

Fall 2005

# C. M. Sedgwick's 'Patient Investigation' of America's Past: An Intertextual Study of Hope Leslie

Ellen Adrienne Foster

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

---

## Recommended Citation

Foster, E. (2005). C. M. Sedgwick's 'Patient Investigation' of America's Past: An Intertextual Study of Hope Leslie (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/550>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact [phillips@duq.edu](mailto:phillips@duq.edu).

C. M. Sedgwick's 'Patient Investigation' of America's Past:

An Intertextual Study of *Hope Leslie*

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty

of the Department of English

McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Ellen Adrienne Foster

15 November 2005

Copyright 2005 by  
Ellen Adrienne Foster

All rights reserved.

Name: Ellen Adrienne Foster

Title: C. M. Sedgwick's 'Patient Investigation' of America's Past: An Intertextual Study of *Hope Leslie*

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy in English

Date: 15 November 2005

APPROVED

---

Frederick Newberry, Ph.D., Professor of English

APPROVED

---

Linda Arbaugh Kinnahan, Ph.D., Professor of English

APPROVED

---

Jean E. Hunter, Ph.D., Professor of History

APPROVED

---

Linda Arbaugh Kinnahan, Ph.D., Chair, Department of English

APPROVED

---

Francesco C. Cesareo, Ph.D., Dean  
McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

## Acknowledgements

Many colleagues, friends, and mentors contributed to the development and completion of this project. Professor Frederick Newberry, my advisor, encouraged my interest in archival research and provided important guidance to this project from its inception. Professors Linda Kinnahan and Jean Hunter, members of my dissertation committee, offered crucial support in their readings of my work. Ann Romanczyk, Elizabeth R. Curry, Danette DiMarco, Jenifer Elmore, Anita Gorman, Marie Konzman Risboskin, Carolyn Steglich, and Donna Waldron enriched this work with their advice and expertise.

The faculty and my fellow graduate students in the English Department and the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts provided an engaging intellectual environment, one that has deeply influenced my scholarship, my teaching, and my service to the profession. The Massachusetts Historical Society's 2001-2002 Ruth R. Miller Research Fellowship supported my dissertation research. I am indebted to the Society for affording me the opportunity to spend extended periods of time in Boston, reading deeply in their collections and exploring the intersections of literature and history, past and present. Quite literally, without the support of the Massachusetts Historical Society and its extensive collections, this study would not exist.

## Abstract

Since the 1987 republication of Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie; or, Early Times in the Massachusetts* (1827), literary-historical interpretations have most often explored its proto-feminist impulses, revisionary history of the Pequod War, and models of American citizenship. Inquiries into Sedgwick's historical research for *Hope Leslie* have largely been limited to internal textual references. This dissertation answers questions regarding Sedgwick's research and also provides a foundation for a number of future studies. That foundation derives from extensive archival research conducted at and supported by the Massachusetts Historical Society, involving the examination of several layers of textual evidence (the unpublished correspondence of Sedgwick and others, Sedgwick's unpublished notebooks, published historical documents, and *Hope Leslie*). This dissertation reviews the conditions of Sedgwick's authorship, provides a timeline of the development of *Hope Leslie*, offers detailed evidence of Sedgwick's research, and discusses the literary-historical significance of Sedgwick's historical research. In addition, the archival evidence points to Sedgwick's religious faith and her concern for tolerance as strong influences on her authorship and *Hope Leslie*. This study finds that, through *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick explores the historical tensions within the Puritan settlement in order to suggest a future America that could embrace religious tolerance yet also claim its Puritan past.

Chapter one reviews the late twentieth-century scholarship that led to renewed interest in Sedgwick's fiction and authorial reputation. Chapter two reconsiders influential perceptions of Sedgwick's authorship and contextualizes the examination of

*Hope Leslie*. Chapter three provides the first documentary history of the development and completion of *Hope Leslie*. Chapters four and five consider Sedgwick's use of history to represent the federal covenant theology of the Puritan past and to explore the potential for religious tolerance. Chapter four focuses on the fictional characters while chapter five examines Sedgwick's use of historical persons and events in *Hope Leslie*. Chapter six suggests avenues for future scholarship. The appendix provides the documentary evidence of Sedgwick's considerable research in American history. The layers of textual analysis in the appendix support the literary-historical interpretations of chapters four and five.

## Table of Contents

Chapter One: Overview	1
Chapter Two: Sedgwick's Authorship	29
Chapter Three: Sedgwick's <i>Hope Leslie</i> : The Writing of a Romance	51
Chapter Four: Writing the Puritan Character	78
Chapter Five: Sedgwick's Use of History in <i>Hope Leslie</i>	111
Chapter Six: Conclusions and Future Considerations	143
Appendix: Sedgwick's Sources	152
Notes	210
Works Cited	223
Works Consulted	235

## Chapter One: Overview

This study has developed out of my interest in American authorship and history from the colonial period through the nineteenth century, and in particular from my interests in historical fiction and women's fiction. The work of Catharine Maria Sedgwick (1789-1867), an early nineteenth-century American writer of six novels as well as numerous short fiction sketches, works for children, and a travelogue, is an ideal subject for the exploration of American fiction and history. Further, Sedgwick's and her family's unpublished correspondence and Sedgwick's unpublished notebooks, held at the Massachusetts Historical Society, provide the resources for an in-depth examination of Sedgwick's authorship and her historical romance, *Hope Leslie; or, Early Times in the Massachusetts* (1827). My findings within these collections, the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I-III and the Sedgwick Family Papers II-V, support my re-consideration of Sedgwick as author, my documentation of the writing of *Hope Leslie*, and my identification of her primary sources in the historical records of colonial New England. Further, I examine the re-appearance of Sedgwick's research in *Hope Leslie* in order to arrive at a better understanding of the tensions in the romance between the Puritans' legacy of covenant theology and the nation's claims for religious tolerance; the centrality of this conflict is not only part of the romance's representation of American history, but also part of a liberal Unitarian literary project.

Readers have recognized, from her earliest publications, Sedgwick's interest in exploring national or social issues; the importance of her family in establishing this direction for her authorship is common knowledge among Sedgwick scholars. Concerns

about the course of the American nation were simply a part of Sedgwick's life because of her father Theodore's and her brothers' (and then her own) involvement in public service. Theodore Sedgwick held a number of important political positions during Sedgwick's childhood. Mary Kelley neatly summarizes his political career:

An ardent supporter of the Revolution, he also briefly held two military positions during the war, first as a military secretary with the rank of major to Major General John Thomas and then as commissioner of supply for the northern department of the Continental Forces from 1775 to 1778. Sedgwick was elected a representative to the Massachusetts General Court in 1780 and again in 1782 and became a state senator in 1784 and 1785. In 1789 he began a twelve-year period in the national legislature as a congressman and a senator, ending as Speaker of the House. From 1802 to the end of his life he served as a justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. (*Private Woman* 51)

Sedgwick's elder brothers Theodore II, Robert, and Henry Dwight (Harry), all lawyers as their father was, were involved in various political and social reforms in western Massachusetts and New York, including abolition, Greek independence, education, and railroad expansion. Theodore II was a Massachusetts state legislator and author of such works as *Hints to My Countrymen* (1826) and *Public and Private Economy* (1836).

Sedgwick's younger brother Charles, a less public figure than his siblings, was a clerk of the courts in Berkshire County; his wife Elizabeth Buckminster Dwight Sedgwick was nationally known as the headmistress of her Lenox, Massachusetts, school for girls. Most interpretations and historicist considerations of Sedgwick's representations of the early

nation focus on her socio-political background, finding that Sedgwick's authorship contributed to the family enterprise, their participation in public life.

Sedgwick's connections to the liberal Unitarian movement, centered in Boston, are as significant to her fiction as the family ties. As Carolyn Karcher notes, with the publication of *A New-England Tale* (1822), Sedgwick "entered on her literary career with the aim of diffusing the blessings of Unitarianism, and she interwove her religious beliefs into virtually all her fiction" (Introduction to *Hope Leslie* xv). Even though Sedgwick lived in New York City or western Massachusetts, seldom visiting Boston, she had close ties to prominent members of the Boston Unitarian community including Eliza Cabot, a writer and later wife of Charles Follen, a Unitarian minister and Harvard professor; Susan Higginson Channing, sister of Thomas Wentworth Higginson, wife of Francis Dana Channing, and sister-in-law to William Ellery Channing; and George Richards Minot, a historian and father to Sedgwick's sister-in-law Jane. On a visit to Boston in 1826, Sedgwick spent a considerable amount of time with the Follens and branches of the Channing family, and thus she became familiar with William Ellery Channing, the chief founder of Unitarianism. Her correspondence and published works suggest the strong influence of the liberal Unitarianism located at Harvard College. One of its most prominent proponents, the Reverend Henry Ware, Jr., called on Sedgwick to contribute to a series of novels, *Scenes and Characters Illustrating Christian Truths*, writing to her that, through fiction, "religion would be promoted 'more efficiently than in many sermons'" (qtd. in Reynolds *Faith in Fiction* 119). Her publication of *Home* (1835) as part of this series marks the shift in her career to works especially devoted to this

purpose; other works in this vein include *The Poor Rich Man, and the Rich Poor Man* (1836); *Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated* (1837); *Means and Ends, or Self-Training* (1839); *The Morals of Manners; or, Hints for Our Young People* (1846); and *Memoir of Joseph Curtis, A Model Man* (1858). Despite this considerable body of writing and the religious emphasis in her earlier fiction, Sedgwick's 1821 conversion to Unitarianism and her religious beliefs are typically mentioned only cursorily in overviews of her authorship; the implications of theological and moral issues in her works rarely receive the attention they deserve. In her own time, however, the religious and moral dimensions of her stories were indispensable to their popular and critical reception. Accordingly, a major aim of my study is to reveal the extent to which Sedgwick's liberal Unitarian beliefs inform her historicized presentation of the theological tensions in early seventeenth-century Massachusetts Bay, the setting of *Hope Leslie*.

Sedgwick's early novels (*A New-England Tale*, 1822; *Redwood*, 1824; *Hope Leslie*, 1827; and *Clarence*, 1830) established her as one of the premier authors of her day. Sedgwick and contemporaries like James Fenimore Cooper and William Cullen Bryant were hailed for their efforts to establish a uniquely American literature. Within the subset of historical fiction, Sedgwick, Cooper, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and other less widely known writers sought to explore the history and legends of such American experiences as the Puritan settlement, Indian wars, and the American Revolution. In *The American Historical Romance*, George Dekker identifies "the nineteenth-century historical romance [...] as a predominantly masculine genre" (221), but Nina Baym's

*American Women Writers and the Work of History, 1790-1860* suggests that women writers of the period wanted "to show that historical fiction, like other forms of historical writing, was not an exclusively masculine genre" and practiced it successfully (153).<sup>1</sup> While Sedgwick is not part of Dekker's study, as she is of Baym's, both studies trace the development of historical fiction to Sir Walter Scott who "created a branch of modern prose fiction which combined the courtship matter of novel and romance with the historical and heroic matter of epic which spoke more directly and exclusively to the experience and aspirations of men" (Dekker 220). Michael Davitt Bell in *Hawthorne and the Historical Romance of New England* finds that "the great theme of the historical romance of New England was not the conflict between Puritanism and external tyranny but the conflict within Puritanism itself between the forces of tyranny and the forces of liberty" (159). This idea underpins nearly all readings of *Hope Leslie*, with the understanding that a search for liberty, beginning with the Puritans and culminating in the American Revolution, wins the struggle. Though the idea of Winthrop's "city on a hill" informs many of these readings (even if it is not mentioned explicitly), few interpretations consider the conflicts that stem from the Puritans' federal covenant theology, even though it is central to the enduring idea of America as that "city on the hill" and to the continued presence of religious controversy in the nation.

The consideration of the religious conflicts within American fiction of the early nineteenth century, including *Hope Leslie*, falls to commentators interested in a project concurrent with the drive to establish an American literature: that of the concerted effort of liberal Unitarians to use fiction as a way to establish its own idea of an American

literary culture and, not incidentally, to counter the still dominant (at least in New England) orthodox Calvinism. In "The Literary Significance of the Unitarian Movement," Lawrence Buell notes that "Unitarianism clearly did exert a literary influence far out of proportion to its denominational size" (164), but the emphasis in literary studies has been a "tendency to sideline Unitarian literary culture as a trivial if not positively baleful epi-phenomenon in the history of American letters" (170), especially when its more conventional products are considered against the canonical works of the Transcendentalists who followed them. In *Faith in Fiction: The Emergence of Religious Literature in America*, David S. Reynolds characterizes liberal or anti-Calvinist fiction, strongly associated with the Unitarians, as "a convenient nondoctrinal shelter from the storm of controversy that raged about them [Unitarians]" during the Second Great Awakening (98). Daniel P. Buchanan in "Tares in the Wheat: Puritan Violence and Puritan Families in the Nineteenth-Century Liberal Imagination" finds that "the fiction of Sedgwick, [Lydia Maria] Child, [Eliza Buckminster] Lee, and [Lydia] Sigourney constitutes an integral part of the theological corpus of antebellum Christian liberalism" (206) as it "was not inherently polemical and, therefore, meshed with the liberal conviction that theological minutiae were less important than ethical living—though liberal fiction always had a theological ax to grind" (207). Stylistically, too, the key features of the Harvard Unitarians' literary aesthetic match Sedgwick's work; according to Daniel Walker Howe in *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861*, these include didacticism (189), sentimentalism (194), "literature as a means of grace" (197), and "the cultivation of a genteel character" (201). Finally, as Howe

explains, "Unitarian aesthetics was also tied to political conservatism" in the post-Revolutionary period (188). These standards provide a useful construct for considering the function and aesthetic of Sedgwick's work as well as her social and political conservatism, which has especially challenged twentieth-century scholars. Even so, such an approach to Sedgwick has been limited to a few studies, including those mentioned above.

Within the projects to establish a national literature and a Unitarian literature, Sedgwick found considerable success. A review in the April 1828 *North American Review*, edited by prominent Unitarians, hailed the success of *Hope Leslie's* anonymous author: "We pray her to go on, in the path in which she must excel, and has excelled, and which she ought consequently to make her peculiar one. We pray her to go on, in the name of her friends, for the public's sake, and for the honor of our youthful literature" (rpt. in Damon-Bach and Clements 76-77). For many years, Sedgwick sustained a strong national and even international reputation and developed close ties with a number of prominent British writers that included Harriet Martineau, Mary Russel Mitford, and Fanny Kemble. As Lucinda Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements note, Sedgwick's "works [were] published on both sides of the Atlantic and translated into French, German, Italian, Swedish, Dutch, and Danish"; "In 1834, based on the reputation she had gained in her first decade of writing, Sedgwick was selected for inclusion in the first volume of the *National Portrait Gallery of Distinguished Americans*," one of two women so honored (Introduction xxiii). Thus Sedgwick became an important part of the early nineteenth century American literary scene.

By the late nineteenth century, however, Sedgwick had been reduced to a footnote in literary dictionaries, passed over in favor of other writers like Cooper and Washington Irving. The turn in Sedgwick's later career to children's and liberal literature probably contributed to her reputation's decline. These works were not particularly "literary," and they likely did not appeal to critics interested in the rise of Transcendentalism, the development of a more sophisticated aesthetic, and the appearance of stylists to practice it (such as Hawthorne, Melville, and Poe). Sedgwick's work simply did not appeal to mid- or late-nineteenth-century tastes or interests. This trend continued into the twentieth century. As Carolyn Karcher suggests in "Catharine Maria Sedgwick in Literary History," Sedgwick's realism, more than anything else, excluded her from the "three paradigms [that] have maintained an especially tenacious hold on scholars: those of the romance, the sentimental novel, and the scribbling woman" (5), among which the romance has been most prized. The canon that developed in the twentieth century often excluded or diminished writers just as admired in their time (if not more so) in favor of others who better fit the scholars' expectations, such as Cooper, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, Hawthorne, and Herman Melville. Sedgwick's contemporary popularity and critical approval did not, then, secure her place in American literature through much of the twentieth century.

Sedgwick's restoration to a position of interest and importance to American literary history required a new wave of criticism that questioned the canon; in the later decades of the twentieth century, feminist scholarship took on this project. Considerable effort was made to reintroduce the works of American women writers who were no

longer known but who had exerted considerable influence among their contemporaries, male and female. At the same time, these scholars were occupied with establishing and legitimizing their own gender-focused theoretical frameworks. Much of this groundbreaking feminist scholarship countered the scholarship of predominantly male scholars examining predominantly male texts. Judith Fetterley's *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction* is among the feminist critiques that questioned the canon and critical focus of American literature. While Fetterley's interpretive work focuses on male-authored texts, as do several other feminist works from this period, it does so in a way that makes the omission of the female—author, critic, interpreter—a pervasive theme. The power, especially anger, of Fetterley's words in *The Resisting Reader* is a reminder of the difficulty in finding female-authored books (especially those from the nineteenth century) and challenging the assumptions of the canon. Among these was the assumption, tacit or expressed, that the study of women writers was a narrow, suspect field of inquiry, that these women writers were, perhaps because of their gender, only marginal contributors to American literature, and that the works by female authors were, almost by definition, an assemblage of weepy, didactic, sentimentalized fairy tales.

In establishing its own theoretical and interpretive territory, feminist scholarship of the 1970s and 1980s was often sharp-edged, intended to cut away centuries of silencing—literal, political, and cultural—of all women's voices: writers, readers, teachers, and students. Yet the binary oppositions seen in much of this scholarship—the strong emphasis on revealing anti-woman sentiments in interpretations of male authors, for instance, or the emphasis on identifying subversive anti-patriarchal themes or tactics

in female-authored texts—now seem as one-sided as the interpretations they were meant to rectify. By the mid-1980s, feminist critics became more aware of the limitations of its theoretical framework, such as its own race and class biases, and thus sought to include more women and men of other classes and color. Feminist criticism in the early to late 1980s thus centered on establishing a voice for women writers and documenting the circumstances of women's lives as they entered into and negotiated with the male-dominated worlds of publishing and public life. Literary and historical researchers also established frameworks for reading the nineteenth-century world, such as the ideologies of the "separate spheres" and constructs of the "cult of true womanhood" and Republican motherhood. These literary-historical concepts are evident in feminist interpretations with respect to the sense of community and the often private or domestic center of women's writing (typically read in opposition to the valorization of the individual and the presumably public concerns of men's writing). Literary interpretations informed by these constructs began to associate a kind of power and action, rather than passivity, with the "woman's sphere." According to these theories, women's power was centered in their ability to inculcate morals within their homes and social circles. Women's private influences had public ramifications, as their husbands and children took these values with them into the "public" sphere. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, women frequently led such social reform movements as temperance and women's suffrage, and qualified for such political action by their very gender—that, as women, they claimed a higher standard of morality than their male counterparts.

The potential for women's political activity is evident in the most influential reinterpretations of nineteenth-century women's writing. Among these is Jane Tompkins's assertion, in *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*, that "the popular domestic novel of the nineteenth century represents a monumental effort to reorganize culture from the woman's point of view" (124). Along with other critics, Tompkins shares Fetterley's approach in pressing against the ingrained interpretations and interpretive strategies of "the male-dominated scholarly tradition" (123) in order to create new ways of interpreting the sentimental novel and, more broadly speaking, women's literature in general. Formulating these new strategies is the explicit point, for example, of Susan K. Harris's *Nineteenth-Century American Women's Novels: Interpretive Strategies*. Cathy N. Davidson's *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* also countered impressions of sentimental fiction as "frothy fictions" by noting that they "evinced, instead, a solid social realism that also constitutes a critique (even if sometimes covert) of the patriarchal structure of that society" (123). The scholarship that drew on these and many other reconceptions of women's lives and writing (not least their attendant political, social, and material conditions) has significantly reshaped scholarly and pedagogical approaches to women's literature. These inquiries into American women's literature of the nineteenth century continue to probe not only the literature but also the underpinnings or limitations of its critics' own approaches.

For several years, literary scholarship has moved away from the polarized "separate spheres" ideology and a similarly divided approach to readings of male- and

female-authored texts. The 1998 special issue of *American Literature*, edited by Cathy N. Davidson and titled "No More Separate Spheres!," formalized a movement which had in fact been taking place for some time. The reprinting of several of these essays, in addition to others commissioned for the volume, in *No More Separate Spheres!: A Next Wave American Studies Reader* (2002), edited by Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher, recognizes the history of the development of feminist criticism and the reasons for the twentieth-century critics' embrace of the separate spheres ideology while the volume also works toward establishing a post-separate spheres criticism. *Separate Spheres No More: Gender Convergence in American Literature, 1830-1930* (2000), edited by Monika M. Elbert, makes a strong case for "dissolving boundaries between public and private spheres and questioning or challenging the stereotypical images of women as ineffectual or vulnerable within nineteenth-century society" (Elbert Introduction 2). These and other works show that feminist criticism has, as Fetterley predicted in her preface to *The Resisting Reader*, continued to "stimulate dialogue, discussion, debate, re-reading, and finally re-vision" of our studies of American literature (viii). As a result, the experiences of reading and rereading of nineteenth-century American literature—written by women and men—has been enriched, and new avenues of inquiry have been made possible.

The re-emergence of Sedgwick as an important nineteenth-century American author has often, but not always, followed these trajectories of feminist literary inquiry. Just as Sedgwick does not fit the paradigms of twentieth-century New Critical scholarship, she is not a perfect fit for the feminist recovery project either—for most of her work does not resemble a model of sentimental or subversive "woman's fiction."

Before the feminist efforts of the later 1970s and 1980s, two unpublished dissertations, by Sister Mary Welsh in 1937 and Richard Banus Gidez in 1958, served as the primary sources of twentieth-century scholarship on Sedgwick. In 1969, Garrett Press reprinted Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* well in advance of the more commonly available edition, edited by Mary Kelley and published as part of the American Women Writers series at Rutgers University Press in 1987. A Penguin edition, edited by Carolyn Karcher, appeared in 1998. In the foreword to the Garrett Press edition, Sedgwick's first appearance in print since the late nineteenth-century, Edward Halsey Foster describes *Hope Leslie* as "among the finest literary works of the early nation" (iv); "*Hope Leslie* remains interesting as a novel of manners, as historical fiction, as a moral tale, and as entertainment" (ix). Foster introduces the novel on its own merits, understanding that, despite Sedgwick's relative absence in twentieth-century literary criticism, *Hope Leslie* still deserves recognition as an important novel of the early nineteenth century.

In *Hawthorne and the Historical Romance of New England*, Michael Davitt Bell suggests the power of Sedgwick's example as a writer of conventional historical fiction. In particular, Bell attends to Sedgwick's use in *Hope Leslie* of "the archetype of the founding father" in John Winthrop (20), "non-Puritan villains," often Catholics (157), the conflict "between the forces of tyranny and the forces of liberty" (159), and "the character of the natural heroine" (164). Bell's reading of the major characters, themes, and plot lines in these works provides the foundation of later historically-oriented analyses of *Hope Leslie* as well as those that inquire into the kinds of nature (wildness, civilization) that the characters represent and enact. Bell's 1970 article, "History and Romance

Convention in Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*," identifies the work as "an invaluable example of the technique of the conventional American historical romancer" (221). Foster's contribution to the Twayne United States Authors Series, *Catharine Maria Sedgwick*, further argues that "Sedgwick was a far more successful stylist than Cooper," "had a greater ability in creating believable women in her fiction," carried "importance as a novelist of manners," and "was much more than a regionalist concerned only with New England" (Preface). Foster and Bell are primarily interested in Sedgwick as a writer of conventional historical fiction and as one of the earliest American writers of the nineteenth century. Their work is distinct from the feminist recovery efforts that soon followed, for these men were interested in evaluating the works of a less recognized contemporary of Cooper, to measure her stature as a writer rather than as a woman writer.

