their use of anger.³⁹ Patriots felt that adopting a structure commonly used in official legal documents would bolster the authority of the *Votes and Proceedings* and make it appear more credible to readers. But for Loyalists any credibility the pamphlet may have had was lost by the illegitimacy of the Patriot committee who published it.

Many pamphlets broadly addressed the political situation in the colonies, while others were directed at individual political bodies. It is important, however, to draw a distinction between the rhetorical audience and the expected audience of these different texts. While many writers explicitly addressed a particular audience in their pamphlets, another separate audience was also anticipated. This is elucidated by a series of pamphlets that were prompted by the meeting of the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia in August 1774. These pamphlets were on the surface addressed to Congress, but the authors decision to express their respective views publicly suggests that their pamphlets also targeted a wider reading public, through whom they sought to shape societal perceptions of Congress. William Henry Drayton, an ardent Patriot, for example, composed a pamphlet early in 1774 titled *A Letter from Freeman of South-Carolina, to the Deputies of North-America, Assembled in the High Court of Congress at Philadelphia*. Speaking directly to the members of Congress, Drayton stated that the:

Eyes and Attention of America, nay of Europe, are fixed upon the American Congress—O Deputies! I doubt not, but that you will act worthy of such an expectation.—Calmly deliberate upon, then respectfully and boldly declare the Grievances and Rights of America.⁴⁰

Drayton expected Congress to take a stand against what he viewed as British tyranny, insisting it was their responsibility to defend colonial rights. Many Loyalists had severe doubts about this meeting of Congress though, as explicated by a pamphlet tentatively attributed to Jonathan Boucher titled *A Letter from a Virginian, to the Members of the Congress to Be Held at Philadelphia, on the First of September, 1774*. In this pamphlet the

³⁸ William B. Warner, *Protocols of Liberty*, 51-53.

³⁹ Gordon S. Wood, ed., *The American Revolution: Writings from the Pamphlet Debate 1773-1776* (New York: Library of America E-Book, 2015), 290.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 228.

author outlines his feelings, hoping that it would place pressure on the members of Congress to use caution during their discussions. He poses this question to Congress:

Can such Proceedings answer any Purpose, but the dangerous Purposes of exasperating and provoking the Indignation and Vengeance of all Orders and Degrees of Men in the parent Country? Of alienating the Affections of the People here, seducing them from their Allegiance, inflaming their Passions, and exciting them to popular Tumults, and Insurrections?⁴¹

Here the author makes his concerns clear, fearing the meeting would serve to exacerbate a rapidly deteriorating situation.

The intended audiences often varied, but most pamphleteers anticipated a local audience.⁴² Such a presumed local audience is evinced by a 1774 pamphlet composed by Thomas Bradbury Chandler, titled *A Friendly Address to All Reasonable Americans, on the Subject of Our Political Confusions: In Which the Necessary Consequences of Violently Opposing the King's Troops, and of a General Non-Importation Are Fairly Stated*. Here Chandler addresses his home colony of New Jersey, warning that many leading Patriots were 'under the undue influence of prejudice and passion' and consequently represented a threat to the future prosperity of the colonies.⁴³ This characterisation of negative emotional responses was a reference to the tumult in New England. Boston's harbour had been closed following the Boston Tea Party in 1773, and Chandler understood that many people from within New Jersey felt that Boston had been harshly treated. But he pleaded with New Jersey not to act rashly in offering support to Boston. He writes that:

The Bostonians, you say, are *over-punished*. If that be the case, they are entitled to our pity, and to our influence in obtaining a mitigation of their punishment. But this can be no reason, for our putting ourselves in the same predicament with them, for making ourselves partners in their guilt, or for bringing upon ourselves a similar punishment.⁴⁴

Chandler was prepared to extend his sympathy to the plight of Boston but was concerned about taking any further action. As he continued:

The foregoing considerations are addressed—not to those obstinate, hot-headed Zealots, who are at the bottom of all our confusions; for arguments would be as much wasted upon them, as upon men that are intoxicated with liquor—but to *all reasonable Americans*, to those who are still in the exercise of their understandings, and whose minds are open to conviction. People of this character, it is presumed, will see the necessity of giving up the present system of American politics, as essentially

⁴¹ Ibid., 279.

⁴² Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 23-24.

⁴³ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 347.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 348.

wrong and destructive; and of entering unanimously upon moderate and conciliating measures, as they regard the restoration of peace and tranquility [*sic*] in this, heretofore, happy country.⁴⁵

For moderates like Chandler, it was clear that the hot-headed zealots were the root cause of colonial unrest. He did not try to reason with those who he believed were beyond his reach, but rather appealed to the moderate section of society, imploring them to stand up to the growing tide of republicanism. In doing so he highlights the discursive rupture that occurred in the pamphlet debates at this time, as authors stopped speaking to the more radical section of the opposing side on the grounds of their emotional excess, undermining one of the core principles of reasoned political discourse up to that point.

The varying ways that people used pamphlets to engage in political debate evokes questions about how people chose to align themselves politically. Thus, we need to consider the emotional implications of partisan allegiance, examining the political divisions that arose, and how such splits impacted ephemeral print from the revolutionary period. As we will see, accusations of party bias were central to each side's political rhetoric, as were claims of people prioritising self-interest over societal betterment. Anger was intrinsic to such rhetoric, but its use was complex and loaded with political meaning. In response to the rising tide of the Patriot emotional regime across the former colonies, and the perceived loss of emotional freedom, the tone of Loyalist arguments becomes imbued with a sense of desperation. As already observed this Patriot emotional regime, defined by a shared understanding of emotional definitions and practices, gave preferment to passionate emotions. Loyalists invoked sincerity and moderation to counter such passionate feeling, but as we will see this was largely unsuccessful, revealing pamphlets to be largely unsuited to reasoned forms of public debate.

Political Identity and Allegiance

Pamphlet production from the revolutionary period reveals the complexities associated with political identification and allegiance. By the time of the Revolution two distinct political groupings had developed in the colonies, the Tories and the Whigs.⁴⁶ While both sides held

⁴⁵ Ibid., 367.

⁴⁶ The Tories, or 'court party' advocated for the supremacy of royal prerogative. They consisted largely of the social elite, who considered the British Empire to be one solitary state, encompassing all Englishmen globally, with the English Parliament their sole legislature. They subscribed to a principle that 'the British Empire [was] one organic whole, whose sovereign government, of kings, lords, and commons, was the unchallengeable head

different positions on many issues, fundamentally they were in agreement with respect to the ‘nature of the state, the theory of natural law made manifest in the natural rights of Englishmen, constitutional restraints upon government, and the ultimate derivation of sovereignty from the people.’⁴⁷ However, a primary point of difference between the two groups pertained to how these fundamentals should work in practice, with this becoming a significant point of contention in the pamphlet debates. The fraught nature of politics at that time saw many pamphleteers dissociate themselves from either position, due to accusations of self-interest.⁴⁸ This was prompted by a commonality of eighteenth century emotionology which dictated that self-interest should not be prioritised over communal good. As such, humility held great appeal, in a tacit acknowledgment that social harmony did not come from a selfish pursuit of self-interest but in the ‘meritorious striving for virtuous conduct.’⁴⁹

Nonetheless charges of partisan bias were ubiquitous, leading writers like Thomas Paine and committed Loyalist Charles Inglis, to deny partisan affiliation as a motivating force behind their pamphlets. Their exchanges also underscore the contested nature of the expression of anger, with any hint of anger as a central driver in one’s thinking being treated with derision.⁵⁰ Paine vigorously rejected suggestions that he was associated with a particular group or motivated by anger, declaring that he was not ‘induced by motives of pride, party, or resentment to espouse the doctrine of separation and independance [sic].’⁵¹ Inglis balked at his claims, arguing that not only was Paine driven entirely by anger, but he had placed ‘himself at the head of a party; and spurns from him with the utmost contempt and indignation, all who will not enlist under his banner.’⁵² He deploys sincerity to counter what

and governor of that whole.’ The American Whigs or the ‘assembly party’ or the American Whigs, consisted predominantly of members of the provincial assemblies and their cohorts. They argued that each colony constituted a sovereign state, irrespective of whether they were ruled over by the British monarchy. Their political philosophy was that of constitutionalism, denoting state formation as being the result of a social compact. From their perspective state government was derived from its people, with ‘the legislature as the most powerful branch of government, the proper agency for the expression of the sovereign will of the people.’ The Whigs argued vehemently for colonial autonomy, insisting that the colonies should have their own form of government based around local conditions and realities. Their thinking was strongly influenced by rationalist ideas, particularly the naturalistic theories of government proposed by philosopher John Locke. In Max Savelle, *Seeds of Liberty: The Genius of the American Mind* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965), 304, 291, 290.

⁴⁷ Max Savelle, *Seeds of Liberty: The Genius of the American Mind* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965), 292.

⁴⁸ Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic*, 45.

⁴⁹ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 48.

⁵⁰ Stearns and Stearns, *Anger*, 33.

⁵¹ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 795.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 910.

he viewed as Paine's uncontrollable anger, believing it would deflate his arguments. Inglis was convinced that because he opposed independence Paine would consider him:

“A disguised tory, a prejudiced man,” or what in his estimation “will be productive of more calamities to this continent than all others – a moderate man.” But I am too conscious of the sincerity of my own heart, and of the rectitude of my intentions, to pay any regard to whatever he is pleased to call me.⁵³

Here, his use of earnest expression is demonstrative of an awareness of the high regard placed on emotional sincerity, and its potential to undermine highly charged emotional displays.⁵⁴

Because of the consequences of being accused of partisan allegiance, ranging from public abuse to social ostracism, many people sought to remain neutral. Philip Livingston helps to exemplify the complicated reality of political identification. In his 1774 pamphlet *The Other Side of the Question*, he refers to independence as ‘the most vain, empty, shallow, and ridiculous project, that could ever enter into the heart of man.’⁵⁵ Livingston was initially a proponent of British sovereignty, but harboured serious concerns about British policy in the colonies and argued strongly against Loyalist attempts to defend British conduct. While having reservations about American independence, however, he went on to reluctantly sign the *Declaration of Independence* in 1776 and commit himself to the Patriot cause.⁵⁶ Livingston illustrates the dynamic nature of political identification, in which a person's political allegiance could potentially change across time. For colonists like Livingston political allegiance was not determined by one defining moment but was rather ‘unplanned and reactive, [and] sensitive to the changing local context.’⁵⁷ Livingston's eventual endorsement of independence demonstrates that the escalating crisis forced people to choose sides. Unlike Livingston, others remained unwilling to support independence and consequently were considered Loyalists by the Patriot authorities.⁵⁸ Many of them did not openly support the British but instead wished to remain out of the quarrel. However, irrespective of their wishes, following the Continental Association in 1774, neutrality became fraught, with Congress increasingly structuring the ‘terms of identification.’⁵⁹ The mechanisms of enforcement that were put in place made ‘dissent, or even impartiality

⁵³ Ibid., 909.

⁵⁴ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 64.

⁵⁵ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 406.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 381.

⁵⁷ Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Side: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 26.

⁵⁸ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 8.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 108.

impossible.’⁶⁰ Patriot tactics of imprisonment, banishment, confiscation, and loyalty oaths, combined with the ever-present threat of mob violence entirely eroded the middle ground.⁶¹ The reality was that by not embracing the cause of independence, a colonist elected not to subscribe to the new Patriot emotional regime, often resulting in persecution and dislocation.

Many Loyalists were frustrated by those in society who privately opposed the Patriots, but who were unwilling to openly show their support for the British. While continuing to appeal to principles of reasoned debate, the tone of Loyalist calls for people to forgo neutrality reflects the wider emotional shift in their ephemeral print culture, as their rhetoric became imbued with a sense of desperation. In his pamphlet *A Friendly Address*, Chandler implored those who refrained from getting embroiled in the conflict to make themselves heard. He stated:

If those who have been most active among us, in raising seditious tumults, and in filling the country with distraction, will not be persuaded, by the foregoing considerations, to recede, it is hoped that others will; and it would be no small point gained, in favor of the Colonies, if those who are friends to order and government, and enemies to the riots and disturbances of abusive *mobs*, would assume the courage openly to declare their sentiments.⁶²

Early in the conflict Loyalists had affirmed the priority of the middle ground, but here Chandler demonstrates how, as with Patriots, they had now begun to actively decry those who remained neutral. It should be noted that his disapproval of neutrality was, however, selective in that he did not want everyone to leave the middle ground, just those who harboured sympathies for the British.

Much Patriot writing fiercely denounced Loyalists, making it difficult for people to openly commit themselves to the Loyalist cause. Moderates repeatedly saw those who published pamphlets appealing for a calm, reasoned exchange of political ideas, ironically condemned as emotionally improper enemies to their country. It was clear that ‘political debate was no longer a polite, reasonable conversation over different means to a common end; it had transformed into with-us-or-against-us combat over irreconcilable abstractions.’⁶³ This inflexible Patriot mentality is exemplified by Paine, who in his second edition of *Common Sense* printed in 1776, describes Loyalists as having ‘narrow and prejudiced

⁶⁰ Ibid., 69.

⁶¹ Chopra, *Choosing Sides*, 25.

⁶² Wood, *The American Revolution*, 357.

⁶³ Taylor Stoermer, ““The Success of Either Lies in the Womb of Time” The Politics of Loyalty in the Revolutionary Chesapeake,” in *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, ed. Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2019), 28.

souls,’⁶⁴ and people ‘who hath not only given up the proper dignity of man, but sunk himself beneath the rank of animals, and contemptibly crawls through the world like a worm.’⁶⁵ Abusive terms such as these gained traction with many Patriots, and Paine himself acknowledged that anyone professing to be a Loyalist needed to be protected from the ‘popular rage’ that proliferated throughout the colonies.⁶⁶ This popular rage often manifested in the belligerent conduct of Patriot groups such as the Sons of Liberty, who frequently persecuted writers publishing pamphlets that propagated notions divergent from Patriot principles. The repressive actions of Patriot groups were roundly criticised by Loyalist pamphleteers such as Chandler who castigated them for ‘striving to intimidate writers, and printers, and readers, and speakers, and thinkers, on the side of government.’⁶⁷

For Paine, there was no room for moderation or neutrality, and he accused those of occupying the middle ground of being dangerous. In *Common Sense*, for example, he describes moderates as having ‘an ill-judged deliberation’ and charged that they ‘will be the cause of more calamities to this continent.’⁶⁸ This ostensible abhorrence of moderation and rationality was unfathomable for Loyalists, who felt that civility was being replaced by barbarity.⁶⁹ To Loyalists, the old colonial emotional regime was being replaced by a new emotional regime built on the notion of Patriot spirit which as discussed earlier, was a fusion of base passions and the respectability of the social elite. People were expected to embrace the newly emerging emotional register, or they would be targets for Patriot scorn. Paine’s political positioning made this clear, as he proscribed both Loyalism and neutrality, leaving support for the Patriot cause as the only acceptable alternative. For Inglis, it was not so black and white, and he resisted any form of political categorisation. His advocacy for moderation, prevalent within Loyalist pamphlets is, however, contrary to the angry tone of his and many other Loyalist pamphlets, underscoring ephemeral print as a space for impassioned partisan debate. This is evidenced by the pamphlet exchanges between Inglis and Paine which reveals the unrestrained nature of pamphleteering during this period, with both authors publicly engaging in vitriolic exchanges, vociferously objecting to the arguments put forward by the

⁶⁴ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 826.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 819.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 826.

⁶⁷ Thomas Bradbury Chandler, “What think ye of the Congress now? or, An inquiry, how far Americans are bound to abide by and execute the decisions of, the late Congress?” Evans Early American Imprint Collection, University of Michigan Library Digital Collections. <http://name.umd.umich.edu/N10953.0001.001>.

⁶⁸ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 792.

⁶⁹ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 14.

opposing side.⁷⁰ This type of unfiltered derision contradicts notions of emotional humility and decency which were common at that time, further demonstrating how the Revolution complicated adherence to the prevailing tenets of sensibility.

In 1774, Ebenezer Baldwin wrote *An Appendix, Stating the Heavy Grievances the Colonies Labour under from Several Late Acts of the British Parliament, and Shewing What We Have Just Reason to Expect the Consequences of These Measures Will Be*. In *An Appendix* he recognises the fractious state of the colonies, observing ‘that the whole continent seems as it were struck with horror and amazement’ with some ‘transported with a wild and enthusiastic rage in the cause of liberty.’⁷¹ Yet he understood that the ‘more sober thinking part feel impressed with a deep and solicitous concern.’⁷² It was the more sober thinking members of the community that many Loyalists pleaded with to stand up against the radical Patriots, pointing to the serious consequences of failing to do so. The next section of this chapter, then, will explore in more depth the arguments made by Loyalists to reach those more rational members of society. As we will see, they employed fear to convince people of the wayward nature of the Patriot cause and routinely alluded to the insincerity of Patriot claims. To further undermine Patriot arguments, they sought to reclaim important emotional terms and concepts but ultimately saw their ability to reach people disrupted by intensifying Patriot control of print production.

Polemical Rhetoric

During the Revolutionary Era pamphlets often functioned as alarmist communications, which ‘traded on rumor and emotion’ in an attempt to ‘manufacture and mobilize public opinion.’⁷³ Many Patriots felt that they lived in a ‘conspiratorial world’ in which those in power were duplicitous in nature, with their words concealing malevolent intent.⁷⁴ They saw plots and conspiracies everywhere, assuming that ‘patterns of events were always the intended consequences of particular human designs.’⁷⁵ In their pamphlets, Patriots employed fear to persuade the public that they were confronted with a deliberate conspiracy to extinguish

⁷⁰ Ibid., 24.

⁷¹ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 420.

⁷² Ibid., 420.

⁷³ Russ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776: Secrets, Leaks, and Revolutionary Communications in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 88.

⁷⁴ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, 62.

⁷⁵ Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 109.

liberty in the colonies.⁷⁶ One such event that Patriots alluded to as a sign of British deceit was the 1774 Quebec Act, which gave Catholics freedom of worship, and was ‘widely understood as a milestone in British imperial legislative efforts to accommodate culturally and ethnically alien subjects.’⁷⁷ The Patriots, however, vociferously opposed the Act, usually through the form of ‘shopworn anti-French and anti-Catholic stereotypes.’⁷⁸ Many Patriots felt that the Quebec Act established Catholicism in the colonies, with Ebenezer Baldwin suggesting that it ‘wears as threaten[ing] *[sic]* an aspect upon Americans as any act that hath been passed by the British.’⁷⁹ Chandler felt these types of assertions were absurd, arguing that ‘more lies and misrepresentations concerning this act have been circulated, than one would think malice and falsehood could invent.’⁸⁰ For Loyalists like Chandler the spuriousness of Patriot claims was further proof of the deep rooted emotional insincerity permeating their cause.

Accusations of emotional insincerity were prevalent in the pamphlet exchanges, and as we have seen, a common feature of Loyalist rhetoric more broadly. Loyalists argued that the Patriot assertion that the British had violated colonial freedoms was entirely disingenuous, exposing the Patriot emotional regime as inauthentic. Patriots often characterised their resistance to British corruption as a justifiable struggle for English liberty, but Loyalists were critical of such a framing device.⁸¹ For Loyalists, the notion that Patriots fought in defence of colonial rights was, as Philip Gould explains, a ‘cheap rhetorical façade masking the self-promotion of colonial protest.’⁸² Chandler contended that the grievances espoused by Patriots in their pamphlets were unfounded, writing:

The present confusion of the Colonies has been occasioned by misinformations *[sic]* and false alarms. If none of our *legal* rights have been invaded, no injury has been done us; if we have not been injured, we have no room for complaint; and we can never be justified in resenting that, which it would be unreasonable to complain of.⁸³

Loyalists felt that the baseless claims propagated by Patriots stirred up public emotions, and they found this troubling. To expose the falsity of Patriot claims, Loyalists alluded to the emotional contradictions evident in their opponents’ pamphlets. They anticipated that the use of such a rhetorical device would illustrate Patriot hypocrisy, invalidating their arguments.

⁷⁶ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, 86.

⁷⁷ Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: HarperPress, 2011), 61.

⁷⁸ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 106.

⁷⁹ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 437.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 344-345.

⁸¹ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 39-40.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 43.

⁸³ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 332.

This suggests that Loyalists saw rhetoric, and its emotional implications, as more transparent and self-evident than Patriots. To expose the inconsistencies in their opponents' arguments, Loyalists pointed to the alliance the Patriots formed with the French in 1778. They lampooned the Patriots for their earlier opposition to the Quebec Act, contending that their assertion that the act represented a threat to English identity and culture was an example of disingenuous anger.⁸⁴ Joseph Galloway while citing Montesquieu to defend British policy in America, for example, quipped 'I will quote the passage in the original; as French must now become the language of America, you cannot begin to learn it too soon.'⁸⁵

To further undermine Patriot arguments, Loyalists used pamphlets to publicly subvert their claims to the term Patriot itself. From their perspective patriotism was assumed to be imbued with conceptions of specific forms of conduct, which were associated with a particular emotional register and specific modes of public expression. They sought to reframe the emotional parameters of the term, suggesting that genuine patriotism consisted of humility, civility, and toleration.⁸⁶ These emotions were deemed to be contrary to the Patriot reality, which was barbaric and exclusionary, comprising 'shameful ignorance, pride and stupidity.'⁸⁷ Loyalist pamphleteers also redefined the term Patriot itself, stripping away any Patriot associations, and adjusting its meaning to incorporate those loyal to the British. For example, Chandler argued that Patriot conduct was 'inconsistent with every maxim of sound wisdom and genuine Patriotism.'⁸⁸ Inglis concurred, castigating the Patriots for their fiery rhetoric, observing that 'I cannot persuade myself, that such fire and fury are genuine marks of patriotism.'⁸⁹ Jonathan Boucher too warned of 'Imposters to Patriotism,' describing how:

Under the Name of constitutional Principles, by bold Assertions, partial Representations, false Colourings, wrested Constructions, and tragical Declamations, have frequently imposed on the Credulity of the well-meaning deluded Multitude. Thus the most honourable Cause that wise and good Men can engage in, the Cause of Liberty, has been often disgraced; Nations once as free and as happy as ourselves, have been frighten'd into Anarchy, plung'd into all the Horrors of a civil War, and ended their miserable Career in the most humiliating and abject Slavery, until the

⁸⁴ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 122-123.

⁸⁵ Joseph Galloway, *A Letter to the People of America, lately printed at New York; now re-published by an American. With a postscript, by the letter, addressed to Sir W***H**** (London: T.Becket, 1778), 20, quoted in Phillip Gould, *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of the Politics in British America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 159.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 156.

⁸⁷ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 367.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 367.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 871.

sacred Name of Liberty has become a Word of Scorn and Mockery in the Mouths of Tyrants, and their abandoned Minions and Emissaries.⁹⁰

This was his warning to Congress, beseeching them to avoid such actions, insisting they were antithetical to true notions of patriotism. He concluded: 'If you have acted from honourable motives, from disinterested principles, from true patriotism...you need fear no attack, nor the strictest scrutiny of your actions.'⁹¹ It was clear in the eyes of Loyalists that true patriotism consisted of love, empathy, and a devotion to one's country. By outlining these views in pamphlets, they hoped that the wider public would agree.

