

Wandering Lonely: Women's Access to the English Romantic Countryside

William Wordsworth “wandered lonely as a cloud,” and his famous “Daffodils” perfectly exemplifies the romantic peripatetic poem. One can imagine his footsteps beating out the meter as he meanders in an ecstasy of abandon. Wordsworth's 1802 preface to *Lyrical Ballads* is the closest thing we have to a manifesto of English romanticism, and it sets out his universalizing claim for the poet to be a “man speaking to men.”¹

Although feminist critics such as Ellen Moers have long since deconstructed such masculinist assumptions, Wordsworth’s aspiration to write “out of repeated experience and regular feelings” does raise the question of whether opportunities to wander the countryside were open to everyone.² How safe was it to “wander lonely as a cloud” in the English countryside of 1804 ?

In fact the romantic trope of the solitary wanderer was less readily translated to the experience of women writers. The pleasure of a meditative stroll along rural byways cannot be taken for granted because the issue of access to the countryside is historically complex. Geographical space, both rural and urban, has always been contested: factors such as class, gender, and age all intersect to determine who may wander where. Furthermore, much masculinist romantic poetry of solitary wandering incorporates a notion of the sublime and pivots upon a struggle with and transcendence of nature gendered as female. Because this association also

sets women in opposition to culture, it can impede the very act of literary creation. To be identified with nature is to be aligned with the antithesis of culture and thus to be set against poetry itself. In the words of Margaret Homans, “Mother Nature’s not a helpful model for women aspiring to be poets. She is prolific biologically, not linguistically, and she is as destructive as she is creative.”³

There also existed more physical obstacles to wandering, such as the enclosure of the land, which was a process largely completed by the mid-nineteenth century. Landowners restricted access in order to protect property, safeguard their interest in blood sports, and preserve the privacy of their estates. Enclosure represented a substantial extension of the aristocracy’s grip upon what was formerly common land. The notorious Game Laws also affected access to the countryside and were perhaps the most harsh and bitterly divisive of all class legislation. Unarmed poachers could be transported by their provisions, and Lord Liverpool’s government actively encouraged the use of “mantraps.” Whether one was looking for nature to put into poetry or the pot, such devices did not discriminate between the nature lover or the trespassing poacher. John Clare spoke resentfully of the harassment he received while botanising, complaining “what terryfying rascals these wood keepers & gamekeepers are they make a prison of the forrests & are its jaolers.”⁴

Obviously, walking in the countryside under such conditions would require courage fortitude from anyone, and there were exceptions women

who braved them. Dorothy Wordsworth and Emily Brontë found time to wander alone when they were not preoccupied by more domestic chores. Certainly neither of these women was too insecure to walk out unaccompanied. A trustworthy dog could make all the difference, even though it might sometimes interfere with the direct appreciation of the local flora and fauna. It is not possible to sustain the argument, and it would be condescending to suggest, that women were too timid to venture out alone. Emily Brontë was inseparable from Keeper, and Mary Russell Mitford invariably shared the excursions recorded in *Our Village* with a greyhound named Mayflower.⁵ For Mary Wollstonecraft, a “solitary evening's walk” was part of the daily routine: “The steeple serves as a land-mark. I once or twice lost my way, walking alone, without being able to inquire after a path. I was therefore obliged to make to the steeple, or wind-mill, over hedge and ditch.”⁶ Wollstonecraft’s lifestyle, however, was certainly atypical, and one which many considered irredeemably eccentric as anti-Jacobin sentiment gained ground. Such forays “over hedge and ditch” were suspect and unconventional behavior for a bourgeois woman. By contrast, and perhaps more typically, Jane Austen almost never walked by herself. A letter to her sister, Cassandra, states that “I enjoyed the hard black Frosts of last week very much, & one day while they lasted walked to Deane by myself.—I do not know that I ever did such a thing in my life before.”⁷

