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Anxiety in Action: Letters of Advice between the Constables of East Bergholt in the Early Nineteenth Century

TREV BROUGHTON

The correspondence of John Constable (1776–1837), edited for the Suffolk Records Society by R. B. Beckett in the 1960s, has been thoroughly trawled for the evidence it offers of the evolution of, and changing influences on, his life and work as a landscape artist, as well as for the touching picture it affords of his prolonged and ultimately successful courtship of the local rector’s granddaughter, Maria Bicknell (1788–1828). Here, I examine the letters through a different lens, focusing on that portion of the family correspondence radiating from the family home in East Bergholt, and asking a series of questions at the interface of the biographical, the literary, and the historical. What do these letters do, and how do they do it? What do they suggest about the role and practice of correspondence in everyday family life in the early years of the nineteenth century? What part does the epistolary circulation of advice play in the maintenance of the correspondence and of family ties?

Much scholarly work on letters has taken as its starting point the history and ubiquity of the letter-writing manual, an approach that neglects the study of letter writing as a social practice. The impact of this branch of conduct literature on ordinary letters has largely been
CONDUCTING CORRESPONDENCE

There is now a well-established corpus of scholarly work attentive to the significance of letter manuals and model letters within various literatures of conduct and pedagogy, notably the French and Anglophone. Educational texts in a range of genres, including but not restricted to letter-writing manuals (or so-called secretaries), have been shown to stress the importance of correct habits of correspondence and of familiarity with relevant conventions, as part of the wider project of disseminating what Dana C. Elder dubs an “ethics of obligation.” The exemplary letter as featured in letter-writing manuals not only illustrates for its reader rhetorical competence and the correct relations between classes, genders, generations, and even nations; it may also model more aspirational qualities, such as wit, financial probity, sensibility, confidentiality, and integrity. Nor is correspondence between intimates exempt from the battery of recommendations. Written communications between family members and between friends – often called familiar letters – are, according to the letter-manual paradigm, as hemmed about by rules and ideals as are communications between employee and employer, client and patron. Even when the ideal in question is naturalness, it remains a learned, and normative, value.

While scholarship increasingly takes account of social change and competition between constituencies, the current scholarly concern with the letter as part of print culture’s armory of manners tends to foreground the ideological element of correspondence. Seen in this context, letters are primarily about conforming and confirming, about generating, reproducing, and regulating an assumed social consensus. Given what we now recognize as the longevity, popularity, multiplicity, and attention to detail of conduct literature, and especially of the letter manual, everything about correspondence, from the choice of paper to the manner of folding it, from the pitch of a compliment to the layout of the address, from the appearance of spontaneity to the rhetorical organization, would appear to be predetermined by deeply ingrained standards of propriety and
convention. When one adds to this the recognition that, until at least 1840, the British postal service was itself a matrix of surveillance and counter-insurgency, any idea of the letter as self-expressive, as subjective rather than subjected, seems utterly quaint. Insofar as letters conform to well-established epistolary conventions, offer formulaic advice to their recipients, and model decorum on the part of their senders, they can appear to function as a transparent medium of social regulation. According to this way of thinking, the maxims and pious sayings we find in the Constable family’s correspondence do little more than register their successful interpellation by an inescapably conservative letter-writing regime.

The existence, or even the consumption, of a letter manual does not, however, mean its advice is followed. The influence of conduct literature in general, and of a body of letter-writing conventions and exempla in particular, is notoriously difficult to gauge. For one thing, letter-writing guides were not as internally consistent with their own principles as their authors pretended and as some commentators imply. Extraneous values – such as celebrity, tradition, curiosity, excitement, and fun – frequently overrode morality in the selection of exempla. Recent scholars have noted the consequent moral divergences between the exemplary letters offered for imitation by secretaries and manuals, and the exemplary correspondents the readers are supposed to aspire to be. Challenging the idea of conduct literature as purely an instrument of repression and confinement, Vivien Jones has warned that we tend to “underplay . . . those aspects of conduct books which might suggest that their ideological effects were rather more precarious and mixed: the differences between individual texts; the ways in which they draw on a variety of, potentially contradictory, generic motifs; and the fluid and various context of a newly burgeoning print culture within which they were produced, and within which, even more importantly, they were actively consumed.”

Following Jones, we might say that the internal contradictions of the letter manual mean that it may lend itself to a range of readings, from the pleasurably compliant to the consciously transgressive. She goes on to hypothesize “resistant readings of [eighteenth-century] conduct literature which might have emerged from, and contributed to, that atmosphere of family negotiation and public debate around issues of desire, pleasure, duty and property. If the impact of prescriptive writing on any particular behavior or belief is seldom straightforward or predictable, and in any case difficult to prove in retrospect, the case of letter writing is especially refracted. Even the survival of a tenet or protocol derived from print culture in a given familiar letter does not guarantee its impact on the letter’s addressee and hence on the correspondence. The relationship between epistolary dogma and actual correspondence – between the normative and the normal – is thus complicated, to say the least. For an epistolary ideal to make its mark on human interaction it must take its chances in a disconcerting bagatelle of incommensurate interests and forces, including competing ideals and pragmatic (and therefore nonideal) negotiations. Needless to say, the stock figures and standard exchanges of the letter manuals – “an officer in the army, to his son at a boarding school, recommending diligence in his studies,” or “a young woman, just gone to service in London, to her mother in the country” – seldom survive the complex situations and shifting relationships that real correspondence mediates. Instead, as we shall see, correspondents developed their own personae through which to harness affect to effect. Ann Constable’s letter-writing persona, while not a vehicle for some essential or pre-discursive self, is never, even at its most prescriptive or trite sounding, merely a passive inscription of disciplinary regimes.