During the pamphlet exchanges a notable rhetorical debate occurred between prominent Loyalist Samuel Seabury, and the Patriot leader Alexander Hamilton, regarding Congressional policy and parliamentary sovereignty. In his 1774-1775 pamphlet *Letters of a Westchester Farmer*, Seabury openly challenged the legitimacy of Congressional authority.⁹² He typically sought an effective balance between impassioned plea and rational analysis in his pamphlets, but occasionally his writing betrays a loss of emotional control, suggestive of 'the dreadful sense of alienation to which Loyalists like Seabury were increasingly subjected.'⁹³ He discloses his increasingly unsettled emotional state in his stinging criticism of Congress, for instance, suggesting they had 'taken not one step that tended to peace: They have gone on from bad to worse, and have either ignorantly misunderstood, carelessly neglected, or basely betrayed the interests of all the Colonies.'⁹⁴ In response to Seabury, Hamilton defended the actions of Congress, noting that 'it was hardly to be expected that any man could be so presumptuous, as openly to controvert the equity, wisdom, and authority of the measures, adopted by the congress: an assembly truly respectable on every account!'⁹⁵ Seabury was undeterred, and continued his attacks on Congress, but because of this he was harassed by the Sons of Liberty, and his final pamphlet, *The Republican Dissected* was suppressed due to fears of retribution.⁹⁶ He was eventually placed under house arrest for his political views, testifying to the serious nature of speaking out against the cause of independence.⁹⁷

⁹⁰ Ibid., 272-273.

⁹¹ Ibid., 293.

⁹² Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 14.

⁹³ Ibid., 71.

⁹⁴ Samuel Seabury, "Free thoughts, on the proceedings of the Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia Sept. 5, 1774," Evans Early American Imprint Collection, University of Michigan Library Digital Collections. <https://name.umd.umich.edu/N10731.0001.001>.

⁹⁵ Alexander Hamilton, *A Full Vindication of the Measures of the Congress, &c., [15 December] 1774*, Founders Online, National Archives. <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Hamilton/01-01-02-0054>.

⁹⁶ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 60-61.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 62.

Similarly, a response composed by Inglis in New York to Paine's *Common Sense*, titled *The Deceiver Unmasked* was prevented from being distributed when a Patriot mob ransacked the printing house, destroying all copies of the pamphlet.⁹⁸ In the 1776 revised version titled *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated*, which was published soon afterwards in Philadelphia, Inglis refers to *Common Sense* as 'one of the most artful, insidious and pernicious pamphlets I have ever met with.'⁹⁹ In the pamphlet Inglis criticises both the author and his pamphlet, attempting to undermine the contents of *Common Sense*, while simultaneously discrediting Paine himself. He concludes: 'I find no Common Sense in this pamphlet, but much *uncommon* phrenzy. It is an outrageous insult on the common sense of Americans; an insidious attempt to poison their minds, and seduce them from their loyalty and truest interest.'¹⁰⁰ Of the author himself he observed that 'he seems to be every where [*sic*] transported with rage – a rage that knows no limits, and hurries him along, like an impetuous torrent.'¹⁰¹ It can be observed that within Inglis' attack on Paine there are shades of irony, as in critiquing Paine's vituperative tone he himself evinces a similarly angry tone. It is possible to see this lack of emotional awareness or emotional self-control as further proof of the Revolution destabilising traditional modes of emotional expression.

As stated earlier, the characterisation of Patriot anger as unruly was an attempt by Loyalists to represent the emotional underpinnings of the Patriot cause as those of the lower sort of society. This draws attention to the implications of social status for the emotional usage in pamphlets. Both sides fought over the legitimacy of their emotional registers, resulting in regular exchanges about the social propriety of emotional conduct. As we will see, Loyalist pamphleteers conflated class and emotion as a mechanism to frame the Patriot emotional regime as unworthy, attempting to invalidate the Patriot cause.

Status and Class Dynamics

Pamphlets were an embedded feature of political discourse during the conflict, with these publications representing 'the material reality of an abstract public,' impacting both the print culture and political participation.¹⁰² As already observed, the development of print culture in

⁹⁸ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, 180.

⁹⁹ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 839.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 840.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 870-871.

¹⁰² Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic*, 61.

the eighteenth century had democratising consequences, enabling the middling sort to increasingly enter the public sphere through debate. This allowed seemingly disparate people to identify shared interests, which contributed to the growth of republicanism in the build up to the Revolution.¹⁰³ Loyalists recognised the significant social reach of pamphlets and accused Patriots of exploiting the medium to stir up public emotions. Charles Inglis felt this was precisely what Thomas Paine endeavoured to do, arguing that *Common Sense* was ‘addressed to the passions of the populace, at a time when their passions are much inflamed.’¹⁰⁴ According to Inglis during such times ‘the mind is easily imposed on, and the most violent measures will, *therefore*, be thought the most salutary. Positive assertions will pass for demonstration with many, rage for sincerity, and the most glaring absurdities and falsehoods [sic] will be swallowed.’¹⁰⁵ From his perspective Patriot pamphleteers like Paine were tapping into a prevalent belief in the eighteenth century, which held that powerful displays of feeling denoted authenticity of expression.¹⁰⁶ However, Inglis felt that the outrage they expressed was simply a device designed to lend their words a veneer of authenticity, suggesting it was used performatively.

Inglis characterised Patriot anger as uncontrollable and in doing so framed their emotional expression as being of the lower sort of society.¹⁰⁷ By conflating class and emotion in this way he was employing a common trope within Loyalist rhetoric which characterised Patriot emotion as consisting primarily of base emotions. Such an assumption served only to reinforce a prevalent belief within Patriot circles that the Loyalist ranks were comprised largely of out of touch elites who knew nothing of the lower sort of society. Not only did such a position risk alienating people from the lower tiers but also left them open to rebuttal. As such, Patriots rejected the negative characterisation of their cause, with the then General Washington jumping to their defence, asserting that the cause of independence was grounded in ‘moral emotions – virtuous spirits – motivated love of country, [and] devotion to freedom.’¹⁰⁸ By attributing lower class emotion to the Patriot cause, and combining this with accusations of insincerity, Inglis was attempting to delegitimise the emotional centre of his

¹⁰³ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 7-8.

¹⁰⁴ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 839.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 839.

¹⁰⁶ Sandra M. Gustafson, *Eloquence is Power: Oratory & Performance in Early America* (United States of America: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 107.

¹⁰⁷ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 157.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 385.

opponent's actions, but Patriots like Washington strongly resisted this and sought to frame their emotional foundation as pure or moral in nature.

The anger that Paine espoused with regards to British treatment of the colonies was shared by many common folk who 'were tired of being scorned and held in contempt by a monarchical and aristocratic world.'¹⁰⁹ But while Paine's arguments appealed to many in society, his firebrand exhortations not only troubled Loyalists, but many Patriots also found his arguments disconcerting, particularly concerning the constitution.¹¹⁰ John Adams was extremely wary of Paine's approach, for example, referring to him as a 'star of disaster.'¹¹¹ Leading Patriots, such as Adams, occupied elite positions within society, and consequently were unable to sufficiently represent the middling sort, to which Paine himself belonged. As a result, while they detested much of the language Paine used, they did not publicly castigate him. They understood that through his pamphlets Paine was effective in reaching the common people, drawing on a form of fiery emotional expression that was anathema to members of the upper echelons of society but helpful to the cause of revolution.¹¹² The abhorrence that many elite Patriots felt regarding the emotional register employed by pamphleteers such as Paine is suggestive of multiple emotional communities coexisting and overlapping within the Patriot movement. One such emotional community consisted primarily of the social elite, and preferred refined emotions, which were also, incidentally, shared by many Loyalists. Another distinct emotional community, associated with the lower tiers of society, encompassed more passionate and impulsive forms of expression. Significantly, Patriots from the upper tiers of society were prepared to embrace aspects of this lower emotional community to further the Patriot cause, while Loyalists were unwilling to do the same.

Patriots such as Paine regularly charged their arguments with strong emotions, as British soldier Henry Barry observed in his 1775 pamphlet *The Strictures on the Friendly Address Examined, and a Refutation of Its Principles*. He noted the 'zeal of the whigs' in dispersing their arguments in pamphlet form, discerning that their ability to do so 'far outstripped that of the tories.'¹¹³ Loyalist pamphleteers, many of whom belonged to the social elite, refused to deploy the same emotional language in their refutations of passionate Patriot pamphlets such as *Common Sense*, instead relying on reason. James Chalmers, a wealthy

¹⁰⁹ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 835.

¹¹⁰ Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, 6.

¹¹¹ John Adams, "John Adams Autobiography, Part 1, Through 1776, Sheet 23 of 53," *Adams Family Papers: An Electronic Archive*, Massachusetts Historical Society, <http://www.masshist.org/digitaladams/>.

¹¹² Wood, *The American Revolution*, 835.

¹¹³ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 479.

Maryland Loyalist, recognised the dangerous potential of Paine's *Common Sense*, and like other Loyalists, was aware of the ability of pamphlets like Paine's to rapidly spread ideas.¹¹⁴ In an appeal to self-evidence, apparent in many Loyalist pamphlets, Chalmers in *Plain Truth* (1776), pleads: 'Ye that are not drunk with fanaticism answer me. Are these words [of Paine] dictated by peace, or bale foul revenge?'¹¹⁵ He argues that Paine is out of touch with the emotional tenor of the populace, and offers a more accurate rendering of their true feelings, declaring:

I will communicate the general purport of their discourse. — "We shudder at the idea of arming with more virulence, more unremitting ardour, against the parent state than against France; by whom our rights, civil as well as religious, certainly were more imminently endangered. With horror we reflect: on the former civil wars, when every crime, odious and baneful to human nature, were alternately perpetrated by the soldiers, particularly by the Independents"¹¹⁶

By ventriloquizing public feeling in such a manner Chalmers attempted to 'establish the authenticity of the public voice' favouring loyalty to the crown, irrespective of the fact that a large section of society supported the Patriot cause.¹¹⁷ This further highlights the rhetorical function of ephemeral print culture, which is especially pertinent when Loyalist members of the upper echelons, like Chalmers, claim to speak for society at large. The reality was that Paine's pamphlets resonated with many in the colonies, primarily due to his decision not to employ detailed classical references, which were a common feature of eighteenth-century pamphlets.¹¹⁸ Instead, he chose to rely on the Bible as his primary reference point, making his arguments more accessible to people lower down the social ladder who were not as intimately familiar with Greek and Roman history.¹¹⁹ Contrary to the types of anger espoused by many classical authors, including ancient Greek historian Thucydides, who argued that its expression should be purposeful and restrained, Paine tapped into the righteous anger of the Bible to condemn the British.¹²⁰ He uses the familiar biblical story of Gideon to illustrate his contempt for kingship, observing how 'the exalting [of] one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority

¹¹⁴ Castronovo, *Propaganda 1776*, 138.

¹¹⁵ James Chalmers, *Plain Truth Addressed to the Inhabitants of America, Containing Remarks on a Late Pamphlet, Intituled Common Sense* (London: J. Almon, 1776), 27.
<https://archive.org/details/plaintruthaddres00chaluoft/page/n7/mode/2up>.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

¹¹⁷ Gustafson, *Eloquence is Power*, 244.

¹¹⁸ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 765.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 765.

¹²⁰ Rob Boddice, *The History of Emotions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018). 20-21.

of scripture.’¹²¹ He shows how Gideon when presented with the crown after leading the Israelites to victory against the oppressive Midianites, declines the offer, claiming that it is not his place to rule as ‘THE LORD RULES OVER YOU.’¹²² By framing monarchy as unnatural Paine was attempting to justify Patriot anger against the king for what he viewed as his oppressive behaviour towards the colonies.

Many Patriot pamphleteers sought to delineate the relationship between the British and the American colonies along status lines, depicting the British as holding the senior position in the relationship. Placing the colonies in a subordinate position allowed Patriots to characterise the British ministry and the king as unfeeling. Patriots, for example, delineated the British as ‘a mean spirited lord,’ which consequently disrupted existing notions of imperial authority, ‘making the traditional grandeur of empire now accessible to critique.’¹²³ Charleston lawyer, William Henry Drayton, following the Coercive Acts of 1774, designed to punish Massachusetts Bay following the Boston Tea Party the previous year, seized the opportunity to openly criticise British policy. He claimed he was animated by a ‘*Spirit of indignation*’ to condemn ‘*the malignant nature*’ of the Coercive Acts, which he felt violated any sense of liberty in the colonies.¹²⁴ Drayton argued that as ‘the Liberty and Property of the American is at the pleasure of a Despotic power, an Idea of *a risque* [sic] of life itself in defence of my hereditary rights, cannot appal me, or make me shrink from my purpose.’¹²⁵ Drayton, like many other Patriots at this time, described being indignant as a result of British treatment, a word that carried clear class connotations, conveying the clear contempt he felt.¹²⁶ His use of the term indignation was intended to explicate the unwarranted disdain with which the colonies had been treated. In choosing not to employ more inflammatory language to express his contempt he asserted the dignity of his dissatisfaction.¹²⁷

By characterising the British as despotic Drayton demonstrates that by late 1774 adherence to notions of propriety in the relationship between the colonies and the British administration had begun to dissipate. Paine took this further, elucidating how by 1776 the status dynamic between Great Britain and the colonies had drastically shifted in the minds of

¹²¹ Thomas Paine, *Common Sense: Addressed to the Inhabitants of America* (London: H.D. Symonds, 1792), 7. https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Common_Sense/PE8UAAAAQAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1.

¹²² Ibid., 7.

¹²³ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 48.

¹²⁴ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 191.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 192.

¹²⁶ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 153.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 342.

the colonists, characterising King George III as a ‘sullen tempered Pharoah [sic] of England.’¹²⁸ The disdain Paine felt for the monarchy grew after the Battles of Lexington and Concord on the 19th April 1776, subsequently describing the king as possessing ‘the pretended title of FATHER OF HIS PEOPLE’ who unfeelingly heard of the slaughter, and yet managed to sleep with the ‘blood upon his soul.’¹²⁹ This kind of familial imagery not only underlines the idea that the conflict is in part a fraternal civil war, but further illustrates the fracturing of family relations explored in previous chapters. However, while more private modes of expression, including diaries and letters, reveal the pain of family separation, more public media like pamphlets highlight an angrier use of such familial imagery as a political device to persuade the public of the writer’s arguments. Paine and Drayton demonstrate how Patriot pamphleteers successfully undermined any sense of British seniority, casting them as unworthy of that status due to their unfeeling treatment of the colonists. By invoking the title of father to describe the king, Patriots such as Paine drew on a trope that was prevalent in the eighteenth century, describing the imperial relationship as being parental in nature.¹³⁰ Many Patriots ‘argued that Britain was an unnatural parent, cruel and unfeeling in her harsh treatment of her children.’¹³¹ Pamphleteers like Paine were able to ‘transform the image of the sentimental parent into a brute who was devouring its young.’¹³² In doing so they sought to reveal the ‘debased insensibility of a people no longer fit to rule.’¹³³

Loyalists challenged Patriot accusations of the British being unsympathetic, alluding to Patriot misapprehensions about what that parental dynamic denoted. In *Common Sense*, Paine insisted that a belief that the future prosperity of America depended on its connection with Great Britain was inherently flawed, arguing that ‘we may as well assert that because a child has thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat, or that the first twenty years of our lives is to become a precedent for the next twenty.’¹³⁴ Charles Inglis rejected Paine’s use of this analogy, stating:

Great-Britain is figuratively called the Parent State of the colonies; their connection, therefore, may be properly compared to the *relation* subsisting between parent and child. But to compare our *connection* with Great-Britain to the *literal food* of a child, a thing different from, and not necessarily belonging to that *relation*, is manifestly

¹²⁸ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 797.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 796.

¹³⁰ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 48.

¹³¹ Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 165.

¹³² Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 122.

¹³³ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 428.

¹³⁴ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 788.

absurd, and a violation of the propriety of language; as all who are judges of the nature of language must be sensible.¹³⁵

By describing Paine's argument as an abuse of language, Inglis exposed Paine's misappropriation of the metaphor, and hoped by extension to invalidate Patriot claims of British insensitivity. To further deflate Patriot arguments, Loyalists turned the parental metaphor back on the Patriots, asserting that their conduct contravened accepted standards of emotional behaviour incumbent on a child towards a parent. In the late eighteenth century, for children and subordinates to blatantly disobey their fathers and masters was considered psychologically unnatural in a world that remained deeply traditional.¹³⁶ Thomas Bradbury Chandler in his 1774 pamphlet *The American Querist* concurred with this perspective, asking: 'Whether some degree of respect be not always due from inferiors to superiors, and especially from children to parents; and whether the refusal of this on any occasion, be not a violation of the general laws of society?'¹³⁷ For Loyalists like Chandler, Patriot actions flouted rules regarding status and emotional etiquette, which subsequently justified any firm measures that the British had taken against the colonies. Chandler observed that the relationship between Great Britain and her colonies was indeed similar to that of a parent and child, and questioned 'whether any parent can put up with such disrespectful and abusive treatment from children, as *Great-Britain* has lately received from her colonies?'¹³⁸ By defending British actions Loyalists sought to restore the powerful familial trope that existed between Great Britain and her colonies by 'sentimentalizing imperial-colonial relations.'¹³⁹ Chandler insisted that Great Britain wished 'by lenity, forbearance and indulgence to secure our affections, and to render us sensible, that our greatest political happiness must arise from her smiles and fostering protection.'¹⁴⁰ Loyalists argued it was Patriot conduct that prevented this from happening, and James Chalmers in *Plain Truth* pleaded with moderate Patriots such as John Dickinson to 'exert those talents with which heaven has endowed you; and cause the parent and her children to embrace, and be foes no more.'¹⁴¹

¹³⁵ Ibid., 875.

¹³⁶ Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 165.

¹³⁷ Thomas Bradbury Chandler and Myles Cooper, *The American Querist: or, Some Questions Proposed Relative to the Present Disputes Between Great Britain and her American Colonies* (New York: James Rivington, 1774), 4.

https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/The_American_Querist/baVbAAAAQAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 5.

¹³⁹ Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 122.

¹⁴⁰ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 349.

¹⁴¹ Chalmers, *Plain Truth Addressed to the Inhabitants of America*, n.p.

Such pamphlet exchanges about appropriate familial dynamics were exclusively between men, revealing the highly gendered reality of the Revolutionary Era print landscape. The next section then investigates this important aspect of print production, in which men were the primary contributors, controlling all aspects of the print sphere. As we will see, the omission of women was due to an acceptance that such involvement was unbefitting for their gender, with women considered incapable of handling the emotional demands of print engagement. However, some women did find ways to participate in print, though their involvement was generally not overtly political. In fact, the gendering of print not only related to its physical creation, but the emotional language used. It is significant that femininity became imbued with undesirable emotional qualities, while seemingly masculine traits were seen in a much more positive light, and this had a marked impact on the emotional character of print ephemera.

Gender and Pamphlets

Print consumption in eighteenth-century America was dominated by propertied white men, and consequently they constituted the primary audience of pamphleteers.¹⁴² Not only audience, but also authorship was monopolised by men during this period, with the majority of pamphleteers being educated gentlemen, writing for ‘rational, enlightened, and restricted circles of genteel readers like themselves.’¹⁴³ That most pamphlets were directed at a solely male audience is illustrated by a 1774 pamphlet by Samuel Seabury titled *The Congress Canvassed: or, An Examination into the Conduct of the Delegates, at their Grand Convention*. Seabury, objecting to what he considered to be the ‘violent means of redress’ that Congress had advocated in reaction to firm British measures, stated:

Let me now request of you, gentlemen, to look back, and consider the whole of the matter, and then determine for yourselves, whether you are bound by the principles of honour, of duty, or of conscience, to adhere to, or carry into execution, the regulations of the Congress, to the subversion of the laws, the disturbance of the peace, the oppression of the inhabitants, and the destruction of the property of the province in which you live?¹⁴⁴

As his pamphlet was directed at the members of Congress who were all men, a female readership was not considered, helping to illustrate the lack of influence and agency that

¹⁴² Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic*, 48.

¹⁴³ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 765.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 321.

women had in eighteenth-century politics.¹⁴⁵ It was not only the assumed audience of Seabury's pamphlet that reflects the gendered nature of print, but its tone and language. Seabury's anger and contempt is apparent throughout, for example, as when he questions the tactics used by Congress, observing: 'Noise and blustering may make you appear of some consequence in a tavern or ale-house: Loud cries of liberty may catch the ignorant and beguile the unwary [and] *Tar and feathers* may silence the pusillanimous.'¹⁴⁶ Rob Boddice has shown that at this time exposure to highly charged emotions was seen as being potentially harmful to women as they 'were thought to be more subject to emotional upheaval, more likely to be overcome by irrational outbursts, and less likely to be able to manage emotional stress.'¹⁴⁷ Therefore it is reasonable to assume that the highly emotional tone adopted by Seabury suggests he did not believe his pamphlet would be read by women.

Patriot Philip Livingston reinforces the notion of the emotional weakness of women and their perceived unsuitability for politics. He disparagingly alludes to their emotional incapacity in *The Other Side of the Question* which was his response to Chandler's *A Friendly Address to All Reasonable Americans*, explaining that he was 'prompted to this undertaking out of regard to the fair-sex. For many weak women may be exceedingly frightened by that awful compound of threats, and texts, and homilies.'¹⁴⁸ In *A Friendly Address* Chandler warned of the actions of radical Patriots, observing that 'the darkness of a rising tempest is beginning to overspread our land. The thunder roars at a distance and appears to be swiftly approaching. It is high time therefore to awaken the thoughtless to a sense of their danger.'¹⁴⁹ It was assertions such as these that Livingston felt would instil a sense of fear in female readers, reinforcing the notion that women struggled to cope with highly charged emotional displays. This was certainly the prevailing view in the eighteenth century, with an acceptance that women experienced and expressed emotions differently from men. This overtly demeaning view expressed by Livingston was an unsavoury feature of the age of sensibility, revealing the 'gendered dynamics of power wherein female inferiority was connected to her emotional state.'¹⁵⁰ These attitudes precluded women's political participation, largely excluding women from actively engaging in pamphleteering activities during the Revolution.

¹⁴⁵ Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook, *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters* (California: Stanford University Press, 1996), 10-11.

¹⁴⁶ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 301.

¹⁴⁷ Boddice, *The History of Emotions*, 122.

¹⁴⁸ Wood, *The American Revolution*, 384.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 331.

¹⁵⁰ Boddice, *The History of Emotions*, 122.

To justify the exclusion of women from the public sphere the representation of femininity was underpinned by distinctly negative qualities, including irrationality and weakness, while masculinity was imbued with more positive attributes such as strength and reason.¹⁵¹ Such a denigrating definition of femininity is reflected in the emotional language of the period, which saw femininity often equated with misery, cruelty, and at times a lack of feeling. Patriot pamphleteers argued that cold hearted British policies had alienated the affections of many within the American colonies, describing such deleterious conduct as possessing overtly negative female connotations. For example, William Henry Drayton, lamented that ‘instead of Parental tenderness, we experience a Step-Mother’s severity—instead of justice, we receive marks of the most unfeeling ingratitude!’¹⁵² In 1774 Scottish-born lawyer and fervent Patriot, James Wilson, when addressing the political situation in the colonies contended that the question was:

Whether the Parent Country, like a happy Mother, shall behold her Children flourishing around her, and receive the most grateful returns for her protection and love; or whether, like a step-dame, rendered miserable by her own unkind conduct, she shall see their affections alienated, and herself deprived of those advantages, which a milder treatment would have ensured to her.¹⁵³

Wilson’s observations show the flipside of femininity, consisting of love and affection, but as his words suggest, these more positive attributes relied heavily on conformity to male expectations, with any deviation drawing the invocation of less desirable aspects of femininity.

While adherence to traditional gender norms largely kept Loyalist women from engaging in pamphleteering during the conflict, some Patriot women did participate in the practice, albeit in a limited sense, further showing how the Revolution challenged accepted societal standards. In 1780 after the British had captured Charleston, Esther Deberdt published a pamphlet entitled *The Sentiment of an American Woman* encouraging women to engage in fundraising activities to aid the Patriot troops. While not overtly political in nature, and largely orientated around normative kinds of female behaviour, she nonetheless infuses her pamphlet with a distinct emotional tone.¹⁵⁴ Staying within traditional female norms of emotional expression she forgoes the use of outrage common to male authored pamphlets, and

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 118.