Furthermore, there remained the rarely mentioned but ever-present possibility that the Arcadia of the Romantic countryside was peopled by potential rapists. The limited evidence suggests that there was less opportunist sex crime during the eighteenth century than there is today. Although, as the social historian, Frank McLynn, comments: “heroines traversing country fields worry that their gowns will be dirtied, not that they will be raped,” such literary evidence may tell us more about the sensitivities of authors than the genuine concern of contemporary women.⁸ Characters rarely blow their noses, urinate or take off their shoes in eighteenth-century novels but it would be wrong to infer that they never did. Fear of disgrace meant that sex crimes often went unreported, and women’s legal status of made it difficult to prosecute with success.⁹

Given the contradictory evidence, we cannot assume that any contemporary dangers that might exist today were of the same magnitude around two hundred years ago.¹⁰ Indeed the account of Sarah Hazlitt would, at first sight, appear to substantiate McLynn’s view: “you may walk all through the country without molestation or insult.”¹¹ However, Hazlitt’s comment, in its very denial, immediately draws attention to the existence of such sexual threats. Given that she is describing her travels in Scotland, there is surely also an implicit contrast with the problems a single woman might encounter when travelling south of the border.

A reading of Romantic women writers suggests that they were conscious of such a threat. I would like to return to the word “lonely” in William Wordsworth’s “Daffodils.” The first point to make is that Dorothy Wordsworth accompanied her brother on the walk, so he was not solitary on this occasion. Indeed, it was her recollection of the golden “host” – which she jotted down in a journal entry for April 1802 – that provided the inspiration for the lines written two years later.¹² Although it is, of course, any poet’s prerogative to make adjustments to the facts for the sake of art, such a vindication is less available to William Wordsworth because of the particular professions of authenticity and truth to outer experience inherent in his approach.

There is also a further instability in the use of the word “lonely.” For Wordsworth, the word carries a sense of personal freedom, of being unencumbered by the presence of other people who might distract his thoughts from the surrounding landscape. At the same time, another reading of the word “lonely” is possible because, ironically, it has a different and contradictory nuance in women’s rural writings. “Lonely” is frequently used as a euphemism for fear of physical attack, suggesting a terrain in which it is dangerous to wander. This sense of a threat is hinted at but quickly dispelled in *The Prelude*, where lonely roads represent an opportunity to witness all human life in microcosm:

Awed have I been by strolling Bedlamites;
From many other uncouth vagrants (passed
In fear) have walked with quicker step; but why

Take note of this? When I began to enquire,
To watch and question those I met, and speak
Without reserve to them, the lonely roads
Were open schools in which I daily read
With most delight the passions of mankind.¹³

By contrast, *Our Village*, Mary Russell Mitford's emphasis implies her awareness of a threat very clearly: "the road thither is smooth and dry, retired, as one likes a country walk to be, but not too lonely, which women never like, leading past the Loddon... and terminating at one of the prettiest and most comfortable farm-houses in the neighbourhood" (313-314). The words of Lucy Snowe, the narrator in Charlotte Brontë's *Villette*, provide a further example: "I should have trembled in that lonely walk, which lay through still fields, and passed neither village, nor farmhouse, nor cottage; I should have quailed in the absence of moonlight."¹⁴

Again, according to the conventions of Gothic fiction, when a heroine wanders alone a disempowering fear for personal safety frequently counterbalances any empowering sense of freedom that she might otherwise enjoy. Adeline experiences a sense of panic in Ann Radcliffe's *The Romance of the Forest* that is clearly provoked by fear of sexual threat:

The spreading dusk at length reminded Adeline... that she had her way to find through a wild and lonely wood: she bade adieu to the syren that had so long detained her and pursued the path with quick steps. Having followed it for some time, she became bewildered among the thickets, ... she thought she distinguished the voices of men at some distance, and she increased her speed till she found herself on the sea sands over which the woods impended.¹⁵

In addition to the direct threat of harassment that discouraged women from rambling alone in the countryside, there also existed more subtle, though no less compelling, considerations of right conduct. The convention of separate spheres, associated with the Rousseau of *Emile*, held it to be “natural” for men to act in the public, outside world and for women to be confined to the private, domestic realm. Rousseau’s insistence upon the distinct but complementary nature of the sexes is based upon the social implications of biological difference. He exaggerates such differences in his discussion of Sophie and Emile, where the desire to wander and a love of outdoor activity become gender issues. For Rousseau, woman is more biologically determined, and her “proper purpose” is to produce children. She therefore needs a “soft and sedentary life,” while men will always be characterized by more robustness in outdoor pursuits, of which the ultimate is war. Speaking of woman, Rousseau asks rhetorically, “will she suddenly go from shade, enclosure, and domestic cares to the harshness of the open air...?”¹⁶ By contrast, it is Emile who is anxious to escape the confines of the home and wander the countryside:

To reduce him all of a sudden to a soft and sedentary life would be to imprison him, to enchain him, to keep him in a violent and constrained state... He needs fresh air, movement, toil. Even when he is at Sophie’s knee, he cannot prevent himself from looking at the countryside out of the corner of his eye... (432)

Rousseau accentuates his construction of gendered difference by introducing the very same phrase, “soft and sedentary” that he used to

describe women in Book V. Clearly, a sedentary life is opposed to one that wanders and roams. Furthermore, to be identified always in relation to partner and children is to be denied the privileges of solitary experience.¹⁷ Thus, when solitary women feature in later romantic poetry, they often do so as a consequence of misfortune, not choice. Martha in “The Thorn”, Margaret in “The Ruined Cottage,” and the nameless woman in “The Complaint of a Forsaken Indian Woman” are three examples of women in sedentary solitude in Wordsworth’s verse. Similarly, Keats’s Isabella and Tennyson’s Mariana are lonely and disturbed female figures.

Class differences, of course, only complicated such gender constructions for women of the romantic period. As Anne D. Wallace observes,¹⁸ walking had long been stigmatized as an inferior method of transport, undertaken by vagrants and the displaced poor. Before the revolution in transport, made possible by industrialization, no one walked by choice, only out of necessity. Walking was labeled as a low status and degrading activity for an aspirant bourgeoisie that opted for decorum of the horse-drawn carriage. It was the advent of cheap, safe, and efficient travel that made the idea of aesthetic pleasure in walking viable. Only after industrialization, therefore, could contemporaries successfully construct the activity of walking as an elevated pursuit connoting sensibility. It became possible to celebrate walking as a simple rural pleasure to be enjoyed by the refined rather than simply endured by the deprived. However, this process was not instantaneous, and physical

exertion was long frowned-upon as an unfeminine trait in a well-bred woman. If class prejudice was not enough to dissuade women from solitary excursions, even more dangerous to the reputation were the opportunities that such movements, if not policed by a chaperon, might afford to consort and flirt with men. Again, Wallace notes that “special difficulties faced women walkers, especially if they walked alone, because their peripateia translated as sexual wandering” (29).

The aesthetics of the natural sublime also made certain kinds of writing problematic for women. Male romantic poets often wander within a feminized natural world, where their elevated sensibilities contrast with the material and corporeal qualities of the landscape, thus inscribing a particular inflection of gender. By celebrating the triumph of a transcendent male over a feminized nature and identifying the feminine with qualities opposed to mindfulness and selfhood, the solitary wanderer trope embraces a logic that inhibits a woman’s creative power as an author – unless she can find strategies for reworking such a discourse. Moreover, if Wordsworthian nature is enjoyed, ultimately, through its transcendence, it is therefore partially at the cost of the displacement and negation of its immediate physicality. In Kantian terms there is a privileging of the subjective, phenomenal world over the objective, noumenal world in the mind-landscape trope. It was just such a perspective that Keats characterized as the “egotistical sublime” in his famous letter to Richard Woodhouse.¹⁹ In spite of William Wordsworth’s

apotheosis of nature, the 1805 *Prelude* clearly privileges constructions of the human mind over the physical world:

...the mind of man becomes
A thousand times more beautiful than the earth
On which he dwells... (448-450)

These tensions and dilemmas can be readily observed in the work of Charlotte Smith (1749-1806), a writer who often described women in natural environments. Situated chronologically between Rousseau and Wordsworth, the two dominant solitary wanderers, she is a member of that disparate group of noncanonical writers that could be called the major-minor Romantics. Smith's position in literary history has been secure but marginal. The standard biography by F. M. A. Hilbish, published in 1941, has now finally been succeeded by the publication of Loraine Fletcher's *Critical Biography*, which reawakens interest and consolidates Smith's continuing presence in literary heritage²⁰. Smith's reputation now rests upon her part in the revival of the sonnet as a poetic form, acknowledged as an influence by Wordsworth and Coleridge.²¹ Her most popular novels, *Emmeline* and *The Old Manor House*, also continue to be read and admired. Over the past decade, the feminist efforts to reclaim women's literary history have generated a fresh interest in this writer, who was respected as a leading poet and novelist in her day.