Most of the surviving East Bergholt correspondence covers a period when Golding Constable (1739–1816), a successful miller and grain merchant, was gradually handing over the reins of his business to his youngest son Abram (1783–1862),
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having reluctantly countenanced John, the eldest, in his vocation as a painter and consequent removal to London. In addition to Abram, there were still three adult offspring living at home: unmarried daughters Ann junior, usually known as Nancy (1768–1854), Mary (1781–1862), and Golding junior (1774–1838), a son who seems to have had learning disabilities of some kind. Another daughter, Martha (1769–1845), had already married and moved to London by the onset of the published correspondence. While their mother, Ann, was overseeing communications between the nucleus of six East Bergholt Constables and the two absent siblings, she seems also to have kept in contact with a wide network of cousins, aunts, and uncles.

Reading the correspondence, one is immediately aware that it consistently participates in at least three overlapping, but not necessarily fungible, moral economies, each with its portion of obligations and responsibilities. The first is that represented by the family as a unit. It is dominated by the idea of duty to one’s parents, which forms the apex of a hierarchical network of familial loyalties perceived to be structural to Christian conduct, as well as necessary to the prosperity and stability of the family business. Individually, the letters iterate this structure through performances of authority and deference; cumulatively, they reinforce it through the attentiveness and regularity of the correspondence. The second moral economy is that of credit and debit, which underpins the protocol of family correspondence as it proceeds over time. “I am certainly in point of etiquette a letter in debt to your Aunt Gubbins and Cousin Jane,” concedes Ann Constable to her absent son, adding tartly that “as writing I know is a trouble to them, I cannot but think reading my letters may be more so.” In this sense of credit and debit, letters are part of a wider domestic budget of gifts sent, acknowledgements returned, compliments and remembrances circulated: a moral economy manifest in the matter, as well as the materiality, of letters. Finally, and sometimes in tension with this system, is a more contingent and thus precarious array of patronage relations: a set of favors and obligations whereby those who cannot or do not travel (such as carers and dependents) rely for communication on letters physically conveyed by those who can and do (usually the wealthy and/or independent). Ann Constable thus occasionally finds herself writing an extra letter to John simply to acknowledge a favor offered by an eminent visitor to the metropolis: “Mr. Travis senior [the local physician] is going to London tomorrow, and has been so kind as to offer to take a letter &c. for me. I am unwilling to neglect this courtesy – therefore I write by this friendly conveyance to you.”

Frequently, the content of a particular letter is perceived to be less socially significant than the conditions of its delivery: the opportunity thus afforded to recognize an act of kindness or express an obligation. The medium, in such instances, is the message. Ann Constable’s location in these concurrent economies is complex and fluctuating. Rhetorically, she must resolve, or at least fudge the difference among, several roles: her relatively powerful position as maternal preceptress and the more conditional roles she occupies as family mediator, female dependent, and provincial onlooker. Her earliest extant letter follows her twenty-two-year-old eldest daughter Nancy to London, where she is spending Christmas with her aunt Gubbins. The letter accompanies a gift of fruit and a turkey for the Gubbins household, as well as some spare shoes for Nancy to counteract the “dirty” weather. Despite its festive occasion, the missive is characteristically but unselfconsciously pious, reminding Nancy not to let her “joy for the birth of a Saviour . . . evaporate into sin & sensuality,” and drawing from the Christmas text “good will towards men” a brisk lesson in Christian charity. Within the category of good will she enumerates “duty to our Parents, such as cheerful compliance to their lawful wishes & desires (& no other would good parents ever give), tender solicitude to their anxieties & care on our account, & kind attention & allowances for the infirmities of their age.” Next down in
then aged thirty-one and pursuing his career as an artist in London, is dated 23 June 1807 and signed “your Affectionate & Anxious Mother.” This is a frequent tag in her correspondence. If affection is the dominant theme of her letters to John, the minor chord of solicitude is never far away. Discernible in almost every missive, it is often explicit, and sometimes emphatic: “I remain as ever your truly affectionate tho’ anxious Mother.”