¹⁵² Wood, *The American Revolution*, 226.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 148.

¹⁵⁴ Joan R. Gundersen, *To Be Useful to the World: Women in Revolutionary America, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 189-190.

instead draws on a sense of love and devotion, seeking to unify and galvanise Patriot women, in which she pleads with them to ‘display the same sentiments which animated us at the beginning of the Revolution.’¹⁵⁵ In this way pamphlets like that of Deberdt, operate similarly to female epistolary activities, or memoirs, enabling women to attain a degree of agency and influence at a time when they were largely deprived of a political voice.

Linda Kerber has observed that it is difficult to find women who characterised their involvement in the Revolution in political terms. She mentions a pamphlet titled *Women Invited to War* by the Patriot Hannah Adams, for example, noting that while the title of the pamphlet is suggestive of a political focus, it is rather a religious homily.¹⁵⁶ While women did not actively engage in political pamphleteering some Patriot women did write satires and plays, some of which were printed in pamphlet form. Mercy Otis Warren, for example, wrote several plays, which were all published anonymously to disguise the fact that she was a woman.¹⁵⁷ One of her most well-known is *The Group* (1775), a satirical play with a strong political edge, prompted by her opposition to the 1774 appointment of Mandamus Councillors to the Massachusetts Assembly.¹⁵⁸ The play’s purpose was essentially a rousing call to arms, encouraging colonists to support the Revolution. Like some of her earlier works, including *The Adulateur* (1772) and *The Defeat* (1773), *The Group* seeks to lampoon the ‘the self-serving acts and attitudes’ of Loyalists.¹⁵⁹ Many of the characters are fictional representations of real people, including the character of Hazlerod, who is based on the then Chief Justice and Loyalist, Peter Oliver. In a biting critique of Oliver, Warren gives Hazlerod the lines: ‘To sell my friends, my country, and my conscience’ and ‘To spread distress o’er this devoted people,’ suggesting that Oliver had placed his own interests over those of his country.¹⁶⁰ Through passages such as this, Warren makes clear her intention to break with the traditional emotional norms observed by pamphleteers such as Deberdt, imbuing her satire with a similar sense of outrage to that of pamphlets produced by men, combining anger and humour to criticise the actions of leading Loyalists.

¹⁵⁵ *The Sentiments of an American Woman* (Philadelphia, 1780), 2. Pdf. <https://www.loc.gov/item/2020769022/>.

¹⁵⁶ Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 73.

¹⁵⁷ Gundersen, *To Be Useful to the World*, 177-178.

¹⁵⁸ Nancy Rubin, *Muse of the Revolution: The Secret Pen of Mercy Otis Warren and the Founding of a Nation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008), 67. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹⁵⁹ Cheryl Z. Oreovicz, “Mercy Otis Warren (1728–1814),” *Legacy* 13, no. 1 (1996): 55, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25679185>.

¹⁶⁰ Mercy Otis Warren, *The Group* (1775) (Boston: Edes And Gill, 1775), 4. ProQuest Ebook Central.

While satirical in nature, the play also has a mournful side, particularly in its closing stages, portending the violence to come at Lexington and Concord later that year. At the plays conclusion the curtain is raised revealing a nameless woman, who mournfully says:

What painful scenes are hov'ring o'er the morn,
When spring again invigorates the lawn!
Instead of the gay landscape's beautiful [sic] dies,
Must the stain'd field salute our weeping eyes,
Must the green turf, and all the mournful glades,
Drench'd in the stream, absorb their dewy heads,
Whilst the tall oak, and quiv'ring willow bends
To make a covert for their countr's [sic] friends,
Deny'd a grave!—amid the hurrying scene
Of routed armies scouring o'er the plain.
Till British troops shall to Columbia yield,
And freedom's sons are Masters of the field;
Then o'er the purpl'd plain the victors tread
Among the slain to seek each patriot dead,
While Freedom weeps that merit could not save
But conq'ring Hero's must enrich the Grave
An adamantine monument they rear
With this inscription—*Virtue's sons lie here!*¹⁶¹

Warren displays an awareness of the bloodshed that a conflict with Great Britain will unleash, leading her to inject these passages with distinct feelings of sadness. However, while drawing attention to the despair produced by war, it should be noted that from her Patriot perspective such violence is justifiable in the pursuit of liberty. Thus, she attempts to show that their suffering has meaning. It is important to remember that the voice Warren attains, although largely behind a veil of anonymity, is an exception to the rule, with her family ties allowing her to obviate typical boundaries pertaining to female involvement in politics. Most women did not have the option available to Warren, and this included Loyalist women, who were generally shut out of the world of public and political pamphleteering in America during the conflict.¹⁶²

Pamphlets were at the forefront of public debate, acting as a medium for highly charged polemical writing, leading to intense public displays of anger. Loyalist outrage was generally prompted by acute anxiety concerning Patriot conduct, with those feelings of unease implicitly shaping the emotional tone and tenor of their arguments. Both sides argued

¹⁶¹ Mercy Otis Warren, *The Group* (1775) (Boston: Edes And Gill, 1775), 22. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹⁶² Rosemarie Zagarri, *A Woman's Dilemma: Mercy Otis Warren and the American Revolution* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015), 4.

vociferously about when and under what conditions it was acceptable to express anger, reinforcing the deeply nuanced and ambiguous nature of Revolutionary Era emotional expression. The contested status of anger resulted in public debates about emotional authenticity. This was foremost in the rhetoric of Loyalist pamphleteers who declared that Patriot anger was counterfeit, and simply a mechanism for stirring up public emotions. By framing Patriot emotions as inherently false Loyalists set themselves up as the purveyors of authentic and honest feelings. While diverging regarding aspects of emotional propriety both sides insisted that their arguments were not motivated by anger, but were influenced by principle and common sense, revealing a general rejection of anger as a driver of behaviour. This explains why during the pamphlet exchanges arguments about authenticity are prevalent, suggesting a common belief in the potential of anger to undermine claims to authentic expression.

The emotional ideals of both sides influenced much of the print produced during the conflict and helped to embed different emotional traits as anchors of either side's emotional regimes. For Loyalists the fiery exchanges of the pamphlet debates subverted notions of civility and gentility, indicative of underlying concerns that the Revolution undermined established notions of acceptable behaviour. The passionate anger common to Patriot pamphlets was rejected by Loyalists who felt that it contradicted the prevailing principles of sensibility. Instead, they embraced more measured forms of expression. At a time when they felt marginalised their advocacy for moderation became politicised, deployed to counter the Patriot use of passionate emotions. Within this context the Loyalist insistence on moderation stood in stark contrast to the polemical reality of print ephemera, which was conducive to impassioned partisan debate. Reduced politically, much Loyalist writing took on a defensive guise, suggestive of a sense of dislocation and fear. That the Loyalist use of print ephemera was ultimately unsuccessful in achieving their aims lends weight to the argument that the medium was best suited to passionate forms of expression, rather than the moderation proffered by Loyalists. This is suggestive of broadsides and pamphlets being conducive to intense polemics, rather than a form for rational argument.

While the analysis of Loyalist pamphlets and broadsides discloses the public use of anger through these diverse forms, the next chapter pivots to investigate late eighteenth and early nineteenth century novels set during the American Revolution where sympathy is the primary emotional focus. As we will see, however, the sympathy represented in early American novels concealed feelings of unresolved grief and anger, reflecting the uncertain

reality of the new United States. Nicole Eustace has noted the failure of sympathy as a unifying emotion in the eighteenth century, suggesting that if ‘shared feeling was supposed to build bridges between people, it too often heralded the building of boundaries instead.’¹⁶³ Essentially, genuine sympathy ‘proved no more than a shimmering mirage.’¹⁶⁴ Picking up on this observation, the following chapter asserts that the persecution of former Loyalists following the war can be interpreted as representing the fissures in American society, disclosing the failure of sympathy to unite the new nation.

¹⁶³ Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 266.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 279.

Chapter 5

Loyalism and the Novel: How Sympathy and Grief Influenced Early American Fiction

In his 1780 novel *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*, British novelist Samuel Jackson Pratt, emphasised the primacy of sympathetic emotion, writing:

The *slender circumstances*, and even the *great misfortunes* of a lover, are no kind of objection in the eyes of a *sentimental mistress*; embarrassments of the world call forth the finer sentiments, and those excite sympathy. Now *sympathy*...in the female breast, a very tender sensation. It is a strange thing, but true, that this same adorable SENTIMENT has ever had (with indeed very few exceptions) a most sore quarrel with solid silver and gold.¹

In this passage Pratt asserts the cultural significance of sympathy for the eighteenth-century transatlantic world. However, as we have seen in previous chapters, it is compromised during the Revolution which is at odds with its elevated status. This is embodied by the harsh confiscation laws passed by numerous colonies against Loyalists, including that passed by New York in 1779, which allowed ‘for the Forfeiture and Sale of the Estates of Persons who have adhered to the Enemies of this State.’² This disjuncture underscores the disruptive influence of the conflict on societal adherence to pre-existing standards of emotional display. As an emotional category in the eighteenth-century sympathy was closely aligned with supposedly feminine genres like the novel, though this did not preclude men from engaging in this form of literary pursuit. In general, tender emotions like sympathy were highly prized in the eighteenth-century transatlantic world, and this is mirrored in the literature produced during this period, with notions of sentiment and fellow feeling held up as key emotional categories. How ideas concerning sympathetic feeling were approached was often dependent on genre type. In this chapter, three prevalent genres in transatlantic fiction are examined, each providing a differing perspective on Loyalism and sympathy during the revolutionary and post-revolutionary period. These are the gothic novel, the sentimental novel, and the picaresque novel; all of which taken together provide a detailed picture of the emotional tenor of late eighteenth-century fiction.

This chapter takes as its model an assertion made by Julia Stern that in the eighteenth-century outpourings of emotion, which are indicative of sentimental literature, concealed a ‘gothic bedrock’ underneath, revealing the presence of ‘violence and rage’ in the new

¹ Samuel Jackson Pratt, *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*, vol. 3 (London: R. Baldwin Pater Noster Row, 1781), 131.

² Wallace Hale, “The New York Act of Attainder, or Confiscation Act,” Provincial Archives of New Brunswick. <https://archives.gnb.ca/exhibits/forthavoc/html/NY-Attainder.aspx?culture=en-CA>.

republic.³ This gothic undercurrent, veiled by the effusive emotion of sentimental literature, ultimately discloses the failure of sympathetic feeling, as evidenced by the 1802 Pennsylvania ‘Black List’ which preserved a record of Loyalists that had implications for voter eligibility in upcoming elections.⁴ While by the early nineteenth century many returning Loyalists had successfully reintegrated into post-war American society, a piece of legislation such as this reveals the lingering antipathy that existed towards them. Such actions raised important questions about the role of former Loyalists in post-war America, particularly relating to future involvement in the political sphere. The Pennsylvania ‘Black List’ highlights the stigma attached to Loyalism, and its possible repercussions, a stigma that often caused former Loyalists to relocate in order to avoid ostracism and exclusion from social and civic life in the early republic.⁵ The ill-feeling towards former Loyalists that continued into the early republic is key here as most of the texts investigated in this chapter were written after the end of the war.

Novels of the period were particularly important vehicles for documenting and critiquing these fissures in post-war American society. The distinct subversive undertones characterising much early American fiction, for example, which often satirised social conventions and groups, destabilises those ideas of unity permeating the nation in the wake of the conflict. Many Loyalists who tried to return to their homes between 1782 and 1783 were physically prevented from doing so, including one man who was tarred and feathered, before being ‘pulled by a party on horseback about four miles with a drum beating and fife playing before being delivered on a boat bound for New York City.’⁶ Incidents like this were commonplace, and demonstrate the ongoing breakdown of sympathetic identification following the Revolution, contradicting the primacy placed on sympathy by the many American theorists of nationhood indebted to Adam Smith. Smith had suggested in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) that ‘whatever may be the cause of sympathy...nothing pleases us more than to observe in other men a fellow-feeling, with all the emotions of our

³ Julia A. Stern, *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 8-9. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁴ Alexander James Dallas and Joseph Borden McKean, *Black List: A List of Those Tories Who Took Part with Great-Britain in the Revolutionary Way, and were Attainted of High Treason, Commonly Called the Black List* (Philadelphia: Printed for the Proprietor, 1802), 5, <https://societyofthecincinnati.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p16923coll4/id/112>.

⁵ Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 58.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

own breast, nor are we ever so much shocked as by the appearance of the contrary.’⁷ He argued that true sympathy was demonstrated by a person’s ability to imaginatively identify with the plight of another. His model of sympathy can be applied within a broader national context. In the early republic it was felt that fellow feeling would help bind the country together along horizontal lines of social affiliation, replacing earlier vertical lines, that were characterised by monarchy and aristocracy. However, the mistreatment of Loyalists during, and after the Revolution suggests that people’s willingness to embrace such ideals was at times conspicuous by its absence.

The failing of sympathy is also suggested by the rise of gothic and picaresque modes of expression, which challenged the primacy of sentimental fiction in revolutionary and post-revolutionary America. The popularity of the sentimental novel is substantiated by the multiple editions produced of such novels as Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740) or Susanna Rowson’s *Charlotte Temple* (1794), both of which received several reprints between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. As Andrew Franta and Sean Silver have observed, the enduring appeal of the sentimental novel lay in ‘the complex opportunities for emotional response which they repeatedly staged.’⁸ However, the upsurge in popularity of gothic novels such as Isaac Mitchell’s *The Asylum, or Alonzo and Melissa* (1811), and picaresque fiction, such as the anonymously authored *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob, Loyal American Refugee* (1787), illustrate the destabilising effect these genres had on the primacy of the sentimental novel, reflecting the deeply fractured cultural landscape of the time.⁹ In these gothic and picaresque novels themes of grief, mourning, and dislocation are foregrounded, becoming entangled with the choice of narrative forms.¹⁰ For Loyalists, fiction provided a means of articulating emotional responses to the war and its aftermath in a way which now challenged the dominant sentimental genre, and the related culture of unity which was said to permeate the new republic.

⁷ Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments; or an Essay Towards an Analysis of the Principles by Which Men Naturally Judge Concerning the Conduct and Character, First of their Neighbours, and Afterwards of Themselves* (Dublin: Printed for J. Beatty and C. Jackson, 1778), 9, <https://archive.org/details/theoryofmoralsen00smit/page/8/mode/2up?view=theater>.

⁸ Andrew Franta and Sean Silver, “Sentiment Analysis and the Sentimental Novel,” *Critical Inquiry* 50, 3 (2024): 410, <https://www-journals-uchicago-edu.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/doi/epdf/10.1086/728948>.

⁹ Elizabeth Barnes, “Novels,” in *A History of the Book in America: Volume 2: An Extensive Republic: Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation 1790-1840*, ed. Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelly (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 443.

¹⁰ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 6.

Profound feelings of grief and despair pervade Loyalist writing from the period more widely and are traceable across the various media I have already discussed. Loyalist Grace Growden Galloway, as we have seen, drew on the ostensible privacy of her diary to lament being separated from her daughter Elizabeth. Similarly, Elizabeth Murray discloses the grief that circulated through Loyalist epistolary networks, in response to watching friends and family flee the colonies due to their Loyalism. In a letter to her father, she bemoans the ‘anxiety we suffered in being separated from so many beloved Friends.’¹¹ Importantly, the epistolary format became a central structuring device for the early sentimental novel, which drew heavily on the form and structure of eighteenth-century letters. Other selected generic forms incorporated into the early American novel have also been examined in earlier chapters of this thesis, specifically diaries, but the letter form was most significant. These epistolary novels sought to replicate real world epistolary exchanges in a fictional space, and by ‘offering mediated rather than direct access to inner life’ they importantly demonstrate the limits in accessing a person’s true feelings.¹²

As the early American novel developed, its thematic and formal conventions remained imprecise, and this lack of clarity is reflected in the uncertain position of British culture and influence within the new nation. As we will see, this complicated, and at times ambivalent, relationship with British culture profoundly impacted early American fiction. At a time when early America lacked a sense of coherent cultural and political identity, the American novel itself echoes this state of mutability.¹³ In turn, this state of flux coupled with the diverse reactions to the conflict has implications for the emotional tenor of the early American novel. In the sections that follow not only will the impact of British culture on early American fiction be examined, but it will be possible to demonstrate the challenge posed by gothic and picaresque novels to the dominance of the sentimental novel, as themes of grief and mourning in the new republic threatened to destabilise notions of sympathy and fellow feeling prevalent within sentimental fiction.

¹¹ James Murray, *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist*, ed. Nina Moore Tiffany and Susan I. Lesley (Boston: n.p., 1901), 267.

¹² Thomas Koenigs, “A “Wild and Ambiguous Medium”: Democracy, Interiority, and the Early American Epistolary Novel,” *American Literary History* 35, no. 1 (Spring 2023): 9, <https://doi.org/10.1093/alh/ajac160>.

¹³ For further information about the complex process of the formation of a distinct American national identity in the late eighteenth century, and the role of British culture within this process see: Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity* Chapel Hill: Omohundro Institute of Early American History & Culture 2010.

Loyalism and the Genres of the Early American Novel

In America before, during, and after the conflict people saw themselves as belonging to a north Atlantic intellectual world strongly influenced by British currents.¹⁴ England was ‘the prism through which...American writers and their art [was] refracted.’¹⁵ However, American novelists did not simply tap into a transplanted form of English culture, but rather translated it for use within an American context, creating ‘a generic notion of Englishness’ adapted for their own particular uses.¹⁶ As such, Englishness took on a performative guise, in which being English was defined more by what someone did rather than where they came from.¹⁷ As Leonard Tennenhouse has suggested, it was this form of generic Englishness which shaped the early American novel.¹⁸ This is indicative of the way the early American novel was suffused with an inherent sense of cultural Loyalism, distinct from political ideation and affiliation.

Before the Revolution the transatlantic relationship was often described in familial terms, as we have seen in the last chapter, and this characterisation continued after the conflict, with little or no change in either the rhetoric or sentiment.¹⁹ The family metaphor became an important element within the early American novel, with domestic dramas taking on political meaning when read through this lens. I will return to this later, but for now it is essential to recognise the relevance of this metaphor for the development of the American novel. While many in society embraced a version of the filial cultural relationship, others had misgivings about the continuing British influence, culminating in an upsurge of nationalistic sentiment, as America set about forging a new identity.²⁰

Following independence, American writers were forced to confront the complex nature of the Anglo-American past.²¹ While borrowing elements from earlier English novels, including, plot, themes, and character types, American novelists differentiated themselves by

¹⁴ William J. Gilmore, *Reading Becomes a Necessity of Life: Material and Cultural Life in Rural New England* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 212.

¹⁵ Benjamin Lease, *Anglo-American Encounters: England and the Rise of American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), xiii-xiv.

¹⁶ Leonard Tennenhouse, *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora 1750-1850* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007), 7. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 15-16.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

¹⁹ Jennifer Clark, *The American Idea of England, 1776-1840* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 197.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 199.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 166.

translating these various aspects to American soil.²² The development of the American novel itself was slow, with the first self-declaredly American novel only appearing in 1789 with William Hill Brown's *The Power of Sympathy*, whose patriotic advertising campaign serves as early evidence of American publishers attempts to differentiate their products from British ones.²³ Brown's epistolary novel takes Boston as its setting, and themes of class and incest as the lens, through which the struggle between the old colonial system and the new national one for influence in post-revolutionary America is represented. In depicting the cultural and political issues at play within the new nation, *The Power of Sympathy* highlights the uneasy relationship that existed between British culture and the development of the early American novel.

Within the boundaries of British cultural influence the novel form featured prominently, with American editions of English novels continuing to appear soon after their publication in Britain throughout the Revolutionary Era.²⁴ This was the case with Pratt's novel *Emma Corbett*, which was first published in Great Britain in 1780, and due to its popularity received multiple reprints in America in the following years.²⁵ Pratt himself never visited America but other British sentimental novelists influential in post-revolutionary America did, including Susanna Rowson, whose life, career and novels, spanned both sides of the Atlantic. While born in England in 1762, Rowson relocated to America when she was young, and throughout her life she spent considerable time in both countries. Her most notable work *Charlotte Temple* was published in England in 1791, before later being published in America in 1794, where it achieved immense popularity.²⁶ Its success was due, in part, to its handling of core themes of grief and loss, which resonated with an American public still wrestling with the painful aftermath of the Revolution. In dealing with such sorrow Rowson offered an optimistic view of an egalitarian society based around sympathetic ideals.²⁷ Early novelists, like Rowson, crafted characters who embodied the shared cultural reality of this transatlantic connection, suggestive of a sense of ambiguity around a clear

²² Cathy N. Davidson, *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 3. ProQuest Ebook Central.

²³ Alexander Cowie, *The Rise of the American Novel* (New York: American Book Company, 1948), 10.

²⁴ Gilmore, *Reading Becomes a Necessity*, 212.

²⁵ Daniel Diez Couch, "Printing Emma Corbett: Revolutionary Violence and the Prosthetics of Typography," *The Eighteenth Century* 59, no. 4 (Winter 2018): 455, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90026486>.

²⁶ Clark, *The American Idea*, 167.

²⁷ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 68.

American identity, at a time when the newly formed United States sought to disentangle a distinct national character from within its British heritage.²⁸

It was from within this evolving cultural context that the nascent American novel arose, and from its inception it was considered, as Dragos Ivana has put it, a ‘radically unstable form, mingling fiction, travel books, letters, journalism, diaries, spiritual autobiographies and epistolary conventions together.’²⁹ The generically mixed nature of eighteenth century novels led to debates concerning what constituted a novel, and the criterion used in making such a judgement.³⁰ The amorphous novel form certainly helps to explain the uncertainty in scholarly circles about the precise generic nature of Loyalist writer J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur’s 1782 work, *Letters from an American Farmer*. *Letters* is a fictional narrative composed of a series of twelve letters which investigate American society, culture, and environment in the build up to, and at the beginning of the American Revolution.³¹ The epistolary structure Crèvecoeur adopts centres on the correspondence between a wealthy Englishman, and the story’s protagonist, Farmer James, ‘a humble but independent and self-reliant’ Pennsylvanian farmer.³² The use of a transatlantic format enables Crèvecoeur to demonstrate the importance of transatlantic exchange, while at the same time illustrating the disruption the Revolution would likely cause to such connections.³³

Crèvecoeur’s narrative suggests the inherent instability of the novel form, since *Letters* has caused much debate pertaining to its categorisation as a novel. Historically, the text has been mired in ambiguity and misapprehension, though most often considered a work of non-fiction. Edward Larkin observes that critics have often considered its ‘representations as factual accounts of the social and cultural landscape of Revolutionary America,’ but insists that this is a mistake, suggesting that the text should be viewed as a ‘work of fiction, and more specifically a novel.’³⁴ Paul Giles concurs, arguing that ‘its epistolary structure mirrors that of much eighteenth century fiction, while its examination of how public affairs affect the private

²⁸ Clark, *The American Idea*, 169-170.

²⁹ Dragos Ivana, “Transatlantic Exchanges: The Rise of the Early American Novel,” *British and American Studies* 26, (2020): 177,

<https://www.proquest.com/docview/2416476289/fulltextPDF/B2BCD20C569B487FPQ/1?accountid=8018>.

³⁰ Marthe Robert, “From the Origins of the Novel,” in *Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach*, ed. Michael McKeon (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 58-62.

³¹ Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook, *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 140.

³² Edward Larkin, “The Cosmopolitan Revolution: Loyalism and the Fiction of an American Nation,” *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 40, no. ½ (Fall 2006): 60, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40267684>.

