

work as a discernible response to *Os Lusíadas*: the critic explores how Ercilla seeks to surpass Camões by the universality and grandeur of his mapamundi. In Nicolopulos' interpretation it is clearly the content of Ercilla's visions that challenges Camões's poem. An innovative aspect of this chapter is the author's emphasis on the points of correspondence between both visions while underlining Ercilla's direct spirit of rivalry with Camões.

Equally versed in the works of Virgil, Ariosto, Lucan, Juan de Mena and Garcilaso, the author draws on his vast knowledge of classical, medieval and renaissance periods as he theorizes the process of imitation. As the above summary highlights, *The Poetics of Empire* predominantly explores the process of imitation in relation to Ercilla's text, but the scholar of Portuguese literature will most certainly find chapters 4 and 5 of interest, and the theoretical criteria and terminology for approaching the question of imitation exposed in chapter 1 would be useful for any study of this nature. Intended for an academic audience, scholars interested in a new reading of the literary representation of colonialism and imperialism will also find this study rewarding. The text balances theoretical insights with aesthetic appreciations of the text, interlocked with cultural, historical and ideological explanations. Great care was taken to assure uttermost clarity of both the content and the overall organization of the book that is further indicated by concise titles and subtitles. The quotes the author includes are pertinent without being overbearing, as theory guides the narrative and steers away from a close reading or a mere textual conflation of both poems. The informative preface and logical progression of the chapters also assure clarity, as does the academic language that avoids excessive theoretical jargon. From all points of analysis, *The Poetics of Empire* constitutes a commendable work of serious scholarship that skillfully vehicles a new appreciation of Renaissance practices of imitation.

Kathryn Bishop-Sanchez, *University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature. By Glenn Hendler. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001. x + 275 pp. \$45.00 (cloth); \$18.95 (paper).

In *Public Sentiments*, Glenn Hendler joins other critics who have recently challenged and complicated two long-standing tenets about the exercise of nineteenth-century American sentiment: first, that senti-

ment was primarily the province of women writers and readers, and second, that sympathy was essentially a privatizing emotional exchange. In their place, *Public Sentiments* offers a more complex understanding of the relationships among gender (especially masculinity), affect, and publicity in the nineteenth century. Hendler begins *Public Sentiments* with an intelligent overview of the historiography of sentiment and sympathy. As the role of sympathy evolved over the course of the nineteenth century, Hendler argues that it became a “paradigmatically public sentiment” (115). He’s especially interested in what he calls “sympathetic identification,” whereby readers or listeners identify affectively with characters, narrators, or speakers; such identification was a crucial component of nineteenth-century sentimental culture, especially as aimed at individual and social reform. Rather than the affect resulting from such identification, however, Hendler is interested in how sympathy and sentiment are articulated. Feelings, he argues, only *seem* private, and when articulated in masculine-oriented texts as diverse as temperance narratives and Horatio Alger’s boys’ books, such feelings often have a social or political orientation. Hendler isn’t claiming that all sentiment is political, but he does persuasively argue that we can no longer view sentimentality as a privatizing, female-oriented subject position in opposition to public, masculine rationality, as we may have done in the past.

One of the strengths of *Public Sentiments* is the diversity of texts and institutions of the public sphere that Hendler examines. He explains that his goal is “to identify and unpack the logic of sympathy as it plays out in each text, each genre, each institution of the public sphere, each social movement, each debate over the social meaning of reading” (214). Central to his argument, however, is how the novel interacts with other institutions of the public sphere. Following Jürgen Habermas in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Hendler sees novels as helping instantiate the bourgeois public sphere through the critical discussion that emerged about them. In addition to exploring the various roles of affect within the rational-critical debate that ensued from fiction, Hendler diverges from Habermas in accentuating the significance of the counter institutions, or “counterpublics,” that developed for working class and black men in the first half of the nineteenth century, a time when the status of American manhood was undergoing profound ideological shifts.

Divided into two sections, the first half of *Public Sentiments* emphasizes “the social formation of publicity, the means by which institutions

of the public sphere constituted spaces in which citizens could carve out public identities and act in the social world" (26). In a fascinating first chapter, Hendler examines the Washingtonian temperance movement of the 1840s. In the narratives that emerged from this movement—both those experience narratives related at meetings as well as fictional forms produced by Whitman and T. A. Shay, we see male expression of affect oriented toward an explicitly public, social goal: liberating working class men metaphorically enslaved by "King Alcohol" and hence stripped of the ability to be sympathetic. These temperance narratives seek to restore listeners/readers to respectable (white) manhood by means of sympathetic identification with the narrator. The voluntarism implicit in the Washingtonian temperance movement was a crucial component of this rehabilitative process; it ensured not only emotional support but also, paradoxically, a powerfully coercive publicity.