The wonted connotations of anxiety, consolidated in the eighteenth century, stem from its etymology in *angere*: to choke or oppress. To be anxious, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, is to be “troubled in mind about some uncertain event; being in disturbing suspense; concerned, solicitous.” Its orientation toward an unknown and uncontrollable future makes it the disposition par excellence of parenthood, while its quality of suspension, of being in the wrong place or time, of missing and being missed, places it among the emotional keynotes of the familial letter. Parental letters such as Ann’s do not, however, just fret about and deplore the uncertain future of offspring; they strive actively to anticipate, to forestall, and to shape it. So another meaning is at play in Ann Constable’s subscription, a more positive resonance evident in the happy assonance of “affectionate and anxious”: to be anxious is to be “full of a strong desire to do something.” There is a sense in which Ann’s concern, expressed as an active “desire to do something,” is a badge of honour, an extension into the realm of writing of her status and role as mother. If anxiety is her lot, it is also her pledge, her title, her claim on her son’s attention and conduct. In her exchanges with John, Ann’s iterations of maternal disquiet may seem at first glance to express powerlessness, but they function, as often as not, as grounds of authority and prompts to action.

The determination to shape the future that underpins, and expresses itself as, Ann’s maternal prerogative, and which exacts the ritualized deference, courtesy, and attention of a junior to an elder family member, competes for

**ANXIETY AS CORRESPONDENCE**

A characteristic feature of Ann’s letter to Nancy is its emphasis on anxiety as a node connecting the role of the writer and that enjoined on her addressee: inviting children’s “tender solicitude to their [parents’] anxieties,” the mother mobilizes a traffic of concern that will unite the generations while providing the momentum of the correspondence. As it turns out, maternal anxiety both tempers the emotional atmosphere of many of her letters and provides a key to her strategy as correspondent. The first surviving letter from Ann to her son John,
Anxiety in Action

is to acknowledge the exigencies of the ritual, while also reacting to the urgency of the occasion. The passage usefully underlines the capacity of correspondence to contribute to the regulation of civility (in "the best managed and most sociable circles") while providing opportunities to address and resolve specific "troubles and anxieties."

From the start, then, Ann Constable’s surviving correspondence is unashamedly, although not unfeelingly, didactic. It draws liberally on a broad repertoire of oral and textual advice cultures: witness her casual references, even in a passage as brief as that quoted above, to a Shakespearean aphorism (the "milk of human kindness") and to the sententiae popularized by school exercises ("juvenile copies"). In her broad survey of eighteenth-century published letters, Clare Brant has challenged the idea that "letter-writers followed manuals like literate sheep," pointing out that letters were as likely to be influenced by such miscellaneous resources as fiction, the Bible, changing ideals of originality, and the expectations and needs of fellow correspondents as by explicit systems of correspondence. Although brimming with clichés, aphorisms, and saws, Ann Constable’s prose constitutes a distinctive epistolary voice: one that improvises a sense of immediacy from the jostling of traditions, and that deploys a rhetoric of disruptive anxiety in the maintenance of an engaged and enhanced sociability.

WRITING ADVICE

For many reasons, including migration, social mobility, schooling, and training, familiar letters wrote parental relationships into being, partly, as we have seen, through the communication of anxiety and the distribution of advice. As Clare Brant puts it: "Letters helped create and uphold the character of parent," while allowing "parents to put a frame of concern and love" – a combination I identify here with Ann’s self-construction as anxious parent – "around advice and dispense that advice in small, letter-sized doses." According to this view, the rhetoric of affect is the sweetener in the stern business of parental regulation. My reading of the Constable letters suggests a slightly more
complex picture. Concern is expressed as advice, and the “anxious mother” persona fuses the character of parent as authority with that of mother as indulgent and tender carer. As a rhetoric that unobtrusively unites affect with agency, and the structural with the contingent, anxiety facilitates the role of Ann’s letters as an effective medium of advice.

By established precedent and according to a shared set of values, correspondence was regarded within the Constable family as a legitimate and capacious forum for guidance and support as households proliferated, economic interests diversified, and allegiances shifted. In season and out, the family letters, especially those of Ann to John, overflow with sage precepts. Moral, spiritual, and bodily welfare, the minutiae of respectability: no element of life but suggests some wise axiom or juicy proverb. Seldom at a loss for a timely platitude or word of advice, whether about diet ("the happy medium between repletion and abstemiousness"), early rising ("Sitting up late, wastes the spirits, the circulation, the coals, the candles, & makes the morning languid"), health ("keep your feet warm and dry"), domestic economy ("pray keep out of debt, that earthly Tantalus"), industry, piety, or the maintenance of family peace through the observation of proper courtesies, Ann Constable effortlessly assumes the prerogative of a parent to supervise, direct, and reprove a child. Even when, as in these letters, the children in question are adults, duty to parents remains at the apex of the Constable regime, second only to (but actually epitomizing) duty to God in the family creed. When Nancy goes visiting to London, when Martha marries, when John leaves home to pursue his artistic studies in London, letters come into their own as a medium of parental surveillance and filial accountability.