³³ *Ibid.*, 60.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 54.

domain of the book's narrator, the fictitious farmer "James," ensures that Crèvecoeur's text inclines...toward the condition of a novel.³⁵ My reading of *Letters* accords with that of critics such as Larkin and Giles, in which I approach the book as a work of fiction. In analysing its contents it is important to note that – as Edward Larkin observes – 'Crèvecoeur wrote the *Letters* as a loyalist,' believing that 'the Revolution was a grave mistake and ardently wished for reconciliation with Great Britain.'³⁶ An associated feature of the generic ambiguity of *Letters* is the difficulty in ascribing it to a single literary category, as the text possesses elements of multiple literary genres. This is consistent with many early novels that typically contain elements of different genres within the same text.³⁷ As such, its variegated nature makes *Letters* a key text for exploring Loyalism within the sentimental, gothic, and picaresque genres.

While it drew on a range of genres, however, the early American novel operated in a more public space than the more private forms explored in earlier chapters, including diaries and memoirs, and typically circulated amongst a wider audience. Its status as a relatively accessible form contributed to its increasing popularity in the post-Revolutionary Era, but the diverse perspectives this occasioned created unease at a time when the new nation was attempting to unify the people behind one collective voice.³⁸ Novels functioned as a means of expression for those on the social and political periphery, tendering an alternative, and often 'gothic' depiction of life in the new republic.³⁹ As such, they acted, in Ivana's words, as a 'locus of socio-political controversies and contradictions, rather than unity and homogeneity.'⁴⁰ Some Loyalists as part of the group excluded from the national narrative, embraced the novel to present a version of the conflict which departed from that proffered by the new national government. In doing so they revealed the intersection between generic heterogeneity and socio-political division present in the new republic. Through the fictional Farmer James, for example, Crèvecoeur conjures a bleak reality, writing:

³⁵ Paul Giles, "Transatlantic Currents and the Invention of the American Novel," in *The Cambridge History of the American Novel*, ed. Leonard Cassuto, Clare Virginia Eby, and Benjamin Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 23, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521899079.004>.

³⁶ Larkin, "The Cosmopolitan Revolution," 57-58.

³⁷ Ralph Cohen, "Genre Theory, Literary History, and Historical Change," in *Theoretical Issues in Literary History*, ed. David Perkins (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 88.

³⁸ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 6.

³⁹ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 2.

⁴⁰ Ivana, "Transatlantic Exchanges," 172.

Pity the lot of those whom you once called your friends; who were once surrounded with plenty, ease, and perfect security; but who now expect every night to be their last, and who are as wretched as criminals under an impending sentence of the law!⁴¹

While the national narrative advanced unity and sameness, Crèvecoeur paints America in distinctly dark tones, portraying a gothic landscape filled with fear and despair.

Yet while providing a voice for marginalised groups, the early American novel also contributed to the othering of various groups, including Loyalists. Unfavourable depictions of Loyalism such as that proffered by Lydia Maria Child in *The Rebels or Boston Before the Revolution* (1825) reinforced earlier derogatory characterisations of Loyalism, such as that conveyed in Isaac Mitchell's *The Asylum*. *The Rebels*, which explores family and loyalty against the backdrop of the Revolution, infuses its Patriot characters with a firm sense of morality, while Loyalist characters are lacking in this regard.⁴² This is evident in the novels' fictional portrayal of the real-life ransacking of the then Lieutenant-Governor Thomas Hutchinson's home by an angry mob. In the story the Patriot response to this act of vandalism is one of outrage borne from a sense of moral indignation, and they take decisive action to prevent future acts of violence. Through this episode it is possible to see a mixture of morality and anger, both in the ransacking of Hutchinson's house by a Patriot mob and in the reaction to the violence by the Patriot leadership. The mob feel they are justified in their assault on Hutchinson's home due to what they perceive as his immoral behaviour, while the outrage of the Patriot elite over the act of vandalism also derives from a sense of moral superiority. In Child's treatment of the episode the Patriots are consistently cast in a positive light, while the Loyalists are portrayed as conniving to make political hay from the affair. As Child writes: 'The friends of government pretended to look on all this as the artful manoeuvres of men anxious to ward off the effects of their crime.'⁴³ In other words, even though they knew otherwise, the Loyalists contrived to depict the Patriot reaction as disingenuous, implying that the Patriot leadership countenanced the violence.

In the aftermath of the war sympathetic identification was considered a method for unifying the nation, projecting a foundation of emotional consensus and shared values. The early American novel drew on this concept of sympathetic identification, which as Elizabeth Barnes notes, urged 'readers to participate in a fantasy of democracy that would fulfil its

⁴¹ J. Hector St John De Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, ed. Susan Manning (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 190.

⁴² Clark, *The American Idea*, 190.

⁴³ Lydia Maria Francis Child, *The Rebels: or Boston Before the Revolution* (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company, 1850), 42, <https://archive.org/details/rebelsorbostonbe00chil/page/42/mode/2up?q=anxious>.

promise of equality by negating diversity in the cause of union.⁴⁴ However, those in society who did not subscribe to republican ideals, especially Loyalists, were largely excluded from this mode of feeling. The importance placed on sympathy saw writers recast socio-political issues as family dramas, converting public issues into private matters, and repositioning the family model as a means for understanding both social and political affiliations. In this context sympathetic identification became grounded in familial associations, with American authors articulating the notion that ‘a democratic state is a sympathetic state, and a sympathetic state is one that resembles a family.’⁴⁵ However, this emphasis on feeling was difficult to control, as evidenced by the number of novels based around themes of illicit or excessive emotional connection, including seduction and incest.⁴⁶

Within early American fiction, gothic and picaresque novels steadily grew in popularity, but the dominant model of emotion responded to was exemplified in the sentimental novel. Since feelings are the overriding force driving sentimental fiction, writers employed these texts to present an idealistic model of sympathetic identification. They provided examples of sympathetic bonding in their stories which served as an exemplar for how readers should engage with sympathy in their own lives. In conjunction with the mediating role of literature, the reader’s own imagination also served a mediating function, with scenes filtered through a personal emotional lens.⁴⁷ As Barnes has shown, ‘acts of sympathetic identification are bound to make one feel not only another’s but one’s own reality more acutely.’⁴⁸ However, this form of sympathetic identification was highly performative in nature, relying largely on the reader’s own projections of the other, thereby reinforcing the subjective (and potentially limited) nature of sympathy.⁴⁹ The affective and imaginative facets of sympathy have the capacity to dissimulate the distinction between fiction and reality, with scenes of anxiety depicted in these novels reflecting the anxieties felt in the material world.⁵⁰

The negative treatment of Loyalist characters in early American fiction represents one example of how this unease manifested and elucidates the indeterminate role of Loyalists in post-revolutionary America. The social order that emerged after the war, ostensibly built

⁴⁴ Elizabeth Barnes, *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 2.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 3. Barnes notes that historically these themes have been interpreted as representing profound anxiety in the early republic (3).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

around republican values, meant that advancement depended less on ‘networks of kin and patronage’ and more on perceived talent and merit.⁵¹ In the vacuum created by the displacement of Loyalists from positions of power, Patriots moved in to fill the vacancies, occupying important positions, ranging from trade to politics. This wholesale replacement disrupted established chains of influence and interest, as the removal of Loyalist gentry, many of whom had operated ‘at the pinnacles of power and patronage,’ profoundly impacted this new-look republic.⁵² The purging of Loyalists from important positions, was an attempt by Patriots to erode the ‘clusters of personal and family influence’ in society, which many viewed as excessive and corrosive.⁵³ This accords with the reimagining of family in early American sentimental fiction, which emphasised bonds of kinship and shared feeling, rather than lineage, rank or status, as defined by the earlier British model of social relations.⁵⁴ The handling of Loyalism in many early novels, however, shows that shared feeling was highly conditional, with bonds of sympathy contingent on conformity to prescribed notions of acceptable emotional conduct.

Sentimental Literature: Sympathy as a Corrective to National Grief

Sentimental narratives position sympathetic bonding front and centre, acting as Barnes writes, as a ‘model for the way in which readers...are expected to respond.’⁵⁵ Within this context, sentimental feeling began to permeate American literature as a response to the horrors of the Revolution. Novels accompanied other forms of literary works dealing with grief and loss, including funeral sermons and black-bordered memorial broadsides, all of which cultivated a penchant for sympathetic feeling within society.⁵⁶ The intention, according to Desiree Henderson, was to ‘soothe the grief-stricken and move the community towards healing and remembrance.’⁵⁷ In the wake of the Revolution, novels functioned in concert with these other forms to delineate an appropriate emotional response to grief, establishing sympathy as the requisite mode of emotional expression.⁵⁸

⁵¹ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 177.

⁵² Ibid., 176.

⁵³ Ibid., 177.

⁵⁴ Tennenhouse, *The Importance of Feeling English*, 53.

⁵⁵ Barnes, *States of Sympathy*, 5.

⁵⁶ Desiree Henderson, *Grief and Genre in American Literature, 1790-1870* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), 5.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 157.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 157.

Eighteenth century philosophers and theorists often emphasised the powers of a sympathetic imagination, arguing that sympathy carried cathartic potential, with feelings acting as a unifying social force.⁵⁹ Adam Smith in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, observed that ‘bitter and painful emotions...more strongly require the healing consolation of sympathy.’⁶⁰ Smith subsequently applied this sympathetic lens to the arguments espoused by colonists in the early years of the Revolution, sensitive to their colonial anger at restrictive trade regulations, and their opposition to taxation without political representation in parliament. He came to believe that it was prudent for parliament to acquiesce to colonial demands to preserve the colonies, postulating that it would ultimately be advantageous to both the Americans and Great Britain. But his position shifted as the conflict intensified, particularly following the 1777 British defeat at Saratoga, and he accepted that reconciliation was impossible. Consequently, in a tacit display of sympathy towards the colonial position, he conceded that an agreement should be reached with the revolutionaries acceding to American independence. Smith felt that while such an agreement would be unpalatable to the British establishment, it would have the long-term benefit of preserving a ‘special relationship’ between Great Britain and the American colonies.⁶¹ While Smith’s sympathetic view was influenced by pragmatism, he nonetheless determined that any future relationship between Great Britain and the American colonies should be based around notions of fellow feeling, which would then be strengthened by ‘a common language and culture.’⁶² While theorists like Smith insisted on the positive and potentially therapeutic nature of sympathy, many post-revolutionary novels suggest a degree of scepticism regarding a society based on a sense of fraternal sympathy, presenting instead a much more fractured landscape.⁶³ Sympathy was thus what Julia Stern has called an ‘operative fantasy’ in late eighteenth century America, with unresolved grief precluding attempts at genuine sympathetic identification.⁶⁴

Sympathy and politics were closely entangled, and this saw many novels draw on the family metaphor to describe the relationship between Great Britain and the American colonies.⁶⁵ At this time, the use of this metaphor was common with authors, including Thomas Paine, who in *Common Sense* combines sympathy and outrage to unite the

⁵⁹ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 25.

⁶⁰ Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 14.

⁶¹ Andrew S. Skinner, “Adam Smith and the American Revolution,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 7, no. 2/3 (Spring 1977): 76, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27547337>.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 76.

⁶³ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 154.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁶⁵ Barnes, *States of Sympathy*, 3.

revolutionaries, revealing gothic traces lurking behind his use of the title concept. To stir feelings of anger he touched on what he viewed as the inherent dangers of monarchy, asserting that ‘by adding the evil of hereditary succession to that of monarchy, that a permanent family interest is created, whose constant objects are dominion and revenue.’⁶⁶ The implication was clear, that the king prioritised his own family’s fortunes over those of his subjects, seeking only to tighten his control of the American colonies, and to extract more revenue through increased taxation. In his shrewd use of the family metaphor Paine delimits the boundaries of familial sympathy in a way that extricated colonists from an outmoded characterisation of the parental role occupied by Great Britain. In doing so he attempted to unify the colonies under a redefined sense of familial affiliation, based on shared values and objectives.⁶⁷ By rearticulating the familial model Paine sought to exclude Loyalists, who adhered to a prior model of familial association, with the king cast as the father of his people, thus rendering them undeserving of sympathy. This reconfiguration of filial bonds not only demonstrates the unifying potential of sympathy for those who subscribed to accepted notions of familial attachment, but also explicates its destructive power through the marginalisation of those who did not conform, with notions of sympathy serving to destabilise ‘the family it was meant to bring together.’⁶⁸ For Paine, sympathy was a common sense shared by all rational creatures, but his perspective excluded Loyalists, who he felt behaved irrationally, and were insensible to American cries for liberty and equality. Far from an inclusive vision which united the nation through bonds of familial sympathy, *Common Sense* instead exposes sympathy’s failing in a state that ostensibly viewed ‘family as a model for the nation.’⁶⁹

Within this wider socio-political context sentimental fiction drew on these prevalent familial themes, recasting socio-political issues as a form of family drama.⁷⁰ This metaphor was used by Crèvecoeur in *Letters from an American Farmer*, for instance, to describe the painful consequences of the rupture between Great Britain and the American colonies. In a letter to a friend, the novel’s narrator Farmer James writes:

But why should I trouble you with such unconnected accounts? men secure and out of danger are soon fatigued with mournful details: can you enter with me into fellowship with all these afflictive sensations; have you a tear ready to shed over the approaching ruin of a once opulent and substantial family? Read this, I pray with the

⁶⁶ Thomas Paine, *Common Sense: Addressed to the Inhabitants of America* (London: H.D. Symonds, 1792), 20. https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Common_Sense/PE8UAAAAQAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1.

⁶⁷ Barnes, *States of Sympathy*, 3.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁶⁹ Tennenhouse, *The Importance of Feeling English*, 43.

⁷⁰ Barnes, *States of Sympathy*, 19-20.

eyes of sympathy; with a tender sorrow, pity the lot of those whom you once called your friends; who were once surrounded with plenty, ease, and perfect security; but who now expect every night to be their last, and who are as wretched as criminals under an impending sentence of the law.⁷¹

In this passage Crèvecoeur deftly converts the public political crisis of Revolution into a manifestly private context, distilling the rift down to its impact on his own family. This transformation of the public into the private is a common theme of eighteenth-century American fiction.⁷² In this way, as Cathy Davidson has argued, ‘individual conflict becomes a metonym for national conflict,’ demonstrating that in the early American novel ‘individual action is inseparable from the national.’⁷³

Crèvecoeur’s use of emotion here is multivalent, in that it is intended to elicit sympathy both in the fictional receiver of the letter, but also in the novel’s reader. However, the form of sympathy at play tends towards the vicarious, and coupled with the passage’s overall fictional nature, enables a degree of emotional distance on the part of the reader. This evokes a crucial aspect of Smith’s views on sympathy, in which he suggests that sympathetic feeling is predicated on a person’s ability to imagine themselves in a similar but not identical situation to the sufferer.⁷⁴ This implies that at its core that there is always a degree of distance attached to feelings of sympathy. In keeping with this notion, while Crèvecoeur’s letter reads like a typical letter, since it is fictitious it does not demand any response on the part of the reader, who is simply eavesdropping, thus rendering any sympathetic reaction almost illusory. This allows the reader to feel a sense of sympathy, without having to engage with those feelings. The emotional distance this affords was not meant to preclude the stimulation of sympathy. Feelings of sympathy were desirable, and the employment of a familial model was intended to reinforce this sense of sympathetic identification. But Crèvecoeur’s depiction of the despairing reality confronted by Farmer James suggests that appeals for sympathy had fallen on deaf ears. In *Letters*, Crèvecoeur increasingly reveals his grief regarding the unnatural nature of the conflict, and implores the American public to show sympathy, rather than violence.

Samuel Jackson Pratt shared Crèvecoeur’s condemnation of the war and prioritised a swift conclusion to hostilities. Pratt was politically pro-American, strongly sympathising with

⁷¹ Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 190.

⁷² Barnes, *States of Sympathy*, 2.

⁷³ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 6.

⁷⁴ Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 22.

the American cause, but favouring a conciliatory approach.⁷⁵ He makes his opposition to the conflict clear in *Emma Corbett*, which as Daniel Diez Couch has observed, ‘critiques the enthusiastic nationalistic fervour that incited the war.’⁷⁶ In the novel Pratt uses a family dynamic to demonstrate the conflict’s internecine nature, but rather than analysing overarching political themes, he reduces the story’s scope to the war’s impact on a single family.⁷⁷ *Emma Corbett* conveys the complete disintegration of a family unit due to the upheaval, elucidating the disruption caused to close emotional bonds between husbands, wives, children, and siblings, which were traditionally based around notions of sympathy and fellow feeling. In the novel, American expatriate, and Patriot supporter, Charles Corbett, sees son Edward travel to America to fight for the Patriots, only to die in combat. Corbett’s daughter Emma, distraught following the death of her brother, watches her lover, Henry Hammond, travel to the colonies to fight for the British. Disconsolate after his son’s death, Charles begs Henry to relinquish his allegiance to the British. Henry refuses, prompting Charles to insist that Henry stay away from Emma. Henry rebuffs Charles’ demands, and subsequently Emma travels to America to find Henry. Once in America, Emma manages to locate Henry, who has been mortally wounded by a poisoned arrow. Emma tries to suck out the poison from Henry’s wound, but fails to save Henry, and ends up poisoning herself. After the loss of Henry, she travels back to Britain gravely ill and dies not long after her arrival.⁷⁸

Emma Corbett uses an epistolary format, enabling Pratt to channel his own views on the conflict into the fictional exchanges between characters. Pratt’s voice is captured in a letter Sir Robert Raymond, a friend of Emma’s father Charles Corbett, writes to his friend Frederick Berkley, in which he discusses an exchange he had with Emma Corbett while viewing a painting depicting a battle scene. During the conversation Corbett makes clear her disillusionment with war, exclaiming:

Behold the images of conquest and defeat! Observe two mighty hosts of human beings met together, after the most deliberate plans of attack, to butcher one another—to perpetrate generally that very crime which, in any particular instance, is punished by the retaliation of a shameful death. To destroy an individual is ignominy; but at the massacre of an army, the trumpet sounds its note of boldest triumph.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Pratt, *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*, 22-23.

⁷⁶ Couch, “Printing Emma Corbett,” 449.

⁷⁷ Trevor McMichael, “Gender, Neutrality, and the Nursing Father in Pratt’s ‘Emma Corbett,’” *The Eighteenth Century*, 56, no. 3 (2015): 279, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24575125>.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 279-280.

⁷⁹ Pratt, *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*, 132.

Corbett's aversion to war is at least in part influenced by grief following the loss of her brother during the Revolution. Her commentary reveals how these fictional exchanges become infused with traces of the emotional interiority of the characters, simultaneously functioning as a 'window onto the outer world of collective affairs and a mirror illuminating the inner states of solitary selves.'⁸⁰ Thus, her opposition to war is not simply predicated on principle alone, but on feelings of emotional loss.

The epistolary structure of *Emma Corbett* facilitates key exchanges between principal characters that mirror actual epistolary exchanges about the Revolution. This includes the fiery public exchanges previously discussed between Thomas Paine and William Smith, who quarrelled over the rationality of independence. The intense fictional political debates in *Emma Corbett* are particularly evident in interactions between Emma's father Charles, and her lover Henry Hammond. During the fictive correspondence Corbett demands that Hammond withdraw from the conflict to preserve their friendship. Hammond refuses, replying: 'My principles hold every man's private opinion as sacred; but the very same principles compel me to forfeit even *your* affection, Sir, if it is to be preserved at the price of my duty.'⁸¹ Hammond employs reason to convince Corbett that their political differences need not prove ruinous to their friendship. He states:

We, unfortunately, happen to see the American dispute in opposite lights. It is sufficient to a soldier that he believes his quarrel to be just. You arraign my humanity. Wherefore? I retort not the accusation. May we not consider a public contest in different points of view, and yet be friends? Both may act from feeling, and both on principle. You imagine America is aggrieved, while I look upon *her* as the aggressor. What of that? Do we interfere with the opinions of each other? I was not accessory to the death of your son; and had it been my fate to meet him in the field, I can conceive the point on which nature would have insisted. She would gracefully have led us both a little from the line of duty, and spared one in sympathy to the other.⁸²

These pleas fall on deaf ears, and Corbett severs ties with Hammond. This has disastrous consequences for Corbett, who ends up losing everyone close to him due to his inability to sympathise with Hammond's position. Characterising Corbett as stubborn and clouded by grief enables Pratt to illustrate the breakdown of traditional sentimental bonds, which serves as a microcosm of the wider conflict, with both sides' incapable, or unwilling, to sympathise

⁸⁰ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 17.

⁸¹ Samuel Jackson Pratt, *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*, Vol. 1 (London: R. Baldwin Pater Noster Row and Pratt and Clinch Bath, 1781), 10.

<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=ECCO&u=univnott&id=GALE%7CCW0113120416&v=2.1&it=r&cookieConsent=true&analyticsOptout=false&aty=shibboleth>.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 10-11.

with the other. Pratt is clear about the importance of sympathetic identification as a remedy to the tumult but laments its breakdown during the conflict itself.

Pratt's description of the death of Corbett's son and the accompanying grief and mourning that follow serves to destabilise the novel's sentimental core with distinctly gothic overtones. In this way the unsettling of the novel's sentimentality acts as a mirror of the wider upheaval of the conflict; while also functioning as a device whereby Pratt can represent his deep opposition to the conflict.⁸³ In the novel the death of Corbett's son profoundly impacts his thinking, resulting in a deep loathing of the British. He makes this clear in a letter to his close friend Sir Robert Raymond, declaring that the loss of his son prevents him from being neutral on the war. As he writes, 'my soul is on fire-I breathe generous vengeance against barbarous Britain: I own it; and, could I move this lacerated body out of England [where he resided] without immediate peril of a life...I would not continue in a soil so accursed.'⁸⁴ For Corbett, the wound caused by the loss of his son prompts his heart to bleed perpetually, but he 'tyed [sic] about it a political bandage' and threw his support behind the Patriot cause against the British, who he insisted were bent on the 'assassination of America.'⁸⁵ The exaggerated use of the term assassination suggests that Corbett's hatred of the British is borne more out of pain than of malice. For Pratt, the death of Corbett's son symbolises the fracturing of the parental dynamic between the colonies and Great Britain, with his 'lacerated body' signifying the deep wound caused to that relationship.⁸⁶

The Gothic: National Mourning and Grief

Gothic literature has traditionally been viewed as a British invention, and while this is accurate, early American gothic literature has its own distinct character, defined by a sense of guilt and mourning in the wake of the Revolution. In the post-Revolutionary Era the new national government sought to create a distinctly homogenised society, but the gothic novel offered a divergent view, often portraying the unseemly and rancorous side of the country's class, gendered, and racial relations.⁸⁷ This dark heart within early American writing runs counter to the official narrative, which ignored the disturbing reality confronting people

⁸³ Henderson, *Grief and Genre*, 14.

⁸⁴ Pratt, *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*, 175.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁸⁶ Couch, "Printing Emma Corbett," 450.

⁸⁷ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 23.

following the conflict. The disparity between the official ideological position, and the pervasive sense of grief within American society culminated in a discernible tension haunting American gothic writing, with these novels oscillating between denial and expression of those national feelings of guilt.⁸⁸ As Julia Stern has rightly argued, a significant objective of late eighteenth century American literature was to ‘address and work through the unprecedented sense of loss Americans’ felt following the dislocation caused by the Revolution.⁸⁹ This was particularly the purview of gothic literature, which was imbued with a sense of gloom, as novelists suggested that the physical and emotional violence of the Revolution could reoccur in the present.⁹⁰

Feelings of grief are captured across multiple forms of expression I have discussed in this thesis, from memoirs to diaries, revealing the various ways people recalled and expressed their painful experiences. As G. Patrick O’Brien has put it, Mary Robie, for example, reflects in her diary on the ‘emotional toll of exile.’⁹¹ In an entry from June 1784 she comments on the plight of Loyalists arriving in Halifax, writing ‘if I look round me, what thousands may I see more wretched than myself.’⁹² However, while many suffered with the grief of exile, Robie and her family viewed sympathy as a means of ameliorating the pain of newly arrived exiles in Halifax. Musing on a visit paid by her mother to a newly arrived family struggling to adjust to their new surroundings, she wrote ‘Mama visited them from a motive of compassion as they knew nobody here.’⁹³ This belief in the potential of sympathy to heal the conflict’s emotional wounds is echoed in much post-revolutionary fiction. Many authors, including Susanna Rowson, felt that sympathy could be a vehicle for unifying the nation.⁹⁴ Her novel *Charlotte Temple*, positions grief as a unifying force, having the ability to bring people together. In a case of art imitating life, through Charlotte, as with Robie, the chaos and dislocation wrought by the conflict is laid bare. But in both instances despair serves to unite people in their shared grief, and in doing so accentuates the promise offered by sympathy as a response to collective mourning.