In contrast, the feminist movement focused on Sedgwick's unique position as a woman among early nineteenth-century American writers and her view of the American woman. Nina Baym's *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels By and About Women in America, 1820-1870*, appearing in 1978, four years after Foster's Twayne volume and in the same year that Fetterley's *Resisting Reader* was published, provides a measured and careful analysis of the existence and worth of nineteenth-century American women's literature. In a chapter devoted to the development of woman's fiction, Baym considers Sedgwick, "the author of the earliest examples of the new kind of American woman's fiction" and the most accomplished of these writers (53).

Despite Baym's considerable stature as a scholar and critic and her perceptive reading of Sedgwick, her attention to Sedgwick is usually not identified as "the" occasion

for Sedgwick's reappearance on the American literary scene. Rather, that designation is typically given to Mary Kelley's influential study of female authorship, *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America*; the history of the scholar and her work in this case suggests the patterns that have attended the development not only of Sedgwick studies but also the broader study of American women writers. Kelley identifies the group of women writers who comprise her study, including Sedgwick, as "literary domestics," a term chosen to recognize that these writers "were women of the home who functioned in untraditional, unfeminine fashion" (*Private Woman* viii-ix). Kelley seeks "to understand [women writers] as historical figures in the social and cultural context of the nineteenth century" (*Private Woman* ix). Yet Kelley's claim of their importance is somewhat undermined by her assertion that these writers "have yet to be understood, just as they failed to understand themselves fully" and that these writers "were forced to confront and grapple with conflict, ambivalence, and guilt" (*Private Woman* xii). This sense that the writers' own identities were confused or disturbed by their own authorship affects the tone of Kelley's scholarship, as if the study has to apologize for itself as these writers might have apologized for themselves. This temerity, I would note, stands in sharp contrast to Baym's assertions in *Woman's Fiction* that these writers deliberately engaged in changing their worlds, that, for instance, "they saw literacy as the foundation of liberation" (31). Kelley's later work on Sedgwick—her editions of *Hope Leslie* (1987) and Sedgwick's autobiography and selections from her journals in *The Power of Her Sympathy*, the article "Negotiating a Self: The Autobiography and Journals of Catharine Maria Sedgwick" (*New England Quarterly*

1993), a biographical note on Sedgwick (*Legacy* 1989), and the preface to the second edition of *Private Woman, Public Stage* (2002)—retreats from the earlier apologetic tone. Kelley comes to understand Sedgwick not as a dependent female author but rather a sophisticated thinker and actor in her field. The development of Kelley's own work, then, demonstrates the growth in scholarly understandings and reconstructions of female authorship in the early nineteenth century.

The scholarship pioneered by Foster, Bell, Baym, and Kelley developed primarily within the critical movements of feminism and New Historicism that established and then refined their own critical methodologies and theories. Guiding these shifts and adjustments were pivotal, sometimes inflammatory claims and assertions, including those already mentioned earlier in this chapter, by critics such as Jane Tompkins and Judith Fetterley. Voices of moderation have also been important to recovering women's literature and finding the appropriate tools for analysis. In this regard, Baym's work deserves particular mention. In addition to the brief history of criticism in *Woman's Fiction* and articles such as "Melodramas of Beset Manhood: How Theories of American Fiction Exclude Women Authors" (1981) and "The Madwoman and Her Languages: Why I Don't Do Feminist Literary Theory" (1984), Baym argued again in *American Women Writers and the Work of History, 1790-1860* (1995) for a more productive framework to approach the work of nineteenth-century women writers. In regard to women's historical novels generally, Baym counters the conventional feminist wisdom about "ascribing revisionary motives to the antebellum women who wrote historical novels" in searching for anti-patriarchal or subversive plots or characters (153); instead,

she states that these writers "aim to participate in the patriotic work of establishing and affirming national origins, characters, and values" alongside their male peers (*American Women Writers* 155). Baym's interpretations of Sedgwick's work, including *Hope Leslie*, *The Linwoods*, and her travelogue *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*, center on their fundamental conservatism and establish a fuller context, culturally and historically, than many other analyses of the mid-1990s. Baym understands the urgency of the academic politics of the moment but believes that rigorous analysis and a thorough rethinking of such issues as the canon and standards of aestheticism are necessary.

Susan K. Harris's *Nineteenth-Century American Women's Novels: Interpretive Strategies* shows a similar awareness of the twentieth-century cultural moment. Harris offers the most sustained analysis of the dilemma posed by her question: "How do we make sense of a book?" (1). The answers to this question are just as important as the responses to the perennial "but is it any good?" queries. Harris points out, as Baym and others do, the limitations of their academic training insofar as their abilities to perceive the narrative strategies and designs at work in nineteenth-century American women's writing. She recommends that modern readers "strive to retrieve some of the symbolic and cultural codes [. . .] and see how writers used them to create hermeneutic codes" (79). By striving to reach a better understanding of the contemporaneous readers' experience, we may then better understand the intricacy and cultural function of these writers' texts. In the past fifteen years, scholars of women's fiction have worked to retool traditional New Critical approaches in order to achieve the kinds of thoughtful and thought-provoking criticism guided by Baym, Harris, and others. In this often recursive

consideration of the methods as well as the intentions of the recovery projects, literary scholars have recently drawn from other critical approaches, such as post-colonialism, and from other disciplines, such as history, sociology, and psychology.

Nevertheless, the maturation of critical approaches and methodologies would not have been enough to reclaim Sedgwick for American literature. The effort depended (and continues to depend) on the reintroduction of Sedgwick's work to more readers, a project that began in earnest with the 1987 Rutgers University edition of *Hope Leslie*, edited by Mary Kelley. The interest in Sedgwick piqued by Kelley's *Private Woman, Public Stage* and Baym's *Woman's Fiction* could continue to develop only if Sedgwick's works were easily accessible. *A New-England Tale* (1822), edited by Victoria Clements, appeared in 1995, from Oxford University Press. *The Linwoods; or, 'Sixty Years Since' in America* (1835), edited by Maria Karafilis, was reprinted by the University Press of New England in 2002. Penguin has released editions of *Hope Leslie*, edited by Carolyn Karcher (1998), and *A New-England Tale*, edited by Susan K. Harris (2003). Proposals for new editions of Sedgwick's short fiction and other novels, including *Redwood* (1824) and *Clarence* (1830), are under consideration at various presses. Other novels and selections of the short fiction are available online through such resources as the University of Virginia's Electronic Text Center and the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Society website. Selections from Sedgwick's work are also represented in such standard anthologies as *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*.

With the resurgence of interest and availability, Sedgwick studies began to develop as more than a curiosity (as has happened to a few of works of American

women writers made available through the Rutgers series of reprints but who have since disappeared yet again). Not surprisingly, given that *Hope Leslie* was the first to reappear in print and become widely adopted in university courses, much of the scholarship to date focuses on that novel. In addition, *Hope Leslie's* current popularity may owe much to the ways its plots and sub-plots satisfy contemporary preoccupations with race and gender.

As Bell notes, *Hope Leslie* has an "incredibly complicated plot" ("History and Romance Convention" 215). The romance opens in old England to introduce William Fletcher, a young Puritan, and his ill-fated courtship of his cousin Alice. Fletcher becomes disowned because of his Puritanism, and Alice is married to Charles Leslie, an Anglican. Fletcher, encouraged by his friend John Winthrop (later the governor of the Massachusetts Bay colony), plans to emigrate to New England, but his departure is delayed. He and his family sail with Winthrop in 1630; they first settle in Boston, but then remove to Springfield and later to a settlement outside of this village. The story then moves ahead to 1636. Fletcher is called to Boston to receive Alice's two daughters, re-named Hope and Faith. While he and Hope stay in Boston, Faith joins the family in Bethel, their home outside of Springfield, as do two Indian captives of the Pequod War, Mononotto's children Magawisca and Oneco. Just prior to Fletcher's return to Bethel, Mononotto exacts his revenge against his family's massacre in the war. He kills Fletcher's family, except for the servant Jennet and those away from the home, including another servant, Digby, and the Leslie daughters' aunt Grafton. Mononotto regains his children and takes Fletcher's eldest son Everell and Faith Leslie as captives. Just as Mononotto prepares to sacrifice Everell's life, Magawisca intervenes; her father slices her

arm off, and Everell escapes and returns to his father's home. Another seven years elapse; Everell is in England, studying, while Fletcher's household, including Hope Leslie, her aunt Grafton, and servants, continue to live in Bethel. When Hope intervenes in freeing Nelema, a Native American healer, from Springfield's prison (she has been accused of witchcraft and sentenced to death), the Puritan magistrates decide not to punish Hope, but rather to remove the Fletcher family to Boston, to live within Governor Winthrop's household. Here, they believe, Hope can be kept in check; Winthrop's niece Esther Downing, a devout Puritan maiden, will be her model for deportment. The plot becomes considerably more complex once the family arrives in Boston. Everell returns from England; newcomers, Puritan in appearance, arrive at the same time: Sir Philip Gardiner (based on the historical person Sir Christopher Gardiner) and his page Rosa (a young woman disguised as a boy). A love triangle develops among Everell, Esther, and Hope, to further complicate the earlier romantic connections drawn between Everell and Magawisca. Hope's primary desire, at this stage of the story, is to be reunited with her sister, Faith, now married to Oneco, converted to Catholicism, and living in the western forests. This reunion, Hope believes, can be accomplished through Nelema's promise that the sisters will see each other again. The latter portion of the novel focuses on the plans to accomplish this reunion. Treacheries against this plot result in Faith's return to the Winthrop household and Magawisca's capture and trial as a conspirator against the colony. Ultimately, Faith is reunited with her husband Oneco; Everell and Hope free Magawisca; Everell's betrothal to Esther is broken; he and Hope are united; and the villains of the novel die in an explosion in Boston harbor. In addition to these major lines

of the narrative, fictional subplots develop as do historical subplots such as Samuel Gorton's trial and punishment.

The romance ends on a high note: Everell and Hope, the hero and heroine strongly associated with nature and liberty, are wed; a democratic future of the colony seems assured. This tale of feisty white and Native American heroines has much to recommend itself to scholars, teachers, and students who are themselves looking for role models or trying to understand the complex history of sexism and racism in the United States. The scholarship has generated a lively conversation that begins to do justice to the romance's complexities, for its intricate web of representations of race, class, gender, religion, and culture is not easily reduced to simple formulations or facile interpretations. These readings of *Hope Leslie* consider the romance's investigation of the meaning of citizenship, the appearance of the "noble savage," American policies of Indian removal, the entangled love relationships of the main characters (including interracial alliance), the relationships among the female characters, and the seduction sub-plot. *Hope Leslie* can support much deeper critical inquiry (its uses and adaptations of history and literary conventions, for instance, as Buell and others suggest) to engage students with its period's literature and cultural preoccupations.

As Sedgwick studies gain momentum, careful analyses of Sedgwick's attitudes about national culture and politics will continue to develop. In particular, as more scholars work with the full range of available published and unpublished writings, a timeline charting Sedgwick's shifts in thought and action may help to answer some of the questions about Sedgwick's beliefs about the racial, class, and gender divides of her time.

At this point, the "recovery" effort seems virtually complete; the active participation of established scholars such as Mary Kelley, Judith Fetterley, Susan K. Harris, and Robert Daly and of emerging voices including the contributors to *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives* suggests the long-term viability of Sedgwick studies. These writers, along with the speakers at the Third Catharine Maria Sedgwick Symposium in June 2003, point out several directions for future inquiry.

Among the most interesting are Carolyn Karcher's investigation of Sedgwick's literary influence on other nineteenth-century American writers in "Catharine Maria Sedgwick in Literary History" and Susan K. Harris's interest in Sedgwick's activity in the pressing political questions of her day in "The Limits of Authority: Catharine Maria Sedgwick and the Politics of Resistance," their contributions to *Critical Perspectives*. Other scholars are researching Sedgwick's role in the histories of periodicals, gift books, and annuals; conversational culture; women's education and the profession of teaching; attitudes toward immigrants, racial, ethnic, and religious minorities, and the poor; and various political and social movements, including abolition, women's rights, and prison reform. Further, only one of Sedgwick's novels, *Hope Leslie*, has received a fair amount of critical attention, thus leaving several more novels and a considerable body of short fiction still awaiting analysis. The thorny questions of race, class, gender, and national politics are often pivotal in these lesser known works, just as they are in the works already in print. The existing critical studies provide a useful foundation for deeper inquiries into Sedgwick and her work. But to create yet more substantive, rigorously

documented, and contextualized readings of Sedgwick, scholars need to engage in a systematic and thorough investigation of the primary sources that inform her work.

My study participates substantially in this project, as archival research provides the basis for my examination of Sedgwick's authorship and analysis of *Hope Leslie*. The critical approach to this project responds to the calls from Judith Fetterley in "'My Sister! My Sister!': The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*" and Joanne Dobson in "Reclaiming Sentimental Literature" for close textual readings that fuse elements of New Critical and cultural critiques. Fetterley describes this new stage

as a way of reading texts by nineteenth-century American women that balances the polarity between the hagiography characteristic of the first phase of recovery [. . .] and the critique associated with the second phase, a critique that implicates these writers and their texts in a variety of nineteenth-century racist, classist, and imperialistic projects. ("My Sister!" 492)

Evidence of the second phase—in which the moral emphasis and elitist viewpoint of much of Sedgwick's work can be critiqued as classist and imperialistic (along the lines that Amy Kaplan describes in "Manifest Domesticity")—is beginning to appear in Sedgwick studies, as the work of Sondra Smith Gates (in "Sedgwick's American Poor," for instance) and others suggests. However, this work has not yet begun to address the classism or racism, for instance, in Sedgwick's better known (and more widely available) romances or to go much beyond acknowledging Sedgwick's privileged position as a white woman of high social status.

Attending to the implications of Sedgwick's status, Susan Harris's keynote address at the Third Catharine Maria Sedgwick Symposium (slightly revised and reprinted in the Society's Fall 2003 newsletter) presses for a deeper reflection upon the "Means and Ends" of Sedgwick studies. Briefly stated, Harris projects this future for Sedgwick studies: "We need to think through . . . what we want to 'do' with Sedgwick, for which audiences, and for what reasons. And we need to think of ways to take Sedgwick beyond the frameworks in which we have traditionally constructed her, so that we can track her own intellectual process" (5). The latter call has already begun, with Charlene Avallone's work in reconstructing Sedgwick's participation in the cultural and conversational circles of her New York and Jenifer Banks's consideration of Sedgwick's involvement in prison reform work, also in New York City.<sup>2</sup> The former is more difficult and complicated, for it requires a re-examination of the goal that has driven much of the scholarship and republication of nineteenth-century women writers. In effect, these commentators question that goal. The recovery and instatement (or re-instatement) of these once-dismissed authors has been accomplished; the authors and their works are present and accounted for in anthologies among their contemporaries. But what follows? To what end should these texts be used, in the scholarship or in classrooms? Is it now "safe" to criticize these authors (as their male contemporaries have been) for their failings, when quite often their limitations have been minimized in order to forward the goal of recovery? Is it now "safe" to admit that quite a few of these women writers are not, in fact, "feminist" or even "proto-feminist," a designation that often justified their recovery? What does it mean to assert that some of these writers were in fact quite powerful (in what we might call "real"

terms – socially, financially – as opposed to the hard-to-measure powers of Republican motherhood, for instance)? How does such an assertion intersect with feminist readings of veiled assertions of female power in subversively encoded female texts? If we believe that some of these writers did in fact wield power, do we have to approve the motivations behind or the uses of this power? And if we don't (as Harris suggests is her case), what might we do about it? Do we cast these writers and their work back into obscurity, or do we open up a discussion of the forces at work?

This study approaches these questions with the understanding that the answers are still developing and some of the questions seem unanswerable. But this study does probe Sedgwick's own sense of her authorship in ways that might break through some of the assumptions that have so strongly influenced the scholarship on Sedgwick specifically and, more generally, on nineteenth-century American women's writing. Further, it offers for the first time a documentary history of Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*. In its interpretations of Sedgwick's fictionalization of history, the study attends to Sedgwick's socio-political agenda and reflect on the implications of Sedgwick's vision of America and its democracy; Sedgwick's promotion of a liberal Unitarian point of view, as part of her general conservatism, is important to this discussion. Further, this study attends to the over-arching presence of Puritan faith and government in the novel—evident in the historical details that inform the plots and subplots of *Hope Leslie*. From this point of view, the novel projects a Puritanism in decline, but still operating as a potent idea, one that permeates New England, and even American, culture, politically and socially. In this way, Sedgwick projects a future of liberalized religion while also claiming the nation's

Puritan heritage; in doing so, she participates in what Sacvan Bercovitch's *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* describes as the consensus view of New England history.

Chapter two documents and establishes the relationships between Sedgwick's private and public writing and offers a reassessment of critical attitudes toward her position as a popular author. My primary research at the Massachusetts Historical Society offered the resources to understand and then to document the circumstances of Sedgwick's authorship; further, this reading suggested to me the limitations of the available published studies of her authorship. This study offers a new perspective on the ways in which Sedgwick's social status and her gender offered her opportunities to participate in the fledging national literature. This chapter then provides a general background for understanding the conditions of Sedgwick's authorship.

Chapter three moves from this general discussion of Sedgwick's authorship to the specific example of the process of writing *Hope Leslie* in order to document that process from a brief outline to the finished novel. In doing so, it offers the first complete reconstruction of the novel's development—insofar as a reconstruction based on fragmentary archival evidence can be considered complete. Further, the chapter provides a basis for understanding Sedgwick's own interest in and research into the Puritan past. My detailed examination of Sedgwick's research notes is presented in the study's appendix, a cross-referencing of Sedgwick's notes, her sources, and the sources' re-appearance in *Hope Leslie*; this is the first study of Sedgwick's research that bases its conclusions on archival evidence rather than solely on textual evidence within the finished novel. Chapter three also discusses the contemporary response to *Hope Leslie*,

focusing on those readers' interest in Sedgwick's representation of the Massachusetts Bay settlement.

Chapters four and five consider Sedgwick's representation of the Puritan past and especially the importance of the Puritans' federal covenant theology and the concept of religious tolerance to *Hope Leslie's* story. In both chapters, my analysis emphasizes the archival evidence of Sedgwick's own notebooks in order to consider the ways in which her research informs her work. Historical documents focusing on the political and theological issues of Massachusetts Bay are central to Sedgwick's research, so my analysis follows the direction of the archival evidence to consider the ways that political and theological tensions in the colony provide the central theme of *Hope Leslie*. Further, Sedgwick's background (in her conversion to Unitarianism and participation in writing liberal Unitarian literature) contributes to my understanding of the importance to her of religious tolerance in the United States and to her consideration of this issue in *Hope Leslie*. My work builds upon the existing scholarship that explores Sedgwick's understanding of citizenship and the tensions between individual freedom and community or national responsibility. Chapter four investigates Sedgwick's interest in writing the "character" of New England through the fictional Fletcher family, while chapter five focuses on Sedgwick's use of historical persons and events.

Chapter six considers the implications of the Sedgwick's representation of the Puritan legacy for future studies. This study, undertaken as Sedgwick and her works command an increasing amount of scholarly interest, offers a documentary basis for such scholarship and reconsiders some of the dominant assumptions about female authorship

in early nineteenth-century America. It also advances the study of American women's writing, moving beyond "recovery" efforts to a fuller understanding of women's participation with their male counterparts in the marketplace and in the cultural work of a national literature. This study also extends our understanding of Sedgwick's use of history, especially by drawing upon the available archival materials to support a view of Sedgwick as a serious researcher and writer. Throughout the study, the importance to Sedgwick of religious faith and tolerance within the United States is considered. In *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick explores the historical and political tensions within the Puritan settlement in order to claim the best of the Puritan past and project a future of religious tolerance.

To understand how Sedgwick uses her authorship in *Hope Leslie* to contribute to an important and on-going national debate over religious freedom, it is important first to explore the conditions of her authorship. Chapter two, then, will review the ways that Sedgwick's authorship has been perceived and offer a more fully contextualized background from which to consider Sedgwick's work in *Hope Leslie*.

## Chapter Two: Sedgwick's Authorship

As twentieth-century feminist scholars began their work to establish a new understanding of nineteenth-century American women writers, they found in Sedgwick a useful case study. Sedgwick often appears in their scholarship, work that focuses on answering these questions: Were these women writers any good? What were their contemporary reputations? What aesthetic or cultural merits might their work have? Who were these women, and why did they go outside the boundaries of what was perceived as "woman's sphere" to take on the public role of author? Did they feel driven to write? Or was authorship a way to fill leisure time or a socially acceptable way to earn an income? Did authorship threaten their sense of womanhood or propriety? In Sedgwick's case, her voluminous personal correspondence and published writings offered scholars key documents for investigating female authorship, documents suggesting that her sex was not an obstacle to be overcome but perhaps even an advantage.

The initial scholarship on American women's writing, including Kelley's *Private Woman, Public Stage* and Baym's *Woman's Fiction*, draws its conclusions from a representative sample of nineteenth-century American women writers. Despite a fairly wide variety of family backgrounds, personal histories, motivations, and interests, these women shared some key characteristics, including a fairly high level of education and, often, a need to contribute to the family income. The scholarship of the 1970s and 1980s frequently emphasizes these similarities in order to establish some basic understanding of these women writers.

By the early 1990s, though, the scholarship was refined so that some of these writers had distinctive identities: Lydia Maria Child, the firebrand reformer; Fanny Fern, the feisty journalist; Sarah Josepha Hale, the genteel editor. Sedgwick's position was exceptional in a number of ways. She was among the first nineteenth-century women writers and among the most famous writers of her day, male or female, recognized abroad and at home. She did not have to write to earn a living; she could rely on her tightly knit family for financial support, if necessary. However, with her family's encouragement, Sedgwick chose to write and to become a public figure, and she seems not to have worried that this would compromise her "femininity" or propriety. In fact, she provided an exemplar of single womanhood; she was Miss Sedgwick, the lady novelist, a role model for many women writers.

Her family background accounts for much of Sedgwick's exceptionality. The Sedgwicks were a moderately wealthy and socially and politically influential family in western Massachusetts; on her maternal side, Sedgwick was descended from the Dwights, one of the families known collectively as the Connecticut "River Gods." Sedgwick was the consummate insider of influential social and political circles, reigning at the family's Berkshire headquarters and her brothers' New York homes. Like her brothers, Sedgwick had a career, a profession. Like her brothers, Sedgwick was a social reformer, active in prison reform and aid to poor children, but unlike her brothers, she refused to support abolition unequivocally. Lydia Maria Child and other of Sedgwick's contemporaries would regret that Sedgwick would not join the public debate over

slavery, but it is consistent with Sedgwick's stance on a number of issues: conservative, though occasionally progressive.