The Constable correspondence reminds us, however, that a parent’s rhetoric of concern may complement epistolary advice-giving, but is not a prerequisite. Ann Constable is quite capable of administering the medicine without the spoonful of sugar, and the occasions on which she withholdsunction throw into relief her more typical tact. She responds guardedly, for instance, to a letter from John probing the thorny subject of his expectations from his grain-merchant father (or his “future participation of this world’s goods,” in Ann’s caustic paraphrase). After an ominously minimal “Dear John,” she notes acridly that she has “received your letter of the 3rd instant and observe every sentence of it with maternal accuracy and attention.” In a language whose emotional neutrality (“accuracy and attention”) is pointedly cold in contrast to her customary attitude, she shows that she can, in extremis, wield authority without anxiety. In a distant echo of the stickling proprieties of the letter manual, the vigilance and meticulousness that characterize Ann’s supervision of her son’s epistolary conduct serve here to remind him of her wider surveillance of his filial duties.

Clearly, the importance for family cohesion of a smooth-running epistolary sociability, which can accommodate the prompts and suggestions of an anxious parent, can be challenged by countervailing loyalties and local emergencies. At such points, the rhetoric of affectionate anxiety is liable to be deposed or derailed. Secure in her position of preceptor, Ann Constable seldom gives vent to anxiety in a form that we would today identify as pathological and paralyzing. Nonetheless, she is hard pressed when confronted by ambiguities in her son’s duty, which arise from conflicts engendered by his courtship. Her confidence is shaken by interests calling on respect for another family’s elders and expectations. On hearing of John’s being at last granted permission to correspond with Maria Bicknell, the London-based granddaughter of Dr. Rhudde, the wealthy but irascible vicar of East Bergholt, Ann finds herself tripped into unwonted uncertainty: “[W]hat can this mean! . . . what ought I to think or do – indeed I am in a great straight. My maternal anxiety is almost overpowering to me.” What does this turn of events mean for the family? At this point, her fears about a union that could prove disastrous (as defying the implacably opposed Rhudde and caus-
The letters between John Constable and his family ponder everything from the fashion in shirts to the essentials of faith, but the energies of exchange play most persistently around a few flashpoints: points of friction between family members, especially over understandings of manliness. Whereas everyone in the family concurs with John that a respectable independent position, based on effort rewarded, is a sine qua non of manhood, there is considerable difference of opinion as to how this quest for independence is to be reconciled with his immediate need to keep his own body and soul together, with the complex interdependencies of kinship and patronage, and with Christian virtue. From one point of view, the issues at stake are simply actuarial, and the letters advise by laying out alternative outcomes. Can John afford to defy the family elders from whom he might have financial expectations? Can he afford to marry a genteel person such as Maria given his uncertain prospects? Can he afford to be as indifferent as he seems to immediate gain (such as might be available through portrait painting) in the hope of long-term success (in the much less assured market for landscape painting)? Drawing liberally on the rhetoric of parental concern, Ann, Golding senior, and Ann's wealthy brother David Pike Watts (1754–1816), a supporter of John's career, lay out the risks and urge calculation.

The need to secure a respectable independence is the main thrust of the advice that John regularly receives from his family – counsel that is no less irritating for being apparently unarguable. As a characteristic letter from his mother puts it: "Would you but make yourself independent, how much would you exalt my heartfelt anxieties on your account. Your valuable Uncle D. P. W. is kind and good but the best friend will tire of giving and lending, without they see great industry and a desire to gain – which must be in such times and such a world as this, but we are fast travelling to another and a better – if we live & act uprightly." The gist of Ann's diatribe is clear: for a man, independence is to be sought as the greatest blessing this imperfect world has to offer. Equally significant, however,
is Ann’s decision to express that advice conditionally (“would you . . . would you”) rather than as a potentially confrontational imperative, or even in the more emphatically obligative should. That odd phrase, “exalt my heartfelt anxieties,” meanwhile, conveys some of the positive resonances of anxiety, while making it clear that, paradoxically, independence will always be dependent on a favorable “account” of John within the family. The whole passage is syntactically effortful, veering awkwardly between tenses and moods, and between practical, ethical, and Christian registers, in a way that underlines the difficulty in reaching a secure consensus about manliness as “value.” Here, independence, industry, and “desire to gain” sit uncomfortably alongside the virtues of the patron (“kind and good . . . giving and lending”), and even more uneasily beside the implications of “another and a better” world. These three fields of merit imply, at the very least, different relationships to money and to futurity (figured as, respectively, desire for economic gain, family expectations, and unworldly piety). Incommensurate hopes and fears are offered up as, and momentarily stabilized in, an anxiety that cannot finally be assuaged but can be “exalted” through hard work.

For the senior Constables, the importance of application and regularity of conduct appear safe themes, in that they provide common coin in the various currencies of manliness. The family wealth has been built on punctuality, businesslike habits, and the careful husbanding of opportunity – as Ann sometimes cannot resist underlining: “All our harvest, was finished on Saturday to satisfaction and thankfulness.” Although the Constables have by this time secured a genteel social standing as merchants and property owners, their primary reliance on milling, and hence on agriculture, is central to the familial self-image and lexicon. When Golding senior approves of his son’s application to his artistic studies over the summer, Ann relays his commendation in the family idiom: “[H]e thinks you was very industrious & made hay as it were while the sun shone.”