⁸⁸ Lise Sorensen, “Susanna Rowson and the Transatlantic Captivity Narrative,” in *Transatlantic Literary Studies*, ed. Eve Tavor Bannet and Susan Manning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 174. ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁸⁹ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 31.

⁹⁰ Sorensen, “Susanna Rowson,” 179.

⁹¹ Patrick O’Brien, “‘Gilded Misery:’ The Robie Women in Loyalist Exile and Repatriation, 1775-1792,” *Acadiensis* 49, no. 1 (2020): 40, <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/Acadiensis/article/view/31314>.

⁹² Mary Robie, Diary Entry, 4-5 June, 1784, Robie-Sewall Family Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

⁹³ Robie, Diary Entry, 4 October, 1783.

⁹⁴ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 7.

In *Charlotte Temple*, Rowson casts the founding of the new republic as what Stern calls a ‘melancholic formation,’ but transforms those feelings of grief into affective bonds.⁹⁵ She employs the ‘sorrowful poetics of narrative,’ in Stern’s words, to convey the pall of sadness that spread over the former colonies after the war.⁹⁶ While *Charlotte Temple* is set during the years of the Revolution, and its depiction of British army officer, John Montraville as a dishonourable cad, can be interpreted as a veiled criticism of the British, it does not directly deal with the politics or the social reality of the conflict. Another of Rowson’s novels, *Fille de Chambre, or Rebecca* does, however, more actively engage with the war, plunging the story’s protagonist headlong into the ravages of the tumult.⁹⁷ The sections of *Fille de Chambre* that grapple with the conflict exhibits a high degree of sentimental emotionality, but such effusive use of emotion disguises a darker undercurrent, marked by violence and brutality. In taking this approach the novel holds up a mirror to post-revolutionary American society, revealing a gothic substratum ‘covered over by an outpouring of feeling.’⁹⁸ By conveying the bleakness of the period Rowson draws on her own experiences during the conflict, in which she and her family were persecuted because of her father’s Loyalist sympathies. This imbues the story with an autobiographical quality, in which her own reminiscences and feelings shape how Rebecca’s experiences are framed. Essentially, through the character of Rebecca she channels her own voice, and in doing so provides insight into her own trials.⁹⁹

In the novel the Abthorpes’ imprisonment resembles the experience of Rowson’s own family, who were placed under house arrest in 1775, before being exiled to Britain.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ Ibid., 8.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 8.

⁹⁷ *Fille de Chambre* centres on Rebecca Littleton, who becomes the companion of Lady Mary, the mother of the Littleton’s landlord, Sir George Worthy, who Rebecca secretly loves. As the story develops Lady Mary dies, and Rebecca falls on hard times. When Worthy offers his assistance, she declines, and instead decides to accompany a young lady named Sophia Abthorpe, to America. After arriving, she resides with the Abthorpes at their home in Boston, and it is during this period that she is swept up in the chaos of the Revolution, due to the Abthorpes Loyalist sympathies. After surviving these hardships Rebecca sails back to England, where she finds herself in financial difficulty. She then encounters Lady Chatterton, who Rebecca mistakenly believes to be Sir George Worthy’s wife. Her feelings for Worthy sway her not to take advantage of the assistance offered by Lady Chatterton. Consequently, her situation further deteriorates, but just when all seems lost, she discovers that not only is Sir George Worthy not married to Lady Chatterton, but he is not actually George Worthy at all, but rather her cousin, George Littleton. Following these startling revelations Rebecca is rescued from her perilous situation, and marries George, finding happiness after all her trials.

⁹⁸ Stern, *Plight of Feeling*, 9.

⁹⁹ Marion Rust, *Prodigal Daughters: Susanna Rowson’s Early American Women* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 147. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹⁰⁰ Elias Nason, *A Memoir of Mrs Susanna Rowson with Elegant and Illustrative Extracts from her Writings in Prose and Poetry* (Albany: Joel Munsell, 1870), 25-31. <https://tile.loc.gov/storage-services/public/gdcmassbookdig/memoirofmrssusan00naso/memoirofmrssusan00naso.pdf>.

Echoing these events, she writes that the party ‘surrounded the house of the defenceless Colonel, making himself, his wife, daughter, and our heroine prisoners, on pretence of his having held correspondence with the enemy.’¹⁰¹ Rowson, before being placed under house arrest, had herself witnessed the death of a British soldier during a skirmish, and she and her family helped to bury the soldier.¹⁰² In a parallel scene in the novel Rebecca is left ‘entirely absorbed by terror’ after seeing a dying British soldier.¹⁰³ In essence the death of the young combatant functions as a proxy for all those killed during the conflict, with the subsequent grief expressed by Rebecca and the Abthorpe family symbolising the grief experienced by families across America. The death of the soldier can also be interpreted as representing the demise of British authority in the colonies, and signifying the sorrow felt by Loyalists following colonial separation from Great Britain.

A prevalent device of Loyalist writing is setting the destructiveness of the conflict against the peace that preceded it. This is notable in both real-world writing and fiction. For example, Elizabeth Forbes, wrote in a letter to her aunt Christian Barnes in April 1776:

Every new scene too fatally convinces me of the melancholy change one twelve month has produced, not only in my present situation, but further prospects, sad reverse, indeed! When will Peace with all her smiling train descend and chase the savage passions from this wretched country?¹⁰⁴

The disturbance to the harmony of American society that she alludes to is replicated in Loyalist fiction. In his *Letters from an American Farmer*, Crèvecoeur positions Farmer James as someone who abhors the prospect of conflict with Great Britain, feeling it to be without just cause. To support this view, he alludes to the mild form of government, and thriving economy, evident in the colonies. He sees America as a sanctuary for oppressed and downtrodden European immigrants. Crèvecoeur was himself one of these European immigrants, who had sought a new life in the American colonies.¹⁰⁵ In *Letters*, he places emotional language front and centre, referring to the fictional James as a ‘farmer of

¹⁰¹ Susanna Rowson, *The Fille De Chambre: A Novel* (Philadelphia: H. & P. Rice, 1794), 172. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹⁰² Nason, *A Memoir of Mrs Susanna Rowson*, 22-23.

¹⁰³ Rowson, *The Fille De Chambre*, 124.

¹⁰⁴ Murray, *Letters of James Murray*, 244.

¹⁰⁵ Born in France, Crèvecoeur relocated to French Canada in the 1760s, before eventually making his way further south to British held territory. After his arrival in the British colonies, he worked as a surveyor and cartographer, before marrying the daughter of a wealthy landowner in 1769. Following the marriage the couple purchased land in Orange County, New York, where Crèvecoeur turned his attention to farming and writing. See Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook, *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 144.

feelings.¹⁰⁶ The prosperity that Crèvecoeur found in America is reflected through James, who expresses his satisfaction at the state of colonial society, writing: 'I cannot describe the various emotions of love, of gratitude, of conscious pride, which thrill in my heart and often overflow in involuntary tears.'¹⁰⁷ The early letters pay regular attention to the idyllic nature of American society. For example, in letter two James states:

Where is that station which can confer a more substantial system of felicity than that of an American farmer, possessing freedom of action, freedom of thoughts, ruled by a mode of government which requires but little from us? I owe nothing, but a pepper corn to my country, a small tribute to my king, with loyalty and due respect; I know no other landlord than the lord of all land, to whom I owe the most sincere gratitude.¹⁰⁸

Through this famous passage Crèvecoeur observes the considerable freedoms afforded to American colonists, which he felt resulted directly from British rule. Farmer James delineates the apparently serene reality of life in America, contrasted with the challenges faced by those in Europe, expressing his good fortune at being an American farmer as opposed to 'a Russian boor, or a Hungarian peasant.'¹⁰⁹

Those feelings of contentment prior to the conflict are at odds with the experience of Farmer James following the outbreak of hostilities. In the late eighteenth-century contentment was 'not simply a matter of personal peace but of smooth social relations,' as Nicole Eustace has described.¹¹⁰ As such, not only was it the loss of his own personal sense of calm that made James feel downcast, but the disruption caused by the war to societal harmony more broadly. It is then that Crèvecoeur infuses the text with distinctly gothic elements, touching on the visceral fear and horror caused by the war. In letter twelve James describes how his previous serenity had been irrevocably disturbed by the conflict, writing:

We never sit down, either to dinner or supper, but the least noise immediately spreads a general alarm, and prevents us from enjoying the comfort of our meals. The very appetite, proceeding from labour and peace of mind, is gone: we eat just enough to keep us alive: our sleep is disturbed by the most frightful dreams: sometimes I start awake, as if the great hour of danger was come; at other times the howling of our dogs seems to announce the arrival of the enemy: we leap out of bed and run to arms: my poor wife with panting bosom and silent tears, takes leave of me, as if we were to see each other no more; she snatches the youngest children from

¹⁰⁶ Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 26.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 24.

¹¹⁰ Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 69.

their beds, who, suddenly awakened, increase, by their innocent questions, the horror of the dreadful moment.¹¹¹

The mention of howling dogs, combined with the placement of James' children in the scene, heightens the tension and fear pervading the entire episode. The passage suggests that the sympathetic bonds that had formerly bound communities together – a prominent feature of his early letters – had been eroded and replaced by a society that was discomposed and filled with misery. Farmer James' once idyllic America of contented individuals has been supplanted by one filled with chaos and sadness.

Early American gothic novels not only reveal a society deeply affected by the conflict, but also demonstrate the importance placed on the past within post-revolutionary literature. As Tennenhouse points out, these novels routinely exhumed 'cultural material that from the perspective of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was associated with a much earlier period of history.'¹¹² The thematic deployment of Loyalism in early gothic literature can be positioned within this context, with its use recalling an outmoded form of political and cultural identification. While much of the fictional output of the 1780s and 1790s depicts Loyalism as a somewhat redundant concept, the reality of Loyalism in America after the conflict was much more nuanced, with the reintegration of Loyalists provoking diverse reactions and raising innumerable difficult questions. Article VI of the Treaty of Paris was an initial step towards reconciliation, foregrounding sympathy and proscribing any further persecution of Loyalists.¹¹³ However, not all states reacted positively to this directive, finding forgiveness difficult, as in the case of South Carolina, which saw many acts of violence against Loyalists after the signing of the Treaty. It also prohibited former Loyalists from taking public office and imposed significant voting restrictions. South Carolina also passed a confiscation act in 1782, which contained the names of approximately three hundred former Loyalists, enabling the state to seize their property.¹¹⁴

Many people decried the ongoing persecution of Loyalists, including Alexander Hamilton, who vociferously denounced such actions in two newspaper essays he wrote in 1784. He insisted that for the country to move forward returning Loyalists needed to be

¹¹¹ Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 189.

¹¹² Tennenhouse, *The Importance of Feeling English*, 97.

¹¹³ Aaron Nathan Coleman, "Justice and Moderation? The Reintegration of the American Loyalists as an Episode of Transitional Justice," in *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, ed. Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2019), 182.

¹¹⁴ Rebecca Brannon, "America's Revolutionary Experience with Transitional Justice," in *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, eds., Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2019), 196-200.

treated with forgiveness and brought back into the fold. As with the earlier Treaty of Paris, Hamilton placed sympathy front and centre, asserting the importance of adhering to the treaty's conditions, which stipulated that 'no person or persons shall suffer on account of the part they may have taken in the war, any damage to person, liberty, or property.'¹¹⁵ Such pleas had the desired result, and by 1787 most states had passed acts of oblivion, absolving Loyalists of prior wrongdoings during the war, enabling the nation to move forward with the process of reconciliation.¹¹⁶ South Carolina heeded such calls, and by 1787 it too had relaxed much of its anti-Loyalist legislation. To facilitate the prompt reincorporation of Loyalists into society, it made a conscious effort to excise Loyalism from its collective cultural memory. To cultivate social unity Loyalism was largely excluded from public mention, with journalists and politicians attempting to 'write out the Loyalist past in order to preserve the fragile reintegration of former Loyalists.'¹¹⁷

As the nation sought to diminish past differences, the sentimental novel became a safe space to explore such internecine conflict. But these fictional portrayals often presented a distorted version of the conflict, casting Patriots as virtuous and heroic, while depicting Loyalists as duplicitous and scheming villains. This form of manipulation was a key feature of the pursuit of national unity, which saw Loyalism relegated to the past with little relevancy for the present.¹¹⁸ Consistent with this style of representation gothic writers often set Loyalism within an earlier and often outdated setting. Isaac Mitchell's *The Asylum, or Alonzo and Melissa*, for example, casts Loyalists as callous rogues and thieves, who terrorise the novel's heroine within the walls of a gothic manor house anachronistically transplanted onto American soil.¹¹⁹ By depicting the pernicious threat of Loyalism lurking in the shadows, *The*

¹¹⁵ Phocion, "Second Letter from Phocion, [April 1784]," Founders Online, National Archives, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Hamilton/01-03-02-0347>.

¹¹⁶ Coleman, "Justice and Moderation?" 188.

¹¹⁷ Rebecca Brannon, *From Revolution to Reunion: The Reintegration of the South* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2016), 177.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 203.

¹¹⁹ *The Asylum* is set during the Revolution and essentially tells the romantic tale of its two central protagonists, Alonzo Haventon and Melissa Bloomfield. The lover's union is initially received with almost universal approval. However, following Alonzo's fathers' dramatic loss of fortune, Melissa's father retracts his support for the couple, and forbids Melissa from seeing Alonzo. He then formulates a plan to keep Melissa from Alonzo, which involves imprisoning her within the walls of the families dilapidated and decaying castle. Unaware of Melissa's whereabouts, Alonzo searches ceaselessly for Melissa, only to uncover a report indicating that Melissa had died. Alonzo is inconsolable but avoids facing his grief by joining the war effort in support of the Patriot cause. During the war Alonzo is captured by the British and transferred to a prison in England. After escaping, he eventually returns to America, and in a serendipitous turn of events is reunited with Melissa, who he discovers is still alive. Following their reunion Alonzo and Melissa see out the remainder of the war before retiring to a quiet cottage together.

Asylum emphasises the internal division evident within the new nation.¹²⁰ Melissa is imprisoned in the house by her controlling family to keep her from her lover Alonzo, who they strongly disapprove of due to his family's declining fortunes. Melissa soon perceives the house to be haunted, which deeply troubles her. As Mitchell writes of one such episode:

She started, in a trembling panic; but endeavored to compose herself with the idea that something had fallen from the shelves. As she lay musing upon the incident, she heard loud noises in the rooms below, succeeded by an irregular and confused number of voices, and presently after, footsteps ascending the stairs which led to her chamber. She trembled; a cold chilly sweat ran down her face. Directly the doors below opened and shut with a quick and violent motion, and soon after she was convinced that she distinctly heard a whispering in her room. She raised herself up in the bed, and cast inquisitive eyes towards her chamber door. All was darkness.¹²¹

The supernatural occurrences can eventually be attributed to a group of Loyalist merchants who had been surreptitiously using the castle as a base of operations. In the story they are described as a 'gang of illicit traders' who are 'carrying on a secret and illegal commerce with the British army,' and are also involved in circulating counterfeit money, which they had 'insidiously sent...out into the country, in order to sink our currency.'¹²²

Mitchell was himself inclined towards republican principles, as evidenced by his editorship of the *Political Barometer* (1802-1806), a Poughkeepsie newspaper in which he routinely championed the values of the Revolution and rejoiced at Thomas Jefferson's re-election as President in 1804. Reflecting on Jefferson's first term he wrote approvingly of 'our exchequer replenished, our finances ample, and peace with all nations.'¹²³ It was inside the *Political Barometer* that Mitchell first published a serialised version of *Alonzo and Melissa* in 1804, before issuing an expanded edition, now titled *The Asylum*, in 1811.¹²⁴ Mitchell clearly channels his republican proclivities into the story, with Melissa and Alonzo's struggle to be together serving as a parallel for the colonists' 'struggle for independence from tyranny,' as Ed White has argued.¹²⁵ In this way the central story fulfilled an allegorical function, projecting in microcosm the wider American struggle for independence.¹²⁶

¹²⁰ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 327.

¹²¹ Daniel Jackson Jr., *Alonzo and Melissa: Or the Unfeeling Father. An American Tale* (Boston: Printed for the Publishers, 1851). <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/28112/28112-h/28112-h.htm>.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Joseph Fichtelberg, "The Sentimental Economy of Isaac Mitchell's 'The Asylum'," *Early American Literature* 32, no. 1 (1997): 3. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25057071>.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 2.

¹²⁵ Ed White, "Trends and Patterns in the US Novel, 1800-1820," in *The Oxford History of the Novel in English*, ed. J. Gerald Kennedy and Leland S Person (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 5:83. ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 83.

However, within this narrative his deployment of Loyalist characters implies a sense of unresolved grief permeating American political and public life in the years following the conflict.¹²⁷ It also supports the idea of the gothic novel acting as a space for the expression of unresolved social crisis. In *The Asylum* the casting of Loyalists as ghostly figures is indicative of an intolerance towards those who opposed independence, suggesting that the civil war aspect of the conflict had not been adequately dealt with in the post-war years. The bloodshed of the conflict left deep wounds throughout the colonies, which not only left a distinctly gothic imprint on much of the fiction produced in this period but also saw those who had been marginalised by the conflict treated with disdain. Such a move suggests that the ‘transparent sympathy’ which was the cultural ideal in post-revolutionary America did not extend to everyone, supporting the notion of an ‘unravelling of fellow feeling’ in the late eighteenth century.¹²⁸

The anti-Loyalist rhetoric, and the failure of a genuine sympathetic response, is reflected in Loyalist centred picaresque fiction also produced after the Revolution, much of which takes aim at the Patriot authorities. The loose structure, and droll tone of the picaresque novel, was sometimes exploited to denigrate Patriot actions, disclosing a sense of unease about their place in post-revolutionary America. This uncertainty manifests in the satirising of Patriot conduct, lending these productions an air of subversion, at a time when the new nation was supposedly coalescing around a desire for heterogeneity and unanimity. Picaresque novels, such as *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob*, present an alternative perspective, revealing a fragmented and broken society, grounded in questionable Patriot morality. Loyalist novels such as *Jonathan Corncob*, in short, expose a world devoid of genuine sympathetic identification, with disenfranchised groups forced to the margins.

The Picaresque: The Subversive Potential of the Novel

The picaresque novel was the freest form of narrative in early American fiction, enabling its protagonist ‘to wander the margins of an emerging American landscape.’¹²⁹ It was also highly politicised, since its loose structure made it suitable for addressing the discordant political landscape of the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary Era. In this way, as Cathy Davidson has argued, the picaresque reflects the period’s ‘diversity and indeterminacy,’ emphasising

¹²⁷ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 4.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 72.

¹²⁹ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 234.

‘the complexity of the political world’ in late eighteenth century America.¹³⁰ The picaresque represents this divergent social and political atmosphere, demonstrated through the novelist’s choice of ‘dialect, deliberate violations of standard English prose, and other linguistic idiosyncrasies, including slang and arcane professional jargon.’¹³¹ Imbued with a pronounced satirical or comedic tone, the picaresque novel uses a different emotional register to either gothic or sentimental fiction.¹³²

The picaresque has been described by Ulrich Wicks as ‘an infinite foray into a world that is forever falling apart.’¹³³ Indeed, a common trope of picaresque fiction is a protagonist ‘who roams the landscape’ after being ejected from their home.¹³⁴ These tendencies thus neatly evoke the displacement and subsequent exile of many Loyalists during the Revolution. Maya Jasanoff has described the trials faced by Loyalist exiles in similar terms, many of whom ‘left behind friends and relatives, careers and land, houses, and native streets – the entire milieu in which they had built their lives.’¹³⁵ This was certainly the reality confronted by Samuel Curwen, following his exile to Great Britain in 1775. In a 1776 letter he laments the emotional and financial toll of exile, writing:

Poverty with all her attendant evils, to one unaccustomed to her presence till old age, is too formidable to be vanquished by philosophy and religion; nor is there a mind in such a situation, in its own natural forces, capable of supporting itself, and not bending under the weight of grief and despair.¹³⁶

The grief and despair felt by Curwen is paralleled in Susanna Rowson’s *Fille De Chambre*, which contains pronounced picaresque as well as gothic elements, when recounting the displacement experienced by the Abthorpe family. In the novel, after the Abthorpes have been forced from their home they are made to endure a period of being moved from place to place, leaving Sophia Abthorpe severely depressed. After encountering a disconsolate Sophia, Rebecca tries to console her, saying: ‘Do not grieve thus, my dear Sophia, for though separated from your friends, you will still live in their remembrance, and they in your’s.’¹³⁷

¹³⁰ Ibid., 234.

¹³¹ Ibid., 235.

¹³² Ibid., 248.

¹³³ Ulrich Wicks, “The Nature of Picaresque Narrative: A Modal Approach,” *PMLA* 89, no. 2 (1974): 242, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/461446>.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 246.

¹³⁵ Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: HarperPress, 2011), 6.

¹³⁶ Sameul Curwen, *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen, Judge of Admiralty, etc., An American Refugee in England from 1775 to 1784*, ed. George Atkinson Ward (New York: C. S. Francis, 1842), 94, <https://archive.org/details/curwensamuelj00curwrch/page/n9>.

¹³⁷ Rowson, *Rebecca*, 181.

The sorrow embodied in this passage is indicative of an emotional register distinct from that typical of picaresque fiction, as it lacks the comedic or satirical quality prevalent within the genre. But its tone of sadness recalls the tragic reality of a picaresque lifestyle for Loyalists like Samuel Curwen who were forced to wander aimlessly from place to place.

The picaresque novel, more than the sentimental or gothic forms, was closely associated with social and political marginality, acting as a platform for the most contradictory aspects of society. The picaresque protagonist was typically an outsider, often because of their own personal or political choices.¹³⁸ This is evidenced by the central character in *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob* who is a Massachusetts Loyalist displaced by the American Revolution. The bulk of the story is set against the backdrop of the conflict, and follows its intrepid and unruly protagonist through a series of adventures across the American countryside.¹³⁹ While published anonymously, *Jonathan Corncob* is widely considered by academics to have been written by a Loyalist exile in Great Britain.¹⁴⁰ If true, it represents a rare example of a Loyalist-authored novel. The relative lack of Loyalist authored fiction gestures to most Loyalists not viewing the medium as a useful vehicle for expression. This was likely due to a perceived lack of interest in their story at a time when the new United States was in the process of establishing a national identity, leaving little room for the perspectives of those who opposed independence.¹⁴¹ It is notable that the few Loyalist sympathising novels that we do have, including *Jonathan Corncob* and *Letters from an American Farmer*, draw on significant gothic and picaresque elements, suggesting that when Loyalists did turn to fiction it was from a subversive or critical position. With respect to *Jonathan Corncob* the author exploits the use of anonymity, common to eighteenth century fiction, to censure Patriot conduct, and by extension the new republican government, without fear of reprisal. This accords with other Loyalist writings, including memoirs and pamphlets produced anonymously or pseudonymously, with the primary intention of protecting the

¹³⁸ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 248.

