

"TO DESTROY THE TEACHER": WHITMAN AND MARTIN FARQUHAR TUPPER'S 1851 TRIP TO AMERICA

JOSEPH L. COULOMBE

MARTIN FARQUHAR TUPPER'S INFLUENCE on Whitman has been intermittently, and usually disparagingly, recognized. While critics often note the likeness of the two poets' long, prose-like lines, few acknowledge any other similarities. Yet Whitman openly admired the popular English author of *Proverbial Philosophy* (1838). On February 20, 1847, Whitman wrote in the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle*, "The author, Mr. Tupper, is one of the rare men of the time."¹ That many Americans agreed with Whitman is evident from the enormous sales of *Proverbial Philosophy*. The *Daily National Intelligencer* (Washington, D.C.) reported that between two and three hundred thousand copies were sold in America alone (April 1, 1851), and the *Literary World* estimated that over one million Americans had read Tupper's proverbial philosophies, "allowing five readers to each purchased copy, which is a low calculation" (June 7, 1851).

Tupper's preeminence extended beyond the reading public and into the literati. During his trip to America in March and April of 1851, he was warmly received by William Cullen Bryant, James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Nathaniel Parker Willis, as well as other notables. Only Derek Hudson's biography of Tupper gives any serious attention to this visit.² Relying on the poet's memoirs and letters, Hudson portrays the visit as successful and exciting for Tupper. If Hudson had followed Tupper's reception in the newspapers, however, he would have seen a less triumphant side of the visit. The American press attentively assessed Tupper's lectures and poetry, discussing his controversial attitude toward America, his sometimes jarring ideas on democracy and the sublime, and his often embarrassing propensity for public recitals. The press, alternatively blunt, disputatious, and laudatory, captured a side of Tupper not usually acknowledged today, a side with which Whitman probably became familiar.

Although relatively little is known of Whitman's life in 1851, no doubt he read newspaper accounts of Tupper's trip through the United States. At the time, Whitman lived in Brooklyn, operated a bookstore and printing office, and attended and gave lectures on art. Most impor-

tant, he was actively developing an aesthetic theory which would debut four years later in *Leaves of Grass*. Considering the press attention Tupper's visit received, Whitman would have found it difficult to ignore him. Ideas under discussion in the newspapers during Tupper's visit eventually appeared in Whitman's own poetry and prose, indicating not only that Whitman was aware of the ongoing dialogue about art in the press but also that Tupper very likely exerted some literary influence on Whitman's ideas at the time.

Most Whitman scholars, seemingly unaware of the debates in the press over Tupper's visit, give Tupper only a line or two. While most mention the similarity of form, the majority disparage Tupper and minimize his influence on Whitman.³ The English poet's vanishing reputation undoubtedly has led many critics to ignore him altogether.⁴ In *The Foreground of Leaves of Grass*, however, Floyd Stovall locates similar ideas in the poetry of the two men, venturing, "The one of Tupper's 'probabilities' most likely to have interested Whitman, then or later, is that evil is not a principle existing of itself, but only relative, a limitation of the good."⁵ Few critics follow Stovall's example (perhaps attributing the idea to Emerson instead of Tupper), and although some concede a very limited influence of Tupper on Whitman, most find no resemblances in their subject matter or ideas.⁶

A more detailed knowledge of Tupper's 1851 visit to the United States and his reception in the newspapers, however, forces a reassessment of the relationship between Tupper and Whitman. At the time, Whitman was absorbing a variety of cultural and literary influences, and Tupper was an irrepressible part of the cultural atmosphere. His popular success could not have escaped Whitman's attention. Tupper earned immediate celebrity with the publication of *Proverbial Philosophy* in 1838. American editions were issued in 1840 and 1843, two more in 1845, and at least two, usually more (sometimes as many as seven), every year from 1846 through 1855 (excluding 1854). An aspiring poet would undoubtedly covet Tupper's ever-expanding readership and try to learn from his example. After the publication of the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* (1855), Whitman must have been pleased to see it compared to Tupper's hugely successful work. The linking, even when negative, brought the all-important initial attention to his uniquely American poetry. (Whitman had no reservations about temporarily riding others' coattails to promote his own popularity, as his use of Emerson's letter shows.) A reviewer for the *London Leader* described Whitman's verse as "wild, irregular, unrhymed, almost unmetrical 'lengths,' like the measured prose of Mr. Martin Farquhar Tupper's *Proverbial Philosophy*."⁷ In the *London Examiner*, a critic supposed that, had Tupper been a self-satisfied backwoods auctioneer, "reading and fancying himself not only an Emerson but a Carlyle and an American Shakespeare to boot," then he would have written "a book exactly like Walt Whitman's