This more complex portrait emerged only in the late 1980s and 1990s, after the scholarship superseded the assumptions of early feminist theories of women's authorship. The scholars of the 1970s and 1980s viewed these writers as dependents, women who seemed to assume their own inferiority and to need to apologize for their presence in print. Sedgwick was also pigeon-holed into this seemingly tidy niche; her dependence, especially on her male relatives, was a given. In *Private Woman, Public Stage*, Kelley introduces Sedgwick as a woman who "enjoyed what was tantamount to a literary escort [of her brothers] almost to the end of her literary journey," on which she was "a bewildered, timid, and reluctant passenger," who perhaps "began a literary career as if she were biding her time while waiting for the legitimate domestic career she was never to have, and to an extent she regarded her literary endeavors as a pale substitute for what she believed should be the calling of a true woman" (Kelley 199).

The attitude toward Sedgwick's authorship as a hapless, if happy, accident continues to influence perceptions of Sedgwick's and other women writers' motivations and attitudes toward their authorship. As Melissa J. Homestead writes, "the idea that women in past centuries withheld their names because they experienced their own authorship as shameful or scandalous has achieved the character of received wisdom" (19). This "received wisdom" requires a closer look, for it tries to make authors fit an artificially constructed concept of authorship, one that assumes that nineteenth-century women believed that they were lesser beings who risked their femininity or reputations if

they were public figures. Rather, scholars need to consider, as Susan Coultrap-McQuin suggests, that

behaviors that sometimes have been identified as evidence of women's anxiety of authorship— anonymity or pseudonymity, claims of writing for the good of humanity, denial of professional status, postures of moral superiority or of self-effacement—actually were common among men as well as women and, when expressed by women, are indications of their expectations of the nineteenth-century marketplace. (xii-xiii)

The evidence that Kelley offers in support of her conclusions—that Sedgwick's brothers encouraged her authorship and in essence forced the publication of *A New-England Tale* in 1822, that her brothers were the primary influence on her career, that Sedgwick regretted her singlehood—is largely drawn from unpublished writings held in the Massachusetts Historical Society collections. My own intensive reading of those materials, in Sedgwick's and her family's correspondence (including her parents, siblings, their spouses, and several of their children), leads to quite different conclusions regarding Sedgwick's authorship, for it seems quite clear that Sedgwick enjoyed her profession and took her work seriously. A review of some of the central issues surrounding the publication of her first novel illustrates this point.

The story of *A New-England Tale's* inception is common knowledge among Sedgwick scholars: She began to write a tract on the principles of Unitarianism, to which she had recently converted, and her brothers, particularly Harry, encouraged her to expand this early short story and prepare it for publication. A flurry of family

correspondence about the release of the novel reveals a coordinated and quite savvy network, a support team of advisors charged with marketing and, if necessary, protecting their author. The writers (including Sedgwick herself) repeatedly refer to her "first appearance" as an author, signaling their anticipation of future appearances; one such example appears in her brother Harry's 22 April 1822 letter to William Minot. They consider the likely controversies that the novel might ignite and how to negotiate these. They ask each other to keep the publication a secret, until it is revealed (as if to spring the novel on the public, perhaps to avoid a frittering away of interest if publication were delayed); they ask each other to encourage her writing, to ensure future publications.

On 26 March 1822, as the galleys are readied for printing, Harry writes to Theodore: "She [Catharine] is unwilling to print at all, and particularly unwilling to do so without your imprimatur" (HDS to TS).<sup>3</sup> In the same letter, Catharine adds, "I have an almost invincible disinclination to committing myself without the passport of your [Theodore's] approbation – It would grieve me more than I can tell to publish anything that could displease you." Her "perfect horror at appearing in print" (Sedgwick's emphasis, HDS to TS, 26 March 1822) has, again and again, been interpreted as a "feminine" shrinking from public appearance. However, in the context of the year or so of correspondence leading up to *A New-England Tale's* publication, the fear seems more likely to stem from Sedgwick's understanding that the novel's subject matter, "the New-England character and manners" of its subtitle, would ignite local and regional (and familial) tensions.

In the years preceding the writing and publication of *A New-England Tale*, Sedgwick had struggled with her religious convictions. She had a long-standing antipathy to the strict Congregationalism practiced in her hometown of Stockbridge. In April 1821, Sedgwick confesses to her sister Frances Watson, a firm Congregationalist, that

I never adopted some of the articles of the creed of that [Congregational] Church, and some of those upon which the doctor [Mason] is most fond of expatiating, and which appear to me both unscriptural and very unprofitable, and, I think, very demoralizing. On some important points I think the doctor is all wrong. Still, it was so painful to me to give up the privilege and happiness of church membership, that, until I thought it became an imperative duty to leave it, I remained one of that congregation. (*Life and Letters* 119-120)

Sedgwick understands that her decision will alienate many family members and good friends, but to Frances she emphasizes her faith in Christ and concludes that "Any thing is better than insincerity, than feeling ourselves obliged, from prudence, to conceal our sentiments. Such a prudence borders too closely on hypocrisy" (*Life and Letters* 119-120). A few weeks earlier, Sedgwick had offered a similar recounting of her struggle to Susan Higginson Channing, sister of Thomas Wentworth Higginson and sister-in-law to William Ellery Channing, in a letter dated 12 March 1821:

I will say to you, in all plainness, that I have not yet made up my mind to adopt the new faith [Unitarianism]. I think you are nearer the truth, by a very great deal, than the orthodox, and yet there are some of your articles of unbelief that I am not

Protestant enough to subscribe to. I have many dear friends, who never will change their opinions, who would be shocked and deeply wounded by what they would consider my apostasy. [. . .] My dear Mrs. Channing, I could write a letter full on this subject, for it interests me more than any other at present. (Sedgwick's emphasis, *Life and Letters* 117)

Mary Dewey recounts a telling anecdote in a footnote to her edition of Sedgwick's *Life and Letters*: One of Sedgwick's aunts, reacting to her niece's conversion to Unitarianism, asked Sedgwick to "come and see me often as you can, dear, for you know, after this world, we shall never meet again" (157). Clearly, Sedgwick knew the risks of her conversion, the losses she would suffer for her conscience. Such tensions are central not only to reading *A New-England Tale* but also to interpreting Sedgwick's reluctance to appear in print. It would seem, then, that Sedgwick's reluctance to go public had much to do with her state of mind regarding religion, and perhaps less to do with her "feminine" fears.

Sedgwick and her brothers were fully aware of the potential for personal and public rejection. Before the novel's appearance, Harry writes to Theodore: "The only objection, which, as I apprehend, you could raise to the book is that it may possibly be considered as an attack upon the orthodox. But there is in it nothing sectarian—& indeed I think nothing which an episcopalian of the arminian stamp would not be likely to write as a unitarian" (HDS to TS, 26 March 1822). Sedgwick herself comments, in the same letter to Theodore, "there is no condemnation of doctrines, but only of their abuse of individuals – There is no unitarianism not a hint of it -- . . . there is no mention of her

[Jane, the heroine's] creed – unless by inference you might get at her faith from her works" (Sedgwick's emphasis, HDS to TS, 26 March 1822). Harry, in a letter to his brother-in-law William Minot, 22 April 1822, says of the book that "There is a little satire of orthodoxy, but it is exceedingly grave & well concealed. [...] She is full of apprehensions that she shall do something to awaken religious bigotry" (HDS to Minot). Later Harry writes (expressing a sentiment repeated on several occasions, before and after publication), "I think it [the novel] stands a better chance of a kind welcome in Boston than here [New York], as it is better adapted to your taste & religious sentiment than to ours" (HDS to Minot, 6 May 1822).

The Sedgwicks anticipated the furor that the book would engender, especially in rural New England, and not least their home base in Stockbridge in western Massachusetts. Sedgwick writes to Susan Channing, 15 June 1822, that

Some of my friends here have, as I learn, been a little troubled, but, after the crime of confessed Unitarianism, nothing can surprise them [...] I love my own people and my own home too well to resign or abandon either, and I have good hope of living to laugh with them over our present difference, and if we do not in this world, I am pretty sure we shall in another. (*Life and Letters* 156-157)

Sedgwick's publication of *A New-England Tale* seems in this context more an act of bravery than a shrinking from public view. She knew very well that her criticism of Congregationalism would endanger her reputation and her friendships—but she proceeded anyway. As Victoria Clements has noted, "Sedgwick's rejection of Calvinist orthodoxy and her acceptance of Unitarianism gave credence in her circle of influence

[...] to a rapidly expanding movement toward a more humanized—to some, dangerously liberal—Christianity" (Introduction to *A New-England Tale* xiv).

Sedgwick's next works take care to moderate her representations of orthodox religion, even as she presses this new variety of Christianity. *Redwood* (1824) includes a conversion to Protestantism while a subplot examines the dangers lurking within the Shaker community (such as the sexual exploitation of women). A moderated version of Puritanism, Congregationalism's linear ancestor, governs *Hope Leslie* (1827); this study will consider the importance to the romance of liberal Unitarianism. Sedgwick centers *Clarence; or, A Tale of Our Own Times* (1830) on moral themes such as benevolence and individuals' responsibility for the welfare of others. If, as Buchanan suggests, "the heart of the evangelical message [of liberal Unitarianism] was [...] *benevolence*" (210), *Clarence* offers a complete expression of this. *The Linwoods*, a historical romance set in the American Revolutionary period, proffers a democratic version of action for the public good. Sedgwick's heroes and heroines, like Jane in *A New-England Tale*, believe in a Protestant God, good works, and the ultimate triumph of justice and right. Years later, Sedgwick set aside novels at the Reverend Henry Ware's request that she write "a series of illustrations of Christian precept" (CMS to JMS, 10 Feb. 1834). The first work to respond to this charge is *Home*, published in 1835, the same year as *The Linwoods*. Here Sedgwick wrote to children, recent immigrants, and others seeking Christian instruction.

Over the course of her career, Sedgwick overcame the early fears of provoking public or private controversy. While Kelley believes that Sedgwick "could not dismiss the fact that the gulf between her private domestic life and public literary career was

immense" (*Private Woman* 30), the evidence suggests that her private faith merged with her public profession. Further, her private connections—with her family and friends—served to encourage and support her career, not to prevent that professional development. And her gender offered no impediment.

Sedgwick's family background has often been reviewed in the scholarship: her father Theodore's public service, her mother Pamela's debilitating depressions and illnesses ending in her early death in 1807, and Sedgwick's ties to her brothers. It would be difficult to overestimate the power of Sedgwick's relationships with her brothers, their wives, and children; Sedgwick's older sisters exerted less influence (except maybe in her decision to remain unmarried, perhaps to avoid her sister's experience of an abusive marriage—though it is more likely that Sedgwick never found a mate who met her standards). In short, the siblings Robert, Harry (Henry Dwight), Catharine, and Charles grew up in a household with a frequently absent father and an often ill mother. Elizabeth "Mumbet" Freeman, the former slave freed when she sued for her freedom in 1781 (Theodore Sedgwick represented her), was, in effect, the children's parent, and they openly referred to her as their mother. The attachment of the Sedgwick siblings to one another is evident throughout their lifetime of correspondence; when not in each other's homes, they corresponded frequently and at length. Sedgwick's brothers were always keen critics and editors of her work; they were also (with the exception of Charles) her lawyers. Thus they provided not only personal encouragement but also professional expertise, which might account for claims that they ushered Sedgwick into the "public sphere." The correspondence suggests that the support was mutual; the family respected

and sought out Sedgwick's advice on literary matters. Sedgwick advised her elder brother, Theodore, in 1826, as he approached the publication of his *Hints to My Countrymen*. His wife, Susan Ridley Sedgwick, also asked Sedgwick for advice and granted her the authority to make final editing and publication-related decisions on Susan's behalf.

Within this tight circle, Sedgwick was comfortably at home, living with one brother's family or another throughout most of her life, either in New York City or western Massachusetts. The family circle was an ideal place from which to launch a public career, and perhaps, within this extraordinarily civic-minded family, a public career was almost inevitable. Sedgwick does not seem to have suffered any gender-based qualms over her suitability for public appearance: no questions that she had something of value to contribute, no worries that she would jeopardize her identity as a lady by appearing in print. Such self-confidence in a world that pressed for gender conformity suggests the stability of her social status and her self-image. If she never doubted that she was a lady, meeting or setting her circle's expectations, who would dare to offer a different opinion? And, as a lady in this world, who could doubt that she had words of wisdom, valuable advice or instruction? Her later "hands-on" work in prison reform and Sunday schools for the lower classes suggests a similar principle. Rather than compromising her reputation, such work simply added to the public sense of Sedgwick as a role model. The length of her career—from her early thirties until a few years before her death at age 77 (her last novel published when she was 67 years old)—further kept her in the public eye as a stable figure of sense and propriety.

Although Sedgwick's authorship can be viewed, in Kelley's terms, as a replacement for the husband and children she did not have, it seems a fairly serious oversimplification, perhaps one that better satisfies late twentieth-century readings of singlehood or women's social positions than it addresses the truly complex matter of a woman in search of a meaningful way to contribute to her world. It is clear that the Sedgwick family valued authorship and understood the medium's potential. Sedgwick's brother Theodore Sedgwick II recommends authorship as a profession to his son Theodore III in an 1824 letter. He anticipates the growth of the profession, both as a method of public influence and "as a living" (Sedgwick's emphasis; TS to Theodore Sedgwick III, 12 June 1824). Brother Robert concurs in a letter written just a month later, writing that "the only objection to it [authorship] is uncertainty. And yet the demand for the profession is calling it into being. Prosperity in such a calling would give a man the most enviable station that Society permits" (Sedgwick's emphasis; RS to TS, 18 June 1824). William Charvat's *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870* suggests just this when he writes that, in the 1820s, "those who had the knack of writing were now wooed by publishers and readers" (30). Susan Coultrap-McQuin's *Doing Literary Business: American Women Writers in the Nineteenth Century* finds that authorship offered "a profession in which it was possible to enjoy economic independence and cultural status," and "by mid-century there were enough commercial outlets and full-time practitioners for authorship to be considered a viable career, at least for some" (194). Sedgwick achieved both the prosperity and the station, instituting authorship as a family business. Several of Sedgwick's contemporaries, including her

brother, her nephew, and her sister-in-law, entered the field; the tradition continues today with John Sedgwick, a novelist and direct descendant of Sedgwick's brother Harry.

Beyond her family, Sedgwick recommends authorship to her friend Eliza Cabot Follen (prior to Follen's marriage in 1828): "Eliza why don't you write for money? It is a horrid carnal proposition to you – but surely – the author of your works [ . . . ] might earn her living—Does your Cabot blood rebel? It is honorable[,] dear" (Sedgwick's emphasis, CMS to ECF, 25 March 1827). Such references to authorship are scattered throughout the correspondence, whether as brief footnotes or longer discussions within the body of letters. These references reveal a matter-of-course attitude toward authorship, applied to Sedgwick and other writers, suggesting that her authorship was in no way exceptional. The overriding sense is that writing is simply Sedgwick's work.

In 1835, the year that both *The Linwoods* and *Home* were published, Sedgwick teases her brother Theodore about the delay in his own publication of *Public and Private Economy*, asking if he fears "a Sedgwick 'glut'" in the publishing marketplace (CMS to TS, 29 March 1835). In that same letter, 29 March 1835, she writes:

I assure you my labor will no more come into competition with yours than ladies plumes & artificial flowers do with blankets & bread-stuffs – You know there are people who live on pate de fois gras – omelette soufflé & such flummery, they are not perhaps worth keeping alive, but they pay for their living & therefore are worth something to their feeders. (Sedgwick's emphasis, CMS to TS)

The sense of humor suggested in this passage highlights Sedgwick's awareness of market conditions and their different audiences. In *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian*

*America, 1815-1846*, Charles Sellers discusses the "explosion of print to feed an increasingly literate populace through technological innovation and mass distribution" (369), including newspapers, tracts, books, and a wide variety of periodicals directed at "literati and farmers, doctors and lawyers, women and children, Democrats and Whigs" (371). The field was crowded, and conditions were uncertain, but as Cathy Davidson notes in *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America*, "the rising middle class, with its increasingly voracious appetite for books, especially novels, portended a new mass patronage of books" (16). Sedgwick's work satisfied this demand, but she carefully notes the importance of her brother's weightier work, one that discusses the power and potential of labor in a market economy.

Sedgwick also understands the trials of authorship; years earlier, she had advised Theodore on his publication of *Hints to My Countrymen* that

you will be wretched from the time you send the first sheet to the press till it is fairly in the hands of the public, and the step is irretrievable – [...] I am somewhat hardened now, but I shall never lose the recollection of all those heart-sickening – loathing feelings – the dread of the world's laugh & contempt – that fear of complete failure in my best purposes which has kept my eyes wide open through many a night-watch. Still there was always one sustaining thought – one impassable barrier between despondency & despair the consciousness of a moral purpose – the feeling that tho' it was a 'rickety child,' it was a good child – Your book I am sure will never give you a pang after it is fairly out – It will do good, confer happiness, & reflect honor on its parent. (CMS to TS, 12 May 1826)<sup>4</sup>

This advice to the anxious author, a highly accomplished lawyer and statesman, as well as advice to others that appears in the correspondence, suggests that a gendered reading of Sedgwick's attitudes toward authorship—the early feminist scholarship's sense of a dependent or frightened woman—fails to recognize an inclusive view of authorship: any person's fear of having one's words open to public scrutiny and interpretation.

Yet a sense of writing as work with a purpose going beyond market demand is also evident in the correspondence. Sedgwick consciously shapes her work to religious and socio-political ends when she promotes individual betterment within a distinctly American and Christian audience. In an 1835 journal entry reflecting on the praise for *Home* as well as her recent visits with British writer Harriet Martineau, Sedgwick writes: "When I feel that my writings have made anyone happier or better[,] I feel an emotion of gratitude to Him who has made me the medium of any blessing to my fellow creatures. And I do feel that I am but the instrument" (*The Power of Her Sympathy* 150-151). Sedgwick takes her responsibilities seriously. This is reinforced from without, as when her brother Charles remarks to her in a New Year's Day letter, 1827: "For yourself it appears to me that your path of duty is plain eno' – write – nothing but write – your writings hallow the mind" (CS to CMS, 1 Jan. 1827). Her duty, in this sense, is closely aligned with Unitarian ideals for public service. Sedgwick therefore fulfills a need to contribute to her community and nation, wholly in accordance with her family's beliefs and her faith's, and she thereby satisfies the "obligation to be a 'force for good,'" as Daniel Howe describes it, one of the principal responsibilities of the Unitarian artist (189).

Another dynamic suggests that authorship served positively on a personal level as well. Sedgwick's mother suffered from severe depressions which might have been aggravated by her husband's lengthy absences, occasioned by his work on behalf of the nation, or perhaps caused by unknown physical and mental maladies. On a number of occasions, Sedgwick recommends "occupation" to others as a cure for the "blues":

Occupation, steady, and as agreeable occupation as you can find or make is the best remedy – Fill up all the intervals of your regular business – give your cares and your thoughts to your clients and let not Satan find an idle moment for his mischief-working spirit – I have had the blues too, and I have found going to work heartily in making pie crust or pancakes or some such humble, household matter was the best exorcism. (CMS to HDS, 28 July 1823[?])

She advises her friend Eliza Cabot that "change of air & scene and new occupations are the only remedies I know for those maladies that have more to do with the mental than the physical system" (CMS to ECF, 19 July 1829). Sedgwick allows that her own writing brings not quite the "soul satisfaction" of her work with charity schools, but it does occupy her mind and spirit (CMS to ECF, 14 January 1824[?]). Such comments suggest the complexity of Sedgwick's sense of her authorship. It functions as one outlet among many for her energies; it may keep depression away; it fulfills her sense of social duty and responsibility; it brings her satisfaction.

Sedgwick's response to public recognition or satisfaction is as complicated. In 1835, she distinguishes between the happiness derived from her family and the satisfaction of writing:

My books have been a pleasant occupation and excitement in my life. The notice and friends or acquaintances they have procured me have relieved me from the danger of ennui and blue devils that are most apt to infect a single person. But they constitute no portion of my happiness – this is of such as I derive from the dearest relations of life. (*The Power of Her Sympathy* 150-151)

This passage is often cited to confirm that a woman's "literary career did not challenge the expectations of her sphere," as Coultrap-McQuin does when she discusses authorship as "genteel amateurism" (14). More likely, however, such a remark realistically assesses the role of authorship in Sedgwick's life. Within the more complete context of hundreds of letters and journal entries, it is evident that Sedgwick did find her authorship more than a "pleasant" diversion, but not to the exclusion of her involvement in an active family and wide social circle and a voluminous national and international correspondence. And public acclaim seems often to have been awkward for her, bringing her satisfaction as well as some discomfort.

While her name appeared only on the title page of *Tales and Sketches* (1835), Sedgwick was widely known as the author of other works (Homestead 19). (As is commonly known among Sedgwick scholars, Sedgwick probably enjoyed the debate over *Redwood's* authorship, attributed in a European edition to James Fenimore Cooper.) As a result, Sedgwick had to learn to be public property. Her journals record the discomfiting nature of overhearing conversations about herself or her work, especially whether or not she should reveal her identity. At other times, strangers would approach her, feeling a familiarity with her because they had read her books. Readers even interrupted her

vacations, as some did in her summer 1827 visit to Saratoga Springs, "with such sage remarks as 'Ma'am, this is an excellent place to make observations,' 'A fine field for characters, Ma'am'" (CMS to LMC, 15 Sept. 1827).

Sedgwick works toward reconciling her self-image with public reception during her July 1826 visit to Saratoga Springs:

I have prayed earnestly, and earnestly endeavored to escape the intoxication of flattery – [. . .] I sometimes perceive an honest heart-felt emotion and I am touched by it, as when a lovely woman said to me "I thought when I saw you I must embrace you" – I do not disguise from myself that I feel a pleasure in being able to command a high station wherever I go, and that I often enjoy the power of being able to gratify others by notice and attentions – But I feel deeply the disadvantage of what my sweet modest Charles calls 'LaFayetteism' on a very humble scale being the quest and possession of the public and being obliged to fritter away in general transient courtesies time and thought and feeling – I am conscious that what distinction I have attained is greatly owing to the paucity of our literature – [. . .] I have more cause to mourn over what I have not done than to exult in what I have done – more cause for humility than for pride –  
(Sedgwick's emphasis, 1826-1827 Journal)<sup>5</sup>

She further cautions herself a few years later, in an entry dated 14 May 1830, just after submitting the proofs of *Clarence*, her fourth novel:

I honestly confess that I earnestly desire & hope for success & expect it – but if I am disappointed I pray to God that I may be humble not irritated against the

world – that I may have the testimony within my own soul that I have not embarked my tranquility on the uncertain wave of popular favor – but have safely anchored it in the humble hope of the approbation & acceptance of my Father in Heaven – (1830-1832 Journal)

Reflecting on a trip to Washington, D.C., and the favor she had received there, Sedgwick notes, on 20 February 1831, that "I do not depreciate the civilities I have received nor the ground on which they are accorded – I find my reputation far greater than I think I deserve – the world is good natured & kindhearted especially to what they consider respectable mediocrity for it neither alarms their pride nor provokes their envy – (Sedgwick's emphasis, 1830-1832 Journal).

And perhaps this self-assessment of her "respectable mediocrity" is important to understanding that neither Sedgwick nor her family believed that she was a "great" author (a term she would have applied to Shakespeare or Sir Walter Scott but not to herself) – which is not to say that they did not think her work worthwhile. Moreover, aware of her own middling position, a big fish in the very small pond of early and mid-nineteenth-century American letters, Sedgwick understood her authorship as a boon to her, socially and personally, but it was not to be mistaken with her self, the self reserved for private relations with family and friends.