¹³⁹ Early in the tale, Corncob gets a local girl pregnant, and to avoid responsibility flees to New York City. Following his arrival in New York he joins a group of fellow Loyalists, and together they set about plundering the countryside of Connecticut and New Jersey. In New York, Corncob is involved in a fracas at a local tavern, which prompts him to head to Rhode Island where he briefly stays, before returning to New York. Later, he boards a ship to Barbados, where he survives a hurricane and finds himself involved in a series of adventures. After Barbados, he again heads back to New York, where he is made a purser on board a British ship called *The Despair*, which is defeated in an engagement with a Patriot ship, resulting in Corncob's capture and imprisonment in Boston. While in prison his captors decide to move Corncob to New York, but the ship transporting him wrecks off the coast of Rhode Island. Finally, Corncob manages to find his way back to New York where his adventures conclude.

¹⁴⁰ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 254.

¹⁴¹ Marco J. Lloyd, "The Reintegration of the Loyalists in Post-Revolutionary America," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*, 22, (2023): 124, <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/ghj/vol22/iss1/9>.

author's identity to prevent retributive action. The already mentioned 1774 broadside *At a Meeting of the TRUE Sons of Liberty*, which like *Jonathan Corncob*, adopted a satirical tone skewering Patriot cruelty, is a comparable example.¹⁴² Its use of sardonic language was utilised by Loyalists across multiple modalities to criticise Patriot actions, demonstrating the wide-ranging use of humour as a mechanism to attack Patriot behaviour.

Like the *At a Meeting* broadside, *Jonathan Corncob* employs a distinctly comedic tone to depict the turbulence of the conflict, casting Patriots in an unflattering light. But its comedic tenor is imbued with a greater sense of anger and moral indignation akin to Juvenalian satire, which as a form that possesses a pronounced 'acidic tone.'¹⁴³ By the late eighteenth century Juvenalian satire, which drew on classical precedents, had been popularised by writers such as Jonathan Swift in *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), and Samuel Johnson in his poem *London* (1738). It expresses anger at the state of society, and is typically 'vehement, scathing, intensely negative, and loudly provocative.'¹⁴⁴ The use of 'Juvenalian anger' is present throughout *Jonathan Corncob* with his satirical deployment intended to provoke 'indignation.'¹⁴⁵ For example, Corncob describes a disturbing scene he witnessed in Boston, observing:

On my arrival I found a great crowd assembled in the street: curious to know the occasion of it, I thrust my nose into the midst of the populace, and saw a naked man lying on the pavement, while several others poured hot tar upon him. Soon after a large quantity of feathers was brought, in which he was rolled, and after the application of some long quills to his tail, this non-descript animal was suffered to rise.¹⁴⁶

Referring to the victim as a non-descript animal suggests the dehumanising and barbarous nature of Patriot justice and was intended to illicit outrage among readers. Tarring and feathering as a form of public shaming, which can be traced back to the Middle Ages, became

¹⁴² *At a meeting of the True Sons of Liberty, in the City of New-York, properly convened; present, John Calvin, John Know, Roger Rumpus, &c. &c. Uc. 15 resolves By order of the meeting Ebenezer Snuffle, Secretary New York, 1774* (New York, 1774), <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.10602600/>.

¹⁴³ R. Lance Holbert, et al., "Adding Nuance to the Study of Political Humor Effects: Experimental Research on Juvenalian Satire Versus Horatian Satire," *American Behavioral Scientist* 55, no.3 (2011): 187-211, <https://doi-org.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0002764210392156>. Juvenalian satire derives its name from 'Decimus Junius Juvenalis, who produced 16 satires on the corruption and vices of Rome from 60AD to 140AD. See R. Lance Holbert, et al., "Adding Nuance to the Study of Political Humor Effects: Experimental Research on Juvenalian Satire Versus Horatian Satire," *American Behavioral Scientist* 55, no.3 (2011): 192, <https://doi-org.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0002764210392156>.

¹⁴⁴ Catherine Keane, *Juvenal and the Satiric Emotions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199981892.003.0001>.

¹⁴⁵ Charles Sanders, *The Scope of Satire* (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971), 254.

¹⁴⁶ *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob, Loyal American Refugee* (London: Printed for the Author, 1787), 27.

a popular punishment of choice for Patriots.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, the practice notably found its way into Patriot fiction, including John Trumbull's mock-epic poem *M'Fingal* (1776/1782), in which Trumbull simultaneously conveys his scepticism about Patriot notions of democracy, while approvingly referencing the use of harsh punishment against Loyalists. In the poem Trumbull repeatedly underlines the authority of the Patriot mob, declaring that in a judgment passed at a liberty pole, they had found the Loyalist M'Fingal to be the 'Vilest Tory in the town.'¹⁴⁸ In his description of the sentence to be meted out against M'Fingal he shows his advocacy for attacks on Loyalists, writing: 'That first the mob slip-knot single, Tie round the neck of said M'Fingal; And in due form do tar him next, And feather, as the law directs.'¹⁴⁹ That both sides drew on tarring and feathering in their satire shows the power the act held in the American imagination, with Patriots alluding to it as an acceptable form of punishment for traitors, while Loyalists felt that it reaffirmed the Patriots as uncivilised.

In 1787 with the process of nation building under way in the new United States of America, disharmonious views expressed in novels such as *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob* were unpopular within some quarters of society. Nathaniel Appleton Haven, for example, observed: 'The great mischief of novel-reading, beside the misimprovement [*sic*] of time, is, that it accustoms our minds to receive ideas without exertion.'¹⁵⁰ Equally, Samuel Miller, argued that a 'reader of novels' will suffer both 'intellectual and moral injury.'¹⁵¹ Such criticism was part of a wider belief that novels had the potential to erode societal values, and sow discord, precisely at a time when unity was desired. During this period of national formation, picaresque novelists 'polemically or satirically exposed inconsistencies at the heart of the national self-image,' according to Davidson.¹⁵² This lent novels like *Jonathan Corncob* a subversive quality, in which they undermined attempts at national unity, revealing a fractured cultural landscape, with those who did not fit within the new national image left marginalised.¹⁵³ Disenfranchised groups, such as Loyalists, were able to capitalise on the forms democratic potential, despite their social elitism, in order to express their grievances

¹⁴⁷ Chopra, *Choosing Sides*, 25.

¹⁴⁸ John Trumbull, *M'Fingal: A Modern Epic Poem, in Four Cantos* (Hudson: W. E. Norman, 1916), 95.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433076040363&seq=105>.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 95.

¹⁵⁰ George Ticknor, *The Remains of Nathaniel Appleton Haven: With a Memoir of his Life* (Cambridge: Hillard, Metcalf & Company, 1827), 279.
<https://archive.org/details/remainsnathanie00tickgoog/page/n8/mode/2up?q=novel&view=theater>.

¹⁵¹ Samuel Miller, *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century* (London: J. Johnson, 1805), 399.
https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/A_Brief_Retrospect_of_the_Eighteenth_Cen/tkoQAAAYAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover&bshn=rime/1.

¹⁵² Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 7.

¹⁵³ Ivana, "Transatlantic Exchanges," 175.

and articulate their feelings.¹⁵⁴ This enabled Loyalists to delineate a counter narrative to that proffered by the new republican government, which emphasised togetherness.¹⁵⁵

By presenting an alternative reality picaresque novels reveal that a barrier to genuine sympathetic feeling was the submersion of competing voices within the national narrative. We see this in *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob* when the author describes a meeting between Corncob and his father in New York. During their conversation Corncob's father describes the awful fate that befell him when he went to see his wife, and word of his arrival spread through the local community. As he states:

The whole neighbourhood assembled, and declared, that there was more pleasure in hunting a tory than in hunting a skunk. They dragged me directly from the arms of your mother, to whom I had scarcely spoken, and forming a lane according to the laudable custom of the Indians, they made me run the gantlet [*sic*]. When I had got to the end, lieutenant-general Hand came up, and asked what was the matter. – We are only giving considerable of a basting to this old tory. – I swear now, said he, that's grand – let him go it again. I was obliged to run through them a second time, and got off better than could be expected, for I had only my left arm and both collar-bones broke, and my skull fractured.¹⁵⁶

Here the author impugns the morality of the Patriot cause, emphasising their unscrupulous nature by satirising their conduct. In another example of art imitating life, Customs Officer John Malcolm, experienced a similar episode to that of Corncob's father in 1774. Following an altercation, in which Malcolm allegedly struck a man with a cane, a vengeful mob seized him and placed him in a cart, before having him tarred and feathered, and carried through the streets of Boston with a noose around his neck.¹⁵⁷ The satirical embellishment of the above passage from *Jonathan Corncob* is intended to illustrate the aberrant nature of Patriot justice, such as that experienced by Malcolm. The choice of the picaresque genre to make these moralising points is significant as the picaresque form typically lacked a strong moral core.¹⁵⁸ Even *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob* itself has been described as possessing an ambivalent tone regarding morality, being largely 'uncommitted to the justice of what Jonathan wants or of what he gets.'¹⁵⁹ But the use of the picaresque genre with its comic and farcical undertones, was an astute choice for Corncob's author, as the writer draws on the genres inherent ludicrousness to lampoon the Patriots, portraying them as unfeeling and

¹⁵⁴ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 6.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹⁵⁶ *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob*, 108-109.

¹⁵⁷ Thomas B. Allen, *Tories: Fighting for the King in America's First Civil War* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2010), 28.

¹⁵⁸ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 250.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 254.

devoid of sympathy. In this way *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob* demonstrates that ‘virtue unmoored from fellow feeling and contingent on the erasure or submersion of social and political difference is a culturally bankrupt ideal.’¹⁶⁰

Novelists not only challenged the narrative proffered by the new colonial regime, but also elucidated the disruption caused by the conflict to traditional understandings of emotion. In *Letters from an American Farmer*, Crèvecoeur draws attention to the fact that the rupture undermined typical emotional categories and definitions. In its composition *Letters* contains discernible picaresque characteristics, including a relatively loose structure, and the use of a first-person perspective. Basing the text around the life of an ordinary American farmer is also consistent with picaresque fiction, which typically focuses on a central character from the non-elite ranks of society. In *Letters*, Crèvecoeur portrays Farmer James as ‘a man who exquisitely feels for the miseries of others,’ but suggests his emotional sensitivity had been destabilised by an apparent shift in what the word misery actually connoted.¹⁶¹ Crèvecoeur writes, ‘so much is everything now subverted among us, that the very word *misery*, with which we were hardly acquainted before, no longer conveys the same ideas.’¹⁶² That misery had seemed to lose its meaning is suggestive of the shifting and unstable nature of emotional categories, which are fluid and constantly subject to change, as we saw with the functioning of melancholy in chapter one. Through the fictional Farmer James, Crèvecoeur exposes this instability, with the conflict disrupting existing emotional categories, and overturning emotional understandings in the colonies.

For Farmer James, the perceived upending of traditional emotional definitions had been brought about by a conflict in ‘which reason herself hath given way to brutality and bloodshed!’¹⁶³ As James’ letters progress, his emotional state grows increasingly panicked, with his emotional fragility mirroring the overall emotional disturbance fostered in the colonies because of the Revolution. His bewilderment reflects the ‘existential despair’ which haunts *Letters from an American Farmer*, as he becomes increasingly disillusioned with life

¹⁶⁰ Stern, *The Plight of Feeling*, 6-7.

¹⁶¹ Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 188.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 188.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 191-192.

in the colonies.¹⁶⁴ In letter III Farmer James poses the question, ‘what is an American?’¹⁶⁵ He answers this question in profusely positive terms, asserting that:

The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles; he must therefore entertain new ideas and form new opinions. From involuntary idleness, servile dependence, penury, and useless labour, he has passed to toils of a very different nature, rewarded by ample subsistence. – This is an American.¹⁶⁶

But the positivity evident in his early letters has completely disappeared by the end of the novel, with James repeating the same question of what constituted an American, but this time declaring ‘not better than the European.’¹⁶⁷ Through Farmer James, Crèvecoeur offers a window into his own disillusionment with life in America, and his belief in the failure of sympathy and fellow feeling in the colonies.

In post-war America, as this chapter has shown, grief and sympathy were prominent modes of feeling, shaping both the themes and narrative focus of early American fiction. Grief consumed early America after the conflict, and sympathy was viewed as a vehicle for mending a deeply fractured society. In this climate sentimental writers adapted the family metaphor to represent an ideal of American family dynamics, but such depictions had the potential to other those in society who did not accord with accepted definitions of family attachment. This had implications for displays of sympathy, as those in society who did not conform to these ideals, such as Loyalists, were viewed as unworthy of sympathy. Family imagery was deployed by them not to assert unity but to demonstrate the tragedy of familial fragmentation, and their fictional work also illustrates how gothic themes can disrupt and unsettle a novel’s sentimental core. Early American gothic novels reveal a shadowy undercurrent lurking beneath the surface of American society, with the intolerance shown towards Loyalists serving as a vehicle for unresolved grief. Feelings of mistrust haunted the American consciousness after the war, with negative representations of Loyalists suggesting an uneasiness regarding the role of Loyalists in the new republic. In this tense atmosphere, in which many Loyalists felt marginalised, some drew on the loose structure and satirical emotional register of picaresque fiction to condemn Patriot cruelty, with the genres itinerant

¹⁶⁴ Alan Taylor, “The American Beginning: The Dark Side of Crèvecoeur’s ‘Letters from an American Farmer’,” *The New Republic*, July 19, 2013, n.p. <https://newrepublic.com/article/113571/crevecoeurs-letters-american-farmer-dark-side>.

¹⁶⁵ Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 40.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 44-45.

¹⁶⁷ Taylor, “The American Beginning,” n.p.

protagonist also evoking the displacement experienced by Loyalists. The subversive nature of such picaresque novels further highlights the fracturing of post-revolutionary American society, contradicting claims of unanimity put forward by the new republican government. Not only does the picaresque show the presence of divergent perspectives in the early republic, but it reveals that the suppression of nonconformist voices acted as an impediment to the creation of a nation built on a foundation of genuine forms of sympathy and unity.

Overall, the early American novel discloses a society deeply divided, with firm anti-Loyalist sentiment exemplifying the elusive nature of genuine expressions of sympathy in late eighteenth-century America. The sympathetic core at the heart of sentimental fiction often obscured layers of grief and mourning hidden below. Such feelings of sadness reflect the despair apparent across the spectrum of Loyalist media explored in this thesis, including the diary of Marie Robie, who laments the deep sense of suffering endured by Loyalist exiles. But as professed by Robie in her diary, it was widely felt that sympathy could act as a curative to such extensive feelings of grief. Many novelists have alluded to the affirming possibilities offered by sympathy to heal social crisis, including Susanna Rowson, and Samuel Pratt, who advocated for sympathy as a remedy to widespread grief. In this context the sentimental novel functioned as part of a broader literary movement to elevate notions of sympathetic feeling in the wake of the conflict, prioritising sympathy as a desirable emotional response to the pervasive grief which affected the new nation. However, doubts lingered regarding the efficacy of sympathy to truly heal the wounds caused by the conflict. The marked anti-Loyalist activity across America after the conflict illustrates the failing of genuine sympathy in the aftermath of the Revolution, reinforcing the notion that sympathy within the new republic was highly conditional and prescriptive in nature.

Rigid boundaries regulating displays of sympathy in post-war America applied to all emotional expression following the conflict. But these standards were delimited by the new Patriot elite, with strict observance expected. In such constraining circumstances differing modes of expression, including novels, memoirs, and pamphlets, afforded former Loyalists a public voice. Through these diverse media they attempted to seize the moral high ground, and in doing so revealed the class and status distinctions evident in emotional understandings. Loyalists characterised the Patriot regime as being built on a foundation of false and base emotion, while they subscribed to genuine and laudable emotional types. These competing emotional registers elucidate the clash between differing emotional regimes, defined by divergent emotional standards. The gulf between Loyalist and Patriot understandings of

emotion are evident across the emotional spectrum, with all emotional categories becoming contested ground. These differing ways both sides perceived and expressed emotion contributed to the destabilising of traditional emotional categories which existed prior to the conflict.

Through their writings, as this thesis has shown, a differentiation is evident between the public and private discourse of Loyalists, both prioritising different emotions. While all media forms exhibit the predominance of negative emotional registers, largely because of the disadvantageous position occupied by Loyalists, there is a difference in the type of negative emotions used. Publicly, anger is the overriding emotion projected, possessing a distinctly defensive edge, while privately emotions such as despair, fear and anxiety dominate. The reasons for this distinction are multifarious, but fear of reprisal, and societal norms were the primary causes. In public they sought to convey a sense of outrage and contempt, while privately they indulged their misery. These distinctions evoke the performative aspects of emotional expression and raise questions about emotional authenticity. The restrictive public sphere caused considerable emotional suffering, and inhibited the demonstration of genuine feeling, but their private writings provided an outlet and functioned as a sanctuary. Across the various media varying degrees of compliance with societal rules applied, with conformity more apparent in public works. But in totality Loyalist media reveals a constant tension between emotional compliance and authentic emotional expression. In addition, their writings also reveal a discernible temporal difference, with regards to emotional intensity, with the texts written close to the events described being more highly charged. The temporality of a text also has implications for the types of emotion conveyed, evidenced by a distinction that can be drawn between fear and sympathy. Fear is infused with a sense of immediacy, lending it to forms written close to the time, including diaries and letters, while sympathy is typically sought after the event, notable in the sympathy memoirs produced after the conflict, and its prominence in revolutionary war fiction in the late eighteenth century. While prevalent, the darker, ironic and critical tone of gothic and picaresque fiction can be interpreted as a response by Loyalists to the failure of sentimental fiction to evoke genuine sympathy for their plight and the limitations of the genres I have explored in previous chapters for containing Loyalist emotions. This recognition both reflects and reinforces the broader breakdown of the culture of sensibility we have seen across other modes of expression.

Conclusion

Loyalist Emotional Forms in Flux

To comprehensively understand the experiences of people in the past an exploration of their emotional lives is essential, but until now this has been a glaring omission from Loyalist studies. To correct this oversight my thesis has departed from earlier studies which have generally focused on ideology and allegiance, and often used a biographical or regional structure, by adopting instead a more capacious approach to fully understand the wider Loyalist experience. Taking a novel approach that methodically surveys several previously understudied mediums of elite Loyalist self-expression, both private and public, my study meaningfully contributes to redressing this gap in the literature by elucidating the intricacies of their emotional lives. By using a structure built around these various textual forms it has been possible to uncover both the internal and external emotional experiences of elite Loyalists.

Analysing each medium separately has allowed for the identification of specific and distinct aspects of Loyalist emotional expression that would otherwise have been obscured through an alternative framework, such as a thematic approach that investigated multiple media forms within each chapter. My chosen structure has made it possible to recognise that Loyalist pamphlets functioned as a public outlet for their feelings of outrage, and that their private diaries acted as an emotional refuge for processing their feelings of melancholy. Observing these patterns of emotional expression within each textual form not only discloses the prevalence of certain emotions within each individual mode but taken together they importantly reveal the most prominent emotional registers within the primary textual forms Loyalists used for self-expression. Not only has my investigation explicated the connection between form and emotion, but it has also shown that certain media are conducive to specific emotional registers and tones; for example, pamphlets are well suited to passionate forms of anger such as outrage. We also see this close relationship between form and emotion with respect to temporality, with emotions of high immediacy, such as fear, being more prevalent in forms written close to the time of experience, while other emotions are more noticeable in forms with a more reflective guise, such as sympathy.

This study importantly demonstrates that across these different media, elite Loyalist emotional expression was severely disrupted, manifesting in the destabilising, challenging, and undermining, of the conventions and standards dictating emotional expression. This is

evident, for example, in the unsettling of sympathy, and the breakdown of sympathetic relations during the conflict, which served to subvert the culture of sensibility, which had crucially influenced emotional expression in preceding years. It has been possible to illustrate the clear disconnect that occurred in how Loyalists and Patriots came to understand and use emotion, and elucidate the class, status, and gender dynamics relating to this divergence, which is evident in the different use and treatment of anger by either side. Picking up on the gendered aspects of emotional expression, this study has sought to overcome an undeniable gender bias that has been apparent within the literature, contributing vital detail to the experiences of Loyalist women during the conflict, showing how and why they employed different textual forms for self-expression.

This thesis also shows that rather than Loyalists simply being unable to comprehend the Patriot emotional regime, as earlier research has suggested, it is more a case of this emergent regime clashing with their own emotional regime and thus causing this undeniable disjuncture. This undoubtedly had an unsettling impact on Loyalist emotional expression overall as reflected across the various forms investigated here. Lacking political or social authority while living under a new and repressive Patriot emotional regime, Loyalists exploited various textual forms as an emotional refuge, which acted as a safe space for emotional expression. It has also been possible to demonstrate how textual modes often function to outline an emotional regime's foundation, while simultaneously acting as a vehicle to invalidate the emotional core of a competing emotional regime. While underscoring the view that emotional expression was influenced by the rules and conventions dictating emotional expression within the late eighteenth century transatlantic world, my study has revealed that notions of emotional authenticity were inextricably tied to these emotional norms, while concomitantly showing that social and political upheaval can complicate the discernment of authentic emotions. Additionally, it has been shown here that during times of political and social repression emotional authenticity is compromised more in public forms of expression than in private forms, due to private forms not being overtly impacted by the wider political and social climate governing emotional life.

As earlier chapters have demonstrated, for Loyalists their chosen medium and specific emotional experience shaped how and why that emotion was expressed. Relatedly, the anticipated audience also played a significant part in how Loyalists utilised a selected form

and expressed a given emotion. Analysing this interconnectivity further allows us to see this important relationship across the various chapters of this thesis. For example, we can see the interrelationship between, form, emotion, and audience, in how Loyalists expressed their feelings of melancholy privately in their diaries. Using their diaries to express their despair was crucial at a time when the public expression of melancholy was not permissible. Their diaries allowed for the ‘letting down of vigilance,’ enabling the expression of feelings unconstrained by external pressures that impinged their ability to freely emote, including societal conventions, and Patriot suppression.¹ Thus, when Grace Growden Galloway reflected on her feelings of anguish she felt comfortable writing in her diary that it had been a ‘dreadful day indeed my spirits gone.’² In this way Loyalists’ diaries acted as ‘a “place” where the prescriptions for emotional style [applied] only in their absence.’³

We again see this important interconnection between form, emotion, and audience, in how Loyalists used the ostensibly public reach of memoir as a vehicle for both justifying their actions during the conflict and eliciting sympathy for their suffering in its aftermath. This demonstrates how emotions within public forms, like memoirs, are clearly influenced by the purpose and tone of the particular medium in which they are expressed. As I have shown in chapter two, those memoirs that had an explanatory function anticipated an elite transatlantic audience and show how Loyalists used anger to attack the Patriot leadership to recover their damaged reputations and tainted honour. While those memoirs that are rooted more in sympathy targeted either the British government, or an elite transatlantic audience, depending on the memoir’s precise purpose. Memoirs that sought financial restitution were directed at the British government, while those that tried to provoke sympathy for Loyalists more broadly, anticipated a wider transatlantic audience. In both cases they framed their experiences to garner sympathy for their plight.

In chapter three we see the interplay between privacy, emotion, and media, in the letter writing activities of Loyalists. Their epistolary networks reveal the full scale of the impact of Patriot persecution, which although evident across the multiple forms investigated in this thesis, is most apparent in Loyalist letter writing, showing how possible censure can curb emotional expression. For example, the threat of their letters being intercepted, and the

¹ William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 153. ProQuest Ebook Central.

² Grace Growden Galloway and Raymond C. Werner, “Diary of Grace Growden Galloway,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 55, no. 1 (January 1931): 71, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20086760>.

