

- FORNÉS, Mercedes, and Francisco J. RUIZ DE MENDOZA. 1996. "Esquemas de imágenes y construcción del espacio." Universidad de La Rioja. (Unpublished draft).
- JOHNSON, Mark. 1987. *The Body in The Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Reason And Imagination*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- LAKOFF, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- . 1989. "Some Empirical Results about the Nature of Concepts," *Mind and Language* 4, 103-129.
- . 1990. "The Invariance Hypothesis: Is Abstract Reason Based On Image-Schemas?" *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.1: 39-74.
- . 1993a. "The Contemporary Theory Of Metaphor," In *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. A. Ortony. 2nd. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 1993b. "The Internal Structure of the Self." Paper presented at the *Annual Berkeley-Ucsd Cognitive Linguistics Conference*, La Jolla, California. To Appear in *Spaces, Worlds, And Grammar*, ed. G. Fauconnier and E. Sweetser (Chicago: U Of Chicago P), under the title "Sorry, I'm Not Myself Today: The Metaphor System for Conceptualizing the Self."
- LAKOFF, George, and M. JOHNSON. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- LAKOFF, George, and Mark TURNER. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBÁÑEZ, Francisco J. 1996. "Blended Spaces and the Pragmatic Approach to Cognition." In *The Intertextual Dimension of Discourse*. Ed. Beatriz Penas. Zaragoza: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza. 233-44.
- . 1997. "Perspectives on Metaphor." In *Estudios de Lingüística Aplicada*. Ed. J. L. Otal, I. Fortanet and V. Codina. Castellón: Universitat Jaume I.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBÁÑEZ, Francisco J., and José L. OTAL. 1996. "Some Notes on Abstract Cognitive Models." *Proceedings of the 14th AESLA Congress, Tarragona* (Forthcoming).
- TAYLOR, John R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes In Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- TURNER, Mark, and Gilles FAUCONNIER. 1995. "Blending And Metaphor." To appear in *Cognitive Aspects of Metaphor*. Ed. X. Shen and A. Kasher. Routledge.



THE "MEMO" PAGES OF FRANKLIN'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY: ON THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN AND ENGLISH LIFE WRITING



JOSÉ MARÍA RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA
UNIVERSIDADE DA CORUÑA

Benjamin Franklin did not live to finish his autobiography, which at the moment of his death in 1790 had grown into a sequence of four drafts written over a period of eighteen years.¹ Although a great deal of attention has been paid to the history of this truncated manuscript, such has not been the case with the transitional fragment that links the first two parts. The so-called "Memo" pages are structured around the two letters that Abel James and Benjamin Vaughan wrote to Franklin in 1783 urging him to continue the narrative of his life begun in 1771.² It is my contention that these pages function in the text of the *Autobiography* as a rite of institution and a *mise en abyme*, since they consecrate in a public context Franklin's first autobiographical effort while also featuring him in all the creative roles in which he appears in the rest of the narrative—author of his own life, of his life story, and of his nation.³ In the "Memo" pages life writing is treated as a conservative instrument of reproduction for transmitting certain values by means of print technologies, and as a disciplinary device for fashioning Americans after Franklin's example. Such values remain unexamined to the extent that Franklin succeeds in ventriloquizing his own thoughts through the voices of two characters (James and Vaughan) who praise him unreservedly and unanimously, and in demonizing other types of self-narration and other versions of his career that might have circulated concurrently with his own.

In the the first two parts of the *Autobiography* Franklin speaks privately to his son and to his friends James and Vaughan at the same time as he sends an institutional message to the generality of fellow Americans. The duplici-

tous status of Franklin's narrative as both a spontaneous conversation and an act of legislation is enhanced by his repeated use of an epistolary formula of address: the "Dear Son" with which the *Autobiography* begins, and the corresponding "My Dear and Honored Friend" and "My Dearest Sir" with which James and Vaughan begin their letters. In this connection, an adroit practitioner of autobiographical and epistolary fiction, Camilo José Cela, has observed that a personal letter can function simultaneously as a "documento privado" (it is meant primarily for private circulation), an "enxeño legal" (it binds two people into an implicit contract), and a fabricated expression of "deseleixo e espontaneidade" (1990: 8). Since all three rhetorical effects are also intrinsic to the Puritan literary tradition in which Franklin began his acquaintance with books, a brief discussion is in order of how the *Autobiography* exploits certain features of Puritan writing to create an illusion of sincerity and moral rectitude that is in fact part of a contrived rhetoric of seduction.