Leaves of Grass" (March 22, 1856). Whitman reprinted both of these reviews in the second issue of the 1855 edition and in the 1856 edition, shrewdly capitalizing on Tupper's popularity.

Whitman's use of Tupper to promote himself also linked him to other firmly established writers. During his visit, the press compared Tupper to various historical and literary giants on several occasions. The *Spirit of the Times* [New York], commenting on Tupper's proverbial philosophies, playfully wrote, "some people, we believe, thinks [sic] them pretty near as good as King Solomon's" (March 22, 1851), while the *Knickerbocker Magazine* asked, "When an American book-selling house can put forth a work entitled '*The Proverbs of Solomon and Tupper*,' how may a clever man not 'think small-beer' of himself?" (June 1851). Actually, the book was James Orton's *The Proverbialist and the Poet*, but it was comprised of quotations from three authors—Solomon, Shakespeare, and Tupper. Even Tupper was embarrassed by its implications,⁸ but the encomiums continued. The *Literary World* proclaimed *Proverbial Philosophy* "worthy of old Chaucer's 'Clerke of Oxenforde,'" outshining Hervey's *Meditations* and Colton's *Lacon*: "it is the Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Emerson of the masses" (June 7, 1851). Whitman's decision to associate himself with Tupper is no wonder; he was joining illustrious company indeed. Whitman's use of Tupper's reputation to further his own ends suggests that Whitman paid close attention to Tupper's progress in the newspapers. In fact, as we will see, some of the ideas under discussion during his visit reappeared later (often in an altered form) in Whitman's own writing.

Before Tupper's landing at New York, the newspapers were anticipatory and even slightly nervous, a mood apparently shared by the English poet himself. The New York *Evening Post* printed an extract from a letter by Tupper to J. C. Richmond: "Mind, I'm a friend, not a miserable lion; a frank brother, not a spy" (March 12, 1851). Most newspapers noted his arrival on March 14, 1851, and welcomed him to America. William Cullen Bryant, a great admirer of Tupper, published four of Tupper's rhymed and metered poems in the New York *Evening Post* (March 14 and 15, 1851). The poems, concerned with his departure and crossing, received passing comment in the New York *Evangelist*: "Though very good in their way, we trust they are not to be taken as indications of the excellent author's designs upon us, at least as to quantity" (March 20, 1851). If the *Evangelist* editors expected more quality and less quantity, they were disappointed. One of Tupper's poems, complete with the Whitmanesque title, "A Hymn for All Nations," appeared on March 22 in the *Home Journal* and was immediately translated into thirty languages and set to music by Samuel Sebastian Wesley.

Tupper's poetic efforts during his visit were not always so grandly received. Visiting the "Institution for the Blind" with several prominent

New York politicians and dignitaries, he recited a poem "written by himself," according to the *New York Tribune*: "He gave the first verse, and the remainder appeared to have escaped his memory, but, after a determined effort, they [sic] came back, and he was enabled to complete the recital" (March 24, 1851). Several newspapers mentioned Tupper's penchant for reciting his own poetry, a practice deemed unseemly at the time. A critic with the *Daily National Intelligencer* (Washington, D.C.) wrote, "He affects the manner of the minstrels of old times, in introducing himself, harp in hand, and forestalling hospitality by laying us under obligations to his muse. . . . Mr. Tupper evidently contemplates a sort of lyrical progress through the country" (April 1, 1851).