Even this consensus about industriousness and completion, however, turns out to be built on shaky premises. Commenting on John’s recent visit to the retrospective exhibition of work by Joshua Reynolds (1723–92) at the British Institution in 1813, his mother ventures a little egging on. The extent of Sir Joshua’s achievement offers the opportunity of a pointed lesson to the dawdling aspirant: “[W]ho can then be satisfied with one landscape, a few sketches & some unfinished portraits, for an annual employment?” John’s perceived tendency to lose interest in a project before it is completed proves a constant source of tension, and the strategies of epistolary intervention adopted by his elders are revealing. Ann’s cautious rhetorical question betrays her consciousness of entering a minefield. Her husband’s epistolary persona is quite different. One of Golding senior’s rare but hard-hitting interventions urges: “When once you have fixed on a subject, inish it in the best manner you are able, & not through despair put it aside & so ill your room with lumber.” The rhetoric is direct, accusative, imperative. Whereas Ann Constable’s idiom of parental advice strives to balance unarguable commonplaces of duty and loyalty with the inessed strategizing necessary – as both mother and son see it – to maximize John’s expectations from his patrons and from the patriarchs of the family (Ann’s husband, Golding senior, her brother David Pike Watts, and John’s putative father- and grandfather-in-law, Charles Bicknell and Dr. Rhudde), Golding dispenses with diplomacy and models a direct, peremptory style of authority. Constitutionally skeptical about John’s chance of making a financial success of his chosen profession, Golding seldom pulls his punches. Writing a solemn New Year’s Eve message in 1811, he characteristically foregoes affectionate preliminaries with a stark “Dear John,” before launching into a businesslike assessment of the situation: “Your present prospect & situation I consider as far more critical than at any former period of your life; as a single man I fear your rent and outgoing, on the most frugal plan, will be found equal to the
produce of your profits. . . . If my opinion was requested it would not be to give up your female acquaintance in toto; but by all means to defer all thoughts of a connection until some removals have taken place, & your expectations more certainly known.” Golding’s advice-giving abjures the dispositions used by Ann (anxiety, care, and so on) in favor of cooler language (fear, consideration, opinion). Imperatives are used freely, rhetorical questions are immediately and unhesitatingly answered. Euphemisms (“your female acquaintance,” “some removals”) are deployed not to obscure the cash nexus, but to draw attention to it by their very transparency; after all, Golding’s own removal is partly at issue here. To Ann’s pleas that John should apply himself industriously, Golding senior adds the more brutal qualifier to focus on “such parts as pay best” and to “Think less and finish as you go.” Shunning interiority and self-reflexion in his own discursive style, he recommends an equally matter-of-fact approach in his artist son: “[Y]our too great anxiety to excel may have carried you too far above yourself: . . . you make too serious a matter of the business & thereby render yourself less capable.” Whereas anxiety powers Ann’s efforts as advisor, Golding codes such an attitude as feminine and unmanly. Getting on with the job should require neither discussion, nor fafing about, nor emotional turmoil. Only toward the end of the letter does the stern demeanor relax a trifle, and then the cordiality serves only to underscore the authority of his advice: “Be of good cheer John; as in me you will find a parent & a sincere friend.”

The austerity of his fatherly style is mitigated three weeks later by the favor of a check for twenty pounds appended to a letter of business, although the fact that the check survives intact suggests that John remained stubbornly averse to the gesture of concession that cashing it might have implied.

In a parallel correspondence, yet another mode of advice addresses the issue of finishing. John’s “valuable” maternal uncle, David Pike Watts, who fancies himself a connoisseur of art as well as a collector of artists (and who, in fact as well as in imagination, was a generous sponsor of his nephew’s career) is perhaps the most readily disposed of John’s relations to shift from avuncular advice to art criticism. A surviving letter of 1810 offers twenty-five carefully numbered comments on Constable’s altarpiece for St. James’s Church, Nayland, Christ Blessing the Elements (1810), only two of which are unqualified praise, and the longest of which complains that “The Face, Neck and Hands are left in an unfinished state . . . so crude and smeared as to show real haste and want of care.” Recommending that Constable return to “complete the Face & Neck” before long, Watts, never one to hold back, opines that “It is scarcely justifiable for any Picture to be shewn so raw, unless a Testimony was affixed that the Artist died before he could finish it.”

Three years later, when Watts yet again hazards “that unpleasant thing, advice,” it is on the familiar theme. He begins playfully enough, suggesting that John should “place or paint a little Starling on [his] Easel with the words ‘Finish! Finish!’” before reporting, more sententiously, the “great struggle” that has prevented him purchasing John’s recent canvas Water Gates (1813): that is, the struggle between “the desire to oblige you . . . and the Revolt which will check such a desire when the Eye perceives Unfinished Traits.” In a response sent on the same day, Constable echoes his uncle’s shift from familiarity to patronage, moving rapidly from filial duty (“Accept my best thanks for the excellent advice”) to chilly professional courtesy: “Your kind solicitude respecting my picture of the Lock . . . may now cease, as the picture has become the property of Mr. Carpenter, who purchased it this morning. He is a stranger, and bought it because he liked it.” Here we see the uncle’s attempts at affectionate anxiety being echoed back to him in the altogether cooler guise of “kind solicitude.”