The stated occasion of Part I of the *Autobiography* is Franklin's desire to inform his illegitimate son William of the history of their family.⁴ Here Franklin follows two conventions of Puritan autobiography: he apostrophizes one of his children as his explicit addressee; and he insists on the didactic dimension of his writerly endeavor.⁵ Unlike earlier Puritans, however, Franklin also emphasizes the sheer pleasure he obtains in relating his own life as well as the carefree situation in which he writes, "expecting a Week's uninterrupted Leisure in [his] Country Retirement."⁶ What is more, he uncharacteristically privileges worldly "Felicity" and "Happiness" (he uses each word twice in the first two paragraphs) over spiritual salvation. In fact, it is often argued that the greatest rhetorical feat Franklin achieves in the *Autobiography* is the transformation of entrepreneurial success, first into a moral "duty" and an "obligation," and later into a sign of divine favor.⁷ Franklin subtly invests a self-serving economic concern with the authority of a moral imperative. This shift is complemented by the notion that, while economic success suggests moral improvement and divine favor, individuals are nevertheless free to choose which way they want to live their lives. In Franklin's case, this freedom entails challenging the authority of his father and his elder brother, another uncharacteristic course of action for a Puritan. Providence is thus made compatible with free will. In summary, Franklin presents an absolutist principle in the guise of an individual choice.

Franklin can afford to publicize these adaptations of the Puritan code to the demands of an increasingly more progressive age because when he sits down to write Part I he has become an international celebrity: he has been hailed by David Hume as the first American philosopher and man of letters,

and by Mather Byles as the most brilliant letter writer in the Colonies. By 1783, when he begins Part II, he has also been acknowledged, by Royalists and American patriots alike, as the father of the Revolution.⁸ Franklin's doctrinal relaxation in fact became a source of uneasiness for the first reader of the four-part narrative, the English divine Richard Price, who in 1790 complained to the author that the general tone and intent of the manuscript was not religious enough, and that given Franklin's popularity across the nation, this secularizing ethos might be a bad influence on young minds (Franklin 1986b: 242). By contrast, Vaughan writes in his letter that the strength of Franklin's personal narrative resides precisely in the novelty of "discovering" the sources of virtue in "a man's private power" (A 80).

From the standpoint of genre classification, Part I looks like a conventional letter of advice written by an experienced father to his estranged son. Yet there is also something odd about a 65-year-old man writing an advisory letter to his successful 45-year-old son, who had held the office of Governor of New Jersey since 1760, when he became the first royal appointee in George III's rule. As William H. Shurr has shown, in 1771 it was Benjamin not William who was in need of protection, since the former "was becoming more and more alienated from the British establishment and the London bureaucracy" (1992: 442). Had the planned Revolution failed, Franklin would have needed loyal friends in high places. On the surface, then, Franklin's good-will gesture of writing to his son indicates that he was appealing to the presumed bond of loyalty between a father and a son, one which should prevail over their mutually conflicting political commitments. This conciliation letter accordingly begins with an affectionate "My Dear Son," but ends reminding William that he is not so much a beloved and respected child as he is legally a bastard, and that his mother was a prostitute: "that hard-to-be-govern'd Passion of Youth, had hurried me frequently into Intrigues with low Women that fell in my Way, which were attended with some Expense & great Inconvenience, besides a continual Risk to my Health" (A 75).⁹ When Franklin characterizes William's conception as an "erratum" and a "sinister Accident" (literally, a deviation to the left, like the mark indicating bastardy in heraldry), he is alienating his son, as if in the course of that "Week's uninterrupted Leisure" in which he writes he had decided against seeking his son's protection. The autobiographical letter was never sent to its intended addressee through the colonial postal system of which Franklin was himself Postmaster General. Instead, it circulated privately—in manuscript form—among political allies and admirers of Franklin, progressively acquiring some kind of authority over an ever expanding circle of readers, the sons (young and old) of the newly-created Republic. The epistolary Part I of the

Autobiography, whether it is seen in 1771 as a premeditated yet ultimately aborted attempt by a father to blackmail his influential son, or after 1783 as a conduct book designed to discipline all young Americans, functions as a quasi-contractual document in that it seeks to impose on its readers a certain identity (they are treated as children in need of parental advice) and to legislate for them a certain course of behavior. The exact terms of this disciplinary enterprise can be further ascertained through a more detailed study of the composition process and publication history of the *Autobiography*.