If some maintained a polite circumspection regarding the unusual practice, others ruthlessly attacked. *The American Review* printed, "How condescending, and how pleasantly and autobiographically egotistic of Mr. Tupper, 'English Poet and Philosopher,' to recite his own doggerel; to carry his own dunghill about with him to crow upon" (April 1851). *Harper's* was more discreet: "The renowned Tupper is undergoing the process of lionization. He has introduced a new feature into his representation of the part, by the recitation in public of his own verses" (May 1851). The *Knickerbocker Magazine*, though excusing Tupper's vanity, quoted *The Morning Star*: "His health having been drunk at a dinner in Baltimore, he incontinently sprang to his feet, and fired twenty-eight lines of original fugitive poetry at the assembled company" (June 1851). The critic suggested "a quiet, unostentatious way" for Tupper and, presumably, other aspiring poets following his progress.

In addition to his recitals, Tupper embarrassed himself in other ways and again lost admirers as a result. An impromptu speech made March 24 on Blackwell's Island caused an outcry from the American press. The *New York Herald* recounted the event on March 25:

Mr. Tupper then said—My dear friends, I have not prepared a speech. All I have to say is, that I love you. I have come over the Atlantic ocean to say I love you—to tell you that England loves you. You have some faults, which I do not mean to flatter; but you deserve to be called Englishmen. (Cheers, mingled with suppressed murmurs.) I find no difference. I have crossed the ditch, and I find you are Englishmen at the other side. (Cheers and hisses.) Yankee Englishmen, I mean. (Cheers and laughter.) I wish to write a book about you.

A Voice—Not in the Dickens' style.

Mr. Tupper—I want to tell the truth about you. I will protect you, though I am aware you do not need protection. I find England here as great as at home. I have come into the land of orators and statesmen. I want to say a few words about this institution. I have come among you.—(Interruptions, with cries of "Go on," amidst which Mr. Tupper sat down, while a horn was sounding in vain for silence.)

His patronizing attitude and sentimentalism caused the Baltimore *Sun* to print, "It was kind in Mr. Tupper to come so far to express so little. The United States can now afford to go ahead" (March 27, 1851). The New York *Herald* defended him, yet admitted that the speech was "not a philosophical mode of coming at the truth" (March 29, 1851). The *Herald* critic asserted that the United States was "the big volume of which will be examined, read, and quoted, when England will lie on the shelf, or be smugly carried, perhaps, in Uncle Sam's breeches pockets." The *American Review* was vitriolic: "What a burst! Vanity was at a high level when that was let off. . . . Lord, what a simpleton" (April 1851). Two weeks after the speech, the *Home Journal* informed readers that Tupper had travelled south "to pluck his laurels among the violets," adding, "We hope he may wear them long, and—modestly" (April 12, 1851).

Not all critics censured Tupper, however. The *Post*, in particular, attempted damage control. Reporting Tupper's public recital at the Church of St. Bartholomew, probably Bryant himself wrote, "after observing that he did not volunteer this service, but that having been requested the day previous to prepare an ode for the meeting, he had believed it his duty to comply" (March 25, 1851). The explanatory, almost apologetic, posture of Tupper and the *Post* writer, only a day after his original recital, suggests the powerfully negative public reaction to poets' readings of their own work.

Other critics shifted attention away from the embarrassing habit. While Tupper visited Philadelphia and then Washington, the critic for the *Herald* described Tupper's poetry as a fusion of "all the wisdom of the ancient and modern poets" (March 29, 1851). The same critic also made the somewhat commonplace suggestion that Tupper (and other poets) could improve his poetry by observing the United States: "He will examine the bold and gigantic scenery of this country, whence his poetical organization will derive fresh and bold impulses" (March 29, 1851). The *Knickerbocker Magazine* provided a different form of commentary on Tupper's poetry and printed a parody of *Proverbial Philosophy* (March 1851).

Yet Tupper could not stay out of trouble for long. The New York *Daily Tribune* quoted a correspondent for the *American Telegraph* who had spoken with Tupper: "He thinks there are only two great dangers ahead of this Government [of the United States]—one is that our religious toleration may lead us into infidelity; and the other, that the Jacobinism of a great number of the people may finally destroy the conservative spirit which alone can preserve us" (April 10, 1851). Despite his ecumenical "A Hymn For All Nations," such antidemocratic sentiments were bound to find opposition. A critic for the *North American Miscellany* wrote: "If Mr. Tupper says no more of us, he will not breed a mob. Mr. Tupper may be a prettier poet, but we hardly reckon him so

shrewd an observer of state policy as DeTocqueville" (April 19, 1851). Nevertheless, Tupper ventured another opinion, suggesting that the American flag was derived from George Washington's coat of arms. Explaining himself in the New York *Evening Post*, Tupper wrote, "[Y]our whole emergent eagle, fully plumed, is now long risen from his erie [sic], and soars sublimely to the sun of heaven" (May 20, 1851).