The sketches and trial canvases that seem like so much wasted time (“lumber”) to his family are, of course, part of John’s self-training as a landscape specialist, as well as a portfolio of details, ideas, and techniques for future reference. And
bachelor establishment. She rejects the arrangement on the grounds of cost and class (“he may be company but he cannot be a companion, & that is what you want to ascend”), but also on the grounds that Johnny may be contaminated by the same morally debilitating relations as she attributes to her son: “[H]e will prove like his patron; & never again regard his home & parental ties, as he did before.” Letters consistently promoting “home & parental ties” are intended to trump the more fickle enticements of patronage, although, as we have seen, the two relationships could merge disconcertingly in questions of financial support, expectations, and inheritance. At the same time, John’s parents and uncle use letters to shore up their seniority by hinting at ways in which his apparently eccentric attitude to the marketplace seems inconsistent with filial duty. According to their advice, his exacting definition of professional attainment, repeatedly coded in their letters as his failure to “finish” paintings, effectively prolongs his dependence on his natal family’s resources. The family correspondence as a whole struggles with the paradox that the patronage relations integral to professional success curtail Constable’s moral independence while subtending his prospects for financial autonomy. It is an area in which the ideology of family loyalty and duty can be jeopardized by the (almost) equally exacting ideology of independence: the duty of a grown man to be self-supporting and self-determining.

This paradox, as we have seen, makes the correspondence between father and son particularly unstable, and in need of careful supervision by other family members. While Golding senior’s incursions in the correspondence represent a rare but avowedly authoritative intervention in the circulation of advice, it is understood within the family that his contributions lack the emotional plenitude of Ann’s pleas, and thus must be contextualized within wider evidence of his attachment. She finds ways of testifying to her husband’s good intentions, even as she supports the tenor of his argu-

The particular conditions of John Constable’s chosen profession, then, exacerbate the potential for epistolary umbrage, or even rift. His need to cultivate influential friends, nurture “expectations,” and to keep the peace with actual or potential benefactors and their demands often seems nettlingly at odds with the exigencies of both family dignity and personal integrity. The dilemma seldom results in open conflict, although when it does, Ann, as we have seen, can be severe. Attuned as her advice-giving is to the nuances of respectability, she can rise to stinging rebuke as well as nudge with persuasion. She condemns his decision to enlist Johnny Dunthorpe (1798–1832), son of his artisan-class village friend, as his assistant, and his invitation to Dunthorpe to share his London
ments. He may consciously disavow the rhetoric of anxiety, but anxious he must nonetheless be seen to be. "Thank God your Father is purely [well]," Ann reports, "& often talking of you, both when awake & sleeping – so you must be convinced, how near your welfare is to him. His earnest wish, is to have you what he terms, earn money." Despite Ann's respectful deference to her husband's prudence and wisdom, such letters constitute an epistolary subculture within the family in which the (adult) children and their mother discreetly "manage" Golding senior's impressions and responses, reframing his imperative to "earn money" as "wishes" for "welfare." Many a "voluntary" action by the father in a desirable direction is noted by the mother with a short but conspiratorial comment: "[S]o far – so good, " so much the better." Although Golding's letters, so formal and final in their dispensation of wisdom that they appear neither to require nor invite a written response, threaten to short circuit the flow of correspondence and with it the flow of attention, other family members are alert to the danger. In a letter accompanying funds, which had been coaxed from Golding senior sufficient to acquit John of a recent debt, his younger brother Abram reminds John that "money comes loath from our Father . . . without value apparent," and that a letter of thanks would not come amiss: "[H]owever my Father appears to condemn, he likes outward attention as much as most." Any suggestion that John can dispense with diplomacy because his father does so meets opposition: what might be acceptable as plain-spokenness from the elder is not tolerated from the junior.

A CORRESPONDENCE IN TRANSITION

Despite the quiet maneuvering and stage management evident in the correspondence, Ann Constable is keen to underline, and her offspring formally to acknowledge, the financial, social, and symbolic significance attached to the figure of the father as provider and guarantor of domestic unity and material stability. While Golding's letters are infrequent and businesslike, and although other family members appear sometimes to run epistolary rings round him, respect for his position is consistently represented as the anchor of family coherence. On Golding senior's recovery from one of his regular seasonal ailments, his wife trusts that "we may still (I hope) continue some time united by the band of his respectability and undivided property in the family circle." The death of the father, and the consequent redistribution of power, credit, and resources from one generation to the next, are foreseen not just as a cause of grief in and of themselves, but also as a site of potential conflict and class hazard. With the inevitable division of property, whose respectability, and whose efforts, will suffice to "unite" the family circle? Can the epistolary circulation of anxiety and attention be maintained as one generation yields to another? Who will respect, worry about, and advise whom?