Why had Franklin deferred the continuation of his autobiography in the first place? Part I stops in the year 1730, when Franklin set up household with his common-law wife, Deborah Read, whom he did not formally marry. William had been born in 1729 from a previous liaison with a prostitute, but was raised by Deborah, whom William loved and cared for as the only mother he had known. If Franklin had finished his work in that first sitting in 1771, leaving out the embarrassing details of his governor-son's birth, the autobiography could have functioned as a ritual of succession by which a father asks his son to continue his work. Yet to Franklin's chagrin, William remained a Royalist through the years of the Revolution, thereby disqualifying himself as the natural depository of his father's trust and therefore also of his personal narrative. As his involvement in politics became increasingly more pressing in the early 1770s, Franklin put on hold the continuation of the narrative, and during the war he lost his own copy of the first draft.

A second copy of this manuscript was happily recovered by Abel James, a Quaker politician and inheritance lawyer, who found it among the effects of another Quaker client, Grace Galloway. James wrote to Franklin informing him of the discovery:

My Dear and Honored Friend,

I have often been desirous of writing to thee, but could not be reconciled to the thought that the letter might fall into the hands of the British, lest some printer or busy body should publish some part of the contents, and give our friend pain, and myself censure.
(A 78)

Here we find an important commonplace of eighteenth-century biographical practice: the famed man of letters does not take any steps toward finding another author who can write his biography; on the contrary, he circulates his letters and confessions privately (for didactic purposes) because he rejects the notoriety of public exposure.¹⁰ Accordingly, Franklin had deposited the draft of Part I with his Quaker acquaintances, Joseph and Grace Galloway, perhaps

even with the conventional instructions that she should one day burn it (as Johnson modestly said he *expected* Boswell to do with his personal letters).

James's mention of the "hands of the British" suggests that he had kept the draft since at least the time of the Declaration of Independence, and that he had not returned it to Franklin (who stayed in France from 1776 to 1783) for fear that a Royalist printer might read and lampoon it. As soon as Franklin returned to America James mailed to him the manuscript along with the letter that would eventually become part of it. James seems aware that one's self-image can be appropriated and manipulated by whoever gathers first-hand information about one's life. Vaughan expresses a similar concern when he warns that, should Franklin fail to write his own life, "somebody else will certainly give it; and perhaps so as nearly to do as much harm, as [Franklin's] own management of the thing might do good" (A 79).¹¹ In late-eighteenth-century England and America, the spread of printing and literacy contributed to creating a reading public interested in learning about the life of the new professional writer.¹² Thus, the person who could control Franklin's image would also control the representation of the Revolution, since Franklin had already been depicted as precisely the "author" of this nation-building event. Vaughan recognizes as much when he asserts that "the immense revolution of the present period, will necessarily turn our attention towards the author of it" (A 83).

Now Franklin says explicitly in his text that what allowed his self-transformation into a successful tradesman and ultimately into the father of the Revolution was his writing ability: "Prose Writing has been of great Use to me in the Course of my Life, and was a principal Means of my Advancement" (A 14). Since self-making is equated with nation-building, then life writing becomes the instrument whereby America is endowed with an identity of its own.¹³ Autobiographical reading and writing can thus function as an institution. The concept of "institution" is here being used in the sense given to it by Wlad Godzich: "An institution is first and foremost a guiding idea, the idea of some determined goal to be reached for the common weal; it is this goal that is sought according to prescribed behavior and by the application of set procedures" (1987: 156).

As Franklin institutionalizes a model of American biography, he also endows the details of his particular existence with some kind of general value. I think William C. Spengemann is right in asserting that "the aim of [Franklin's] *Autobiography* . . . is not so much to explain how his life is justified by some universal principle as to justify his life by persuading others to make its conclusions universal" (1980: 54). In other words, Franklin can deviate from the restrictive conventions of Puritan life writing on the

condition that he provides an alternative form of life planning and life writing in keeping with America's own self-transformation from rebellious daughter of England into a divinely ordained sovereign state. Franklin is characterized by Vaughan as an exceptional "individual" who embodies in his person the very essence of America's virtue: "When [the English] think well of individuals in your native country, they will go nearer to thinking well of your country" (A 84). This hypostatizing of Franklin's self into the totality of America entails an occultation or naturalization of a discrete agency, a key operation at the root of all institutionalizing processes.¹⁴ Vaughan himself seems to grant the possibility of alternative modes of life writing when he argues that Franklin's narrative will "make a subject of comparison" with other autobiographical forms.