One of Charlotte Smith's most frequently anthologized *Elegiac Sonnets*, "On being Cautioned against Walking on a Headland

Overlooking the Sea, Because it was Frequented by a Lunatic,” directly foregrounds and addresses the dangers of “wandering lonely”. However, it ultimately challenges such prescriptions in that much of the force of the sonnet rests in Smith’s refusal to respond with stock horror.

Is there a solitary wretch who hies
To the tall cliff, with starting pace or slow,
And, measuring, views with wild and hollow eyes
Its distance from the waves that chide below;
Who, as the sea-born gale with frequent sighs
Chills his cold bed upon the mountain turf,
With hoarse, half-utter’d lamentation, lies
Murmuring responses to the dashing surf?
In moody sadness, on the giddy brink,
I see him more with envy than with fear;
He has no *nice felicities* that shrink
From giant horrors; wildly wandering here,
He seems (uncursed with reason) not to know
The depth or the duration of his woe.²²

The very title is a reminder that the romantic tradition of peripatetic poetry, written while roving and musing among wild nature, is less open to women. Both the immediate implication of a physical threat and the social and cultural prescriptions about women in public spaces are in play in this sonnet. The “wildly wandering” “lunatic” of Smith’s imaginings is something of a caricature. He is an unindividuated, embodiment of otherness and irrationalism. His presence is threatening because, although he is never positively sighted, he appears actual and not fictional. He is naturalized and exiled from the society that cautions against him. As a woman writer with a precarious financial and social status, Smith looks for points of connection with this disempowered and

alienated individual. Such sympathy is partly a convention of eighteenth-century sensibility, but the sense of self-identification goes beyond this. She makes an imaginative leap that makes for a curious and unexpected response: “I see him more with envy than with fear.”

Smith envies the psychic freedom of the “lunatic” as well as the physical liberty to wander that he enjoys. The identification of the “lunatic” with nature is conveyed primarily by the fact that he is inarticulate. “Uncursed with reason”, his “hoarse, half-utter’d lamentation” sets him firmly apart from culture so that he becomes a mouthpiece for unreason and all that is anathema to cultural sensibilities. Reason is accompanied by self-consciousness and, most ironically, it is in the very absence of this faculty that the “lunatic” can attain a rather unlikely kind of liberation. In this sense Smith confers a positive quality upon this very unawareness as a psychic space that, while apparently deeply troubled, is, from the poet’s perspective, a refuge from suffering.

Through her implicit sympathy with the “lunatic”, Smith links the idea of cultural obstacles to the expression of her own perspective. Jeffrey C. Robinson asks fruitfully, “Does this doubling of mood – hers and that projected onto the lunatic – invert itself into an open space of linguistic possibility?”²³ As a female writer, Charlotte Smith faced two difficulties. Firstly, given the exclusivity of education and the political and legal system, she was confronted by inhibitions against projecting herself in the

public domain. Second, decorum required that she articulate her voice within certain bounds – the genres and subjects that were deemed suitable.²⁴ As a single mother with twelve dependents, the threat of destitution compelled her to write material that was marketable and in keeping with public taste.

The exact location of the headland in this sonnet is not specified and indeed is loosely described with an indefinite article as “a headland.” Given Smith’s poetical topography as a Sussex poet, it is reasonable to assume that the “tall cliff” is in the vicinity of Beachy Head. Furthermore, as a woman Smith has to obey the decorum of “nice felicities” and pay attention to her own personal security when strolling on the headland. Consequently, she has regretfully become a prisoner of those very “nice felicities” that have been formulated to protect her. And it is at Beachy Head, whose geographical wildness is somehow a counterpart to the madness of the “lunatic” and the irrational parts of Smith’s own psyche, that rationality ends so abruptly. Beachy Head with its five-hundred-foot sheer cliff face, is the most accessible experience of sublimity on the chalk downs of southern England.