Although his thoughts on the flag received little notice in the press, Tupper's understanding of the sublime created another storm of discussion. The debate centered on Tupper's sonnet, "Niagara," which appeared in the New York *Evening Post* and contained the lines: "I longed for The Sublime! / —Thou art too Fair, / Too fair, Niagara, to be sublime" (May 7, 1851). Writing for the *Post*, Bryant explained that Niagara "delights rather than overawes. It is only after long contemplation of Niagara, that the mind opens to the idea of its vastness and grandeur." Bryant's justification did not appease all critics. The New York *Observer* reprinted the poem, adding, "We regret to say that he did not feel their sublimity as others have, who preceded him" (May 15, 1851). A month later, the *Albion* printed a response to "Niagara" from the anonymous "Horse-Shoe," who asked, "Has the soul of a 'Tupper' departed? or shall we say that he could never have had any?" (June 14, 1851). The editor of the *Albion*, however, disagreed with "Horseshoe," arguing that "a sense of the *sublime* is not particularly awakened by the most *perfectly beautiful* spectacle which the world contains." To the editor, the sublime must be "more majestic and more awe-inspiring" than Niagara Falls.

Tupper left the United States for England on May 24, 1851, and in May and June several newspapers and magazines reviewed *The Complete Works of Martin F. Tupper*, four volumes recently released by E. H. Butler of Philadelphia (his only authorized American publisher). Most of the reviews were favorable, but they provided only general comments on the poetry itself. A reviewer for the *Democratic Review*, however, offered a perspective which would not have been lost on Whitman: Tupper "is no doubt ambitious of standing well with the American public, through whom he has sagacity enough to see the works of an English author can alone be transmitted to posterity, and he takes pains to secure success" (June 1851). As already discussed, Whitman probably saw Tupper as both a positive and negative example of how a poet "secures success." Tupper's trip was essentially an effort to publicize his *Complete Works*. His impetuosity is echoed in Whitman's well-known efforts to promote himself. Both poets reveal an intrepid determination to gain popular recognition and success, and Whitman certainly agreed with the *Democratic Review* writer's assertion that aspiring poets should court an American reading public.

Yet what Whitman likely learned from Tupper and his trip to America involves more than the Englishman's example of self-promotion or his long lines. As Stovall suggested, the ideas of the two poets also intersect. Whitman's 1847 review of Tupper's *Probabilities, An Aid to Faith* in the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* supports Stovall's suggestion; Whitman wrote, it "has a lofty, an august scope of intention! It treats of the great mysteries of the future, of God and his attributes, of the fall of man, of heaven and hell!"⁹ Whitman admired the boldness and breadth of Tupper's subject matter, not mentioning form at all. The 1851 trip and its coverage in the newspapers provided an excellent opportunity for Whitman to study Tupper's ideas and their popular reception while developing his own aesthetic.

Several important topics discussed in the press during Tupper's visit later appeared in Whitman's poetry, prose, and lectures. The debates occasioned by Tupper's tour could have been more important to Whitman than Tupper's actual poetry. For example, the debate over Tupper's "Niagara" anticipated Whitman's keen interest in the sublime. Whitman's conception of the sublime differed substantially from Tupper's, however. To Whitman, the sublime involved a transcendental bond between the soul and nature. In the 1855 preface to *Leaves*, Whitman argued that the sublime came from within, not without: "What do you think is the grandeur of storms and dismemberments and the deadliest battles and wrecks and the wildest fury of the elements and the power of the sea and the motion of nature and of the throes of human desires and dignity and hate and love? It is that something in the soul which says Rage on, Whirl on, I tread master here and everywhere." Here Whitman brings the external inside himself and exults in the presence of the sublime; Tupper, on the other hand, focused only on the external and "longed for the sublime" ("Niagara").