Sedgwick's fame brought her friendships that she would value until her death, particularly with British writers Harriet Martineau and Mary Russell Mitford, the actress Fanny Kemble, and the many acquaintances who offered her introductions abroad. At home, she had strong ties with William Cullen Bryant and a number of lesser New York

poets; she enjoyed meeting the Grimké sisters and other political activists (even if she did not share their views). Sedgwick offered considerable advice and encouragement to the young Lydia Maria Child, who flattered her with an intense hero-worship—until Sedgwick refused to take a strong position against slavery in Child's pro-abolition publications. Even among these relationships, though, Sedgwick remained close-mouthed, somewhat cagey, and sometimes self-deprecating, about her work and work-in-progress, as revealed in letters to Child and journal entries regarding Martineau's visit.

To Lydia Maria Child, during the composition of *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick writes:

I was a little ashamed of myself for replying to you as I did when you asked me at Mrs. Minots what I was writing – or something to that effect – I did not reply with perfect sincerity – but the simple truth is that I have so little confidence in doing anything, or in anything I may do that so far from exciting expectations in my friends, I have none myself. (CMS to LMC, 8 Feb. 1827)

On 8 October 1834, Sedgwick responds in her journal to Martineau's evident annoyance that Sedgwick did not want to talk about authorship, their mutual profession. Sedgwick writes:

I have as much pleasure in success - (& certainly as much in the consciousness of deserving it) as others – but I early took a disgust to hearing people talk of themselves [...] I see that most persons soon weary of listening to these self-glorifiers self-expounders, or whatever they may be – We are in danger of self-exaggeration – the object that is nearest appears larger to the mental as well as the physical vision – I think too honestly it befits me to be modest [;] I have great

defects of mind, partly resulting from my defective education & partly from my own self negligence. (Sedgwick's emphasis, 1834-1835 Journal)

On her 45<sup>th</sup> birthday, 29 December 1834, Sedgwick summarizes her sense of her authorship:

I am forty-five years old – [ . . . ] I have enjoyed far more of the world's respect than I ever expected, or I believe I can honestly say cared for – any farther than I may make it subservient to my usefulness – [ . . . ] My prayer & desire now is to spend the time that remains to me for the good of others for their good & happiness & to be prepared by a faithful service for the summons of my master – (Sedgwick's emphasis, 1834-1835 Journal)

In the next year, Sedgwick turns her attention to a full-time emphasis on "the good of others for their good & happiness," taking up Henry Ware's call for work intended to spread the liberal Unitarian value system. *Home* resulted from this decision, though the central position of Unitarian values in Sedgwick's works really began with *A New-England Tale*. Having braved the storm of religious controversy over that first novel, Sedgwick approached her work as a thoughtful professional, willing to speak her mind and shape her work toward a particular end. In this effort, she bears little resemblance to the stereotypical nineteenth-century American woman writer presented in the scholarship of the late twentieth century.

Between *A New-England Tale* and *Home*, Sedgwick published four novels, *Redwood* and *Clarence*, both concerned with nineteenth-century American values, and *Hope Leslie* and *The Linwoods*, her American historical romances. In the latter two,

Sedgwick turns to the Puritan settlement and the American Revolution respectively to consider the lessons of history and to predict the course of a nation in the making. In these romances, she draws from more than her personal beliefs or observations of society (as she often does in the other novels). Instead, Sedgwick undertakes serious research and a serious investigation into America's past. In doing so, she commits herself to authorship as an occupation with socio-political implications, an unsurprising choice for Judge Theodore Sedgwick's daughter.

To deepen the exploration of Sedgwick's professional authorship and to better understand her participation in the establishment of a national literature, the following chapters of this study offer a close examination of *Hope Leslie* as an example of Sedgwick's purposeful engagement with American history. Fortunately, the archival evidence required for such a close examination of *Hope Leslie* exists; in fact, the archival evidence is richest in quantity and in detail in regard to *Hope Leslie*, more so than for any other of Sedgwick's published works. This study's close reading of the layers of textual evidence related to *Hope Leslie* then provides the foundation for further inquiries into Sedgwick's authorship and historical research. Chapter three documents the development of *Hope Leslie* and introduces this study's consideration of Sedgwick's reading in the historical records of the colonial period.

### Chapter Three: Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: The Writing of a Romance

As Dana Nelson has noted, "It's no accident that Sedgwick returned to popular critical attention as the author of *Hope Leslie*" ("Rediscovery" 290). Just as its first reviewers were attracted to the adventurous Hope Leslie, so too were late twentieth-century scholars and teachers seeking proto-feminist heroines in nineteenth-century American texts. For classroom use, as a counter or companion to James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* or Lydia Maria Child's *Hobomok*, *Hope Leslie* offers a highly readable romance with a full complement of dashing heroes, brave and lovely heroines, dastardly villains and villainesses. For scholars of literature and history, the novel provides an engaging narrative largely grounded in American colonial history. But, to date, their examinations of this history have been limited to references within or extrapolated from their study of *Hope Leslie*; similar limitations apply to the development of the novel itself. This chapter will provide a documentary narrative of *Hope Leslie*'s composition, building upon chapter two's general discussion of her authorship; the appendix to this study examines Sedgwick's research sources as they relate to the completed novel.

Most commentators on *Hope Leslie* focus on Sedgwick's role in establishing a national literature and the attendant project of nation-building, the tensions between individual rights and community welfare, and issues of race (particularly miscegenation and Indian removal policies) and women's public and private roles. Most of these interpretations use feminist or New Historical perspectives to tease out Sedgwick's vision

of America, often reading *Hope Leslie's* emphasis on liberty as an anticipation of the American Revolution. The conclusions of this body of scholarship vary, but they settle along similar lines of thought. Michael Davitt Bell initiates the discussion in "History and Romance Convention in Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: "the symbolic point of *Hope Leslie* remains manifestly clear. Miss Sedgwick is celebrating the historical movement from artificial to natural, or, as romantic historians liked to express it, from 'tyranny' to 'liberty'" (220). Suzanne Gossett and Barbara Ann Bardes focus on this liberty, writing in "Women and Political Power in the Republic: Two Early American Novels" that "for Sedgwick individual liberty is the highest political value"; their interest is in the conflicts that this liberty poses, especially for women (20). For Mary Kelley, *Hope Leslie's* love plot "is interwoven with the narrative of Indian displacement to provide a structure for the investigation of both American and female character, issues of primary importance for Sedgwick" (Introduction xxi). Philip Gould in *Covenant and Republic: Historical Romance and the Politics of Puritanism* considers the ways in which "*Hope Leslie* both critiques the viability of masculine, classical republicanism and participates in a larger cultural debate over the nature of citizenship in the early American republic" (65). Judith Fetterley asserts in "'My Sister! My Sister!': The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*" that Sedgwick "offers a different basis and hence an alternative model for women's inclusion in the American republic" (496). In "Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: Fostering Radical Democratic Individualism in the New Nation," Maria Karafilis explores both communitarianism and individualism, focusing on "Sedgwick's desire to offer an alternative model of governance and citizenship

appropriate for members of a democratic republic and her desire to foster a fledgling domestic national literature" (328). As he develops a discussion of nineteenth-century concepts of public versus private spheres in "Magawisca's Body of Knowledge: Nation-Building in *Hope Leslie*," Gustavus Stadler finds that "the novel thus levels a critique against the contemporary antebellum gendered politics of citizenship and against the increasingly privately defined domain of women" (43). Mark G. Vasquez's "'Your Sister Cannot Speak to You and Understand You As I Do': Native American Culture and Female Subjectivity in Lydia Maria Child and Catherine [sic] Maria Sedgwick" considers the ways that *Hobomok* and *Hope Leslie* "critiqued male historical and religious authority, promoted a figurative language of mediation, and addressed the ideas of Native American and female subjectivity" (par. 5).

These interpretations generally center on the relationships among Hope, Magawisca, and Everell, their relative freedom of action and expression throughout the novel (particularly as they contest Puritan hegemony), and the significance of Hope and Everell's marriage. Their marriage predicts the birth of generations that will move beyond the Puritan legacy to embrace political and personal freedoms, just as Magawisca's movement away from the colony foretells the disappearance of the Native American. These writers are concerned with the broad idea of American liberty and the tensions that have always existed between individual liberties and the public good. Further, they explore the limitations of women's participation in public life, not only in Hope Leslie's time but also in Sedgwick's. These interpretations and others have established a rich body of scholarship, often contextualized with remarks on the positive

responses of its contemporary reviewers (as well as their reservations about the heroic figure of Magawisca, the Indian maiden) and Sedgwick's own pleasure in the book and the compliments she received from readers. But the scholarship has not yet established a timeline for the romance's development, and much remains to be said of Sedgwick's research in the primary historical documents that contribute to her vision of early Puritan history. This project will supply those elements.

Carolyn Karcher notes in her introduction to *Hope Leslie* that "James Fenimore Cooper's *The Spy*, Eliza Lanesford Cushing's *Saratoga*, Harriet Vaughan Cheney's *A Peep at the Pilgrims*, and Lydia Maria Child's *Hobomok* all appeared in 1823 and 1824, as Sedgwick was preparing *Redwood* for the market" (xviii). This "proliferation of frontier romances," along with other factors such as the contemporary debate over white and Indian relations, no doubt prompted Sedgwick to consider setting her own novel in the Puritan settlement (Karcher xviii). A brief outline of the major events of *Hope Leslie*, dated July 1824 and found in Sedgwick's journal, suggests that Karcher is correct:

July 11' 1824 – Tutor in a noble family – nephew of my Lord – is enamored of Margaret – the only child – heir of the family – avows his conversion – is discarded – treated with ignominy – the young lady married – he comes to NE [New England] – seeks retirement, she dies[,] bequeaths to him her twin children – sent to – goes to B [Boston] to receive them – sends one to C [Connecticut] River – retains the other to escort her himself [and] arrives in sight of his mansion – sees a bright streak along the horizon – alarmed hurries onward and finds his house a ruin – (Diary, 1811-1812, and Notes)

But for a few differences in names, this sketch, to my knowledge never before identified or published, makes evident the early actions of the finished novel: A controversy over religious principles forces William Fletcher to leave his love and his native England. He acquires his lost love's daughters (now sisters rather than twins) and sends one to the Connecticut River area while the other waits with him in Boston. Upon returning to his frontier home, he finds his family destroyed by an Indian massacre. The date of the outline, in the summer of 1824, does not definitively mark the beginning of Sedgwick's work on *Hope Leslie*, but it does provide a certain point of departure for understanding the timeline of the novel's development from 1824 to its publication in 1827.

Sedgwick's earliest research for *Hope Leslie* has connections to her childhood in Stockbridge, as nearly every commentator on Sedgwick has noted.<sup>6</sup> The first link is with her family history, beginning with Sedgwick's grandparents, and particularly her maternal grandmother, Abigail Williams Sergeant Dwight, and her association with the Stockbridge Indian mission, through Dwight's husband's as well as her role as headmistress. Sedgwick's *Autobiography* speaks of the stories of Indian attacks and alarms in Stockbridge, including one that seemed to threaten her mother Pamela. Moreover, Sedgwick was interested in the experiences of Eunice Williams, grandmother Dwight's cousin and a child captured in the 1704 Deerfield Massacre and never redeemed to her family. Karen Woods Weierman suggests too that the very ground of the Sedgwick homestead affords an important way to consider the novel's early conception, as Sedgwick's father "participated in the final land grab" associated with the Stockbridge Indians' final removal from the area, purchases that included the land on which the

family's homestead was built (still owned and occupied by his descendants) (427). Like the scholars before her, Weierman considers *Hope Leslie* as a response to these family connections and further to the contemporary issues of the national policies of Indian removal, noting further that "Cherokee removal had become a family matter when Sedgwick's cousin Harriet Gold married Cherokee Elias Boudinot" (435). In sum, Sedgwick's family background, local history and legends, perhaps even the day trips of the family to Monument Mountain or Laurel Hill (believed to be the scene of Magawisca's sacrifice) or Sedgwick's own witnessing of the occasional returns of the Stockbridge Indians, inform *Hope Leslie*. Further evidence of Sedgwick's interest in the Native American is found in her extensive notes from a range of published works that include Roger Williams's *Key into the Language of the Indians of New-England*, 1643; John Heckewelder's *History, Manner, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighbouring States*, first published in 1818; and Daniel Gookin's "Historical Collections of the Indians of New England," 1792.<sup>7</sup> For access to these and other works, Sedgwick would call upon family and friends.

The early months of 1825 seem to have been a period of Sedgwick's seeking materials and inspiration for her next work. Her brother Charles writes that "I am sorry that you have written nothing but I shall not reproach you until 2 yrs have gone by since the appearance of *Redwood*," published in 1824 (CS to CMS, 21 Feb. 1825). A letter to her brother Harry suggests a project under consideration:

I wish with all my heart that I could do something toward a reparation of NE  
[New England] character – If you can think of the plan of any story[,] do suggest

it to me – Charles says that Judge Walker has a long manuscript written by a plain sensible man[,] an actor in the Shay's Rebellion containing minute particulars of that domestic war – Would you advise me to get possession of that? and will that subject admit of a portraiture of the best traits of NE character? (CMS to HDS, 1 June [1825?])

Evidently Sedgwick continued to feel the sting from the controversy surrounding *A New-England Tale*, for letters near the period of *Redwood's* publication in 1824 show that Sedgwick continues to worry that the unsatisfactory reputation of the first novel would taint the reception of the second. In any event, Sedgwick continued to pursue the idea of a story based on Shay's Rebellion, soliciting her brother-in-law Thaddeus Pomeroy for an account of the period. On 30 March 1825, Pomeroy provides the account, which focuses particularly on the role of Sedgwick's father in the Rebellion. At the close of the letter, Pomeroy writes, "Your letter is destroyed – Do the same to mine" (Pomeroy to CMS). Fortunately, Sedgwick neglected to do so. Sedgwick no doubt later used this material in the tale, "A Story of Shay's War," published in 1835.

Although no clear evidence survives to explain Sedgwick's decision to return to the 1824 plotline set in the Puritan settlement rather than to Shay's Rebellion, another letter to Harry offers the best available clue to the sources for Sedgwick's details on that period:

The book I think we were talking about was Hubbard's history – I have had a very kind letter from [Judge Samuel] Howe expressing his disappointment on account of your not going to North<sup>n</sup> [Northampton] and offering to obtain for me ~~any pub~~

some rare books on the pilgrim subject – He says he can doubtless obtain the manuscript, but he does not believe that will answer my turn – He mentions Winthrop's journal – and the collections of the [Massachusetts] historical society, which he says he can obtain from Hale [likely Nathan Hale, 1784-1863, a Boston editor] – I shall write to beg that he will. (CMS to HDS, 14 August [1825?])<sup>8</sup>

Sedgwick refers, respectively, to William Hubbard's *A General History of New England*, 1682, John Winthrop's *The History of New England from 1630-1649* (ed. Savage, 1825-1826), and the First and Second Series of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, a total of twenty volumes published between 1792 and 1823.<sup>9</sup> Evidently Howe brought Sedgwick these books, for Sedgwick's unpublished notebooks and the text of *Hope Leslie* are filled with references from these works, among others.<sup>10</sup> Further correspondence about book-borrowing either does not survive or has not yet been located.<sup>11</sup> Work on *Hope Leslie* must have continued only intermittently as, in this same letter, Sedgwick allows that "I have not had spirit to touch mon ebauche" because of the distraction of family concerns (CMS to HDS, 14 August [1825?]). The rest of the family's 1825 correspondence passes without explicit mention of a *Hope Leslie* in progress.

On 20 January 1826, Sedgwick remarks in a letter to her friend Eliza Cabot, "My precious book: It is always on the table beside me," suggesting that work on *Hope Leslie* has continued (CMS to ECF). The next mention of the work appears a full year later, in letters that ask if she is still writing (CS to CMS, 1 Jan. 1827) and letters from Sedgwick that complain of the toll that her writing is taking on her physically and mentally (CMS to

Catherine Watson, 6 Jan. 1827). Since the evidence of the letters suggests that Sedgwick is at this time working on a translation to be published in *The Christian Examiner* (ES to CMS, 22 Jan. 1827) as well as on her tale "The Chivalric Sailor" (earlier titled "Modern Chivalry") and other shorter projects, these comments may not refer explicitly to *Hope Leslie*, but to the combination of ongoing projects.

Sedgwick's journal, however, reveals strong evidence. The first entry for 1827, in March, notes the long lapse of several months since her last entry: "My time has not been idly spent though perhaps not profitably – My book – if book it ever be – is now within a hundred pages of the conclusion" (1826-1827 Journal). As during other times when Sedgwick was engaged in fiction-writing, her correspondence and journal writing slacken, a fairly clear indication that the novel was engaging much of her time and energy. Still, a few scattered references offer clues to some points of the romance's development.

Sedgwick chose the epigraph of the novel from an unpublished poem, "Sachem's Point," by her friend Eliza Cabot.<sup>12</sup> Until recently, the author was unknown.<sup>13</sup> Sedgwick writes to Cabot to ask for its use, telling her that a friend had "begged me to [...] request that it might be inserted in the Souvenir – The piece I alluded to is Sachem's point – and it is very disinterested in me to ask it, because I had set my heart upon begging you to let me take two stanzas for the motto to my book – which they suit as nothing else ever will" (CMS to ECF, [1827?]). "Sachem's Point" remarks elegiacally on the erasure of the Native American from the American landscape. The choice of this poem as well as Sedgwick's comments in the introduction to *Hope Leslie* (not to mention her depiction of

the Indian heroine Magawisca) suggest that Sedgwick would have liked to overcome white biases against the Native American, but she could not quite reconcile her conflicted views or the reality of white expansion.

In addition to this serious contribution, Sedgwick's friends offered inspiration for lighter moments of *Hope Leslie*. The comic relief that Master Craddock, Hope's tutor, provides on occasion was at least in part inspired by a letter from Sedgwick's friend Susan, likely Susan Higginson Channing.<sup>14</sup> As Sedgwick reports to their mutual friend Eliza Cabot, "I was in the midst of a scene where I wanted just such a description of a person and manner as her [Susan's] inimitable one of the Gymnic – so I ~~inserted~~ set the jewel forthwith in my rough frame – and if she should read "Hope Leslie – or early times in the massachusetts" tell her she will find her own embodied imagination in Gov'r Winthrop's parlor in Master Craddock's [sic] form" (CMS to ECF, 25 March 1827). Throughout the novel, Craddock is described as physically awkward, ungainly. But his affection for Hope is deep, so that any notice from her enlists his whole attention and makes him forget his posture. Here, Sedgwick likely refers to an incident in which Craddock incrementally, seemingly unconsciously, moves his chair closer and closer to Hope as she recounts her adventures in escaping from a crew of drunken men. Her particular mention that her knowledge of Italian—one of Craddock's few successes in teaching her— causes Craddock to "burst into a peal of laughter, that resembled the neighing of a horse more than any human sound" (*Hope Leslie* Karcher ed. 284; Kelley ed. 271).

And a rare and extended visit to Boston during the writing of *Hope Leslie* no doubt provided Sedgwick with details about the city and its bay. On 24 November 1826, she and her friends took a boat trip from Long Wharf to Governor's Island, with "Antoine Baptiste an Ital'n and a German for our boatmen," on which the group had "a fine view of Boston – Charleston – Chelsea Point and even there of Castle Wm – Thompsons Island – behind which is Quincy & Sachem's Point—to the South and East the Island is level, with a harbor at flood tide for boats" (1826-1827 Journal). On this excursion to and walk around the island, Sedgwick likely gathered impressions of the harbor, city, and island used in *Hope Leslie*, especially in the scenes that take place on Governor's Island and describe Hope's narrow escape from a group of drunken sailors. The Italian boatman may also have inspired Hope's rescuer, Antonio, a crewman on Chaddock's ship.

Other references in the correspondence raise some concerns, particularly about the title of the novel. Sedgwick's brother Charles writes that "I shd like the title if Leslie did not sound Scottish" (CS and ES to CMS, 28 March 827). Nothing of Sedgwick's response to this comment, much less her original decision to give to her characters Hope and Faith the Leslie surname, seems to have survived. Within the romance, readers learn very little about the girls' paternal connections, except that their father Charles Leslie "perished in a foreign service" (Karcher ed. 20; Kelley ed. 20) and that Hope is "the daughter and sole heir of Sir Walter Leslie" (Karcher ed. 208; Kelley ed. 199).<sup>15</sup> Karcher's edition notes that "Walter Leslie's role in the siege [of the Isle of Rhée] remains undocumented, but there was a Count by that name (1606-1667) who served in many military campaigns" (388, n. 5); this is the only discussion of Sedgwick's choice of the

Leslie name that I have discovered. Leslie's name might be intended to evoke both King Charles I as well as a famous Scottish military commander, David Leslie, who fought with Cromwell's forces in the 1640s and then for the monarch's forces in 1650 ("David Leslie").

Other names within the novel also suggest connections to the period of the English Civil War. Leslie's sister, Dame Grafton, the novel's representative of the Church of England, might recall Henry Fitzroy, the First Duke of Grafton and one of Charles II's illegitimate sons ("Henry Fitzroy"). The name of Digby, the Fletcher family servant and later superintendent on Governor's Island, may originate with Sir Kenelm Digby (1603-1665), an adventurer and sometime scientist with ties to Charles I's queen Henrietta Maria as well as Ben Jonson; Digby was raised in the Roman Catholic church, converted to Anglicanism to protect his government position, but later returned to Catholicism ("Sir Kenelm Digby"). Further, Sir Digby's father was named Everard, which could have suggested Everell Fletcher's first name. As for the surname Fletcher, I have found no connections to the English Civil War, but the correspondence from 1827 includes mention of attempts to find a book on Mrs. Mary Fletcher, the wife of John Fletcher, a prominent Methodist and John Wesley's chosen successor. Sedgwick may also have had in mind the French for "arrow," "flèche" or "flècher"; perhaps this name, and the prominence of the family in the novel, points out the direction of the future, toward moderate principles and religion.

As Judith Fetterley has noted, the novel "takes place against the background of the English Civil War" ("My Sister!" 80), and so Sedgwick might have had these names

in mind. Sedgwick may simply have liked the sound of the name "Hope Leslie," or, as Fetterley suggests, perhaps she intended Hope Leslie to read as "hopelessly" ("My Sister!" 87). Even if he were aware of these possibilities, Sedgwick's brother Charles may have objected to the Scottish surname because it seems inappropriate to or misleading for a book centered on English settlers.

The Leslie surname does not seem to have concerned Sedgwick. Instead, she is "troubled about one half of my title. 'Early Times' etc lest it should be deemed pretensionary – It is merely a story not violating the spirit of the times" (CMS to LMC, 28 May 1827). Yet, despite conceding that it might be seen as over-reaching, Sedgwick retained the full title, for she does not refer to it by any other name in the correspondence or journals.