As his parents decline in health, the youngest Constable, Abram, assumes more responsibility for the family business, and it gradually falls to him – reputed the siblings' "readiest writer" – to take on, not always comfortably, the role of epistolary advisor, broker of the family's reputation, and champion of its values. Abram's style of counsel develops over time and is in some ways distinct from that of either parent. While Golding's letters often look and sound like decrees, and Ann's dispense maxims freely and unapologetically, Abram's approach is much more cautious. Advice to his brother John is dealt out sparingly, smugly inside of a large budget of news. Awareness of the sensitivities of appearing to hector a brother who, although older (and indeed by now middle aged), is still an active drain on the household resources, Abram seldom resorts to direct guidance. Instead, he tends to model self-accounting for his brother, interjecting tiny homilies to himself within family gossip: "Poor Uncle Thomas's was a melancholy finish . . . I pray to profit by his example & in a review of his faults not to overlook my own, which are many." Warnings to John, which might other-
wise strike his reader as priggish or sententious, are offered as arising naturally from ruminations about his own spiritual and moral welfare. Hence the lesson of Uncle Thomas’s fate is gently passed on: “[L]et not your spirits be cast down, as we do not know what awaits us . . . a few years will put an end to all cares & pleasures.”54 Writing to John is presented as an opportunity to reflect on, and attempt to balance, the benefits and costs of being his father’s successor in the business – a fate that has tied him to the provinces and the family establishment, but that at least promises financial rewards commensurate with his enterprise (unlike his brother’s less certain efforts): “[T]he more I do, the more I can do, and the better I like it . . . idleness can never be happy . . . I hope I shall be able to pass through Life, with some sort of happiness, independent of all that one would wish to be independent of.”55 Abram uses the tactic of a lecture to himself on the satisfactions of hard work as a vehicle for recommending his own attitude to John (a potentially insubordinate stance in a younger brother). The final phrase is telling, encapsulating as it does the moral and emotional, as well as financial, pressures on masculine self-definition, and the difficulty of recognizing and acknowledging, never mind attaining, the proper forms of independence. In tentatively proffering himself as fraternal exemplum, Abram proposes a relative – and thus ironically dependent – definition of independence: a strategy designed to smooth out incompatibilities between his own professional ethos and his brother’s. Epistolary care is tendered less in the form of direct advice than in “hopes” and “wishes” that the brothers can feasibly share.

Such tact marks Abram’s awareness that, in due course, he will inherit his parents’ responsibilities as head of the East Bergholt Constables, without their moral leverage as parents. In fact, the decisive transition between generations came rather suddenly. The deaths of Ann and Golding Constable senior in 1815 and 1816 respectively, were followed swiftly by John’s decision to defy his fiancé’s family and marry Maria Bicknell.56 By early 1819, East Bergholt House had been sold, and the unmarried siblings – Ann junior, Mary, Abram, and Golding junior – had dispersed to separate establishments.57 These events – as far as we can see from the surviving letters – slow and narrow but do not arrest the flow of epistolary support to John. The professed duty to express and, where possible, mitigate anxiety, remains part of the epistolary currency shared among the siblings, just as that duty prevailed in their mother’s correspondence.58 They soon find ways, too, of conflating their mother’s pious moralizing with their father’s more worldly good sense. The exhortation, as the ever-cautious Abram puts it, to thank “kind providence for the blessings within our reach” – with its watchful balance of submissiveness and enterprise – is traded back and forth, especially at times of potential strife over money.59

All, but especially Abram, deplore the need to interfere in any matter touching on John’s (always twitchy) sense of personal dignity: “Nothing could induce me thus to write to you, perhaps hazarding your censure, but my sincere regard for your interest, & future welfare, therefore I trust you will make those allowances for me I require.”60 Family loyalty and affection have some purchase, but do not automatically exact that “cheerful compliance to [parents’] lawful wishes & desires (& no other would good parents ever give).” The affective epistolary currency – anxiety, regard, trust, allowance – of which parents are the guarantor, has to be earned by a sibling, and the basis for epistolary intervention has to be renegotiated.