The common conception of the sublime advocated in the newspapers concentrated on external nature and its effect upon human nature. The critic for the *New York Herald* suggested that Tupper, and presumably any poet, might embolden his poetry by observing the United States and its "gigantic scenery." Although the advice was apparently lost on Tupper, its Emersonian flavor had already found fertile ground in Whitman. Two days after the *Herald* article appeared, Whitman gave a lecture before the Brooklyn Art Union. He argued that the "province of Art" is to observe nature and then "nourish in the heart of man, the germ of the perception of the truly great, the beautiful and the simple."¹¹ In his preface to *Leaves* four years later, Whitman described a deeper, more personal relationship between the artist and nature: "His spirit responds to his country's spirit. . . . he incarnates its geography and natural life and rivers and lakes."¹² To Whitman, the sublime was a phenomenological concern, residing more in one's perception and perspective than in external objects themselves, but his conception of the

sublime was sharpened by the debates generated by Tupper's inability to find Niagara Falls sublime.

Less important than Whitman's evolving sense of the sublime and its relation to the newspaper commentary, but interesting all the same, are the ideas and phrases used by critics which later surfaced in Whitman's poetry. The New York *Herald* critic described Tupper's poetry as a fusion of "all the wisdom of the ancient and modern poets." Whitman also claimed such a fusion in *Leaves of Grass*: "My faith is the greatest of faiths and the least of faiths, / Enclosing worship ancient and modern and all between ancient and modern."¹³ Avoiding obvious literary allusions in his poetry, Whitman nevertheless avowed a comprehensive historical influence recognized in Tupper by the *Herald* critic. The same critic described the United States as "the big volume" of poetry, an analogy which anticipated Whitman's assertion in the 1855 preface: "The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem."¹⁴ Whether Whitman read the *Herald* article is less important than the fact that he somehow absorbed the very sentiments, practically the very words, voiced in the popular press. His disagreement with Tupper, who considered the States as a literary adjunct to England, underscores his desire to create a distinctly American poetry. Whitman undoubtedly objected to Tupper's Blackwell Island speech as well. In the 1855 preface to *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman noted the pride of Americans, "the fierceness of their roused resentment . . . their susceptibility to a slight."¹⁵ The press's outrage provided Whitman with a ready example of America's "roused resentment."

In addition to intersections of thought and word in the press and Whitman's writings, coincidental similarities also exist between Tupper's speech and Whitman's emerging style. The New York *Evening Post* published the extract from Tupper's letter: "Mind, I'm a friend, not a miserable lion; a frank brother, not a spy" (March 12, 1851). His words, like the statement from his speech ("I love you"), share a directness and simplicity with Whitman's "Song of Myself." Both are unabashed, spontaneous, and personal. Whitman, only two months before Tupper's speech, in the February 1, 1851, New York *Evening Post*, described artists as "warm, impulsive souls, instinctively generous and genial, boon companions, wild and thoughtless often, but mean and sneaking never."¹⁶ In light of this view, Whitman may have regarded Tupper's speech as well-intentioned, amiable impulsiveness, rather than conceited anti-Americanism; stylistically anyway, a likeness of tone and diction exists.

Whitman's belief in the good nature and impulsiveness of poets undoubtedly informed his opinion of Tupper's unannounced public recitals and their condemnation by critics. He surely sympathized with Tupper. Having studied and practiced oratory, Whitman certainly yearned for the chance to read his own poems, to make a "lyrical progress

through the country." After *Leaves of Grass* appeared, he dreamed of a lecture tour in 1858 to promote his poetry. His objective was "lecturing, (my own way)." In a draft of a circular, he wrote: "One dime—Or my fee for reciting . . ." and then deleted " . . . a Lecture."¹⁷ Perhaps by deleting "Lecture," he intended to leave open the opportunity to recite poetry as well. During the twenty years after Tupper's visit, however, public attitude shifted considerably. Whitman was invited to read a poem at the fortieth "National Industrial Exhibition" in September, 1871.¹⁸ He not only earned \$100, but received "loud and prolonged applause."¹⁹ The change of attitude probably resulted for several reasons, but Whitman evidently helped make the practice acceptable, all the time following Tupper's ill-received lead.