As Sedgwick approached the final stages of *Hope Leslie*, her brother Charles responded to the news:

I am rejoiced beyond all expression at the progress of the book. I have all along thot [thought] it nearer the end than your letters intimated & now that it is nearly done I can jump for joy. [. . .] I do not know what other gratification I wd not part with to hear a few chapters of the Massachusetts! Do tell me if it will take till the middle of June to print this book. If so, I must go & see you." (CS and ES to CMS, 28 March 1827)

Sedgwick's niece Catharine adds a note to her father's letter: "I shall like very much to get that new book you are publishing called Hope Leslie. Mother has told it to me as a secret and I have not betrayed it" (CS and ES to CMS, 28 March 1827). Those who had

read the book in manuscript were pleased with the results, but its reception was overshadowed by Harry Sedgwick's illness.<sup>16</sup>

Just before *Hope Leslie*'s publication, Sedgwick's sister-in-law Jane, in a letter to her sister-in-law (Sedgwick's sister) Frances Watson, offers these compliments:

I long to say every thing about sister Catharine's last book "Hope Leslie, or early times in the Massachusetts" but I know it is a mistaken kindness to trumpet a work before it appears. I am sure the author has never before been as well satisfied with any of her productions – it is decidedly her favorite & mine. I cannot pretend to judge much for the world who run after Cooper's novels but they must have a blindness ten times thicker than [illegible – perfect?] if they think the best story he ever wrote, at all worthy to be named with this. In my opinion it is the first female novel ever written & contains the finest specimens of elevated religious & moral feelings ever produced by any writer. (JMS to Watson, 9 April [1827?]).

This letter encapsulates the family's attitude toward Sedgwick's work as well as the animated discussion of her place in American letters. They were keenly aware of Cooper as Sedgwick's competition, but their readings of his work—sometimes approving, sometimes not—seem more a genuine reaction to the work than an attempt to aggrandize "their" author. Samuel Howe was a bit more cutting on this issue: "The decided preference given to it [*Hope Leslie*] by those individuals over the productions of another individual author who has proved a great favorite with the American public was not only gratifying on your account but because it indicated a correctness of taste & sentiment

which has not always existed among us" (S. Howe to CMS, 1 July 1827). Jane's desire not to overstate the merits of the book (that it would be a "mistaken kindness" to do so) was also characteristic of the family's tendency to offer a balanced judgment of Sedgwick's work, to counter any prejudices they might have in her favor.

Sedgwick's own estimation of the novel balances her expectations for the novel with her own assessment of it. In this case particularly, the language she chooses is worth noting.<sup>17</sup> In a letter to Eliza Cabot, Sedgwick writes: "I have almost perpetrated another novel – [ . . . ] I think this is much better than any thing that has gone before it – but this is a bad sign – the rickety children are always preferred" (CMS to ECF, 25 March 1827). Sedgwick's choice of "perpetrated" suggests a deliberate transgression into a territorial dispute (probably with Cooper). This is the only known instance of Sedgwick characterizing her work in this way, and thus it is difficult to decide how to read it, to understand if the word choice stems from a bout of frustration or an intent to assert her claim to authorial stature. The next line, declaring the fitness of her work and her pride in it, is immediately stilled by Sedgwick's awareness of that the public, in preferring the "rickety child," will likely not recognize or value the merits that she claims for the work.<sup>18</sup>

Sedgwick perceives that reviewers will be comfortable heaping praise on the work of a "lady," as long as the work is pleasantly mediocre in style and presents no threat to prevailing ideas of "feminine" propriety or American nationalism. Sedgwick therefore had some cause for concern, knowing that *Hope Leslie* would challenge the

contemporary perceptions of Native American (even though her Indians quietly disappear to the west) and believing that this is her best work to date.

But the work also had faults of which she was all too aware. To Lydia Maria Francis Child, Sedgwick confesses to what she believes are its shortcomings:

[N]othing I ever have done, or shall do will have a systematic plan – A great part of the book has been written under the pressure of domestic anxieties, and since I have been publishing it, my mind has been so engrossed that I can scarcely confine my thoughts to it even while my hands are on the proof-sheets – My brother H [Harry] too has from the state of his eyes, and other causes been unable to render me any assistance – and my brother Robert has only been able to look over my proofs when exhausted by office-business—so that I expect to furnish abundant food for the critics. (CMS to LMC, 28 May 1827)

Yet these general remarks touch primarily on non-substantive matters, not on important issues of theme, structure, or characterization. In any event, Sedgwick's concerns were misplaced, although an 1836 review in the *American Monthly Magazine* does point out some of the book's stylistic irregularities. The first nine pages of the April 1828 review in the *North American Review* valorize what it terms "female literature," with Sedgwick as the exemplar and *Hope Leslie* "the best" of her works thus far (411). The reviewer particularly credits Sedgwick with meeting the challenges of writing a historical novel by having

the industry to study the early history of New England, the costume and carriage, the spirit and temper of the settlers and aboriginal inhabitants, and the talent to

combine the results of her researches with the embellishments of her own resources [ . . . ] to verify our theories, to enliven our ancestral attachments, to delight, instruct, and improve us. (413).

And Sedgwick's readers seem to have agreed whole-heartedly. After the romance's appearance in the summer of 1827, Sedgwick received warm letters from family and friends. One of the most detailed came from Judge Samuel Howe. Howe, of course, was instrumental in obtaining resource materials for Sedgwick, and his description of his father-in-law's response suggests that his father-in-law's library might have been one source of Sedgwick's reading:

Mrs. Howe's father who is the greatest lover of american antiquities I ever knew, whose favorite works are Mather's Magnalia, Winthrop's Journal, Prince's annual [sic] & New England's Memorial [ . . . ] but who never read a novel in his life was induced by the period & place to which your book related to peruse it & he was delighted with it. He has never before he says seen justice done to the character of our pilgrim fathers. He does not understand how you should have become acquainted with the internal appearance & domestic arrangement of the Governors household which he does not doubt you have accurately described. He recollects Sir Phillip very well & says he does not doubt there was a family of Fletchers of Springfield altho he does not know any of their descendants. He is greatly obliged to you for directing public attention to this portion of our history & for the light you have shed upon the puritan character" (S. Howe to CMS, 1 July 1827).

Sedgwick's use of history satisfied this reader. Howe also reports the praise of his fellow judges and expresses his own delight in the book, especially its ability to evoke strong emotions. He further approves of Sedgwick's conservative depiction of Native Americans:

You have introduced yours just enough to afford them an opportunity to display the simple elements of their character & to assist in developing some of the most interesting scenes without at all embarrassing the progress of your story – You have said everything which should be said about them & nothing more. (Howe to CMS, 1 July 1827)

Perhaps most of all, Howe deeply appreciated her portrayal of the Puritans: "As one of their descendants I feel very grateful to you for the manner in which you have illustrated their noble characters" (S. Howe to CMS, 1 July 1827). This response suggests that Sedgwick had met an ideal of the liberal Unitarian aesthetic, to "create an emotional impact," particularly one that would "stimulate the benevolent sentiments of society," here an appreciation of the nation's history (D. Howe 194). Evidently others agreed that Sedgwick had done well by the Puritans, for she notes that she met "three handsome young Winthrops—lineal descendants of the old governor" while in Saratoga Springs, "and received their thanks which I did not think were quite my due" (CMS to ECF, 25 July 1827). Years later, in 1834, Sedgwick would receive what she called "a valuable present": "a Mr. Stearns of Springfield" had sent her "a beautiful writing desk [...] made from some of the oak of the old Pynchon house, where Hope Leslie spent the night on which Nelema escaped" (Sedgwick's emphasis; CMS to JMS, 20 Feb. 1834).

Other readers, such as the British writer Lucy Aiken, believed that "Very rarely indeed have the puritans of either hemisphere been drawn with so much impartiality as you display, or the Indians either," adding that she wished that Sedgwick might

give us from those early authorities which are evidently familiar to you, *Memoirs of the Pilgrims*; a work which in your hands could not fail of being made both entertaining & interesting, whilst it would afford opportunities, which you would not neglect, of serving in many ways the cause of truth & of virtue. (Aiken to CMS, 15 Sept. 1827).

Not every reader, however, was happy to offer only compliments. The Scottish traveller and writer Basil Hall, visiting the United States, felt a need to write to Sedgwick with instructions to attend to "the best standards both as to taste & to mere expression" (Hall to CMS, 2 Oct. 1827). Hall asks that Sedgwick consider her readers and therefore "avoid the introduction of persons, or of scenes, or of circumstances which would not bear to be introduced into conversation in good company, without raising a blush – or exciting horror," such as the character Rosa, and all vulgar language (2 Oct 1827). Hall's letter concludes with a long list of specific "errors in English composition" that Sedgwick has committed, perhaps intending for her to use his advised replacements (such as "various" in place of "variant" or " a bit – a slice – some – a little" in place of "a piece of meat") (2 Oct. 1827). While Sedgwick's reaction to such admonitions does not seem to exist, Hall makes it clear that her family members (with whom he was visiting) had suggested that she would welcome his critique. Perhaps Sedgwick did, and probably

with a sense of humor, just as she would characteristically temper excessive praise of her work.<sup>19</sup>

In her response to Child's admiring comments on *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick encourages Child's own work, likely referring to Child's *The First Settlers of New-England: or, Conquest of the Pequods, Narragansets and Pokanokets, as Related by a Mother to her Children* (1829), a didactic work, also in the liberal tradition, that bluntly makes clear Child's objection to the "crooked and narrow-minded policy, which we have adopted in reference to the Indians" (iv). According to Carolyn Karcher, Child worked on this project in at least two stages, before and after her marriage to David Child in October 1828 (*The First Woman in the Republic* 89). Sedgwick's comments are encouraging:

Your real Indian cannot be impaired by being shadowed forth by a mere sketching of the imagination –[. . .] I am not sure that it is not absolute murder to destroy a creature into whom (I would say it without any improper allusion) you have breathed a living soul – Then do reconsider this – and give to my Magawisca a companion for her solitude – (CMS to LMC, 25 July 1827).

The matter at hand was no doubt familiar to Sedgwick and Child, but without access to the corresponding letters, it is difficult to determine exactly what Sedgwick means. It is clear, though, that the fate of Native Americans continues to occupy Sedgwick, if not to the degree that their oppression and African-American slavery consume Child.

There is something in this comment of Hope Leslie's own impossible wish (and her ethnocentrism), that Magawisca would remain with the Fletcher family, because

"your noble mind must not be wasted in those hideous solitudes [western forests]" (Karcher ed. 351; Kelley ed. 332). Magawisca knows better: "Hope Leslie, there is no solitude in me; the Great Spirit, and his ministers, are every where present and visible to the eye of the soul that loves him. [. . .] [T]hink you I go to a solitude, Hope Leslie?" (Karcher ed. 351-352; Kelley ed. 332). Sedgwick makes clear that, despite Hope's and Everell's affection for Magawisca, the white world would make no real accommodations for a Magawisca, no matter the talents she might have to offer to that world. The heroic, elegiac figure of Magawisca captured the attention of Sedgwick's readers and reviewers, then and now; she contributes much to the action and sub-text of the story. But the Native American history of *Hope Leslie* is not its only history, or its only revisionary history, though this aspect of the romance has occupied a central place in critical attention.

The earliest known germ of the romance, the plot outline mentioned earlier in this chapter, has at its core the tensions of the English Civil War and the Puritans' New England settlement (Diary, 1811-1812, and Notes). As Fetterley points out, this conflict provides the backdrop to the romance; "references to treason and sedition, to plots against the state, appear with considerable frequency in *Hope Leslie*" (500). The resistance within the romance, of course, begins not with the young Hope and Everell, but with their parents' generation, the original Puritan settlers. The tradition of resistance continues from Hope and Everell to the American Revolutionaries and beyond, but, for Sedgwick, it is conservative, a resistance that largely entails efforts on the part of the socially elite to exert influence and maintain a measure of control. This, perhaps, is what Sedgwick

means when she expresses her desire to find a "subject [that will] admit of a portraiture of the best traits of NE [New England] character" (CMS to HDS, 1 June [1825?]): the ability to challenge authority followed by the re-establishment of a reasonably progressive power structure that will, in its turn, be subject to challenge—but a challenge tempered by an adherence to moral behavior and governed by a Lockean version of reason. Typically, the theme of resistance in *Hope Leslie* is considered in purely political terms—the establishment of the United States and the meaning of individual action and freedom. Yet the political cannot be separated from the theological when the Puritan community is considered. Therefore, we must consider the ways in which the novel's claims to extolling the New England character draw from Puritan history, and especially covenant theology, to fulfill the idea of the United States as "this promised land of faith" (Karcher ed. 75-76).

For a fuller understanding of New England history and its implications, Sedgwick read widely in accounts of the Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth colonies, many of them describing first-hand experiences, all of them marked, as is Sedgwick's work, with Eurocentric and Protestant biases. As already noted, Samuel Howe played an important role in 1825 in obtaining for Sedgwick a number of resources. Between 1825 and early 1827, Sedgwick completed her research in works including Winthrop's *History*, Hubbard's *General History*, and the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. A June 1827 journal entry records that she had "written the greater part of it [*Hope Leslie*] since the middle of January but the materials were all in preparation" (1826-1827 Journal). That Sedgwick read widely in these and other sources is evident from a close

examination of Sedgwick's notebooks, part of the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers held by the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the text of *Hope Leslie*. The appendix to this study cross-references Sedgwick's notes, her primary sources, and *Hope Leslie*.

Although most of the historically-oriented scholarship to date focuses on *Hope Leslie's* revisionary history of the Pequod War, the internal evidence of the romance and Sedgwick's notebook entries show that the Puritan versus Native American conflict was only a portion of Sedgwick's interest in the New England settlement. Her notes on Native Americans most often focus on details of dress, appearance, mythology, cultural practices, and Puritan inquiries into the same—not massacres, disputes over tribal lands, or war. The lives and writings of John Winthrop, John Cotton, and John Eliot drew her attention, through both first-generation accounts of the colony as well as later accounts by such authors as Cotton Mather. From these and such works as Edward Johnson's *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Savior in New England* (1654) and "The Settlement of the First Churches in Massachusetts" (also known as an "Ecclesiastical History of Massachusetts" (1647), Sedgwick derives factual details for descriptions of church matters and Providential blessings and punishments. In *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick directly quotes from these sources or uses them more allusively in representations of the Puritans as worthy individuals engaged in commendable work but also fundamentally limited. Such a stance accords with liberal nineteenth-century attitudes, as Bercovitch, Bell, Buell, and others find in their studies of New England's consensus view of history.

To construct her version of the Puritan past and its character, Sedgwick acknowledges "that some liberties have been taken with the received accounts of Sir

Philip (or Sir Christopher) Gardiner; and a slight variation has been allowed in the chronology of the Pequod War" (Karcher ed. 3; Kelley ed. 5). These statements immediately mark the novel as a fictionalized if not revisionist version of history, suited to her novelistic, historiographical, and cultural aims. Readers are thus alerted that the author will sometimes play loose with the histories of colonial settlements. Further, the confluences of time (from the 1620s through 1660s), Euro-American colonies, and Native American tribes are intentional. Sedgwick also explicitly invites readers to consult historical sources to investigate the subjects further. What matters, it seems, is that readers suspend any desire for a strict adherence to documented facts and agree to suspend disbelief as they enter a colonial world driven by a narrative line.

Sedgwick signals her use of research within *Hope Leslie* in a number of ways. When she uses a fragment borrowed from her research, she typically cues its presence with quotation marks, not by other references or commentary. While some of the sources of the quotations might have been familiar enough to knowledgeable readers, such as those from Shakespeare, Milton, or Wordsworth, most would have escaped general notice. In the occasional instances when Sedgwick wants to emphasize her source, as with some passages from the works of Winthrop or Hubbard, she overtly refers to their authors or offers a brief in-text commentary or an author's note. Most often, however, she inserts historical details so quietly that few readers would notice their presence as different from the fictional constructs integrated with them. Such references are usually brief, just phrases or evocative details that establish or contribute to a historicized sense

of time and place. Sometimes, Sedgwick allows her characters to mention historical details in their dialogue.

Sedgwick understands her work as a fiction within which "we are confined not to the actual, but the possible" (Kelley ed. 4). Such terms identify Sedgwick with a tradition of the American historical romance. Lawrence Buell in *New England Literary Culture* finds that

historical fiction, then, was to provide an illusion of mimesis that legitimated it as realistic yet at the same time was not simply a mimesis and indeed owed some of its mimetic power to projection onto the past of romantic fantasy and present-minded ideology—defined at the conscious level, to be sure, as authorial perception of the constants of human nature. (241)

In the preface to *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick distinguishes between her fiction and "historical narrative, or a relation of real events"; her primary sources are "accounts" described as "clear, copious, and authentic" (Kelley ed. 3), or "genuine histories" (Kelley ed. 4). Her language suggests that she understands "history" as a narrative or report expressing some truth, some fact-based reality (or what its writer believes is a fact). But Sedgwick also understands that perspective implicates interpretation—that the authenticity of a work of history cannot be disassociated from its writer or that writer's cultural position. For instance, the preface remarks on the seventeenth-century observers' view of Indians and contrasts it with that of "an impartial observer" who would see the situation "in a light very different from that in which they were regarded by our ancestors"; just as "naturally," Native American "historians or poets, if they had such, would as naturally,

and with more justice, have extolled their [ancestors'] high-souled courage and patriotism" (Karcher ed. 3, 4; Kelley ed. 6).

As interpreter of the Puritan past or New England character, Sedgwick understands that she cannot be an "impartial observer." Her research into the documents of early New England provided her with multiple points of view on her subject; her own social, political, and religious background contributed to these. Joyce Appleby's *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* focuses on the wide range of anxieties confronted by the first post-Revolutionary generation, of which Sedgwick, born in 1789, was a part: "Their knowledge of it [the War of Independence] consisted of passed-on tales rather than first-hand experiences, yet they were the ones to fashion the revolutionary affirmations that gave the United States a national culture" (5). Philip Gould's *Covenant and Republic* marked the first stage of inquiry into the contemporary context of Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* (among other works, focusing especially on "the ideological tensions of republican womanhood" (99); Gould considers this ideology's relationship to virtue and citizenship. Further, Buchanan suggests that writers like Sedgwick "offered domestic *theology* as public policy, expecting that a family-oriented transformation of society would be fundamentally God's work," thereby "ensuring the success of the American experiment with democracy" (208). Gould and Buchanan, among many others, identify the centrality of Sedgwick's concern with the future of America, and in particular the inculcation of moral, socially beneficial behavior in its young citizens—the virtue that Gould discusses, the benevolence and affectionate ties that Buchanan considers.

Sedgwick's understanding of such principles influences her representation of Puritanism, as she works to find the source of New England's character in the Puritan past while reconciling that past with her democratic, Unitarian present. To do so, she creates a fictional family, the Fletchers, and places them in the historical moments of the Puritan migration to New England and their settlements in Boston and Springfield. The next chapter of this study focuses on the significance of Puritan federal covenant theology for this fictional family's anticipation of nineteenth-century liberties, with chapter five considering Sedgwick's treatment of seventeenth-century history in *Hope Leslie*.

#### Chapter Four: Writing the Puritan Character

As Sedgwick indicated in her correspondence, she had a plan to "do something toward a reparation of NE [New England] character" (CMS to HDS, 1 June [1825?]). This idea comes to fruition in *Hope Leslie*, and the preface further explains her strategies in approaching such a project. To fulfill her plan, she undertook a course of study; this borrowing from the historical record "was found very convenient in the execution of the author's design, which was to illustrate not the history, but the character of the times" (Karcher ed. 3; Kelley ed. 5). Beyond such study, of course, she relied on her own experiences as a daughter of New England's socio-political establishment, which was deeply influenced by a theology rooted in Puritan orthodoxy. Underlying her representation of the Puritan source of the New England character, therefore, is Massachusetts Bay's covenant theology and its evolved Unitarian counterpart in the nineteenth century.

In his review of nineteenth-century characterizations of New Englanders, Lawrence Buell finds them associated with "the two most fundamental themes of Protestant piety and civil liberty" as well as "industry and related qualities (thrift, common sense, practicality, adaptability) and the comprehensive commitment to education" (*New England Literary Culture* 199). All of these, according to Buell and the evidence he produces, result from the Puritans' legacy. And their legacy begins with the tenets of Puritan New England's federal or covenant theology, which "brought together the personal and the historical, the private and the public, the individual and the

communal, in such a way as to demonstrate that all of these were bent toward one and the same end: the fulfillment of God's errand in the New World" (Lang 47).<sup>20</sup> As Sacvan Bercovitch explains the workings of the federal covenant in the Massachusetts Bay Colony,

Having united the visible and the spiritual, they were free to actualize the metaphors of visible sainthood (for the individual) and national election (for the community). They proceeded, accordingly, to invoke the covenant of grace in defining the bonds of civic harmony and the covenant of works in standardizing the saint's preparation for heaven. (*The Puritan Origins of the American Self* 90)

Events in *Hope Leslie*, both fictional and historical, amply demonstrate the challenges of keeping the terms of the Puritans' federal covenant.

The idea of the federal covenant continued to influence American thought into the nineteenth century (and beyond) when the American Revolution, for instance, was read as another level of the culmination of "the sense of divine chosenness and the germ of the ideas of patriotic resistance to tyranny and of a 'new order of human freedom'" that began with the Puritans (Buell *New England Literary Culture* 196). Sedgwick, though, is aware of the ironies of recasting the Massachusetts Bay Puritans as the nation's first champions of religious or individual freedom. Her representation of the Puritans, as much as it draws from the ideas of the federal covenant, also shows the limitations of the Puritan colony; further, her awareness of contemporary nineteenth-century controversies appears as the subtext of *Hope Leslie*.

Reflecting on the differences between her own time and that of the early colonies, Sedgwick writes:

The character of man, and the institutions of society, are yet very far from their possible and destined perfection. Still, how far is the present age in advance of that which drove reformers to a dreary wilderness!—of that which hanged quakers!—of that which condemned to death, as witches, innocent, unoffending, old women! But it is unnecessary to heighten the glory of our risen day by comparing it with the preceding twilight.

(Karcher ed. 15; Kelley ed. 16)

The "risen day" of Sedgwick's 1820s was, as she knew, not so sunny a time. Even though Americans were in the year prior to *Hope Leslie's* publication celebrating the jubilee of the Revolution and its heroes (as in LaFayette's tour of the nation in 1824-1825), the country was in social, economic, and political turmoil. As Charles Sellers makes abundantly clear in *The Market Revolution*, "market stress, agrarian crisis, and the dawning industrial revolution" threatened Americans in large numbers (203); the Second Great Awakening, also concurrent with *Hope Leslie's* writing and release, in many ways met the emotional needs of a people trying to adapt to the destabilization of traditional culture.

Within the competing forms of religious belief or expression during this period were orthodox Congregationalism and liberal Unitarianism. Sellers finds that "Unitarianism reshaped Christianity most fully to the market mentality," particularly for the elite, who most benefited from the market economy (202). In contrast, the varieties

of Calvinist orthodoxy and evangelism attracted those people whose livelihoods and ways of life were jeopardized by this same economy. The competition for souls between Calvinists and Unitarians played out in fiction as well as it did in efforts such as the formation of benevolent societies, sermonizing, and essays. David Reynolds suggests that Calvinist fiction (covering a range of Congregationalist, Methodist, and Baptist writers), especially after 1825, centered on "illustrating the operations of orthodoxy in daily life" (82) and "the protagonist's ability to confront tragedy with pious resolve" (81). Anti-Calvinist or liberal fiction developed in part because "Unitarianism, lacking both revivalist fervor and the dramatic dualities of heaven and hell, grace and depravity, verged on being dull," and so had trouble competing with the vigorous Calvinist evangelizing of the Second Great Awakening (Reynolds 100). Liberal writers typically created a "protagonist [who] was often a paradoxical amalgam of sturdy courage and winning gentleness, reasonableness and warmth, firm adherence to principle and doctrinal caution" and who resisted "such doctrines as depravity and predestination" (Reynolds 110).