Just what other forms? Throughout much of the eighteenth century, first-person accounts remained associated with the four types of life writing (whether factual or fictional) that Vaughan emphatically decries in his letter: "the lives of various public cutthroats and intriguers, and . . . absurd monastic self-tormentors, or vain literary triflers" (A 83).¹⁵ Here Vaughan delivers a blow to criminal biography (e.g. Defoe's *Moll Flanders*); to the immoral life writing of courtesans and "intriguer[s]" (from Cleland's *Fanny Hill* and Teresa Phillips' *Apology* to Lord Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son* and Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*); to Puritan conversion narratives (from John Bunyan to Jonathan Edwards); and to the egotistical "literary triflers" (Colley Cibber's *Apology* and Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* would qualify as such).¹⁶ These biographical types were more popular in England than in Puritan America, and in fact forms of social interaction such as "intriguing" were considered by some as effeminizing European vices. Thus Thomas Jefferson writes in 1785 that an American youth who exchanges his native values for those acquired through a European education "is led, by the strongest of all the human passions, into a spirit for female intrigue, destructive of his own and others' happiness" (1944: 533).¹⁷

Of the autobiographical models mentioned by Vaughan, the most prestigious one is that of personal accounts by "monastic self-tormentors." It is no wonder that Vaughan, who was raised as an orthodox Protestant and soon embraced the Enlightenment ideal of secular progress, should not like autobiographies by religious fundamentalists.¹⁸ This type of literature was best represented at the time by Jonathan Edwards, whose *Personal Narrative* had been published by Samuel Hopkins in Boston in 1765. There Edwards depicts himself as an ostensibly tormented individual who can only find momentary relief to his chronic bouts of self-loathing when he retires to "particular secret places of [his] own in the woods" (1962: 57, 60, 61). There

are five such places in the first five pages of the *Narrative*. This solipsistic attitude could not be farther removed from Franklin and Vaughan's Enlightenment project of devising forms of collaborative action so as to improve the material conditions and the social integration of all Americans.¹⁹ Vaughan must have intuited what a formidable rival Franklin had in Edwards in his quest for appropriating the autobiographical form as a vehicle for shaping Americans.²⁰ Sacvan Bercovitch, in an incisive comparison of Edwards's *Personal Narrative* and Franklin's *Autobiography*, has argued that these two works feature "alternate modes of identity" and "mirror inversions of each other." In so doing, they function as interlocutors in the same "intra-cultural dialogue" on how to "resolve the contradictions between self and society" within a culture where "individualism" and other ideologies of self-help threaten to damage the notion of community (Bercovitch 1982: 141).

But Edwards is not just another interlocutor in an open cultural dialogue, as Bercovitch asserts; at least for Vaughan, he is someone whose religious radicalism (i.e. his notion that human beings are fallen creatures beyond complete redemption) might lead his readers to choose a solipsistic, self-serving, and ultimately un-American way of life. These "good people," says Vaughan, "will cease efforts deemed to be hopeless" (efforts, that is, toward reforming and improving themselves within the cultural bounds set up by the religious community), and "perhaps [will] think of taking their share in the scramble of life, or at least of making it comfortable principally for themselves" (A 84).

Competitions among life models had been dramatized in English fiction since at least *Joseph Andrews* (1741), an encyclopedia of life patterns that self-consciously pits the development of Joseph's life against those of Colley Cibber, the young Mr. Wilson, and the squire-huntsman, among others; and the development of Fanny's life against the models furnished by her sister Pamela and by the servant girl Betty.²¹ Vaughan further discloses his own literary and moral affinity with Fielding when he writes:

I have always maintained that it is necessary to prove that man is not even at present a vicious and detestable animal. . . . I am anxious to see the opinion established, that there are fair characters existing among the individuals of the race. . . . (A 84)²²

The idea that man is "a vicious and detestable animal" appears in Edwards's *Freedom of the Will* in the form of "the total depravity and corruption of man's nature." This debasement places all human beings "wholly under the

power of sin," rendering them "utterly unable, without the interposition of sovereign grace . . . to do anything that is truly good" (1962: lxix, 301).

By contrast with Edwards and earlier spiritual autobiographers, Franklin and Vaughan are optimistic about the perfectibility of human character.²³ Throughout the *Autobiography* Franklin provides numerous instances of various habits leading to self-improvement, such as industry, frugality, and sociability.²⁴ However, it is only in the self-referential moment of the "Memo" pages that reading and writing are extolled as the two most important technologies through which Americans can improve themselves as individuals and as a nation. The only critic who has dealt with these pages in some detail, G. Thomas Couser, has argued persuasively that the kind of text James and Vaughan hope for when they urge Franklin to complete his narrative is "a master text that will serve to discipline present and future Americans," that is to say, "a counter-revolutionary text that would account for the past revolution in such a way as to forestall future ones" (1989: 45).