While the differences between Whitman and Tupper clearly overwhelm the similarities, the similarities should not be ignored. Whitman knew and learned from Tupper's poetry, as the intermittent critical commentary attests. In 1851, Whitman was still developing his own aesthetic theories. His active participation in the artistic community and the newspaper industry indicates that he would pay attention to the reception of a poet greatly admired by the populace and positively reviewed by him. Even though Whitman probably knew that he had surpassed or would surpass, Tupper as a poet, he was not above learning from his inferiors. Whitman kept a clipping from the *Edinburgh Review* (April 1849) on which was written, "It is the privilege of genius . . . to extract their gold dust out of the most worthless books."²⁰ Whitman's ability to glean the precious from the "worthless" actually shows real respect for Tupper. As he wrote in "Song of Myself," "He most honors my style who learns under it to destroy the teacher."²¹ In some ways, Whitman destroyed Tupper by appropriating and improving his style. But by doing so, he honored him as well, a distinction Tupper rarely receives today.

University of Delaware

NOTES

1 Emory Holloway, ed. *The Uncollected Poetry and Prose of Walt Whitman*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, Page, 1921), 1:136. Hereafter abbreviated as UPP.

2 Derek Hudson, *Martin Tupper: His Rise and Fall* (London: Constable Publishers, 1949).

3 In *Walt Whitman: His Life and Work* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1906), Bliss Perry wrote, "A more cogent example of the popular success then attained by a composition lacking rhyme, metre, and indeed rhythm—except such as inheres in its Biblical phraseology—was presented to Whitman in Tupper's *Proverbial Philosophy*" (90-91). Other critics were less even-handed. In *Walt Whitman & His Poetry* (London: George G. Harrap, 1915), Henry Bryan Binns, after finding several precursors for Whitman's

verse form, wrote, "Ossian was a warning rather than an example to him; so, surely, was Martin Tupper" (37). In *Walt Whitman's Pose* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938), Esther Shepherd grudgingly credited Tupper: "Outwardly, his unrhymed and unmeasured lines resemble those of Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy; but in no other way are they akin to those colorless platitudes" (103). In *Walt Whitman: Poet of Democracy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), Hugh Fausset merely listed Tupper among several "recognizable influences" upon Whitman (88).

4 Several major works on Whitman fail to include any reference to Tupper, notably Gay Wilson Allen's *The Solitary Singer* (1955; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985) and Justin Kaplan's *Walt Whitman: A Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980).

5 Floyd Stovall, *The Foreground of Leaves of Grass* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1974), 188.

6 In *Language and Style in Leaves of Grass* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), C. Carroll Hollis notes similarities between the poets' lists and catalogs as well as their propensity to address the reader directly. Ultimately, however, Hollis considers Tupper a "negative influence" (235). Both Paul Zweig in *Walt Whitman: The Making of a Poet* (New York: Basic Books, 1984) and Kenneth Price in *Whitman and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) believe that Tupper provided Whitman with a successful example of self-promotion. Zweig writes that Tupper "demonstrated that a poet could reach an audience vaster even than Longfellow's; that poetry could make use of the printing industry's new capacity to produce large numbers of books inexpensively, and get them into the hands of uncounted readers" (149). Beyond popularity, though, neither Zweig nor Price finds much to Tupper's credit. In *Whitman Between Impressionism and Expressionism: Language of the Body, Language of the Soul* (Lewisburg [PA]: Bucknell University Press, 1995), Erik Ingvar Thurin agrees, stating that Tupper's example is not enough to account for Whitman's innovation (82).

7 Quoted in Stovall, 256.

8 Hudson, 121.

9 UPP, 1:136.

10 Sculley Bradley and Harold W. Blodgett, eds. *Leaves of Grass* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1973), 720. Hereafter abbreviated as *Leaves*.

11 UPP, 1:241.

12 *Leaves*, 713.

13 *Leaves*, 78.

14 *Leaves*, 711.

15 *Leaves*, 712.

16 UPP, 1:237.

17 Quoted in Allen, 219.

18 Allen, 432.

19 Anonymous. "The American Institute. Inauguration of the Fair. The Opening Exercises—Poem by Walt Whitman." *New York Commercial Advertiser* (September 7, 1871). Cited in Scott Giantvalley, *Walt Whitman, 1838-1939: A Reference Guide* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1981), 31.

20 Quoted in Allen, 134.

21 *Leaves*, 84.