Sedgwick participated in the liberal fiction movement from the appearance of her first novel *A New-England Tale* in 1822; *Hope Leslie* incorporates into this project the long view of history—the history from which Unitarianism, as well as the nation, developed. In *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick offers a view of Puritanism that softens the indictment of Calvinism and Congregationalism appearing in *A New-England Tale*. This is not to say that Sedgwick reverses her position against strict Congregationalism in *Hope Leslie*; rather, she reveals its weaknesses while acknowledging the first generation's

sacrifices, the sacrifices that arguably made further expansion of white settlement possible. This approach is consistent with the Harvard moral philosophy that Sedgwick was aligned with. As Daniel Howe writes,

The Unitarians greatly admired their Puritan forbears, despite a strong distaste for their theology. [...] What the Unitarians liked about the Puritans was their social morality: their 'deep tone of seriousness,' their 'disinterestedness,' their 'extreme cautiousness regarding outward conduct.' [...] What nineteenth-century America really needed, Harvard Unitarians implied, was Puritanism without Calvinism. (D. Howe 138)

In representing the Puritans, Sedgwick seldom uses theological terms. Instead, she applies "the combined themes of liberal fiction since 1810: practical principles of religion are to predominate over theology; a mixture of narrative and discussion is to supplant logic; the operation of faith in the heart and life will sentimentalize and secularize religious commentary" (Reynolds 118). Through this approach, Sedgwick can claim the Puritan legacy and forecast a nineteenth-century liberal Unitarian ideal. Therefore, orthodox Puritanism dominates her seventeenth-century colony, socially and politically, but the community also permits some dissent. Further, the ending of the romance projects a more tolerant future, one in which Puritanism and Anglicanism co-exist and enrich the community. Everell and Hope, exposed to each faith in their childhoods and not closely aligned with either, suggest the Unitarian ideal of moral conscience; Esther Downing, the ideal Puritan maiden, carries her devotion to visible sanctity, a form of the covenant of good works, to the benefit of others. Through *Hope*

*Leslie*, Sedgwick finds a way to represent the Puritan past while at the same time engaging post-Revolutionary issues of religion and religious tolerance.

A brief review of the action of *Hope Leslie* reveals the strong presence of religious controversy: The opening chapters describe the Puritan discontent in old England; William Fletcher's religious conscience brings him to New England. Once arrived, Fletcher's quiet dissent from his Puritan neighbors sends him to the dangerous wilderness margins of Bethel. As he becomes foster-parent to Hope and Faith Leslie, his household expands to include Dame Grafton, an Anglican who barely submits to Puritan rule, and Master Cradock, a tutor whose religious inclinations are not clearly delineated but which are informed by Calvinism as well as the classic authors he studies and teaches. Native Americans are viewed with fear and suspicion, not only because of the threat of physical danger, but also because of their non-Christian belief; Nelema's imprisonment amply demonstrates the Puritans' historical stigmatizing of Indians as pagan idolators. The captured Faith Leslie turns both Native American and Catholic; her marriage to Oneco is blessed by a Catholic priest, presumably one of the French Jesuits working along the frontiers of the New World. After Hope is suspected of aiding the escape of Nelema, the Indian healer accused of practicing witchcraft, Fletcher's household removes to Boston, living under the direct supervision of John and Margaret Winthrop. In Boston, the public (and historically based) issues of the Samuel Gorton trial, Sir Philip Gardiner's masquerade, and even Thomas Morton's imprisonment highlight the religious controversies of the time; the Reverends John Cotton and John Eliot also appear in the novel. Religious beliefs and practices are often the subject of

private conversation that offer both comic relief (Dame Grafton's chafing at Puritan restrictions) and serious inquiry (Winthrop's chastisement of Fletcher and the leadership's interest in the marriages of Everell, Hope, and Esther Downing). In many ways, then, the tensions of a state religion or theocracy constitute the backbone of *Hope Leslie*. To demonstrate this friction, Sedgwick establishes a historically informed background for her colony and places within it her fictional family, the Fletchers.

At the outset of the novel, accommodation of divergent religious doctrines is not possible, as the conflict in the Fletcher family in England shows. Sedgwick's note that sketches out the plan for *Hope Leslie* (discussed in chapter three) centers on religious controversy: William Fletcher flees England after his conversion to Puritanism. Sedgwick may have drawn on accounts of various Puritan divines and leaders (likely from Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*) to create a history for Fletcher: conflict within his family, abandonment of his fortune (the romantic angle of the loss of his true love is conventional historical romance and sentimental fiction), seeking of religious freedom and peace in a new world. In England, such circumstances required irrevocable choices, and thus Fletcher's Puritanism would put him beyond any chance of family reconciliation. The power of his uncle and his lover's father to prevent his marriage to his cousin certainly proves cruel to all parties; disowning Fletcher and preventing his and cousin Alice's marriage blocks a long-held and mutual wish to unify the family's fortunes and titles. Such a drastic conclusion to Fletcher's situation mirrors the virulence of anti-Puritan sentiments in old England and offers readers a perspective from which to consider the real burdens of following one's religious conscience.

Fletcher's motives in emigrating to the New World are pure, his actions throughout the novel supporting that purity. More than any other Puritan character, Fletcher pays for his faith, over and over again – in the loss of his true love Alice; in the loss of his family connections; in the massacre of his family at Bethel; in the crushed hopes for an alliance between his son Everell and his foster-daughter Hope; in his friends' suspicions that he is not sufficiently strict with his children and that he wants Hope and Everell to marry so that he can secure her fortune. No other character is made to struggle with his earthly affections or to sacrifice so much or to defend the purity of his motives. No other character is required to "edify us with a seasonable word" or to "turn your affliction to the profit of the Lord's people," as Fletcher is, before the shock of the Bethel massacre can even begin to be understood (Karcher ed. 74; Kelley ed. 72). Not even Gardiner, the stranger to the community and a Catholic in disguise, is put to such tests; in fact, he is accepted into the community on the basis of a letter from a Jeremy Austin, even though Winthrop has to admit that he does not know the man (Karcher ed. 162; Kelley ed. 155)<sup>21</sup>. Nevertheless, Winthrop, a friend of Fletcher's since their time in England, and William Pynchon, head of the Springfield settlement, believe that Fletcher and his family represent threats to the community, so much so that the family is sent to Boston and put under Winthrop's direct control.

Sedgwick introduces Winthrop as "a man of the most tender domestic affections and sympathies" but also as one whose every action is aimed toward "the great and good cause to which this future statesman had even then begun to devote himself, as the sole object of his life" (Karcher ed. 9, 10; Kelley ed. 11). Sedgwick's Winthrop is "generally

presented rather favorably" (Bell "History and Romance" 220); he is "a firm but kindly leader of impeccable moral character" (Gossett and Bards 19). While Sedgwick does not refer directly to Mather's hagiographic description of Winthrop in the *Magnalia*, the sense of Winthrop as a typological Nehemiah, a patriarchal leader, is evident, and the archival evidence shows that Sedgwick read Mather's work on Winthrop. This typology appears too when Gould finds that "Sedgwick's governor is implicitly a rewriting of Belknap's and others' political typology between Winthrop and George Washington" (105), representing a man who "exemplifies an outmoded communitarian ideal" (106). Winthrop governs as a paternal figure, finding a bride for Fletcher, a home for Magawisca and Oneco, and spouses for Everell, Hope, and Esther Downing. He almost always appears in his home in the novel, a somewhat softened domestic version of his public self. When challenged, he acquiesces—or waits to see if others might take action to defuse a crisis. When the sagamore Miantunnomoh points out the rudeness of his lesser position at a separate table in Winthrop's home, Winthrop rectifies the discourtesy.<sup>22</sup> When Hope breaks the household rules by disappearing after dark to meet Magawisca, Winthrop reproves her but does not really punish her. He is relieved, above all, when Magawisca successfully escapes from the prison: a difficult situation, politically and perhaps morally, has been corrected for him.

Winthrop's authority depends on the willingness of others to submit to it; the need for a clear social hierarchy with particular submission of the low in status to the high is central to Winthrop's "A Modell of Christian Charity." Whether Sedgwick read this work is not certain, but she is evidently familiar with its major points; her support for a

hierarchical social system draws not only from the federal covenant implied in the "Modell" but also from later Federalist thought. At one point, Winthrop reminds Fletcher that their Puritan enterprise seeks to establish Massachusetts Bay as a "city on a hill," a direct quotation from the "Modell," and he cautions that "all appearance of evil should be avoided" (Karcher ed. 158; Kelley ed. 151). But when Fletcher, Hope, and others resist conforming to instructions, Winthrop most often allows their violations to pass without the firm remonstrance that one might expect from the Levitical orientations of Massachusetts Bay. Sedgwick allows her characters to interpret Winthrop as kindly, but he is also fallible as, for example, when he fails to see through Gardiner's disguise or to quell misbehavior under his own roof.

Sedgwick also puts the Massachusetts Bay government in the position of having to react to threats, both internal and external. The dangers of a threatened and reactionary state become clear to readers, as Judith Fetterley notes, when they "recognize the degree to which the state perceives itself to be in danger and is willing to mobilize against such danger, whether real or apparent" ("My Sister!" 500). Fetterley here points out the context of the British Civil War; I would add that the commercial and ecclesiastical concerns within the emerging colony are equally important and posing immediate challenges for those living in New England. These are evident too in the tensions among Puritan and Anglican or Catholic characters including Dame Grafton, Sir Philip Gardiner, his page Rosa, and Faith Leslie.

Winthrop's *History* immerses readers in these social and theological conflicts, recording a community chronically inflamed by discord. The dangers were plenty, of

course, and they began with the need to acquire sufficient food, water, and shelter; establish law and order; secure the community's physical safety; and work toward the commercial success of the colony. These needs vied for prominence with the Puritans' commitment to the eternal matters of salvation as well as history, their deep desire to be that "city on the hill," a beacon to the world and their descendants. As Winthrop describes the errand to Fletcher before embarking to New England, "'there was a great call for such services as he could render in the expedition just about to sail, and which was like to fail for the want of them'" (Karcher ed. 10; Kelley ed. 12).

Though Fletcher does not make this sailing, clearly he has the potential to become one of the colony's leaders, and the demand for such men persists. Ultimately, Fletcher emigrates with Winthrop in 1630, but he is soon "disappointed at the slow operation of principles" (Karcher ed. 14; Kelley ed. 15) and "mortified at seeing power, which had been earned at so dear a rate [. . .] sometimes perverted to purposes of oppression and personal aggrandizement," including the oppression of some people whose religious practices and beliefs differ from those in theocratic power (Karcher ed. 15; Kelley ed. 16). Such misgivings about the failures of the Puritan enterprise suggests that Sedgwick was familiar with Roger Williams's objections to Massachusetts Bay's alliance of church and state. Fletcher's fellow settlers view him with some suspicion, thinking that "when a man shuts the door of his lips that there must be some secret worth knowing within" (Karcher ed. 14; Kelley ed. 15). Disillusioned with Boston, Fletcher moves to Springfield in the Connecticut Valley, settling there in 1636, a clear echo of the historical Thomas Hooker's and William Pynchon's resettlement in that year. But he soon moves

again, to the margins of the community, "deeming exposure to the incursions of the savages very slight, and the surveillance of an inquiring neighbourhood a certain evil" (Kelley ed. 17). Fletcher is disappointed in his fellow travellers, and they are disappointed in him, but for very different reasons. Like Roger Williams, Fletcher seeks a free exercise of his religion divorced from politics; he also seeks solace from the wounds suffered when he lost Alice. His faith remains sure; if he has a failing, it is that "from my youth, my path hath been hedged up with earthly affections" (Karcher ed. 159; Kelley ed. 152). In New England, those earthly attachments are to Everell and Hope and his wish that they marry, a kind of vicarious fulfillment of his and Alice's plan to wed. In this respect, Sedgwick reveals her nineteenth-century Romanticism: "natural affections were ultimately more powerful than any system of doctrine" (Buchanan 215). Fletcher also wants an immediate realization of an idealized Puritan world, seeming unaware of the challenges in establishing the new colony, and thus he does not use his energies or position to shape that world. Buchanan identifies Fletcher (as well as Hope and Everell) as a "liberal interloper," "a Puritan, or often, an Anglican or Quaker visitor to a Puritan community who voices the author's perspective on Puritan practices of persecution and violence" (222) and who is "fully immersed in the ambivalence of history" (223). Fletcher also enacts what would become a classic American theme, searching for a fresh start with the family that had begun, under Winthrop's direction, in old England, but he cannot find it in Boston, Springfield, or Bethel. Karen Richardson Gee finds that, "like other romantics, Mr. Fletcher believes that in the wilderness, he can remain outside of civilization, of societal control, and of patriarchal authority" (162), but I would argue

instead that Fletcher seeks only a more tolerant civilization, one based on affectionate ties. Accordingly, he registers Sedgwick's nineteenth-century critique of the socio-political limitations of early Massachusetts Bay.

The Puritan communities have little sympathy for Fletcher's disappointment; further, they resent his failure to participate actively in their enterprise. The people of Springfield "at first welcomed [Fletcher] as an important acquisition," but he responds by distancing himself, literally (Karcher ed. 16-17; Kelley ed. 17). The term of acceptance is expressed in commodity terms: attracting men of standing and fortune was a major part of the colonization, for without their assets (education, practical know-how, money, influential connections in England), the colony would fail. Winthrop's *History*, likely the best source for precise information on the Puritans' early settlement, is full of notices of the arrivals of ships. The human cargo of well-known ministers and other persons of social or economic rank is detailed as much as the imported goods and supplies. Fletcher therefore is initially considered a valuable asset to the community, especially in light of the time invested in persuading him to take part in the Puritan errand. His behavior once in New England irritates the leadership and leads to the mistrust that the fictional Winthrop and others exhibit toward him.

Like Child and Hawthorne, Sedgwick characterizes the Puritan settlers as narrow and harsh. Historical records of the Puritan settlement show that the motives and behavior of no individual were left unexamined. Matters worthy of scrutiny included property issues, personal disagreements, and such worldly concerns as the protection of English cattle from wolves (Winthrop I. 115), the deportation of "a very burdensome

woman" (Winthrop I. 153); and divergent views on church government (one example of many appears in Winthrop II. 182). More urgent concerns such as the cases of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson, the persecution of the Quakers and other religious dissenters, and the disruptive potential of Thomas Morton's Merry Mount settlement are now familiar to students of the period, but close scrutiny was not limited to those who challenged Puritan hegemony. John Cotton's reputation did not protect him from serious questioning during the Hutchinson trial, nor did it exempt Winthrop from legal charges, as his trial and acquittal in 1645 show.<sup>23</sup>

To establish and maintain social control against internal or external threats, public scrutiny and the threats of public shame and humiliation (not to mention corporal punishments) were standard; for those within the faith, constant self-examination of their failings or their progress toward salvation provided an internal control over external behavior. The Puritans' system of punishments, brutal as it may seem, effectively maintained their dominant position. When a person seemed impervious to their measures, banishment was a solution—as Hutchinson, Williams, Samuel Gorton, Morton, and Sir Christopher Gardiner learned. But Sedgwick's fictionalized Puritan leadership, for all its criticism of Fletcher's leniency with his children, is curiously lenient with respect to the multiple threats that Fletcher's household, not least Hope and Everell, pose for their community. Rather than imposing public reprimands, the Puritans place them under a private surveillance in Winthrop's household, as if physical containment would provide a safeguard leading to their submission. However, neither Everell nor Hope seems likely to accept anyone else's authority over their personal autonomy, for Fletcher

has reared dissent in his household. When Winthrop and William Pynchon make the supervision of Fletcher's children their responsibility, the situation does not materially affect their freedom, for Everell and Hope seem genuinely unafraid of the Puritan leadership and unconcerned about the consequences of defying it.

Their lack of fear is related to their belief in their individual freedom. As Bell understands Hope Leslie, "she *is* liberty; she is progress. [...] Hope's desire for personal liberty—her wish to have her own way—is precisely analogous to the political liberty Catharine Sedgwick saw as the essence of American history" ("History and Romance" 221). Maria Karafilis further refines this concept in her description of "Sedgwick's model of citizenship," "a principle of behavior—a grammar for citizenship—that serves as a guide to ethical political action" (336). These liberties in the service of a communitarian ideal are further evident in the nineteenth-century reading of the Puritan covenant, in which the Puritan founders are the prototypes of the American Revolutionaries and their descendants. As much as *Hope Leslie* supports these political readings, a re-animated interest in religion (and religious liberty) during the time of the Second Great Awakening is also present.

Hope and Everell, as nineteenth-century projections of what the Puritan legacy should be, do not explicitly express objections to Puritanism in principle or practice. They are familiar with—and more or less accept—both the Puritan and Anglican traditions. It is probably as true for Everell as it is for Hope that this multiple accommodation "permitted her mind to expand beyond the contracted boundaries of sectarian faith. Her religion was pure and disinterested—no one, therefore, should doubt

its intrinsic value, though it had not been coined into a particular form, or received the current impress" (Karcher ed. 128; Kelley ed. 123). Hope and Everell are, in Buchanan's terms, liberal interlopers who "serve as models of a practice of liberal faith and devotion independent of potentially violent social structures" (223). They need not expend efforts in searching their souls or the physical world for signs of grace or in performing good works in token of their sanctification. Instead, Hope and Everell exemplify the active manifestation of benevolent affections, described by Daniel Howe as "natural and unreflective, seeking the good of others without conscious selfishness" (58). For Buchanan, they fulfill liberal fiction's understanding of "benevolence as a model of ethical engagement with the entire world and religious engagement with God that retained the romantic and familial affections as the vital center of both engagements" (212).

Therefore, with respect to Hope and Everell, it is important to consider the ways that they also anticipate a nineteenth-century liberal Unitarian guided by conscience, which "required that all of man's faculties should be bent to the service of morality" (Howe 108). Hope and Everell are guided by their internal compasses; they seem to know instinctively what is right and what is wrong. Hope's impulsiveness to do what is right is both natural and unerring; as Fletcher says of her, "what is difficult duty to others, hath ever seemed impulse in her" (Karcher ed. 160). This sort of impulse, again and again in the novel, places Hope in conflict with Puritan authorities, for they worry about the potential disruptiveness of a person who cannot be contained by external controls and whose internal controls seem contrary to their wishes. Perhaps because his outward

conformity is more satisfactory to the magistrates, Everell attracts less of their attention, except when his actions favor or show sympathy for Magawisca.

Yet, to the Puritans, Hope and Everell, ostensibly Puritan, are not Puritan enough; they do not meet the expectations of visible sanctity. The character of Esther Downing, represented as the embodiment of visible sainthood, provides the chief contrast to Hope's and Everell's liberal principles. Yet Sedgwick also reveals the shortcomings of the idea of visible sanctity: while Esther's may be genuine, Winthrop fails to see through Gardiner as a Catholic villain in Puritan clothing. Therefore, the evidence of appearance or conduct are unreliable indicators of sanctity. As Winthrop's brother-in-law Downing (Esther's father) puts it, Everell's "puritan principles [are] uncorrupted" by his time in England, but "he has little of the outward man of a 'pilgrim indeed'" (Karcher ed. 157; Kelley ed. 150). But Everell's appearance and behavior repeatedly reveal that he is as out of place in seventeenth-century Boston as are Hope and Dame Grafton. This is vividly demonstrated when he tries to convince Esther Downing to assist him in arranging Magawisca's escape from prison. Esther refuses: "she thought they had not scripture warrant for interfering between the prisoner and the magistrates" (Karcher ed. 292; Kelley ed. 277-278). Everell's response to her claim that "'we are commanded in the first of Peter, 2d chapter, to 'submit ourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake . . .'" is that "'surely, Esther, there must be warrant, as you call it, for sometimes resisting legitimate authority, or all our friends in England would not be at open war with their king'" (Karcher ed. 292; Kelley ed. 278). Their conversation hints at a future American revolution, but it also points to a dangerous weakness in the Massachusetts Bay

settlement: the magistrates can only hold their power for as long as its citizens are willing to submit themselves to its authority—or to agree that the magistrates have rightful authority.

While Everell manages to evade censure by maintaining appearances, Hope errs, in Winthrop's view, by being a "lawless girl," one too given to "*performances*," who lacks "that passiveness, that, next to godliness, is a woman's best virtue" (Karcher ed. 160; Kelley ed. 153). Hope's errors are related especially to her actions, which are not only insufficient proof of her election, but also evidence against her. As Fletcher tells Winthrop, "I have sometimes thought that the covenant of works was to her [Hope] a hindrance to the covenant of grace; and that, perhaps, she would hate sin more for its unlawfulness, if she did not hate it so much for its ugliness" (Karcher ed. 160). In other words, the social demand to act in a particular way impeded Hope's ability to embrace the Puritan faith (the acceptance of the covenant of grace); she cannot accept a Puritan definition of bad behavior (one that would offend the covenant of works) when that behavior or act seems to her to accomplish a benevolent purpose.

Hope's understanding of legality differs substantially from the Puritans' definition, as her behavior shows. Of all of her actions, many creating conflict within her family or community, she feels remorse only when she inadvertently hurts Esther. In that case, Hope sees the ugliness of her behavior, and she tries to set it right. And of all the characters, the ones to whom Hope responds negatively are Jennet, the pietistic but selfish servant; Gardiner, the duplicitous man who wants Hope for her fortune; and the

drunken sailors. Hope's repulsion stems from the ugliness of their sinful or hurtful behaviors.

To a surprising extent, Hope's attitude toward the covenant of works—her essential rejection of the Puritan definitions of law—links her to the historical precedent of Antinomianism, a rejection of the covenant of works, and therefore to Anne Hutchinson, who appears by name in the novel. Fletcher's agitated response to the letter that signals Hope's arrival suggests to his wife that perhaps "poor deluded Mrs. Hutchinson again presumed to disturb the peace of God's people" (Karcher ed. 18; Kelley ed. 19).<sup>24</sup> Like Hutchinson, Hope does disturb the magistrates' peace, but her disturbances are not obviously or strictly theological. Instead, they involve a sort of amorphous, Romantic distinction between right and wrong. Hope manifests Sedgwick's understanding of the mutability of law, its dependence on context, purpose, and ends. Thus Hope is linked to a history of dissent, a descendant of Hutchison, described by Amy Schragger Lang "as a symbolic locus for a broad spectrum of fears about self-assertion and individual autonomy, about the relationship between the public and private self, and about the reliability of the visible world" (17). Because Hutchinson continued to provide a potent symbol in Sedgwick's nineteenth century, Sedgwick indirectly associates her with Hope, but as a positive form of female dissent. If Hope's major characteristic is her desire to have her own way, it is also true that she always "chose the right way," as Digby says (Karcher ed. 235; Kelley ed. 225). Hope's dissent is not technically theological, for she is not interested, at all, in doctrinal disputes; as her aunt Grafton's comment suggests: "Hope Leslie study theology! you are as mad as a March hare—all

her theology she has learned out of the Bible and common prayer-book" (Karcher ed. 220; Kelley ed. 211). Hope's dissent is political, in a Puritan world that does not clearly distinguish the theological from the political. In this way, she anticipates Sedgwick's ideal of the "heroine for the nineteenth century," Gertrude of *Clarence; or, A Tale of Our Own Times* (1830)—"practical, efficient, direct, and decided—a rational woman—that beau-ideal of all devotees to the ruling spirit of the age—utility" but not without a trace "of olden and romantic times clinging to her; that she loved in moonlight and retirement, to abandon herself to the visions of her imagination; that she sought and loved the beauty and mystery of nature" (I. 239-240).