But how could Franklin's autobiography institutionalize a new form of subjectivity that remains uncontested for generations to come? To do that Franklin would have to avoid the suspicion that his life could have followed any number of other possible paths. Vaughan unwittingly exposes this maneuver of concealment when he tells Franklin: "[Your life] will show that you are ashamed of no origin; a thing the more important, as you prove how little necessary all origin is to happiness, virtue, or greatness" (A 82). If in Franklin's life there is no teleological connection between origin and actuality, then his successful career is (despite his solid Puritan credentials) as arbitrary a reality as the Revolution by which thirteen colonies developed into a prosperous nation. What authorizes and naturalizes both processes is the existence of a consensus on the course of action devised by a single "author." Just as he had called Franklin the engineer or "author" of the Revolution, Vaughan also insists that Franklin changed his life by means of a "plan": "As no end likewise happens without a means, so we shall find, Sir, that even you yourself framed a plan by which you became considerable" (A 82). For Vaughan as for Franklin, then, a life story without a "plan" is one that openly proclaims its own contingent nature, admitting that its "end" is not the effect of any definite "means."


To recapitulate, the "Memo" pages outline a context of competition among rival modes of life writing in a nation where the concepts of citizenship and Americanness are being defined for the first time. In a changing environment like this, nothing could seem more important than to present the parallel progress of that nation and of individual lives according to a preconceived plan. Vaughan appropriately claimed that the salutary effects of this

plan had been tested to his satisfaction in the person of none other than the father of the Revolution. If Franklin and Vaughan were to succeed in inculcating the inevitability of both processes (nation-building and self-making) and their mutual connection, then all other biographical forms would be effectively driven from the field of competition. In this manner, Franklin's model would reign uncontested as both a recipe for individual success and a disciplinary instrument for social homogenization.

The practice of this biographical discipline seems to have begun at Franklin's own home, with one of his grandsons. Benny (Benjamin Franklin) Bache emulated his grandfather and namesake in many important aspects, from spending part of his youth in Europe and becoming a printer to advocating Enlightenment pedagogical projects. He even went so far as to write an exact replica of the *Autobiography*. As personal secretary to his grandfather between the years 1785 and 1790, Bache not only took care of Franklin's correspondence, but made several clean handwritten copies of the extant drafts of the *Autobiography*.²⁵ This extraordinary feat of emulation invites the following two questions: did Benny Bache "improve his mind" by endlessly copying Franklin's original manuscript, as Vaughan thought a prolonged contact with the *Autobiography* would do to young and impressionable minds? And did Franklin use Bache as simply a blank page on which he could inscribe a repeated fantasy of self-perpetuation and mastery?²⁶ These may be unanswerable questions, but the very possibility of their being asked in connection with a reader who so closely resembled Franklin reinforces the idea that in the *Autobiography* the practices of life writing function as an instrument of reproduction—in short, an institution.

I have tried to show how the "Memo" pages, being a highly self-reflexive moment in the *Autobiography*, open a window into the inner workings of a narrative whose very emplotment rehearses the narrator's discovery of three plans. These are a plan to conduct his life, another to build a nation, and a third one to write his life.²⁷ It is Abel James and Benjamin Vaughan who provide an internal readership eager to see a correlation drawn among the three endeavors. In addition to their role as readers, James and Vaughan fulfill three other important functions in the institutionalization of a particular version of American autobiography: first, they stigmatize alternative forms of life planning and writing; second, they constitute themselves, in the egregious company of Franklin, into an ecumenic spiritual community (James is a Quaker, Vaughan an Anglican, and Franklin a Puritan); and third, they contribute sketches of Franklin's character which themselves become part of the *Autobiography*. These functions are precisely the ones alluded to by Godzich in his outline of what he calls the "instituting path" that a proposed "guiding

idea" must follow: "The idea itself is adopted by a group of individuals who become its public possessors and implementers. This group becomes then an institution as a result of the combining of the guiding idea with the set procedures" (Godzich 1987: 156).