³ Rob Boddice, *The History of Emotions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 98.

serious consequences that awaited, forced Loyalists to be cautious, curtailing any notion of openness in their letter writing. The prospect of their letters falling into Patriot hands created doubts as to precisely what was permissible to write, causing fear and anxiety to spread through Loyalist epistolary networks. While this reveals letters to be a significant mode of disseminating emotion throughout an emotional community, it also importantly shows how Loyalists used the ostensible privacy of their epistolary networks to hide such feelings within their own emotional communities. This demonstrates how letters have the potential to function as a crucial outlet for emotional expression within a specific emotional refuge.

The convergence we have already seen between emotion, medium, and audience, is again evident in chapter four, demonstrating how broadsides and pamphlets served as a rapid means of emotional dispersal during the Revolution. This underscores the potential of textual forms to convey emotion to a wide public audience, while also illustrating how the emotional tone of such productions can shape a reader's emotional response. As observed earlier, it was this aspect of print ephemera that Loyalists objected to, arguing that the Patriots sought to negatively influence the public through broadsides and pamphlets. William Smith, for example, in his 1780s pamphlet *The Candid Retrospect* berated the Patriot leadership for manipulating the public through fear, arguing that they had 'terrified many' to support the cause of independence.⁴ For Loyalists, such abuse of emotions like fear conflicted with their traditional and conservative views of emotional expression. The frustration they felt at what they considered to be the Patriot misappropriation of fear, and emotion more broadly, manifests in a distinct sense of outrage being projected through their pamphlet output. Initially, during the pamphlet debates their expression of anger was consistent with their moderate stance, in which they remained controlled in their rebuttals to forceful Patriot arguments. But as we have seen, their deteriorating political and social realities caused this calm approach to be replaced by overt demonstrations of outrage, with the tenor of later Loyalist public writing being defensive and borne from a sense of exasperation, illustrating the disjuncture caused to their traditional view of emotional expression.

In chapter five the intersection between emotion, form and audience is observable in how eighteenth and early nineteenth novels reflected American society's deeply felt anxieties towards Loyalism after the conflict, elucidating how a society's emotional tenor is captured and projected through fictional modes. We see this in Revolutionary Era novels representing

⁴ William Smith, *The Candid Retrospect: or, The American War Examined, by Whig Principles* (Charlestown: John Wells, 1780), 12.

the post-war fissures present in American society, with feelings of unresolved grief and anger highlighting the failure of sympathy to unite the nation following the conflict. As I have argued, this failing saw the primacy of sentimental fiction, a genre that prioritised notions of sympathetic identification, being challenged by gothic and picaresque literature. For many, the discord and carnage of the conflict was an obstacle to demonstrations of true sympathetic identification. Many early American novels produced in the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary Era contain emotional content of a distinctly gothic valence, suggestive of a profound sense of collective mourning shaping fiction after the conflict.

Across all the chapters of this thesis, we have seen the important interaction between form and emotion in the different ways that men and women used various media forms to express themselves in the late eighteenth century. For example, the memoirs of Loyalist men show clear evidence of anger, while those composed by Loyalist women focus more on the despair of war. Another distinct aspect of the generic forms analysed here is the perceptible gendering of emotion, which we have seen in earlier chapters, with the negative perception of the female experience of melancholy, and the widely held belief that women experienced fear and anxiety more than men. In addition, femininity was ascribed with unfavourable emotional characteristics, while masculinity was seen in much more positive terms. As seen in chapter four, not only did this view impact the language and form of pamphlets, but this negative view of femininity also contributed to the exclusion of women from political engagement, including political pamphleteering. Women were severely limited politically during the conflict, but as shown in chapter three, Loyalist women defied these restrictions in their letter writing, functioning as important nodes of contact within their constant epistolary networks. They further circumvented such constraints through their diaries, which acted as one of the few places Loyalist women could freely express themselves away from the social and political confines impacting their emotional expression.

The extent to which emotion interacted with both literary form and contemporary social subjects is reflected in the new emphasis placed on emotional authenticity produced by the revolutionary rupture in the pre-existing culture of sensibility. As Rob Boddice has shown, the ‘prescription for emotional expression provides the basis for judging the authenticity of emotions.’⁵ While this is correct, during the period I have examined what authentic expression looked like was intensely debated by both sides. Before the conflict,

⁵ Boddice, *The History of Emotions*, 86.

when the culture of sensibility was dominant, there was widespread acceptance about definitions of specific emotional states, and the protocols dictating their expression, but this broke down in the upheaval of the Revolution. As we have seen in earlier chapters, a split occurred between how Loyalists and Patriots interpreted sensibility, and appropriate emotional expression more broadly. This saw authenticity pushed to the fore, with both sides asserting the greater sincerity of their own emotional regime. This separation is evident in Loyalists framing Patriot emotion as morally bankrupt, while positioning their own emotional regime as being more respectable. The amplification of emotional sincerity at this time saw authors fixate on appearing genuine in their writing, with a higher degree of authenticity observable in private forms, compared to public forms, which were more directly affected by societal rules governing emotional expression. This suggests that what was paramount to writers was not true authenticity, but the appearance of authentic expression.

The contested nature of emotion is reflected in the unsettled reality of emotional categories in the late eighteenth century. This is evident in the divergence between how Loyalists and Patriots conceptualised anger, more specifically passionate forms of anger. While Patriots saw passionate anger as politically useful, Loyalists abjured such uncontrollable forms of anger. Reverend Myles Cooper, an ardent Loyalist, for example, was highly critical of Patriot conduct, and sought to impugn those responsible for implementing and enforcing the repressive Patriot policies, arguing they were driven by a ‘fatal Rage.’⁶ As observed in the memoirs chapter, this interpretation of rage implies that Patriot anger was malicious and unrestrained which, as we have seen, contrasts with how Loyalists interpreted their own use of rage. They saw their use of rage as an appropriate reaction to the injustices committed by Patriots. Such a split in how both sides interpreted and used emotion explicates the complicated relationship colonists had with anger in the eighteenth century, revealing the ambiguity associated with its use, with its acceptability being highly subjective. This illustrates how conformity to previously held emotional standards was destabilised during the Revolutionary Era.

Inevitably, due to length constraints some modes of expression have had to be prioritised over others in this thesis. Those selected importantly demonstrate different aspects

⁶ Myles Cooper, “The Patriots of North-America, A Sketch,” Evans Early American Imprint Collection, University of Michigan Library Digital Collections, 33.
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/evans/N11357.0001.001/1:3?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>.

of the Loyalist emotional experience, both privately and publicly. But others have been excluded which would also likely show crucial detail of the emotional lives of Loyalists. They include newspapers, periodical essays, and poetry, all of which can contribute meaningfully to an analysis of Loyalists.⁷ My focus too has been on material primarily produced between 1765 and 1800, whereas the final genre I address – novels – continued, in particular, to address the Loyalist emotional experience long into the nineteenth century. Many of these novels intermix generic forms within their pages, providing fertile ground for future research into the different uses and presentations of Loyalist emotion across multiple fictional modes. For example, Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *The Linwoods* (1835) draws heavily on the epistolary form. The novel explores the lives of two families during the American Revolution, the Loyalist Linwoods, and the Patriot Lees. The story's central protagonist, Isabella Linwood, starts out as a Loyalist, but throughout the course of the story becomes a firm supporter of the Patriot cause. *The Linwoods* touches on themes relating to identity and loyalty during the conflict and illustrates the disruption caused by the upheaval to family unity. The novel's use of letters as a narrative device not only helps to advance the plot but also reveals the complex emotional lives of the story's main characters.⁸

⁷ For research into Loyalist newspaper activity see: George Edward Cullen Jr., "Talking to a Whirlwind: The Loyalist Printers in America, 1763–1783" (PhD diss., West Virginia University, 1979); Timothy M. Barnes, "Loyalist Newspapers of the American Revolution, 1763–1783: A Bibliography," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 83, no. 2 (1973): 217–240.

<https://www.americanantiquarian.org/sites/default/files/proceedings/44517562.pdf>; Joseph M. Adelman, *Revolutionary Networks: The Business and Politics of Printing the News, 1763–1789* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019). ProQuest Ebook Central; Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan, eds., *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012); Leroy Hewlett, "James Rivington, Loyalist Printer, Publisher, Bookseller of the American Revolution, 1724–1802: A Biographical-Bibliographical Study" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1958); Janice Potter and Robert M. Calhoon, "The Character and Coherence of the Loyalist Press," in *The Press and the American Revolution*, eds. Bernard Bailyn and John B. Hench, 229–272 (Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1980); Robert M. Calhoon, Timothy M. Barnes, and Robert S. Davies, *Tory Insurgents: The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010). ProQuest Ebook Central. For research into Loyalist Poetry see: Michael C. Weisenburg, "Fugitive Verses & Faded Histories: Recovering The Poetry & Influence Of The British American Loyalists" (PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2017); Pastora San Juan Cafferty, "Loyalist Rhapsodies: The Poetry of Stansbury and Odell" (PhD diss., George Washington University, 1971); Cynthia Dubin Edelberg, *Jonathan Odell: Loyalist Poet of the American Revolution* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987); Philip Gould, *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of Politics in British America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). For research into Loyalist periodical essays see: Mary Beth Norton, *1774: The Long Year of Revolution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2020); Ruma Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York City during the Revolution* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); Phillip Gould, *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of the Politics in British America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Robert M. Calhoon, *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760–1781* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanich, 1973).

⁸ For more information about Catharine Sedgwick's use of history in *The Linwoods* see: Charlene Avallone, "Catharine Sedgwick's White Nation-Making: Historical Fiction and *The Linwoods*," *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 55, no. 215 (2009): 97–133. <https://muse-jhu-edu.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/article/270175/pdf/pdf>.

As already noted, previous research has until now been largely rooted in regional studies, and while this thesis has sought to rectify this bias through the application of a transatlantic scope to investigate the emotional lives of Loyalists, it remains an issue plaguing the field. Historians like Maya Jasanoff have sought to expand the scope, assessing the lives of the Loyalist diaspora, but further work is needed that investigates the wider Loyalist experience to better understand patterns and themes of the experience of Loyalists. This includes the emotional lives of those Loyalists who went into exile in different parts of the world, such as the Caribbean. This study has specifically focused on the emotional lives of Loyalists in North America, and Great Britain, but those Loyalists who headed to other places potentially reveal new facets on this group's emotional experiences.

A significant focus of this thesis has been to redress the gender imbalance plaguing Loyalist studies, by investigating the emotional experiences of Loyalist women, which until now have been underrepresented in the literature. My study, combined with other recent research, including that undertaken by historians like Kacy Dowd Tillman, has sought to rectify this omission. Through analysis of the various media utilised by Loyalist women for emotional expression, this thesis has added important depth to our understanding of their emotional lives, exploring crucial aspects of their experience, from their use of various media forms to attain a degree of personal agency, to the persecution they faced by Patriots, as well as the challenges confronted by those Loyalist women who remained in America, in addition to those who went into exile. It is important that future studies build on the foundation provided by this investigation, examining emotional registers not explored here, and media forms not focused on by this investigation, to more fully reveal the lives and emotions of women during the conflict.

Finally, while the emotional experiences of Black Loyalists have been examined here, this has been largely restricted to the years during the conflict, with investigation of the emotional lives of African Americans in the years following the war remaining largely unexplored and consequently this represents a fertile area for further research. This is particularly true with respect to Black Loyalists who were part of the Loyalist diaspora, leaving America both during and after the conflict, and settling in places like Canada, the Caribbean, and Sierra Leone. The process of resettlement was complex and fraught, with many confronting significant racism, discrimination, and hardship. While many aspects of the Black diaspora require further study, including issues of cultural identity within these new geographic contexts, their emotional lives specifically demand analysis, in which researchers

must examine the emotional consequences of resettlement. It is likely that future projects will encounter the same issues faced by this study relating to limited source material concerning the emotional lives of Black Loyalists, but it is an important area of research requiring innovative and creative thinking to unlock the details of their emotional lives.

My thesis lays the foundations for such future work by providing a detailed analysis of Loyalist emotional expression across a wide array of media forms, revealing the disruption caused to the norms governing their emotional lives, the complicated nature of emotional authenticity, and the unsettling of emotional categories more broadly. The wide and varied media forms used for this investigation offers important footing for future studies tasked with investigating emotional expression during the American Revolution, and Loyalist emotion more specifically. By highlighting the interrelationship between emotion, media, and audience, this study also offers fertile ground for future studies exploring eighteenth century emotional expression during the Revolutionary Era. Additionally, the capacious scope adopted by this study regarding regional focus, gives a firm basis for further research examining the wider Loyalist experience; for example, any studies exploring the Loyalist diaspora, or investigating the wider Loyalist experience in America. The explicit focus of this investigation on gender and Loyalist women more specifically, lays important groundwork for future research into gender during the Revolution, and the eighteenth century more generally.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Adams, John. "John Adams (From the Autobiography of John Adams)," Founders Online, National Archives. <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/01-03-02-0016-0001>.

Adams, John. "John Adams Autobiography, Part 1, Through 1776, Sheet 23 of 53." *Adams Family Papers: An Electronic Archive*. Massachusetts Historical Society. <http://www.masshist.org/digitaladams/>.

Adams, John. "To the Inhabitants of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay, 23 January 1775." Founders Online, National Archives. <https://founders.archives.gov/?q=slavery%20Author%3A%22Adams%2C%20John%22&s=1111311111&r=26&sr>.

Advices from Philadelphia, dated July 23, 1774, "The Committee from the several counties of this Province, met in this City the 15th instant, and have been very busy ever since in framing instructions to the Assembly, with which they were permit. New York, N.p. 1774. Pdf. <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.1060250a/>.

Anglus Americanus. Pseud. *To the citizens of New-York on the present critical situation of affairs. Were I neither a Philadelphian, a New-Yorker, a Bostonian, nor even a native of this continent, as a friend to the rights of mankind, I should interest myself in the fate.* New York, N.p. 1774. <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.1060090a/>.

At a meeting of the True Sons of Liberty, in the City of New-York, properly convened; present, John Calvin, John Know, Roger Rumpus, &c. &c. Uc. 15 resolves By order of the meeting Ebenezer Snuffle, Secretary New York, 1774. New York, 1774. <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.10602600/>.

Black Loyalists: Our History, Our People, Canada's Digital Collection. "Book One Part One of the Book of Negroes." <https://blackloyalist.com/cdc/>.

Boston King, *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King, a Black Preacher, Written by Himself* (1798), https://www.latinamericanstudies.org/slavery/Boston_King.pdf.

By his Excellency the Right Honourable John Earl of Dunmore, his Majesty's Lieutenant and Governour-General of the Colony and Dominion of Virginia, and Vice-admiral of the same. A proclamation Declaring martial law and to cause the same to be. Norfolk, 1775. <https://www.loc.gov/item/2020769135/>.

Chandler, Thomas Bradbury. "What think ye of the Congress now? or, An inquiry, how far Americans are bound to abide by and execute the decisions of, the late Congress?" Evans Early American Imprint Collection. University of Michigan Library Digital Collections. <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/N10953.0001.001>.

Clinton Memo. August 7, 1782. Vol. 195. Clinton Papers, Clements Library, Ann Arbor.

Cooper, Myles. "The Patriots of North-America, A Sketch." Evans Early American Imprint Collection. University of Michigan Library Digital Collections. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/evans/N11357.0001.001/1:3?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>.

Hale, Wallace. "The New York Act of Attainder, or Confiscation Act." Provincial Archives of New Brunswick. <https://archives.gnb.ca/exhibits/forthavoc/html/NY-Attainder.aspx?culture=en-CA>.

Hamilton, Alexander. *A Full Vindication of the Measures of the Congress, &c., [15 December] 1774*. Founders Online. National Archives. <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Hamilton/01-01-02-0054>.

Mary Robie Diaries. Robie-Sewall Family Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, USA.

New York City. Committee Of Correspondence. *Committee-Chamber, Proceedings of the Committee of correspondence. The resolves proposed by the Board to the inhabitants of this City, having been published and dispersed through the town several days*

previous to this meeting. New York, N.p. 1774. Pdf.

<https://www.loc.gov/item/2020768579/>.

Phocion. "Second Letter from Phocion, [April 1784]." Founders Online. National Archives.

<https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Hamilton/01-03-02-0347>.

Poplicola Pseud, *To the worthy inhabitants of the City of New York. Every good citizen will be inclined from duty as well as interest, to love his country, and to be zealous in advancing its welfare* Arguing in favor of the purchase of tea shipped by the British.

New York, 1773. <https://www.loc.gov/item/rbpe.10500100/>.

Seabury, Samuel. "Free thoughts, on the proceedings of the Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia Sept. 5, 1774." Evans Early American Imprint Collection. University of Michigan Library Digital Collections.

<https://name.umd.umich.edu/N10731.0001.001>.

Washington, George. "From George Washington to George William Fairfax, 10–15 June 1774." Founders Online, National Archives.

<https://founders.archives.gov/?q=shackles%20Author%3A%22Washington%2C%20George%22&s=1111311111&r=1&sr>.

Published Sources

Boerhaave, Herman. *Boerhaave's Aphorisms: Concerning the Knowledge and Cure of Diseases*. London: Printed for B. Cowse, and W. Innys, 1715.

<https://archive.org/details/b30539201/page/292/mode/2up?q=Application>.

Boucher, Jonathan. *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution; In Thirteen Discourses, Preached in North America between the Years 1763 and 1775*.

London: G.G and J. Robinson, 1797. https://archive.org/details/bim_eighteenth-century_a-view-of-the-causes-and_boucher-jonathan_1797/page/n1/mode/2up.

Bouchier, Jonathan, ed. *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist, 1738-1789: being the Autobiography of Reverend Jonathan Boucher*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry Into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1757.

<https://archive.org/details/enqphilosophical00burkrich/page/13/mode/1up?q=capable>.

Chalmers, James. *Plain Truth Addressed to the Inhabitants of America, Containing Remarks on a Late Pamphlet, Intituled Common Sense*. London: J. Almon, 1776.

<https://archive.org/details/plaintruthaddres00chaluoft/page/n7/mode/2up>.

Chandler, Thomas Bradbury, and Myles Cooper. *The American Queriest: or, Some Questions Proposed Relative to the Present Disputes Between Great Britain and her American Colonies*. New York: James Rivington, 1774.

https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/The_American_Querist/baVbAAAAQAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0.

Child, Lydia Maria Francis. *The Rebels: or Boston Before the Revolution*. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company, 1850.

<https://archive.org/details/rebelsorbostonbe00chil/page/42/mode/2up?q=anxious>.

Connolly, John. *A Narrative of the Transactions, Imprisonment, and Sufferings of John Connolly, an American Loyalist, and Lieutenant-Colonel in His Majesty's Service*. New York: Charles L. Woodward, 1889.

Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St John De. *Letters from an American Farmer*. Edited by Susan Manning. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Curwen, Samuel. *Journal and Letters of the late Samuel Curwen, Judge of Admiralty, etc., An American Refugee In England from 1775 to 1784*. Edited by George Atkinson Ward. New York: C. S. Francis, 1842.
<https://archive.org/details/curwensamuelj00curwrch/page/n9>.

Dallas, Alexander James, and Joseph Borden McKean. *Black List: A List of Those Tories Who Took Part with Great-Britain in the Revolutionary Way, and were Attainted of High Treason, Commonly Called the Black List*. Philadelphia: Printed for the Proprietor, 1802.

<https://societyofthecincinnati.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p16923coll4/id/112>

Debate of February 17, 1783. *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England from the Norman Conquest in 1066, to the Year 1803*. Vol. 23. London: T.C. Hansard, 1814.

Dickinson, J., and R. T. Haines Halsey. *Letters from a farmer in Pennsylvania, to the inhabitants of the British Colonies*. New York: The Outlook Company, 1903.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=loc.ark:/13960/t48p6fz4d&view=1up&seq=100>.

Fanning, David. *The Narrative of Colonel David Fanning (A Tory in the Revolutionary War with Great Britain): Giving an Account of his Adventures in North Carolina from 1775 to 1783*. New York: Yale University, 1865.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=yale.39002016217557;view=1up;seq=1>.

Force, Peter. *American Archives: A Documentary History of the English Colonies in North America from the King's Message to Parliament, of March 7, 1774, to The Declaration of Independence by The United States*. Vol. 5. Washington DC: M. St.

Clair Clarke and Peter Force, 1844).

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015010552027&view=1up&seq=123>.

Horwitz, Allan V., and Jerome C. Wakefield. *The Loss of Sadness: How Psychiatry Transformed Normal Sorrow into Depressive Disorder*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hulton, Ann. *Letters of a Loyalist Lady: Being the Letters of Ann Hulton, Sister of Henry Hulton, Commissioner of Customs at Boston*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 1927. https://archive.org/details/lettersofloyalis0000hult_j3m3/page/72/mode/2up.

Hutchinson, Peter Orlando. *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson: Captain-General and Governor-In-Chief of His Late Majesty's Province of Massachusetts Bay in North America*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886.

Ingraham, Hannah. *The Narrative of Hannah Ingram* (1783). Edited by R.P. Gorham. <https://preserve.lib.unb.ca/wayback/20141205151334/http://atlanticportal.hil.unb.ca/a/cva/loyalistwomen/en/documents/ingraham/>.

Jackson Jr., Daniel. *Alonzo and Melissa: Or the Unfeeling Fatherthen American Tale*. Boston: Printed for the Publishers, 1851. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/28112/28112-h/28112-h.htm>.

Jefferson, Thomas. *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Boston: Lilly and Wait, 1832. <https://archive.org/details/notesonstateofvir00jeff/page/144/mode/2up>.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals*. London: J.F. and C. Rivington, 1785. <https://publicdomainreview.org/collection/samuel-johnson-s-dictionary-of-the-english-language-1785>.

King, Boston. *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King, a Black Preacher, Written by Himself*. 1798. https://www.latinamericanstudies.org/slavery/Boston_King.pdf.

- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Alexander Campbell Fraser. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.
<https://archive.org/details/concerninghumanu01lockuoft/page/448/mode/2up?q=as+far+as+this+consciousness>.
- Mather, Cotton. *The Angel of Bethesda*. Barre: Barre Publishers, 1972.
<https://archive.org/details/angelofbethesda0000unse/page/46/mode/2up?q=mead>.
- Mead, Richard. *Medical Precepts and Cautions*. Translated by Thomas Stack. London: J Brindley, 1751.
- Miller, Samuel. *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*. London: J. Johnson, 1805.
https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/A_Brief_Retrospect_of_the_Eighteenth_Cen/tkoQAAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover&bsh=m=rim/1.
- Moody, James. *Lieut. James Moody's Narrative of His Exertions and Sufferings in the Cause of Government, Since the Year 1776*. London: Richardson and Urquhart, 1783.
https://archive.org/details/cihm_56778/page/n7/mode/2up.
- Murray, James. *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist*. Edited by Nina Moore Tiffany and Susan I. Lesley. Boston, 1901.
<https://archive.org/details/lettersofjamesm00murr/page/n157/mode/2up?q=barnes>.
- Nason, Elias. *A Memoir of Mrs Susanna Rowson with Elegant and Illustrative Extracts from her Writings in Prose and Poetry*. Albany: Joel Munsell, 1870.
<https://tile.loc.gov/storage-services/public/gdcmassbookdig/memoirofmrssusan00naso/memoirofmrssusan00naso.pdf>.
- Paine, Thomas. *Common Sense: Addressed to the Inhabitants of America*. London: H.D. Symonds, 1792.
https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Common_Sense/PE8UAAAAQAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1.