The generational shift and its coincidence with John and Maria’s marriage thus mark a moment of renegotiation of epistolary authority within the family, as well as a tentative retuning of the familiar advice-giving voice to accommodate John’s changed domestic and legal circumstances. Advice must now take into account what Ann junior (Nancy) tactfully calls “your whole self.”61 The unselconscious platitudes and aphorisms so characteristic of the matriarch’s idiom, although they do not disappear com-
pletely, gradually fade from the family idiolect as sibling correspondence supersedes more direct parental surveillance.\(^59\) As time goes by, and as John becomes more firmly established as the head of his own growing household in the metropolis, the hitherto unquestioned sense of his behavior, reputation, and expectations as common property – shared not just within the family at East Bergholt but even in the village as a perceived open invitation for commentary – is gradually modified. The unmarried, childless siblings remaining at home find their sphere of legitimate influence curtailed by distance and difference in experience, and by the gradually diverging interests and expectations of John’s London professional circle. The family correspondence finds many ways of accommodating and managing such differences and thus keeping the ball rolling – often by asking for advice and, thereby, tactfully acknowledging unfamiliar cultural capital. Hence, John and his married sister Martha are urged to participate in the potentially divisive sale and distribution of the contents of the East Bergholt house: “as unmarried ones want a little assistance from those of more experience in the wants of housekeeping.”\(^60\) Likewise, a complaint from Abram – all the more wistful for its comparative rarity in his letters – about the pressures of running the family business in hard times, and a gentle nudge to his self-absorbed brother to count his blessings, are couched in terms of his own disadvantages as a bachelor: “I hope Mrs. C. & the little ones are well, and the boy mending. It requires a good deal of manly courage & resolution to bear up against the many little troubles that continually arise in this life, and I look at your conduct with admiration & affection. I assure you I begin to feel the want of a true friend to lighten the gloom . . . I have found more sleepless nights within a twelvemonth than in all the former years of my life.”\(^61\) Characteristically, Abram finds ways of dissipating the offense of criticism by implying that the fault or lack may be partly within himself as a bachelor, evi-
vice must be calibrated to accommodate divergent agendas, local sensitivities, and shifting power relations; agents as well as recipients of advice have to be carefully managed if the sometimes precarious family consensus is to be maintained. Ann writes: "You see my maternal energy – but I must not urge you too much."

The Constable family letters are shaped by a didactic tradition that conditions their form, encourages their use as moral intervention, and simultaneously supports their role in self-advancement. As such, this tradition inscribes hierarchies, but also provides a forum for their constant renegotiation. In some ways highly conventional, the didacticism is nevertheless thoroughly implicated in, and contributes to, the dynamic micro-politics of everyday life. In particular, I would suggest, the frequency of advice in familiar correspondence makes it a productive site for the study of the transactions between the ideological and the subjective. Adapting the flexible conventions of the familiar letter, the Constable family, as a gradually evolving formation, develops a nuanced repertoire of advisory voices, manners, gestures, and idioms, which serves to mitigate potential or actual conflicts of interest and to ward off the threat of division.

There is little evidence that the Constable correspondence was informed in any systematic way by a particular letter-writing manual, and, as we have already witnessed, sermons, commonplaces derived from both print and oral culture, and other modes of traditional wisdom held equal – if not greater – prominence in the well-wrought familiar letter. It is not their subscription to codes of conduct, much less their fidelity to published templates, but their finessing of such codes and templates to the concerns of the moment that enables these letters to function as correspondence. To read Ann Constable’s letters, along with the wider family correspondence both during her lifetime and after her death, is to witness the establishment and evolution of a local but elaborate literature of conduct as it transmits itself between generations and adapts to changing social and economic circumstances. Modes of epistolary counsel were inherited and modified from one generation to the next. Furthermore, the agency afforded by advice-giving as a means of synchronizing individual and family interests was sometimes lubricated, and sometimes fueled, by gestures of affection so familiar to the epistolary form as to be virtually indistinguishable from it: attention, regard, anxiety, care, allowances, wishes.

Bridging the gap between the platitudinous and the particular, the axiomatic and the accidental, Ann Constable’s “anxious mother” persona is crucial to the correspondence as guidance. In her hands, letters can function as a species of conduct literature adapted to the unpredictability of everyday life. Anxiety, I have suggested, is the keynote of Ann Constable’s letters, modulating many of the exchanges within the family network. Today, anxiety is typically treated as a problem, a symptom in need of a cure. In cultural theory, it often denotes the contradictions in the social sphere supposedly soothed by ideology. In my reading, anxiety as an epistolary subjectivity has a more positive function in that it actively mediates divergent expectations of class, gender, and generation. As anxiety in action, letters, I argue, grant us a lens onto the way individuals and groups could generate acceptable, if not always accepted, modes of advice-giving and, hence, negotiate the often ticklish transactions of daily life. According to my reading, anxiety, along with wishes, attention, care, and consideration, constitute what Linda Pollock has recently called a “cluster concept”: an umbrella term that links “a diverse array of related ideas, providing bridges between and connective pathways through the associated attributes.” Such concepts can be hospitable to the normative and the personal, to the ethical and the pragmatic, to action and affect, and may draw together these disparate impulses in ways we may not readily recognize today. By their very versatility and capaciousness, these concepts afford vital links between different and sometimes competing modes of sociability: kinship, civility, patronage,
friendship, love. Those cluster concepts that I have identified in the Constable correspondence are not exclusive either to letters or to advice-giving, although they may, I suggest, contribute to the correlation between the two genres. As such, they may be structural to the letter-acy of early nineteenth-century familiar letters, rather than simply conventional to the form. They remind us that our desiccated epistolary "good wishes" and "kind regards" have their basis in a desire to shape circumstances for the better.
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