Finally, James and Vaughan also envision the lives of future Americans in the act of either reading Franklin's narrative or taking up the pen to represent themselves in the manner established by the *Autobiography*. It seems ironic that the first young American to undergo this disciplinary process were another Benjamin Franklin, and that his own contribution to the institutionalizing of the *Autobiography* consisted in making faithful reproductions of the original manuscript. In Godzich's own words: "Institutions are fundamentally instruments of reproduction . . . in that they ensure that regulative processes take place" (Godzich 1987: 157). Institutions tend to repress their own origin as simply another deviation from standard procedures or as a moment of subjective interpretation. This is so because the main task assigned to the guardians of an institution is to hide the arbitrariness and provisionality of its regulations. If Franklin and Vaughan were to declare openly this unmotivatedness (and of course they do not), they would be encouraging an open competition for representation among rival biographical modes. As it is, however, they discourage other writers from trying to interpret their American experience, outlaw counter-versions of that experience, and contribute to the presentation of a seemingly decentered narrator who speaks *in persona aliorum*—through the voices of his friends. In so doing, Franklin naturalizes and consecrates—i.e. institutionalizes—a particular model for interpreting the life of individual Americans, the craft of American letters, and the history of the American nation. 

NOTES

1. The word "autobiography" is a romantic coinage that can be traced as far back as to Friedrich Schlegel in Germany (who uses it approvingly in 1798) and William Taylor in England (who considers using it, but finally rejects its validity in 1797). The actual words that Franklin and his earliest posthumous editors used in the title of his personal narrative were "memoirs," "remains," "notes," and "history," each normally followed by the modifying phrase "of my life" or "of his life."

2. James's and Vaughan's letters constitute one of five external documents that Franklin decided to interpolate into the manuscript of the *Autobiography* (Franklin 1986b: xviii-xix).
3. For the concept of "rite of institution," see Bourdieu 1991: 119. I follow Prince in his brief discussion of the history and function of the "*mise en abyme*" (1987: 53).
4. Franklin does not specify which son it is. That it should turn out to be an illegitimate child is ironically significant, as is the fact that in 1771 William was already a middle-aged man and the Governor of New Jersey. On Franklin's pretense that he is addressing an ingenuous and inexperienced youngster, see Griffith 1974: 79-80.
5. For the conventions that Franklin borrowed from the Puritan tradition of Bunyan, Shepard, and Mather, see Shea 1988: 239-41. The presence of Bunyan and Defoe in the *Autobiography* is masterfully treated in Wilson 1989: 33-40.
6. Franklin 1986a: 3. All subsequent references to this edition of the *Autobiography* (abbreviated A) will appear incorporated into the text. I quote from the Penguin edition because of its general availability.
7. This understanding of the *Autobiography* derives from Max Weber's famous reading in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Franklin 1986b: 282-85). For the influence of Franklin's entrepreneurial teachings on the "economic romanticism" of the first American pioneers, see Charles L. Sanford's remarks in "An American Pilgrim's Progress" (Franklin 1986b: 308-12).
8. All these testimonies are now readily available in Lemay and Zall's Norton edition of the *Autobiography* (1986b: 231-32, 241-42). Warner elaborates on the idea that Franklin was the first American man of letters in the narrower sense of an intellectual who acquires literary renown in a print-culture environment (1990: 76).
9. A chronology of the principal events in the life of William Franklin appears in Franklin 1986b: 183. For a brief discussion of William's sense of social inferiority on account of his illegitimate birth, see Shurr 1992: 443-45.
10. This topos of humility is nowhere better enacted than in Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. See, for instance, 1,344, 355, 374.
11. Reising (1994) observes that Franklin was by no means a paragon of virtue, and that the lies he fabricates and the roles in which he casts himself in the *Autobiography* are meant to forestall the eventual disclosure of the ugliest aspects of his life. The best clinical and literary discussion of why and how a first-person narrator feels compelled to "impersonate" any number of characters takes place in Bruner (1993).
12. A detailed account of the growth of a biographical industry in eighteenth-century England is presented in chapter 3 of Caffarelli (1990). Being Franklin's British publisher, Vaughan writes to him in awareness that life writing can also be a lucrative venture: "your biography . . . would secure attention to your former writings" (A 83; phrasing adjusted).
13. Imagining the return home of a European-educated American, Jefferson argues vigorously for the interrelation of nation and writing: "He returns to his own country . . . speaking and writing his own tongue as a foreigner, and therefore unqualified to obtain those distinctions, which eloquence of the pen and tongue ensures in a free country" (1944: 533).