Although he advocated temperance, Martin Delany's construction of public masculinity differed from that of the working class white men associated with the Washingtonians. Only minimally engaged with issues of affect and hence less integrated with the other chapters, Hendler's second chapter instead focuses on citizenship. Citizenship, Delany argues, entails full access to the public sphere and political power. Through his participation in the Negro Conventions, Delany attempted to expand definitions of the public sphere; one way he did so was by exposing how non-whites were alienated from public life in the United States, not merely because they were denied voting rights, but also because their numerical minority status limited their access to political power. With *Blake*, Hendler suggests, Delany turned to fiction as an institution of the public sphere that would bring his rational-critical debate about black citizenship and nationalism to a broader audience.

The public in Alger's novels refers not so much to public spaces as to the legibility of a boy's character or good actions performed for an audience. Rather than seeing Alger's novels as simple rags to riches stories, Hendler argues that proper management of publicity is at the heart of these texts, for while Alger's boy heroes do rise economically, more importantly, they rise from obscurity to public renown. As in the preceding chapters, Hendler here explores the intersection of different institutions of the public sphere when he discusses how Alger's novels became embroiled in controversy as libraries struggled to establish themselves as public institutions separate from the market. Despite the emphasis on good behavior in Alger's books, acquisition of these texts

troubled librarians, for they feared that reading such commodified texts (as opposed to literary “art”) would turn patrons into passive consumers, rather than discriminating readers.

In the second half of *Public Sentiments*, likewise composed of three chapters, Hendler examines the performative aspects of public identity, what he identifies as “the psychological formation of publicity, the means by which subjects performed their public identities through the very categories that seem to distance and differentiate them from the public sphere: particularities like race and gender, categories like personality and intimacy, forms of affect like sympathy” (26). Chapter 4 examines the relationship between sympathetic identification and publicity in women’s sentimental fiction, especially Louisa May Alcott’s *Work*. Hendler sees *Work* as differing from antebellum sentimental novels in that it tries to “reimagine sentimental literature’s domestic utopias as institutions of the public sphere” (137). Antebellum sentimental fiction, he argues, often suggests a longing for political change but frequently forecloses the possibility of such change by focusing narrowly on a closed family unit. In *Work*, Hendler sees Alcott transforming sympathy “into a form of political mediation” (137), illustrated in its multiple concluding vignettes of feminist collectivity.

The fifth chapter puts male and female writers into conversation to suggest how gender inflected understanding of publicity. Fanny Fern shared Alcott’s suspicion of theatricality, but much of Fern’s distrust of performativity stemmed specifically from the figure of the dandy, embodied by her brother Nathaniel Parker Willis as a man who publicly performed his feelings. While Willis prided himself on his affect and explored the psyche of the dandy in *Paul Fane*, Fern saw the dandy, figured in *Ruth Hall* as Apollo Hyacinth, a thinly veiled version of her brother, as excessively theatrical, feminized, and inauthentic.

In his final chapter, Hendler turns to the “bad-boy” books of postbellum fiction—novels such as *Tom Sawyer* that were popular with young male readers. Both the dandy and the “bad boys” glorify theatricality, but in a different fashion. Where the dandy is feminized through the theatrical expression of his sentiments, the “bad boys” use theatricality to enhance a very different form of masculinity. Further, identification in “bad-boy” books differs radically from the sympathetic identification of antebellum sentimental fiction; instead of one deeply affective identification, these later books for boys suggest multiple, pleasurable forms of masculine self-possession. The “bad-boy” books reject depictions of suffering, which they portray as excessively feminine

and feminizing; instead, they emphasize the “natural” savagery of boys and the freedom of multiple identities offered by play in the masculine world of gangs.

Sophisticated, yet lively and readable, *Public Sentiments* will be useful to those readers interested in how sentiment shaped public identities and institutions in nineteenth-century America; especially valuable is its emphasis on the masculine experience of affect. Hendler emphasizes the power of sympathetic identification to shape the subjectivity of the speaker and reveals the frequently coercive—even if voluntary—nature of this identification for readers and listeners.

Karen A. Weyler, *University of North Carolina at Greensboro*