Ann Radcliffe, Smith’s contemporary, also felt something of Beachy Head’s disorientation and a sense of personal threat. In a diary entry written after a visit with her husband, William, the preeminent novelist of Gothic horrors, appears to be strangely intimidated by her encounter with the sublime:

Walked to the shore and along it, with a hope of having some sight of the sea-front of Beachy Head from beneath it, Within half a mile of the great front, unable to proceed further; sat down on a block, wearied out, desiring William to go on; he was soon hid by the cliffs. Almost frightened at the solitude and vastness of the scene, though *Chance* [Radcliffe's dog] was with me. Tide almost out; only sea in front; white cliffs rising over me, but not impending; strand all around a chaos of rocks and fallen cliffs, far out into the waves; sea-fowl wheeling and screaming; all disappeared behind the point, beyond which, is the great cliff...²⁵

Again it is clear that, for a solitary woman writer, an open space was not necessarily a site of liberation. This passage, written on July, 23, 1800, is almost exactly contemporaneous with Smith's sonnet about the "lunatic", written just three years before in 1797. Radcliffe's uneasy perspective, in which her aesthetic appreciation is tempered by an ambivalent but unspecified discomfiture during her moment of solitude, reinforces the sense of mystique surrounding the vertiginous cliffs.

My claim that Smith's sonnet refers to Beachy Head is strengthened by the fact that her slightly macabre fascination for this sheer rock face, long notorious for suicides, is also explicitly recorded in a later poem called "Beachy Head." This lengthy but unfinished poem also features a wild character who is exiled from the corruptions of society. It is possible to speculate that the Parson Darby who "for many years had no abode than his cave, and subsisted almost entirely on shell-fish" in "Beachy Head" (Curran ed. 61), is the very same individual about whom Smith was warned a few years earlier. While she does not tell us that the "lunatic" lives in a cave, it remains plausible that the benign but

unorthodox hermit could have been considered an unstable, and hence threatening, character by local people. Unaccompanied women might well have been cautioned to beware.

If the writer refused to take heed of the caution about wandering on the headland, and successfully evaded hazard at the hands of the allegedly dangerous male, she could reclaim a space foreclosed to her by obedience to such prescriptions. By literally and physically walking away from society's "*nice felicities*,"²⁶ she could also walk away in a more figurative sense from the constructs and constraints that society placed upon her. However, the perils of wandering lonely are insistent and the italicized emphasis upon the pronoun "*he*" in line 11 implies strongly that Smith herself must, by contrast, take heed of the warning. So while the choice of the word "envy" might seem surprising in this context, it ultimately suggests resignation and not defiance. For women writers the possibilities to explore the predominantly masculine trope of the solitary wanderer are problematized by the confines of a more bounded existence and are more sharply contingent upon cultural expectations and local circumstances.

Therefore, beyond the literary highways of canonical male writers, a close reading of the texts of less-frequented women's writings reveals a problematic tension at the heart of the idea of the solitary wanderer, one of the central tropes of the romantic period. While I do not suggest that Wordsworth would have endorsed the impediments to wandering on the

part of women that I have described, I do believe that the self-revealing engagement with the countryside that he encouraged takes a form that is sharply contingent upon the identity of the wandering subject. As Lawrence Buell, puts it succinctly “in adolescence, female protagonists become socialized away from nature, while the male continues to enjoy freer mobility and the option of questing.”²⁷ Present environmental contemporary concerns, such as the issue of identity and spatial mobility as factors that complicate access to the land, allow for a re-reading that can expose the nuances of gendered difference in romantic texts. For women to engage in the romantic quest could be a risky undertaking, possibly earning a reputation for social transgression or making one vulnerable to physical attack. Romantic women could and did “wander lonely” in the countryside of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England, however, “wildly wandering” into the dangerous terrain of the sublime was ill-advised. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, technical improvements to the bicycle made unchaperoned exploration of the countryside more viable. Most ironically, it was the adoption of the chain that made this liberation possible.