14. As Godzich writes, this operation consists of "the reconduction of what appears particular through the paths of the general, or, more precisely, through the instituting insightful path which is no longer treated as particular" (1987: 157).
15. Compare Friedrich Schlegel's fragment 196 of the *Athenaeum* (1798): "Pure autobiographies [Ger. *reine Autobiographien*] are written either by neurotics who are enthralled by their own egos—a class that includes Rousseau; or out of robust artistic or adventurous self-love, like that of Benvenuto Cellini; or by born historians who consider themselves nothing more than the raw materials of historical art; or by women who are playing the coquette with posterity as well as with their contemporaries; or by worrisome people who want to clean up the least little speck of dust before they die and who can't bear letting themselves depart this world without explanations" (1971: 188).
16. Shurr (1992: 449) highlights a number of features shared in common by Chesterfield's *Letters* and Part I of the *Autobiography*. For the scandalous memoirs, see chapter 8 of Nussbaum (1988). Cibber's *Apology* (1740) was considered the work of a "vain literary trifler" by its earliest critic, Henry Fielding, who ridiculed it in chapter 1 of *Joseph Andrews* (1742), entitled "Of Writing Lives in General." Like Vaughan, Fielding praises Plutarch.
17. In Ketcham's anthology of Franklin's political writings there are many instances of shorter pieces showing a marked anti-European bias. See for instance his 1775 letter to Joseph Galloway on political corruption in England as well as his famous "Dialogue between Britain, France, Spain, Holland, Saxony and America" (Franklin 1965: 282, 283-88). The attacks on the general decay of European mores are part of an orchestrated patriotic campaign for the publicizing of American emancipation. Yet Franklin's public condemnations of Europe are belied by his own nine-year sojourn in Paris and his personal decision to have his grandsons educated in Switzerland.
18. Johnson thought that the "monastick life" was most readily embraced by individuals who were "glad to supply by external authority their own want of constancy and resolution . . . when long experience has convinced them of their own inability to govern themselves" (Boswell 1933: 1,243).
19. A very readable introduction to the Enlightenment ideals shared by Franklin and his grandson, Benjamin Franklin Bache, appears in Smith (1990).
20. The one truly popular spiritual autobiography antedating Edwards's *Personal Narrative* is Elizabeth Ashbridge's *Account of the Life of E.A.* (c. 1755; publ. 1774). For the milestones in the development of Quaker journals and Puritan autobiographies, see Shea 1988.
21. This competition occurs in the main subtext of Fielding's novel, Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, between the eponymous hero and the chivalric models he both emulates and criticizes, and between himself and other characters in the novel such as Ginés de Pasamonte and Sansón Carrasco.
22. Compare Fielding's contention than in real life there are "many Exceptions" to the general moral decay that he depicts in his novel, and that these people's virtuous lives are an "honour" to their respective ranks (1971: 169).
23. I am puzzled by Dauber's gloss of Vaughan's above-quoted passage as an expression of "apocalypticism" and "fundamental pessimism" (1990: 12).
24. Shea explains that Franklin adopted what D. H. Lawrence called the persona of "the dummy American" in order to convince his readership "with indulgent irony" that the

"dummy of patterned behavior . . . is willing to sacrifice the ideal of perfection in exchange for the more realistic aim of moral improvement" (1991: 39).

25. This fact is mentioned in Smith 1990: 101. All the information on Bache used in this essay comes from Smith's book, especially chapters 4 and 5.

26. Warner notes Franklin's use in the *Almanack* of Poor Richard as a "ghostwriter," a fictional being with whom the empirical author can engage in a textual game, "a fantasmatic self-splitting or self-objectification that results in a concealed or absent subject behind a manipulated surface" (1990: 78). The terms of this game are greatly altered when another persona, Titan Leeds, takes possession of Richard's mind and body to write his own opinions through Richard's "hand": "the Hand written is mine, tho' wrote with yours" (qtd. in Warner 1990: 77). I think a similar game takes place in a real-world context with Bache as unwitting participant.

27. Franklin mentions the American Revolution only in terms of the impact that it had on the successive stages of writing the *Autobiography*. The effect of these seemingly tangential comments are: (1) to emphasize that "Franklin's act of conceiving, discovering, or inventing himself almost exactly coincides with the birth of America"; and (2) to make "Franklin's personal history stand in place of the revolution" (Cox 1989: 16; emphasis in the original).