- Paine, Thomas. *The American Crisis*. London: R. Carlile, 1819.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.hxj2jt&view=1up&seq=22>.
- Paine, Thomas. *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*. Edited by Philip S. Foner. Vol. 2. New York: Citadel Press, 1945.
- Plutarch. "Poplicola." Translated by John Dryden. The Internet Classics Archive, MIT.
<http://classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/poplicol.html>.
- Pope, Alexander. *The Rape of the Lock: An Heroi-Comical Poem in Five Canto's*. Edinburgh: James Reid Leith, 1751.
- Pratt, Samuel Jackson. *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*. Vol. 1. London: R. Baldwin Pater Noster Row and Pratt and Clinch Bath, 1781.
<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=ECCO&u=univnott&id=GALE%7CCW0113120416&v=2.1&it=r&cookieConsent=true&analyticsOptout=false&aty=shibboleth>.
- Pratt, Samuel Jackson. *Emma Corbett: In Two Volumes*. London: R. Baldwin, 1783. Vol. 2.
- Pratt, Samuel Jackson. *Emma Corbett; or the Miseries of Civil War*. Vol. 3. London: R. Baldwin Pater Noster Row, 1781.
- Pynchon, William. *The Diary of William Pynchon of Salem: A Picture of Salem Life, Social and Political, A Century Ago*. Edited by Fitch Edward Oliver. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890.
<https://archive.org/details/diaryofwilliampy00pync/page/2>.
- Raymond, W.O., ed. *Winslow Papers: AD 1776-1826*. St John, The Sun Printing Company Ltd, 1901.
<https://archive.org/details/winslowpapersad100raymuoft/page/367/mode/2up>.
- Rowson, Susanna. *The Fille De Chambre: A Novel*. Philadelphia: H. & P. Rice, 1794.
 ProQuest Ebook Central.

Rush, Benjamin. *Medical Inquiries and Observations, Upon the Diseases of the Mind*.

Philadelphia: Kimber & Richardson, 1812.

<https://archive.org/details/DKC0034/page/n91/mode/2up?q=despair>.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments; of an Essay Towards an Analysis of the Principles by Which Men Naturally Judge Concerning the Conduct and Character, First of their Neighbours, and Afterwards of Themselves*. Dublin: Printed for J. Beatty and C. Jackson, 1778.

<https://archive.org/details/theoryofmoralsen00smit/page/8/mode/2up?view=theater>.

Smith, H. W. *Life and Correspondence of the Rev. William Smith, D. D.: With Copious Extracts from his Writings*. Philadelphia: S. A. George, 1879-1880.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293007963519&view=1up&seq=547>.

Smith, Julia Bernard. *Julia Bernard Smith Memoir*. Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1900.

Smith, William. *The Candid Retrospect: or, The American War Examined, by Whig Principles*. Charlestown: John Wells, 1780.

The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob, Loyal American Refugee. London: Printed for the Author, 1787.

The Sentiments of an American Woman. Philadelphia, 1780. Pdf.

<https://www.loc.gov/item/2020769022/>.

Ticknor, George. *The Remains of Nathaniel Appleton Have: With a Memoir of his Life*. Cambridge: Hillard, Metcalf & Company, 1827.

<https://archive.org/details/remainsnathanie00tickgoog/page/n8/mode/2up?q=novel&view=theater>.

Trumbull, John. *M'Fingal: A Modern Epic Poem, in Four Cantos*. Hudson: W. E. Norman, 1916. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433076040363&seq=105>.

Vernon, Thomas. *The Diary of Thomas Vernon: a loyalist, banished from Newport by the Rhode Island general assembly in 1776*. Edited by Sidney S. Rider. Providence: Sidney S. Rider, 1881.

Warren, Mercy Otis. *The Group (1775)*. Boston: Edes And Gill, 1775. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: With Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. Dublin: J. Stockdale, 1793.

Wood, Gordon S. ed. *The American Revolution: Writings from the Pamphlet Debate 1773-1776*. New York: Library of America E-Book, 2015.

Monographs

- Adelman, Joseph M. *Revolutionary Networks: The Business and Politics of Printing the News, 1763-1789*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Allen, Thomas B. *Tories: Fighting for the King in America's First Civil War*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2010.
- Arch, Stephen Carl. *After Franklin: The Emergence of Autobiography in Post-Revolutionary America 1780-1830*. United States of America: University Press of New England, 2001.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776: 1750-1765*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Bannister Jerry, and Liam Riordan. *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Boddice, Rob. *A History of Feelings*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2019.
- Boddice, Rob. *The History of Emotions*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018.
- Bradley, Patricia. *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999.
- Brannon, Rebecca. *From Revolution to Reunion: The Reintegration of the South*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2016.

Brown Christopher Leslie, and Philip D. Morgan, eds. *Arming Slaves: From Classical Times to the Modern Age*. Yale University Press, 2006.

Cahill, Edward. *Liberty of the Imagination: Aesthetic Theory, Literary Form, and Politics in the Early United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
ProQuest Ebook Central.

Calhoun, Robert M. *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.

Calhoun, Robert M., Timothy M. Barnes and Robert S Davis, eds. *Tory Insurgents: The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Castronovo, Russ. *Propaganda 1776: Secrets, Leaks, and Revolutionary Communications in Early America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Chopra, Ruma. *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013.

Chopra, Ruma. *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York City during the Revolution*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Clark, Jennifer. *The American Idea of England, 1776-1840*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013.

Clifford, Mary Louise. *From Slavery to Freetown: Black Loyalists After the American Revolution*. London: McFarland & Company, Inc. Publishers, 2006.

Cook, Elizabeth Heckendorn. *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

- Couser, G. Thomas. *Memoir: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cowie, Alexander. *The Rise of the American Novel*. New York: American Book Company, 1948.
- Culley, Margo. *A Day at a Time: The Diary Literature of American Women from 1764 to the Present*. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 1985.
- Davidson, Cathy N. *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Dierks, Konstantin. *In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Edelberg, Cynthia Dubin. *Jonathan Odell: Loyalist Poet of the American Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1987.
- Egerton, Douglas R. *Death or Liberty: African Americans and Revolutionary America*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2009.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Edited by Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell. Translated by Edward Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- Eustace, Nicole. *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Fliegelman, Jay. *Declaring Independence: Jefferson, Natural Language & the Culture of Performance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Furedi, Frank. *How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018.

- Gaul, Theresa Strouth, and Sharon M. Harris, eds. *Letters and Cultural Transformations in the United States, 1760-1860*. New York: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Gilbert, Alan. *Black Patriots and Loyalists: Fighting for Emancipation in the War for Independence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Gilmore, William J. *Reading Becomes a Necessity of Life: Material and Cultural Life in Rural New England*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.
- Gould, Phillip. *Writing the Rebellion: Loyalists and the Literature of the Politics in British America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Gundersen, Joan R. *To Be Useful to the World: Women in Revolutionary America, 1740-1790*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Gustafson, Sandra M. *Eloquence is Power: Oratory & Performance in Early America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Henderson, Desiree. *Grief and Genre in American Literature, 1790-1870*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011.
- Hoffman, Ronald. Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, eds. *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry during the American Revolution*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1985.
- Humphrey, Carol Sue. *The American Revolution and the Press: The Promise of Independence*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2013. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Ingram, Allan, Stuart Sim, Clark Lawlor, Richard Terry, John Baker, and Leigh Wetherall Dickson. *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Ingram, David. *Habermas: Introduction and Analysis*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2010. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Jackson, Stanley W. *Melancholia and Depression: From Hippocratic Times to Modern Times*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Jasanoff, Maya. *Liberty's Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire*. London: HarperPress, 2011.
- Kadar, Marlene ed. *Essays on Life Writing: From Genre to Critical Practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Kamensky, Jane. *A Revolution in Color: The World of John Singleton Copley*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2016.
- Kann, Mark E. *A Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics*. New York: New York University Press, 1998. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Keane, Catherine. *Juvenal and the Satiric Emotions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199981892.003.0001>.
- Kerber, Linda K. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Knott, Sarah. *Sensibility and the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009.
- Laffan, Michael, and Max Weiss, eds. *Facing Fear: The History of an Emotion in Global Perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012. ProQuest E Book Central.
- Lease, Benjamin. *Anglo-American Encounters: England and the Rise of American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

- Lee, Wayne E. *Crowds and Soldiers in Revolutionary North Carolina: The Culture of Violence in Riot and War*. Florida: University Press of Florida, 2001.
- Mallon, Thomas. *A Book of One's Own: People and Their Diaries*. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1984.
- Marculescu, Andreea, and Charles-Louis Morand Métivier, eds. *Affective and Emotional Economies in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG, 2017.
- Matt, Susan J., and Peter N. Stearns. *Doing Emotions History*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2014.
- McConville, Brendan. *The Kings Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- McLennan, Rachael. *American Autobiography*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.
- Murphy, Kevin, and Sally O'Driscoll, eds. *Studies in Ephemera: Text and Image in Eighteenth-Century Print*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2013. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England 1774-1789*. Toronto: Little, Brown & Company Limited, 1972.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *1774: The Long Year of Revolution*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2020.
- O'Neill, Lindsay. *The Opened Letter: Networking in the Early Modern British World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

Oliver, Peter. *Origin and Progress of the American Rebellion: A Tory View*. Edited by Douglas Adair and John A. Schutz. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1961.

Papacharissi, Zizi. *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Pasley, Jeffrey L., Andrew W. Robertson and David Waldstreicher, eds. *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Pearsall, Sarah M. S. *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Piecuch, Jim. *Three Peoples, One King: Loyalists, Indians, and Slaves in the Revolutionary South, 1775-1782*. University of South Carolina Press, 2008.

Plamper, Jan. *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*. Translated by Keith Tribe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Potter-Mackinnon, Janice. *The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Pybus, Cassandra. *Epic Journeys of Freedom: Runaway Slaves of the American Revolution and Their Global Quest for Liberty*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2007. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Radden, Jennifer, ed. *The Nature of Melancholy: From Aristotle to Kristeva*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2000. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Reddy, William M. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. ProQuest Ebook Central.

- Robin, Corey. *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H., and Riccardo Cristiani. *What Is the History of Emotions?* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018.
- Rubin, Nancy. *Muse of the Revolution: The Secret Pen of Mercy Otis Warren and the Founding of a Nation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2008. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Rust, Marion. *Prodigal Daughters: Susanna Rowson's Early American Women*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Sanders, Charles. *The Scope of Satire*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.
- Savelle, Max. *Seeds of Liberty: The Genius of the American Mind*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965.
- Schama, Simon. *Rough Crossings: Britain, the Slaves and the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 2010).
- Shenstone, Susan Burgess. *So Obstinate Loyal, James Moody, 1744-1809*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. *This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity*. Williamsburg: Omohundro Institute of Early American History & Culture, 2010. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Stearns, Carol Zisowitz, and Peter N. Stearns. *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1986.

- Stern, Julia A. *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Taylor, Alan, “The American Beginning: The Dark Side of Crèvecoeur's ‘Letters from an American Farmer.’” *The New Republic*, July 19, 2013.
<https://newrepublic.com/article/113571/crevecoeurs-letters-american-farmer-dark-side>.
- Taylor, Alan. *American Revolutions: A Continental History 1750-1804*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2016.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750-1850*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Tillman, Kacy Dowd. *Stripped and Script: Loyalist Women Writers of the American Revolution*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019.
- Vacek, Heather H. *Madness: American Protestant Responses to Mental Illness*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Wahrman, Dror. *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Walker, James W. St. G. *The Black Loyalists: The Search for the Promised Land in Nova Scotia and Sierra Leone 1783-1870*. London: Longman & Dalhousie University Press, 1976.
- Ward, James. *Memory and Enlightenment: Cultural Afterlives of the Long Eighteenth Century*. Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018.
- Warner, Michael. *Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

- Warner, William B. *Protocols of Liberty: Communication Innovation & the American Revolution*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Yagoda, Ben. *Memoir: A History*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2009.
- Zagarri, Rosemarie. *A Woman's Dilemma: Mercy Otis Warren and the American Revolution*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015.
- Zboray, Ronald J., and Mary Saracino Zboray. *Everyday Ideas: Socioliterary Experience Among Antebellum New Englanders*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2006.
- Zinsser, William, ed. *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998.

Journal Articles

- Allen, James. "Diary of James Allen Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778 (Continued)." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 3 (October 1885): 278-296. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084711>.
- Allen, James. "Diary of James Allen, Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 2 (July 1885): 176-196. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084701>.
- Allen, James. "Diary of James Allen, Esq., of Philadelphia, Counsellor-at-Law, 1770-1778 (Concluded)." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 4 (January 1886): 424-441. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20084727>.
- Avallone, Charlene. "Catharine Sedgwick's White Nation-Making: Historical Fiction and The Linwoods." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 55, no. 215 (2009): 97-133. <https://muse-jhu-edu.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/article/270175/pdf/pdf>.
- Banes, Ruth A. "The Exemplary Self: Autobiography in Eighteenth Century America." *Biography* 5, no. 3 (Summer 1982): 226-239. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23539239>.
- Barnes, Timothy M. "Loyalist Newspapers of the American Revolution, 1763– 1783: A Bibliography." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 83, no. 2 (1973): 217– 240. <https://www.americanantiquarian.org/sites/default/files/proceedings/44517562.pdf>.
- Baxter, Beverley. "Grace Growden Galloway: Survival of a Loyalist, 1778-79." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 62-67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345995>.
- Bourke, Joanna. "Fear and Anxiety: Writing about Emotion in Modern History," *History Workshop Journal*, no. 55 (2003): 111–33. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4289830>.

- Caley, Percy B. "The Life Adventures of Lieutenant-Colonel John Connolly: The Story of a Tory (I, II)." *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 11, no. 1 (January 1928): 10-49. <https://journals.psu.edu/wph/article/view/1451/1299>.
- Couch, Daniel Diez. "Printing Emma Corbett: Revolutionary Violence and the Prosthetics of Typography." *The Eighteenth Century* 59, no. 4 (Winter 2018): 449-469. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90026486>.
- Dorsey, Peter A. "To 'Corroborate Our Own Claims': Public Positioning and the Slavery Metaphor in Revolutionary America." *American Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (September 2003): 353-386. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30041981>.
- Errington, Jane. "Loyalists and Loyalism in the American Revolution and Beyond." *Acadiensis*, 41, no. 2 (2012): 164-173. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41803357?seq=1>.
- Fichtelberg, Joseph. "The Sentimental Economy of Isaac Mitchell's 'The Asylum'." *Early American Literature* 32, no. 1 (1997): 1-19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25057071>.
- Franta, Andrew, and Sean Silver. "Sentiment Analysis and the Sentimental Novel." *Critical Inquiry* 50, 3 (2024): 402-424. <https://www-journals-uchicago-edu.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/doi/epdf/10.1086/728948>.
- Galloway, Grace Growden, and Raymond C. Werner. "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 55, no. 1 (1931): 32-94. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20086760>.
- Galloway, Grace Growden, and Raymond C. Werner. "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway, Kept at Philadelphia, July 1, to September 30, 1779." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 58, no. 2 (1934): 152-189. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20086864.pdf>.
- Green, Samuel A., Henry Lee, Henry F. Jenks, James F. Rhodes, John C. Ropes, and T. Jefferson Coolidge. "January Meeting, 1896. Tribute to Robert C. Winthrop; Letters

- of Jonathan Sewall; Letter of George Whitefield; Letter of Jonathan Edwards; McClellan's Peninsular Campaign." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 10 (1895-1896): 404-440. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25079785>.
- Grubb, F.W. "Growth of Literacy in Colonial America: Longitudinal Patterns, Economic Models, and the Direction of Future Research." *Social Science History* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1990): 451-482. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1171328>.
- Heventhal Jr., Charles. "Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* in Early America." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 63, no. 3 (1969): 157-176. <https://doi.org/10.1086/pbsa.63.3.24301906>.
- Holbert, R. Lance, Jay Hmielowski, Parul Jain, Julie Lather, and Alyssa Morey. "Adding Nuance to the Study of Political Humor Effects: Experimental Research on Juvenalian Satire Versus Horatian Satire," *American Behavioral Scientist* 55, no.3 (2011): 187-211. <https://doi-org.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0002764210392156>.
- Hunter, Christophe A. "William Smith's Catonian Loyatism, Race, and the Politics of Language." *Early American Literature* 3, no. 52 (2017): 531-558. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90014915>.
- Ivana, Dragos. "Transatlantic Exchanges: The Rise of the Early American Novel." *British and American Studies* 26, no. 26 (2020): 171-178. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2416476289/fulltextPDF/B2BCD20C569B487FPQ/1?accountid=8018>.
- Koenigs, Thomas. "A "Wilds and Ambiguous Medium:" Democracy, Interiority, and the Early American Epistolary Novel." *American Literary History* 35, no. 1 (Spring 2023): 8-22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alh/ajac160>.
- Kohn, Margaret. "Language, Power, and Persuasion: Toward a Critique of Deliberative Democracy." *Constellations* 7, no. 3 (2008): 408-429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.00197>;

Larkin, Edward. "The Cosmopolitan Revolution: Loyalism and the Fiction of an American Nation." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 40, no. 1/2 (Fall 2006): 52-76.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40267684>.

Lloyd, Marco J. "The Reintegration of the Loyalists in Post-Revolutionary America," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*, 22, (2023): 124-147.

<https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/ghj/vol22/iss1/9>.

Margeson, Ian. "Defender of the Atlantic Empire: Reverend William Smith and His Miranian Vision." *Utopian Studies* 3, no. 16 (2005): 365-392.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/20718761>.

Massey, Gregory De Van. "The British Expedition to Wilmington, January-November, 1781." *The North Carolina Historical Review* 66, no. 4 (October 1989): 387-411.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23520938>.

McLean, Carmen P., and Emily R. Anderson. "Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender differences in fear and anxiety." *Clinical Psychology Review* 29, no. 6 (2009): 496-505.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.05.003>.

McMichael, Trevor. "Gender, Neutrality, and the Nursing Father in Pratt's 'Emma Corbett'," *The Eighteenth Century*, 56, no. 3 (2015): 279-295.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/24575125>.

Mouffe, Chantal. "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism?" *Social Research* 66, no. 3 (1999): 744-758.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40971349?seq=1>.

Norton, Mary Beth. "Eighteenth-Century American Women in Peace and War: The Case of the Loyalists." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 1976): 386-409.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/1921540>.

- O'Brien, G. Patrick. "'Gilded Misery': The Robie Women in Loyalist Exile and Repatriation, 1775-1792." *Acadiensis* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2020): 39-68.
<https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/Acadiensis/article/view/31314>.
- Oreovicz, Cheryl Z. "Mercy Otis Warren (1728–1814)." *Legacy* 13, no. 1 (1996): 54-64.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/25679185>.
- Reddy, William M. "Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions," *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (June 1997): 327-351.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/204622?seq=1>.
- Skinner, Andrew S. "Adam Smith and the American Revolution." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 7, no. 2/3 (Spring 1977): 75-87. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27547337>.
- Stearns, Peter N., and Carol Z. Stearns. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards." *The American Historical Review* 90, no. 4 (Oct 1985): 813-836. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1858841>.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, Karin. "Questioning the Ideal of the Public Sphere: The Emotional Turn." *Social Media + Society*, 5, no. 3 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119852175>;
- Wicks, Ulrich. "The Nature of Picaresque Narrative: A Modal Approach." *PMLA* 89, no. 2 (1974): 240-249. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/461446>.

Book Chapters

- Ashe, Samuel A'Court. "David Fanning." In *Biographical History of North Carolina from Colonial Times to the Present*, eds. Samuel A. Ashe, Stephen B. Weeks and Charles C. Van Noppen, 90-97. Vol. 5. Greensboro, NC: C. L. Van Noppen, 1906.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. "Novels." In *A History of the Book in America: Volume 2: An Extensive Republic: Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation 1790-1840*, edited by Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelly, 440-448. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Ben-Amos Batsheva, and Dan Ben-Amos. Introduction to *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, 1-24. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "'I Write for Myself and Strangers': Private Diaries as Public Documents." In *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women's Diaries*, edited by Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia Anne Huff, 23-37. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.
- Brannon, Rebecca. "America's Revolutionary Experience with Transitional Justice." In *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, edited by Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore, 190-207. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2019.
- Cohen, Ralph. "Genre Theory, Literary History, and Historical Change." In *Theoretical Issues in Literary History*, edited by David Perkins, 85-113. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Coleman, Aaron Nathan. "Justice and Moderation? The Reintegration of the American Loyalists as an Episode of Transitional Justice." In *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, ed. Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore, 177-189. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2019.

Dillard, Annie. "To Fashion a Text." In *Inventing the Truth: The Art and Craft of Memoir*, edited by William Zinsser, 141-162. Boston: Cengage Learning, Inc, 1998.

Febvre, Lucien. "Sensibility and History: How to Reconstitute the Emotional life of the Past." In *A New Kind of History; The Writings of Febvre*, edited by Peter Burke, 12-26. London: Routledge, 1973.

Giles, Paul. "Transatlantic Currents and the Invention of the American Novel." In *The Cambridge History of the American Novel*, edited by Leonard Cassuto, Clare Virginia Eby, and Benjamin Reiss, 22-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521899079.004>.

Kagle, Steven E. and Lorenza Gramegna. "Rewriting Her Life: Fictionalization and the Use of Fictional Models in Early American Women's Diaries." In *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women's Diaries*, edited by Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia Anne Huffs, 38-55. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.

Lejeune, Philippe, and Catherine Bogaert. "The Practice of Writing a Diary." In *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, edited by Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos, 25-38. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Mansbridge, Jane, James Bohman, Simone Chambers, Thomas Christiano, Archon Fung, John Parkinson, Dennis F. Thompson, and Mark E. Warren. "A Systemic Approach to Deliberative Democracy." In *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*, edited by John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, 1-26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Matt, Susan J. "Recovering the Invisible: Methods for the Historical Study of the Emotions." In *Doing Emotions History*, edited by Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns, 41-56. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

- Motz, Marilyn Ferris. "Sharing Secrets in Nineteenth-Century America." In *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, edited by Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos, 261-273. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Potter, Janice, and Robert M. Calhoon. "The Character and Coherence of the Loyalist Press." In *The Press and the American Revolution*, edited by Bernard Bailyn and John B. Hench, 279-272. Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1980.
- Rak, Julie. "The Diary Among Other Forms of Life Writing." In *The Diary: The Epic of Everyday Life*, edited by Batsheva Ben-Amos and Dan Ben-Amos, 58-74. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Robert, Marthe. "From the Origins of the Novel." In *Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach*. Edited by Michael McKeon. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Sorensen, Lise. "Susanna Rowson and the Transatlantic Captivity Narrative." In *Transatlantic Literary Studies*, edited by Eve Tavor Bannet and Susan Manning, 169-185. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Stoermer, Taylor. "'The Success of Either Lies in the Womb of Time' The Politics of Loyalty in the Revolutionary Chesapeake." In *The Consequences of Loyalism: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Calhoon*, edited by Rebecca Brannon and Joseph S. Moore, 11-32. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2019.
- White, Ed. "Trends and Patterns in the US Novel, 1800-1820." In *The American Novel to 1870*, edited by J. Gerald Kennedy and Leland S. Person, 73-88. Vol. 5 of *The Oxford History of the Novel in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy." In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, 120-136. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

PhD Theses

Cafferty, Pastora San Juan. "Loyalist Rhapsodies: The Poetry of Stansbury and Odell." PhD diss., George Washington University, 1971.

Cullen Jr. George Edward. "Talking to a Whirlwind: The Loyalist Printers in America, 1763–1783." PhD diss., West Virginia University, 1979.

Hewlett, Leroy. "James Rivington, Loyalist Printer, Publisher, Bookseller of the American Revolution, 1724–1802: A Biographical-Bibliographical Study." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1958.

O'Brien, G. Patrick. "Unknown and Unlamented: Loyalist Women in Nova Scotia from Exile to Repatriation, 1775-1800." PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2019.
<https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6378&context=etd>.

Weisenburg, Michael C. "Fugitive Verses & Faded Histories: Recovering The Poetry & Influence Of The British American Loyalists." PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2017.

Zimmer, Anne Young. "Jonathan Boucher: Moderate Loyalist and Public Man." PhD diss. Wayne State University, 1966. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/56683867.pdf>.