¹ William Wordsworth, *William Wordsworth: Poetical Works*, ed. Thomas Hutchinson, Ernest De Selincourt (London: Oxford University Press, 1987), 737.

² Ellen Moers, *Literary Women*, (London: Women’s Press, 1978), p. 55.

³ Margaret Homans, *Women Writers and Poetic Identity: Dorothy Wordsworth, Emily Brontë, and Emily Dickinson* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980), 13.

⁴ Margaret Grainger, ed., *Natural History Prose Writings of John Clare*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 234.

⁵ See Anne K. Mellor, *Romanticism and Gender* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 188-189; Mary Russell Mitford, *Our Village*, (1832; rpt. London: Dent, 1936).

-
- ⁶ Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Short Residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (1796; rpt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1987), 115, 117.
- ⁷ R.W. Chapman, ed., *Jane Austen's Letters to Her Sister Cassandra and Others* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), 39.
- ⁸ Frank McLynn, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 108.
- ⁹ See Roy Porter, "Rape – Does It Have a Historical Meaning?" in *Rape*, ed. Sylvana Tomaselli and R. Porter (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 221.
- ¹⁰ A. D. Harvey indicates some of the difficulties and even contradictions that arise in the study of the evidence provided by legal records pertaining to this area. See A. D. Harvey, *Sex in Georgian England: Attitudes and Prejudices from the 1720s to the 1820s* (London: Duckworth, 1994), 75.
- ¹¹ Sarah Hazlitt, "Journey of my Trip to Scotland," *University of Buffalo Studies*, 24, (1959): 208.
- ¹² See Dorothy Wordsworth, *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Mary Moorman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 109.
- ¹³ William Wordsworth, *The Prelude* in *Wordsworth: Poetical Works*, 581.
- ¹⁴ Charlotte Brontë, *Villette* (1853; rpt. London: Dent, 1983), 38.
- ¹⁵ Ann Radcliffe, *The Romance of the Forest*, ed. Chloe Chard (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 299-300.
- ¹⁶ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile, or On Education*, ed. and trans. Alan Bloom (1762; rpt. New York: Basic Books, 1979), 361-362.
- ¹⁷ "The male is male only at certain moments. The female is female her whole life or at least during her whole youth" (Rousseau, 361).
- ¹⁸ Anne D. Wallace, *Walking, Literature and English Culture: The Origins and Uses of the Peripatetic in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 10, 18.
- ¹⁹ Maurice Buxton Forman, ed., *The Letters of John Keats*, 2nd ed. (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1935), 227.
- ²⁰ Florence May Anna Hilbish, *Charlotte Smith, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806)*, (Philadelphia, n.p.: 1941); Loraine Fletcher, *Charlotte Smith: A Critical Biography* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998).
- ²¹ See Stuart Curran, *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 30-31; Ernest De Selincourt, ed., *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, 6 vols., 2nd rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press), I: 381.
- ²² Stuart Curran, ed., *The Poems of Charlotte Smith, Women Writers in English 1350-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 61.
- ²³ Jeffrey C. Robinson, *Romantic Presences: Living Images from the Age of Wordsworth and Shelley* (Barrytown, N.York.: Clinamen Studies Station Hill, 1995), 180.
- ²⁴ Smith is singled out in Richard Potwhele's "Unsex'd Females." While Smith's published novels were favourably received, much contemporary critical opinion revealed anxiety about "democratic cant" – perceived radicalism in her allusions to social and political issues – and expressed disapproval of unconventional love matches among her characters. See Carroll Lee Fry, *Charlotte Smith, Popular Novelist*, (New York: Arno, 1980), 14-19.
- ²⁵ Qtd. in Clara Frances McIntyre, "Ann Radcliffe in Relation to her Times," *Yale Studies in English* 62 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1920; rpt. New Haven, Conn.: Archon Books, 1970), 27.
- ²⁶ The editor of the sonnet, Stuart Curran, suggests in a footnote that this is a misquotation from Horace Walpole (Curran ed., 61).
- ²⁷ Lawrence Buell, *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writings and the Formation of American Culture* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press), 46.