WORKS CITED

- BERCOVITCH, Sacvan. 1982. "The Ritual of American Autobiography: Edwards, Franklin, Thoreau." *Revue Française d'Études Américaines* 7: 139-50.
- BOSWELL, James. 1933. *The Life of Samuel Johnson*. Ed. R.W. Chapman. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- BRUNER, Jerome. 1993. "The Autobiographical Process." In *The Culture of Autobiography: Constructions of Self-Representation*. Ed. Robert Folkenflik. Stanford: Stanford UP. 38-56.
- CAFARELLI, Annette Wheeler. 1990. *Prose in the Age of Poets: Romanticism and Biographical Narrative from Johnson to De Quincey*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P.
- CELA, Camilo José. 1990. "Acerca do xénero epistolar." *La Voz de Galicia* (25 February): 8.
- COUSER, G. Thomas. 1989. *Altered Egos: Authority in American Autobiography*. New York: Oxford UP.
- COX, James M. 1989. "Autobiography and America." *Virginia Quarterly Review* 47 (1971). Rpt. in *Recovering Literature's Lost Ground: Essays in American Autobiography*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP. 11-32.
- DAUBER, Kenneth. 1990. *The Idea of Authorship in America: Democratic Poetics from Franklin to Melville*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P.

- EDWARDS, Jonathan. 1962. *Representative Selections*. Ed. Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson. New York: Hill.
- FIELDING, Henry. 1971. *Joseph Andrews and Shamela*. Ed. Douglas Brooks. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- FRANKLIN, Benjamin. 1965. *The Political Thought of Benjamin Franklin*. Ed. Ralph L. Ketcham. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- . 1986a. *The Autobiography and Other Writings*. Ed. Kenneth Silverman. New York: Penguin. (Abbreviated A).
- . 1986b. *Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography: A Norton Critical Edition*. Ed. J.A. Leo Lemay and P.M. Zall. New York: Norton.
- GODZICH, Wlad. 1987. "Afterword: Religion, the State, and Post(al) Modernism." In *Institution and Interpretation*. By Samuel Weber. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P. 153-64.
- GRIFFITH, John. 1971. "The Rhetoric of Franklin's Autobiography." *Criticism* 13: 77-94.
- JEFFERSON, Thomas. 1944. *Basic Writings*. Ed. Philip S. Forner. New York: Willey.
- NUSSBAUM, Felicity. 1989. *The Autobiographical Subject: Gender and Ideology in Eighteenth-Century England*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- PRINCE, Gerald. 1987. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P.
- REISING, Russell. 1994. "Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography: Reading Mr Write; or, The Multiple Voices of Ben the Penman." *Prose Studies* 17: 64-94.
- SCHLEGEL, Friedrich. 1971. *Friedrich Schlegel's Lucinde and the Fragments*. Trans. and ed. Peter Firchow. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- SHEA, Daniel B. 1991. "The Prehistory of American Autobiography." In *American Autobiography: Retrospect and Prospect*. Ed. Paul John Eakin. Madison: U of Wisconsin P. 25-46.
- . 1988. *Spiritual Autobiography in Early America*. 2nd ed. Madison: U of Wisconsin P.
- SHURR, William H. 1992. "Now, Gods, Stand Up for Bastards': Reinterpreting Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography." *American Literature* 64: 435-51.
- SMITH, Jeffery A. 1990. *Franklin & Bache: Envisioning the Enlightened Republic*. New York: Oxford UP.
- SPENGEMANN, William C. 1980. *The Forms of Autobiography: Episodes in the History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- WARNER, Michael. 1990. *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- WILSON, R. Jackson. 1989. *Figures of Speech: American Writers and the Literary Marketplace, from Benjamin Franklin to Emily Dickinson*. New York: Knopf.



THE HUNCHBACK AND THE MIRROR:



AUDEN. SHAKESPEARE.
AND THE POLITICS OF NARCISSUS*

STAN SMITH
UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE

1. A MIDDLE-AGED MAN WITH A CORPORATION

"Hic et Ille," W. H. Auden's 1956 sequence of aphorisms in the journal *Encounter*,¹ later collected in *The Dyer's Hand* (1963) under the section heading "The Well of Narcissus,"² adds a droll new inflection to the intellectual history of narcissism. In Auden's version

Narcissus does not fall in love with his reflection because it is beautiful, but because it is his. If it were his beauty that enthralled him, he would be set free in a few years by its fading.

'After all,' sighed Narcissus the hunchback, 'on me it looks good.' (Auden 1956: 33; 1963: 94)

Self-love can handle a hunch back. Auden may have in mind here the fawning self-regard of Shakespeare's Richard III. Certainly, the section which follows "The Well of Narcissus" in *The Dyer's Hand*, "The Shakespearian City," scrutinises Shakespeare's history plays in a series of complexly reasoned essays which frequently return to the theme of narcissism.³ One