Hope's dissent most often manifests itself in practical, rational ways: to do good, to protect those who cannot protect themselves. A characteristic instance, the first in which readers see Hope's willingness to challenge her superiors, occurs when she first suggests that she will suck the rattlesnake poison from Cradock's hand. Hope is forced to desist because the men fear that she might then cause her own death, despite Hope's assertion that she has read of such treatments in her aunt's 'The Wonders of the Crusades' (Karcher ed. 106; Kelley ed. 102). This is no authority for Digby; he maintains that Cradock will have to wait to "get help it's lawful for you to use" (Karcher ed. 107; Kelley ed. 103).<sup>25</sup> Hope then insists, against even more considerable objection, that Nelema be called to treat Cradock. Later, when she sees the wrong in the charges of witchcraft against Nelema and frees her from the make-shift jail at Pynchon's home, Hope again takes decided action to correct the situation. She accomplishes her ends: Cradock is healed, and Nelema is protected.<sup>26</sup> Again, when Hope makes her own plans to

be reunited with her sister Faith or when she works against her own self-interest to announce Everell and Esther's betrothal, she finds the most direct, practical route to achieving her aims, without regard for the conventions of passivity that, for instance, Winthrop would have her follow. Though Everell is less active than Hope in many ways, he demonstrates similar principles in his attempts to free Magawisca, though it is worth noting that he needs Hope's assistance to succeed.

Ultimately, the authorities' suspicion (if not sure knowledge) of Hope's complicity in Nelema's escape leads to their decision that Fletcher's family must move to Boston, to live under the direct supervision of the Winthrops. Here, they believe, Hope can be influenced or forced into good behavior, if not by the example of Winthrop's wife Margaret, then in marriage "with a godly and approved member of the congregation," such as William Hubbard (Karcher ed. 159; Kelley ed. 152). The solution is the same for Everell when he returns after receiving his education in England: marriage to the godly Esther Downing will make him a fit citizen.

While Hope and Everell receive close attention, Winthrop and Pyncheon seem uninterested in the rest of the household, even though it presents a kind of microcosm of the historical conflict in the Massachusetts Bay that Sedgwick knew about from her reading in the historical record. In her imaginative reconstruction of that reading, Sedgwick creates characters including Digby, the faithful servant and friend; Dame Grafton, Anglican and unafraid of saying so; Master Cradock, the tutor; Jennet, the unlikable, pietistic household servant; Martha Fletcher and Esther Downing, godly women both; and Faith, Hope's lost sister. Sedgwick's use of historical detail in

constructing this group's interactions within Pynchon's or Winthrop's households and the larger Puritan community suggests the challenges that these characters pose to Massachusetts Bay.

Of these characters, Digby most embodies the potential for resistance and change within the historical moment; he too becomes antinomian. Digby is presented as the most loyal and capable of Fletchers' servants, and this loyalty continues after he leaves their employ to take on "the superintendence of the Governor's garden" and into his old age (Karcher ed. 200; Kelley ed. 191).<sup>27</sup> Digby is consistently the model of faithfulness—the servant that Martha Fletcher depends upon for protection and the experienced soldier who earns Everell's youthful admiration. Later, Digby becomes Hope's most important adult ally, not because he speaks on her behalf, as William Fletcher also does, but because she can trust Digby to assist in her plans, first, to free Nelema from Pynchon's cellar, and, second, to meet her sister Faith on Governor's Island. Everell also relies on Digby, as both attempt to free Magawisca from her prison cell; here, Digby speaks with the voice of reason, warning Everell that they must give up their attempt. Over the course of the novel, Digby's attitudes change, more so than those of any other character. He would therefore appear best to exemplify Sedgwick's gradualist view of historical change and accommodation, whether social, political, or theological.

In the early scenes in Bethel, Digby, a veteran of the Pequod war, holds Native Americans in contempt. Not only does he warn Everell away from the potential temptation of miscegnation, suggested by Magawisca's romantic charms—"like to like, throughout all nature," he says (Karcher ed. 44; Kelley ed. 43), but he also distrusts her

late night disappearance into the woods. In response to her behavior, Digby tells Everell that "'I like not her secret ways – 'it's bad ware that needs a dark store'" (Karcher ed. 57; Kelley ed. 55). Here, Sedgwick borrows from "Bacon and Ingram's Rebellion," the historical narrative of a 1676 revolt in Virginia. The quotation is anachronistic (given that the Bethel period of the novel takes place in 1636-1637)—but it serves to give the feel of colonial language to Digby's speech. Through his experiences in searching for and eventually finding Everell, Digby continues to conform with Puritan principles, as when he rejects Hope's suggested cure or treatment for Cradock's rattlesnake bite.

Yet, at some point between Cradock's recovery, achieved through Nelema's efforts, and Nelema's appearance before the Springfield magistrates, Digby undergoes a change of heart, and secrets do not then seem signs of "bad ware." He not only assists Hope as a party to Nelema's successful escape but also speaks against the magistrates' proceedings; according to Hope's letter to Everell, Digby "maintained, in the teeth of her [Jennet's] exhortation and invective, that an angel had wrought for the innocent old woman" (Karcher ed. 117; Kelley ed. 113).<sup>28</sup> For his pains, Digby is "publicly reprov'd for expressing himself against their [the magistrates'] proceedings"; Pynchon's remonstrance includes Sedgwick's paraphrase of a lengthy section of Winthrop's *History*, which details the providential punishments of "'such scoffers'" (Karcher ed. 113; Kelley ed. 109). While readers are not made aware of the events of the intervening seven years (between the Bethel massacre and Nelema's capture, which seems to have occurred just prior to Everell's return from England), Digby exposes some change of opinion. In his first conversation with Everell after the latter's return, Digby mentions Magawisca,

avowing that "time was, when I viewed you as good as mated to Magawisca," asking Everell's forgiveness for bringing up such a projected match and noting that such a pairing would have been unlikely, once Hope arrived (Karcher ed. 224; Kelley ed. 214). While it is likely that Digby's feelings on intermarriage have not considerably changed, his assistance in freeing Nelema and his outspoken defense of her suggest that he has a higher opinion of, at least, individual Native Americans.

Later, Digby aids Hope in accomplishing her planned meeting with Magawisca and Faith Leslie. When Hope offers a truthful excuse against the likely objections of Digby's wife, that he should "'tell her, that I like to have my own way'" (Karcher ed. 235; Kelley ed. 225), Digby's response expresses the underlying dissent in the colony. His statement approvingly includes a quotation from Mather's *Magnalia*: though the Puritans "hold a pretty tight rein," "there are many who think what blunt Master Blackstone said, "that he came not away from the Lords-bishops, to put himself under the Lord's-brethren"" (Karcher ed. 235; Kelley ed. 225). Digby therefore expects a wave of liberty to rise in the colony, anticipating the decline of Puritans and the advent of the American Revolution, a time in which liberty would in fact "'be every man's birth-right'" (Karcher ed. 236; Kelley ed. 225). Mather's use of Blackstone's remark is quite different, however, for Blackstone is mentioned as one of a "fourth class" of New England divines, whom Mather terms "*anomalies of New-England*" (I. 242, Mather's emphasis). Yet Mather is forced to admit the piety of this group, but he cannot overlook their errors in religious practice or, in Blackstone's case, a refusal to become a member of any Congregational church.

In giving Digby this speech and making him Hope's accessory in subterfuges against the Puritan hierarchy, Sedgwick marks Digby as a threat against the Puritans. He is physically removed from the community when he takes on work at Governor's Island (the more common name for the Governor's Garden) where, perhaps, he and his family can live more freely. This distance and Digby's experience over the seven years of the action of the romance alter his understanding of and perspective on the Puritans' control over the townspeople. He has a strong appreciation for the heroism and knowledge of Native Americans, for he respects Magawisca's sacrifice of her arm in exchange for Everell's life and Nelema's cure of Cradock from the natives' store of knowledge against the physical dangers of the wilderness. Digby's close observations of his fellow colonists result in his understanding that the leadership's control is incomplete and "meddling," that is, interfering with petty, private affairs (Karcher ed. 243; Kelley ed. 232). In this process, Hope and Everell are agents for Digby's changes; because of the affectionate ties among the three, it is difficult to know if their ideals are congruent with his or if their ideals suggest a path for him. No matter the case, for Digby follows his conscience—the Unitarian ideal—when he assists Hope and Everell and speaks on behalf of Nelema. His willingness to risk his physical safety and freedom links him to generations beyond the Puritans (who themselves had risked all in their migration). Digby thereby suggests the transformative powers of the American colonial experience, the ways in which these realities required adaptation, often resulting in a declension from the original Massachusetts Bay ideals. But in terms of the nineteenth-century reading of the federal

covenant, such adaptation could only lead to the American Revolution, the fight for a different set of liberties and freedoms.

As Digby presages the future and the potential for change, Hope's aunt Bertha Grafton represents traditional English culture transplanted to the New World. Despite her migration, Grafton's allegiances continue to reflect her devotion to England: its culture and its church. In this way, Grafton imports the more worldly and permissive side of English culture into the Fletcher (and later Winthrop) household. Her conversation reminds listeners that the world still matters: the news from Charles I and Henrietta Maria's court, the latest fashions among the French Catholic queen's ladies, and romance. As Martha Fletcher reveals, Grafton also brings "Spenser's rhymes, and many other books of the like kind" (Karcher ed. 32; Kelley ed. 32). Grafton's responsibility throughout the novel is to keep the idea of old England alive and, by virtue of doing so, to keep alive in Hope her connection to that culture; for the community, Grafton provides a comic foil, lightening the somber mood and reminding them that there is more to life than the Puritans' sober behavior and their weighty theological errand.

For Grafton, an inseparable part of English culture is the Church of England, what would later be called Anglicanism. Despite the "frequent exhortations and remonstrances" of the Puritan community, Grafton remains an unreconstructed exponent of the high church and its association with Roman Catholicism (Karcher ed. 27; Kelley ed. 27). And she provides a strong rationale as she resists conversion: "'that a faith and mode of religion that had saved so many was good enough to save her'—'that she had received her belief, just as it was, from her father, and that he, not she, was responsible

for it" (Karcher ed. 27-28; Kelley ed. 27). Grafton uses the argument of tradition, or precedent, to emphasize the Massachusetts Bay's defiance of its fathers. This would be an uncomfortable point for those who, after their own rebellion, demanded strict allegiance to their civil and religious policies: if they could reject their past, might not their children reject them?

Grafton also offers an alternative interpretation to one of the many examples of providential intervention in Winthrop's *History*, that of the Book of Common Prayer completely destroyed by mice while other books in the library were left untouched—thus signifying God's use of the mouse to endorse the Puritans' opposition to the Book of Common Prayer (II. 20). Grafton re-tells the story:

'It is peculiar that a man [Winthrop] of his commodity of sense, should bamboozle himself with that story he told at breakfast. [...] well, he says, that in his son's library, there are a thousand books, and among them, a Bible and prayerbook bound together—one jewel in the dung-hill—but that is not what he says—it seems this unlucky prayerbook is gnawed to mince-meat by the mice, and not another book in the library touched. I longed to commend the instinct of the little beasts, that knew what good food was; but every body listened with such a solemn air.' (Karcher ed. 221; Kelley ed. 211).<sup>29</sup>

Grafton casts both the story and Winthrop in a very different light, challenging Winthrop's authority to interpret events in Providential terms. The private disclosure of her interpretation, in the parlor with Hope, Cradock, and Gardiner, shows that Grafton understands the need to keep silent at times, but neither her thoughts nor her speech will

be silenced. Sedgwick gives to Grafton a voice of dissent that claims its own religious liberty and the right to enjoy life. And she has at least some success in spreading her own dissent in the community—for example, convincing Deacon Knowles's wife that her new, fashionable dress is just within the boundaries of the sumptuary laws (Karcher ed. 173; Kelley ed. 165). Sedgwick allows an anachronism in that Grafton's freedom and influence do not put her at risk from the Massachusetts Bay leadership, but Grafton's ability to preserve and even promote English culture denies the Puritans' desire to claim only select portions of their English past.

Like Grafton, Master Cradock, Hope's tutor, imports an aspect of Old World culture: his knowledge of world languages and the classics. His faith is not Puritan, but it is Calvinist. Sedgwick gives to Cradock a line from John Cotton, gleaned from Mather's *Magnalia*: "I 'sweeten my mouth always before going to bed'" with the words of Calvin (Karcher ed. 220; Kelley ed. 210; not identified in either edition; corresponds to Mather I. 274). While Cradock is no minister, he brings another version of Calvinism to the colonies, evidently one that can co-exist with New England's Puritanism. Further, like to many other characters, Cradock is an example of Hope's ability to persuade others to help her to have her way. For the most part, Cradock functions as comic relief—his awkward postures, his tedious speeches—but his loyalty to Hope is absolute. He is completely devoted to her even before he credits her with saving his life by insisting that Nelema be called to administer her antidote to his snakebite. His compliance, at Hope's insistence, as she helps Magawisca escape from the prison speaks to Cradock's novelistic function: he exists to serve Hope's ends.

In stark contrast to Digby, Grafton, and Cradock, the household servant Jennet emphatically opposes Hope. She represents a hard-line Puritanism; as Christopher Castiglia puts it, hers is "Puritanism at its most intolerant and restrictive" (9). Further, Jennet cannot be trusted any more than the characters aligned against the Puritan leadership, no matter the degree of their rebellions. Her loyalties belong to her self above all: self-love and self-interest belie her appearance of conformity and piety, and thus the presumption of visible sainthood. Tolerated as a capable household servant, she is never included as one of the family, for instance in Everell's disposing of gifts upon his return from England. Jennet does not scruple over eavesdropping or spying, and she proves instrumental in the charges of witchcraft against Nelema and in endangering Everell and Hope's plan to rescue Magawsica from prison. Sedgwick punishes Jennet's hypocritical brand of Puritanism by placing her in a position to die in the ship's explosion that also takes the lives of Gardiner and Rosa, Gardiner's page and mistress. It is not so remarkable, then, that no one in Winthrop's household seems to miss Jennet's presence at the accounting of destinies at the end of the novel; in terms of the federal covenant, her self-serving "good works" or appearance of piety cannot contribute to the future of New England Puritanism.

In contrast, the orthodox Puritanism represented in Martha Fletcher and Esther Downing offers a powerful testimony to Puritan faith well-lived. Both women are models of Puritan feminine virtues of submission and love for their fellow mortals; each seeks the love of a man whose true affections lie elsewhere. Neither Martha nor Esther require Puritan surveillance, for they monitor their own actions, fully in accord with their

faith, respect for their superiors, and concern for the well-being of others. Castiglia points out that "as her name indicates, Martha is the woman who serves—she serves the myth of English, male superiority" (7). Even though Martha's life is cut off in the Bethel massacre, she proves before her death the virtue of living her faith purely and disinterestedly. Castiglia reads her death as necessary if "Magawisca and Hope, her surrogate daughters, are to achieve their potential as women" (8). Castiglia's reading is greatly compromised, however, because Martha's death does not foretell the end of Puritan womanhood; it survives, even thrives, in Esther, whose name suggests that she will save her people. In fact, Esther lives to serve the larger community; Sedgwick allows her to voice the last words of *Hope Leslie*, words that reverentially bepeak her faith in action. Thus she provides the novel's fullest expression of the valuable legacy of Puritanism: a visible sanctity that wholly embraces faith and good works.

But this recounting of the novel's major characters leaves out the one named Faith, Hope Leslie's sister. What of this Faith? Studies of the novel that do mention Faith approach her as either the unredeemed captive (linked to Sedgwick's relative, Eunice Williams) or as an example of interracial marriage; these interpretations view the childlessness of Faith and her husband Oneco, Magawisca's brother, as a statement on the barren future for racial mixing in the nation. Although Faith is not a prominent character in the novel, she becomes most noticeable by her absence. Hope's desire to be reunited with Faith drives the major actions of the novel, even though her wish is not very important to the other characters. Ultimately, Hope has to give up the search when Faith refuses the reunion.

When Faith is viewed from the angle of religion or the federal covenant, her character, or its elusiveness, becomes central to the novel. She is the one character who truly embodies the conflicts over race and religion. Like Hope, Faith experiences both Puritan and Anglican religious practices. Even before her capture, Faith and Oneco are bonded as one; they are mirror images of child-like wonder and affection.<sup>30</sup> Once made captive, Faith adopts Native American dress and language and becomes Oneco's wife. A Catholic priest blesses their union, and Faith wears a crucifix, anathema to Puritans. Faith, then, is a mixture of white, Native American, Protestant, and Catholic. And she resists attempts to contain her. When she is forcibly returned to the white community, she pines for her husband and her adopted Indian way of life. She refuses to rejoin the community because she is as alien to it as it is to her. Historically, Indian captives often chose to stay within their adoptive tribes rather than return to their white homes, whether because they preferred their Indian families or feared rejection by the white community. The point here is that Faith, childlike as pure faith may be, is outside of a community that claims to be, above all, faith-based.

What, then, is Hope without Faith? Very little work has been done with the naming in *Hope Leslie*, though Judith Fetterley has suggested that we might read Hope Leslie as "hopelessly" ("My Sister!" 501). Thus we perhaps need to consider what "faithlessly" has to do with Sedgwick's historicist treatment of Massachusetts Bay. What does the absence of Faith mean for the larger community and for the novel? Faith exists in the community, in the Puritans' embrace of the covenant of grace, but when this faith moves to action, it is not the pure, disinterested, multi-faceted faith that Faith Leslie

suggests. Instead, the faith of Massachusetts Bay is the partisan faith of Puritanism, one as infused with political aims as with the spiritual, and Sedgwick makes clear its limitations as a model for the future American nation. As an alternative, she presents Hope and Everell's faith in the future and in themselves. They are "Puritan" only in the sense that they attend, as required, its lectures and observances. Their faith is not expressed in theological terms; instead, it is an assurance of a harmony that they can enact through their own good will to the rest of the community. This assurance is closely akin to the faith imagined by the architects of the American Revolution. It is a faith in a meritocracy, in the sort of educated upper-class individuals that Hope and Everell represent, and in the future. It is a faith that does not know denomination or require a particular church doctrine, but it bears a strong resemblance to the early nineteenth-century liberal Unitarianism that developed out of Congregationalism and that in some measure would soon be rejected in favor of Transcendentalism. Through this sense of an evolving faith, Sedgwick finds a way to represent the best features of the Puritan legacy of New England character.

Sedgwick uses details from the historical record, as this chapter has shown, in her representation of the fictional Fletcher household. She sets them within Massachusetts Bay colony, with the novel's action corresponding to the 1630 migration, the 1636 settlement of Springfield, and the 1643 Gortonist controversy. Over these historically accurate moments, Sedgwick layers the enduring issues of Native American presence and displacement and alters the historical timeline to include Sir Christopher Gardiner, an associate of Thomas Morton and thus a representative of the conflicting commercial and

ecclesiastical aims of white settlement in Massachusetts Bay. The significance of these histories is the subject of chapter five.

## Chapter Five: Sedgwick's Use of History in *Hope Leslie*

Through the experiences of the fictional characters discussed in chapter four, Sedgwick outlines the challenges to the Puritan hierarchy with authentic details borrowed from her reading in historical materials. She also has her characters interact with real historical persons in connection with actual historical events. In doing so, she invents private lives for men and women known to her only through the historical record. Through this technique, Sedgwick merges the private and public controversies of the Massachusetts Bay colony, controversies that reveal the tensions and inadequacies of its federal covenant theology.

Historical persons and events become part of the story throughout *Hope Leslie*. John Winthrop and the Reverend John Eliot, the "Apostle" to the Indians, are Fletcher's friends, even before he emigrates; Eliot re-appears to attend Magawisca's trial. The Reverend John Cotton, next to Thomas Hooker the most renowned Puritan minister, baptizes Hope and Faith Leslie upon their arrival in Boston; later, he speaks at the service attended by Samuel Gorton and his men (a historically accurate moment). Anne Hutchinson is mentioned in passing early in the novel, allowing Sedgwick warrant to duplicate her antinomian spirit of defiance. Sir Christopher Gardiner enters the community, pretending to be a Puritan. The incident of Endicott's involvement in rending the red cross from the British flag is mentioned as Everell and Gardiner sail into Boston harbor, as is the moment when the colony is debating the use of tobacco. The sumptuary laws are mentioned several times, at greatest length by Cotton at the end of the

Gorton service. Everell is reproved for proposing an illegal toast at Winthrop's table, at the same table when chief Miantunnomoh is excluded and therefore not accorded the honorable hospitality that Native Americans extended to white guests. When Magawisca is imprisoned, Thomas Morton, infamous for his antics at Merry Mount, is held in a small room within her own cell. Gorton and his compatriots are housed in the prison at the same time. Chaddock's crew is harbored in Boston where they indulge in the drunken revels recounted in Winthrop's *History*. Winthrop recommends the Reverend William Hubbard (just then graduated from Harvard) as a future husband for Hope. These and other historical incidents, detailed in the appendix, reveal the depth and breadth of Sedgwick's reading and thinking about the period.

Sedgwick chooses three especial incidents from the historical record and develops them to flesh out her historical romance. The appearances of Gardiner, the Native Americans of New England, and Gorton exhibit Sedgwick's deliberate conflation of time for the purpose of drawing attention to the major threats against the Puritan colony and its federal covenant. The historical Gardiner arrived in Massachusetts in 1630 and left in 1632; the controversies between the English and the Pequods ran from 1634 through 1638; Gorton's troubles with the Massachusetts Bay Colony culminated in his capture and trial in 1643. Yet, in *Hope Leslie*, they occupy Boston and the magistrates' attention at the same time. That time is 1643, a calculation based on Winthrop's statement to Everell that the custom of drinking to healths was discontinued "in the year of our Lord, 1639, four years since" (Karcher ed. 156; Kelley ed. 149), and the dating of Hope's letter to Everell prior to his departure from England, some seven years after the Bethel attack,

circa 1636 (Karcher ed. 99; Kelley ed. 95). Sedgwick's preface notes that "some liberties have been taken with the received accounts of Sir Philip (or Sir Christopher) Gardiner; and a slight variation has been allowed in the chronology of the Pequod War" (Karcher ed. 3; Kelley ed. 5). Sedgwick does not, however, mention Gorton in the preface, and she does not need to, for she locates that controversy accurately in terms of time. Through Gorton, Gardiner, and the Native American issues (represented largely through Magawisca and Nelema), Sedgwick essays to suggest not only the social and political battles fought by Massachusetts Bay leadership, but also the questions of whether those were battles worth winning.

Sedgwick makes very few changes to the received accounts of the Gortonist controversy—except that she portrays the Gortonists sympathetically.<sup>31</sup> They are first introduced just prior to the Sabbath service that, for the novel, is important for Hope's impatience as she endures the lecture, for her a tedious obstacle to meeting Magawisca and learning news of her sister Faith. But this is also the lecture that the Gortonists will attend as part of the Puritans' effort to give them, as the fictional Margaret Winthrop tells Everell, "the benefit of all our public teaching" prior to their trials (Karcher ed. 170; Kelley ed. 163). Sedgwick does not provide the details of the backstory to the Gorton's appearance in Massachusetts Bay colony. Rather, she writes only that "This Gorton, whom Hubbard calls 'a prodigious minter of exorbitant novelties,' had been brought, with his adherents, from Rhode-Island by force of arms, to be tried for certain civil and ecclesiastical offenses, for which, according to the most learned antiquary of our new world, (Mr. Savage,) they were not amenable to the magistracy of Massachusetts"

(Karcher ed. 170; Kelley ed. 163). The Gorton case has little impact on Sedgwick's story, but it is central to a fundamental point in the novel regarding religious tolerance.

Historical accounts of the Gorton case agree on the details of Captain Cook's capture of the Gortonists and their imprisonment, trial, and punishment but offer differing perspectives on the reasoning that set these events into motion: did Gorton's letters to the Massachusetts Bay (not mentioned in *Hope Leslie*) so inflame the Massachusetts Bay that a strong response was necessary, or did Massachusetts Bay really believe that it had a civil claim against Gorton? The case centers on the interpretation of property boundaries, civil jurisdiction, and religious belief and practice. Winthrop's record of the controversy suggests that the Puritans' claims against Gorton were civil in nature and undertaken only "upon the complaint of the English of Patuxet near Providence, who had submitted to our jurisdiction, and the two Indian sachems there, of the continual injuries offered them by Gorton and his company" (II. 137). The pretext for the Gortonists' arrest therefore is the Massachusetts Bay's claim, on behalf of those under its jurisdiction, that the Gortonists were wrongly occupying Massachusetts Bay property, and that the Gortonists were, by their residence there, under the Massachusetts Bay's authority. Winthrop writes that "we wrote to them [the Gortonists] only about civil controversies between them and our people," but not about "their opinions, we did not meddle with them for those" (II. 144). But the bulk of Winthrop's commentary does in fact have much to do with those opinions, which he characterizes as "blasphemings and revilings" (II. 144). In short, as much as Winthrop claims that civil, not religious, matters are under consideration, the focus of his commentary suggests otherwise. The Gortonists were ultimately charged as

"blasphemous enemies of the true religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of all his holy ordinances, and likewise of all civil government among his people, and particularly within this jurisdiction" (Winthrop II. 146). Such charges suggest a conflict much different from a dispute over property boundaries.

The Gortonists understandably have a different view of the events. The writer of "Account of Providence, R.I." calls the entire affair "a very arbitrary exertion of power, by the Massachusetts colony" (199) and one that stands in stark contrast to the Rhode Island communities' long-standing commitment to religious liberties. Hopkins notes the movement of Gorton from his arrival in Massachusetts Bay to Plymouth and then to Providence; he also details the land transactions that, according to Massachusetts Bay, put Gorton under its jurisdiction but, in Hopkins' view, demonstrate that Gorton's property was legitimately purchased and lay outside that of Massachusetts Bay—and that Massachusetts Bay magistrates were quite aware of the illegitimacy of their civil claims against Gorton. Therefore, it was no surprise that, once Gorton and his company "were now in safe custody, nothing is heard further of the complaint of Pomham, and the Indians" (Hopkins 200).<sup>32</sup> In the words of Gorton, John Wickes, Randall Holden, and John Greene, co-signers of the petition, dated 4 March 1664-65, they were "evilly intreated [. . .] without any faults of ours, that we know, or can be made to appear, only they [Massachusetts Bay] took offense" to their differences in church order ("A humble petition" 68). Thus, once the Gortonists were in custody, Massachusetts Bay turned to its real complaint, the Gortonists' religious beliefs, as shown in the charges and the punishment levied against them.

For these differences, Gorton and seven of his co-defendants were sentenced to separate confinements within the homes of magistrates in and around Boston; they were further ordered not to speak except "with any of the elders, or any other licensed by any magistrate" (Winthrop II. 147). The 1664-1665 petition and Hopkins's "Account" agree that the punishments were meant to silence the Gortonists and, not incidentally, to prevent them from continuing to build their settlement at Warwick; both also mention the magistrates' inability to agree on a death sentence for Gorton and his co-defendants. At the next General Court, the Gortonists were released; Savage notes that "these misguided prisoners were liberated, because their keepers were in danger" from the public support for the Gortonists (Winthrop I. 148 n. 1).

The Gorton case raises a number of questions. Did Massachusetts Bay have a legitimate claim to the Gortonists' property? Or did the Gortonists have clear title to their land as part of the Rhode Island colony? If the Gortonists did have clear title, then they were not within the Massachusetts jurisdiction. But if they did not, as the Massachusetts magistrates claimed, were the Gortonists then under Massachusetts jurisdiction? These questions were never really answered at the time of the Gortonists' trial. The trial turned into a referendum on religious conformity, and the punishment imposed silence and then banishment. Central, then, to understanding the Gortonist controversy is whether they offended on civil or ecclesiastical grounds—or both—and whether there was, for Massachusetts Bay, any distinction between the civil or the ecclesiastical.

Why would Sedgwick choose Gorton most prominently as her representative historical dissenter, the case study of civil and ecclesiastical tensions? In doing so, she

passes over the more famous cases of Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams, who receive brief mention in the novel. Perhaps Anne Hutchinson's case was too well known or too notorious. Would readers extend sympathy to a Hutchinson, a woman whose supposed doctrinal errors led to her banishment and whose ill adventures after that fact—such as her molar pregnancy or her massacre in an Indian attack—suggested to the Puritans a providential judgment against her religious errors? It is likely enough that Sedgwick wanted to avoid the association of lawlessness or dissent (Hutchinson's Antinomian legacy) with disastrous ends, for her version of the fulfillment of the promise of the Puritan legacy depends on the success of dissent as Hope and Everell embody it. Roger Williams, in that case, would seem a perfect choice for a historical precedent, and Sedgwick was familiar with his work, as her reliance on his *Key into the Language of the Indians of New-England* for information on the Native Americans of New England shows. But much of *Hope Leslie* has to do with the attempt to dissent and achieve freedom *within* Massachusetts Bay, not outside of it. In that case, Williams's fame as the founder of the Rhode Island colony presents an obstacle; in Sedgwick's time, he is simply too well known as a typological forebear of the Revolutionary founders of the United States. And though he is the central example in New England of an individual's ability to found a community on the ideals of the separation of church and state and freedom of religious conscience, he was forced to leave (or, more accurately, escape Massachusetts Bay) to achieve these ideals.

Gorton's case affords Sedgwick an opportunity to insert a known but not central historical figure who was embedded in a controversy that showcases Massachusetts Bay's

hypocritical and heavy-handed actions toward civil and ecclesiastical dissent. That Gorton survived the controversy, gained popular support, and went on to serve honorably in his own community in Warwick might have made him a yet more attractive choice: he was a dissenter, surely, but he can be viewed as a wronged man who ultimately became a conservative figure. According to Savage's correspondent, determining just who Gorton was, or what the truth of his case might be, was a challenge even to learned men: "I have lost nearly all confidence as to the truth of what is related [in the accounts of the Gorton controversy]. [. . .] How then can I know what took place 200 years ago, when I have no evidence but that which is distorted by the worst passions?" (Winthrop II. 58n).

Moreover, Savage adds, "It would be a remarkable fact, that a man should be an enemy to *magistracy*, to religion, in short a bad man, and yet constantly enjoy the confidence of his fellow townsmen and receive from them the highest honours in their gift" (Winthrop II. 59n). It seems that Gorton was a flashpoint to the Massachusetts Bay, yet perfectly acceptable, upstanding, to those in his own communities.

Evidently, Sedgwick uses Gorton's case to suggest the real strains within the early Puritan settlements and to review the popular support that led Gorton to a kind of victory over Massachusetts Bay. But in doing so, she does not offer a "recital" of the Gorton case as she does the Pequod War, a recital that is important to making clear the dual losses of Puritan-Indian engagement and evoking sympathy for vanishing Native Americans. Instead, the only scene in which the Gorton controversy dominates is the Sabbath lecture; other references to the case receive brief mentions in other scenes. The

Gorton case provides the historical type or precedent for the movements toward a proleptic American liberty that the major characters enact.

Sedgwick begins to establish the sense of public sympathy for the Gortonists, expressed in clear opposition to the magistracy, with Everell's response to Margaret Winthrop's comment that the Gortonists would attend the evening's lecture: "I should fear that they would deem this punishment before trial" (Karcher ed. 170; Kelley ed. 163). In response to this sarcasm, Margaret Winthrop says that the prisoners have requested and received an opportunity to speak after the lecture. A Mr. Wheeler, rather than, in the historical account, John Cotton (who does speak later in the fictional version of the service), delivers the lecture, and Gorton, as in the histories, offers a rebuttal. The text on which both speak, "Acts 19, of Demetrius pleading for Diana's silver shrines or temples, &c." (Winthrop II. 143) is the same historically and fictionally. Sedgwick's attention to this detail is important, for it offers an opportunity to re-construct the scene of a Puritan lecture and suggest its length and depth of Scriptural interpretation. The specificity of Acts 19 is also important, for it is likely that Cotton chose the text deliberately, in order to prove Gorton's "errors" publicly. The Biblical text speaks of Paul's teaching at Ephesus, and its themes resonate with the civil and ecclesiastical tensions of the Gorton case. This chapter is concerned with identifying a "true" Christian (not just a baptized person, but a believer in the Holy Spirit), the worship of false idols, and the authority of the state over church matters.

The Biblical text can be interpreted in multiple ways, and Gorton did so: "smarting under a sense of wrongs, he repeated all the points of the discourse, and made

points where there were none; refuted and attacked, and proved (to his own satisfaction), 'that all ordinances, ministers, sacraments, &c. were but men's inventions—silver shrines of Diana'" (Karcher ed. 172; Kelley ed. 164; the indirect quotation from Winthrop II. 143). Gorton thus returns Massachusetts Bay's impugning of his Christianity and religious practice by suggesting that, instead, the colony's authorities are the ones out of grace, not "real" Christians, not practicing the true faith, and further that their complaints against him and his company and their claim to jurisdiction are illegitimate. Such challenges to interpretive authority are important, and not only to the Gorton case.

Questioning the legitimacy of Massachusetts Bay Colony's jurisdiction over others raises the issue of the colony's legitimacy, always a troublesome matter, whether involving the colony's relationship to England, the extent of the authority granted to the colony in its charter, civil rule in New England, or church order. All of these vexed issues have a conflated corollary in the rebellion against civil and ecclesiastical authority in England, as witnessed in the English Civil War, which is concurrent with the major part of the action in *Hope Leslie* in 1643. Everell raises precisely this point when he tries to convince Esther of the legitimacy of action to free Magawisca (discussed in chapter four). And Sedgwick knew from her reading in Winthrop that the magistrates had to be aware of their tenuous hold on power, for beyond the Puritan refusal to conform to the rites of the Church of England, the colony consistently engaged in a balancing act of appeasing and defying England, even as it quietly ignored the persistent demands of Charles I to give up its charter to the crown.

Once in power, the magistracy worked to maintain its political authority and social superiority. Thus, when Winthrop emphasizes Gorton's audacity in questioning Cotton's Sabbath lecture, he objects not only to Gorton's different interpretation of scripture but also to the source: "they [the Gortonists] were all illiterate men, the ablest of them could not write true English, no not common words, yet they would take upon them the interpretation of the most difficult places of scripture, and wrest them any way to serve their own terms" (II. 145).<sup>33</sup> Here, Winthrop is attacking Gorton's social position, for clearly the man could not have written the letters that so incensed Massachusetts Bay if he had been really illiterate. What Gorton lacks is a social or educational pedigree; in effect, he is violating the social hierarchy so sacred to Massachusetts Bay and expressed in Winthrop's "A Modell of Christian Charity." Hopkins's "Account of Providence, R.I." counters Winthrop's social condescension by noting that Gorton was "of a good family, was a man of good learning, though not bred at any university" (199). But, the authorities of Massachusetts Bay invariably advocated a learned clergy, and therefore Gorton lacked the credentials for a man who sought to speak or preach in public. Something closely akin to this outlook was integral to the Bay's case against Anne Hutchinson, but with an anti-woman twist.

Winthrop and the others of the magistracy were probably no less concerned with what must have been Gorton's charismatic personality and public speaking style. The same might be said of their objection to Hutchinson, a woman not trained to be a minister but obviously able to gather a following that threatened both the ministry and the magistrates. Gorton left the Massachusetts Bay colony after his initial arrival there in

1636 with a group of followers who had been attracted to his unauthorized preaching. Hubbard's *General History of New England* notes that the magistrates in March 1643 banished the Gortonists because "they could not keep them from seducing others, nor yet bring them to any sight of their folly and wickedness" (407). Such skill in attracting disciples is no less evident in Gorton's response to the Sabbath lecture. In the novel, that response captures Hope's interest so much "that she forgot her own secret subject of anxiety" (Karcher ed. 172; Kelley ed. 164). Given Sedgwick's emphasis on Hope's impatience during Wheeler's portion of the lecture, the contrast is striking. To explain it, Sedgwick borrows Savage's note in Winthrop's *History*, comparing Gorton to Swedenborg, the eighteenth-century philosopher and spiritualist known for attracting a large following (Winthrop II. 58n). Sedgwick strengthens the case for public support in favor of Gorton by noting that Everell's and Digby's attempt to free Magawisca from prison was believed to have been a "desperate effort" by some of Gorton's adherents, for "the community had been much agitated concerning the heresies and trial of Gorton and his company" (Karcher ed. 277; Kelley ed. 264). Further, the Gortonists gained the sympathy of their soft-hearted jailer, Barnaby Tuttle, who admits to Gardiner that he has "dropped salt tears for them" and wishes that some way might be opened for their pardon (Karcher ed. 266; Kelley ed. 253).

Tuttle's comment and Gardiner's response offer, in a very brief space, telling possibilities for Sedgwick's interpretation of the Gorton case. Tuttle says that "'betimes I hear them calling on the Lord, like Daniel in the lion's den, for hours together'" (Karcher ed. 266; Kelley ed. 253). Like Daniel, Gorton and his company are punished for their

worship, and their faith is tested. They emerge from their encounter with the Puritan lions with their lives and their freedom, suggesting that their belief is true and worthy. And Gardiner's response to Tuttle's wish for the Gortonists' pardon sums up the case, for pardon is unlikely "unless those sore revilers should renounce their heresies, or— [ . . . ], or their title to the Indian lands" (Karcher ed. 266; Kelley ed. 254). Through Gorton's case, Sedgwick exposes the actual historical circumstances that raised questions about the civil and ecclesiastical authority of Massachusetts Bay. It seems fairly clear that she accepts Savage's assessment of the case and his explicit sympathy: "we must rejoice that they obtained justice" in England (Winthrop I. 149 n.1). Thus Sedgwick joins other nineteenth-century descendants of the Puritans whose filio piety toward the founding fathers was partially tempered by their recognition of the essentially anti-democratic, authoritarian rule of the Puritan patriarchs.

Another group of historical challengers to Massachusetts Bay would not be so successful in obtaining justice, including the historical Sir Christopher Gardiner, who with Thomas Morton and Philip Ratcliffe tried to bring complaints against the colony but failed to exact satisfaction. In Gardiner's case, Sedgwick borrows historical details from Winthrop's *History* and Hubbard's *General History*, including the facts that Gardiner appeared in the false guise of a Puritan and attempted to join the community, that he travelled with a woman who was not his wife, that he was Morton's associate, and that incriminating letters addressed to Gardiner came into the magistrates' possession and revealed Gardiner's true identity. Unlike his fictional counterpart, the real Gardiner was sought out, captured by cooperative Indians, and then imprisoned in Boston in 1632; after

he was deported to England, Gardiner "there showed his malice against the country; but God prevented him" from a successful case against the Massachusetts Bay colony (Hubbard *General History* 150).

Sedgwick's Gardiner is now Philip instead of Christopher (perhaps a way to blend the historical identities of Gardiner and his partner Ratcliffe). He is, as Bell says, "not so much based on history as inspired by it" ("History and Romance" 218). He infiltrates the Puritan community, but in 1643, not the early 1630s; Gardiner's appearance is so promising that Winthrop suggests him as a potential husband for Hope. Winthrop makes this case for Sir Gardiner's background, noting especially his aristocratic origins: "He is a man of good family, who, after having fought on the [Royalist] side where his birth naturally cast him, [. . .], [and] he hath come to cast his lot among us, instead of joining our friends in England" (Karcher ed. 162; Kelley ed. 154). Further, Winthrop "thought the gentleman scarcely needed other [recommendation] than he carried in his language and deportment" (Karcher ed. 162; Kelley ed. 155), a signifying counterpart of visible sanctity. His educated and aristocratic manners thus became sufficient recommendation, just as their absence marked Gorton as an undesirable upstart. Winthrop extends such confidence in Gardiner that he consults with him on state matters; as Jennet observes to him, "'you and the Governor are one in counsel'" (Karcher ed. 314; Kelley ed. 298). When Gardiner's true self is exposed, his identity coincides with that found in Winthrop's *History*:

Sir Philip had formerly been the protégè, and ally of Thomas Morton, the old political enemy of the colony; that he was a Roman catholic [sic]; of course, that

the Governor and his friends had been duped by his religious pretensions; and in short, that he was an utter profligate, who regarded neither the laws of God nor man. (Karcher ed. 358; Kelley ed. 338).

Winthrop allows Gardiner's external appearance of conformity to outweigh the questionable letter of introduction offered on Gardiner's behalf, a letter that Fletcher forces him to admit has not come from a person known to Winthrop. Winthrop misses other signs as well—Gardiner's refusal to eat meat on the Friday he arrives in Boston, the odd behavior of his page, his overt flirting with Hope Leslie. By creating a close (if fictional) relationship between Gardiner and Winthrop, Sedgwick once again critically analyzes Massachusetts Bay's pretension to rule by wise authority. The governor's inability to detect an imposture and especially the discrepancies between appearance and reality exposes the failings of the Puritans' reliance on visible sanctity.

As might be expected, Dame Grafton readily approves of Gardiner's appearance, but for a reason different from that of Winthrop. To her (and to Hope), Gardiner presents himself as a polished, convivial cavalier—conforming to expected Puritan behavior, of course, but always ready with a witticism, a poem, or a flirtatious compliment. He provides a breath of fresh English air, a man who would be comfortable within the court circles Grafton loves to fancy, a man who knows how to appreciate a woman. Thus Gardiner offers a possibility that Hope will be spared a dull Puritan marriage. Given the novel's emphasis on Grafton's interest in pretty baubles, her attraction to Gardiner makes sense, as she is starved for humor, variety, and courtly culture. But this singular failing sharply contrasts with her usual keen ability to point out Puritan hypocrisies or over-

reactions and thus, as an English loyalist partisan, she serves quite well Sedgwick's vision of the anti-Puritan bias of the loyalist camp.

Gardiner presents his Puritan façade to the Puritans and a courtly mask to Hope and her aunt Grafton, who, after his imposture is revealed, "soon dubbed him Sir *Janus*" (Karcher ed. 369; Kelley ed. 348). He hopes to woo Hope to fulfill his own ends, to possess her fortune along with her physical beauty, as a letter to his friend Wilton makes clear. In their interview in the garden on Governor's Island, Gardiner recites to Hope a pretty French verse, translated in both the Karcher and Kelley editions, but its title not identified. Gardiner intends the lines as a discourse on "the harmony between the passions," as he puts it (Karcher ed. 227; Kelley ed. 217), as Hope defends Esther's ability to love passionately as well as to serve God (for Esther and Everell have just been betrothed). The opening lines of Gardiner's recital, "And in truth I remind you / God and love are in agreement" (Karcher ed. 389 n. 4; Kelley ed. 362 n. 4), explain the substance of the passage. But without the context of this passage, the lines signify only on the superficial level, Gardiner as would-be lover.

Yet more must be said about Sedgwick's choice of this particular poem. The lines come from "Le Lai de L'Oiselet," a thirteenth-century French poem that might also be categorized as a morality tale; the title of the work as well as several lines are recorded in Sedgwick's notebook, *Notes and Anecdotes*, n.d.. In her scholarly edition of the poem, Lenora Wolfgang notes that the passage used in *Hope Leslie* "varies most in terms of vocabulary" across the five extant versions, but the meaning is the same: "God and love are in accord, and if you heed what they love and hate, you will succeed" (109). As

Wolfgang notes in a synopsis of "Le Lai de L'Oiselet," the moral of the story is that "He who covets all loses all" (3). This message and that of the quoted passage have important implications for both Gardiner's and Hope's stories, as do the parallels between the poem and novel.

The scene in the Governor's Garden in *Hope Leslie* mirrors the setting of "Le Lai de L'Oiselet," the garden of an ancient manor house. The story that takes place in this garden has its own parallels with the plots and subplots of *Hope Leslie*. In brief, "Le Lai de L'Oiselet" relates the following story. A villein, an upstart villager who is also a villain, possesses the manor, built for a nobleman. In the manor's garden lives a bird whose "song had the power to bring joy to the unhappy and to inspire love where it was not even thought of before"; further, should this bird leave, the garden "would wither and the fountain would dry up" (Wolfgang 2). One day, rather than singing about God and love (the passage given to Gardiner in *Hope Leslie*), the bird turns to a much different song. He (for the bird is styled as a male) commands the river, the tower, the hall, the flowers, the herbs, and the tree to destroy themselves, because "This place used to be dear to courteous lovers, but now this envious, covetous villein listens to me. He prefers wealth to love and looks at me with the idea of eating!" (Wolfgang 2). The bird flies away, and the villein sets a trap; once the bird is trapped, the two argue over the bird's freedom. The bird claims that "never will I sing in a cage!" and "You will commit a sin if you kill me" (Wolfgang 2). Finally, promised three truths in exchange for the bird's freedom, the villein releases the bird. The three truths revealed are these: "'Do not cry for what you have never had!"; "'Do not believe everything you hear!"; and "'what you

have in your hands, do not throw at your feet" (Wolfgang 2, 3). The simplicity of these truths enrages the villein, for he knows that he has been tricked into losing the bird in exchange for nothing but common proverbs. Finally, the bird characterizes the villein: "They say that he who listens does not hear: He talks much about wisdom and has little; he talks about courtesy and would not know how to practice it; and he believes himself wise and is guided by folly" (Wolfgang 3). Then the bird flies away, the garden dies, the grand manor decays, and the villein has none of these riches to enjoy. Thus the moral of the story is about the dangers of covetousness.

The lines that Gardiner recites belong to the bird, but in the context of *Hope Leslie*, he parallels the villein and Hope the bird. As an interloper in the community, Gardiner is determined to possess, first land (until he finds out that Morton is imprisoned and their plans go awry) and then Hope. Given the novel's consistent association of Hope with liberty and self-determination, such possession could only destroy her. Further, Gardiner does not care even for what he already possesses, as Rosa's experiences with him amply demonstrate, and he seeks only self-satisfaction. For readers familiar with the passage from "Le Lai de L'Oiselet," which speak of the harmony of God and love, it becomes clear that Sedgwick subtly forecasts Gardiner's true intentions, to show his duplicity. At the end of the novel, Sedgwick's destruction of Gardiner in the explosion of the ship, if heavy-handed, points to the moral consequences not only of his duplicity but also the terms of the moral of "Le Lai de L'Oiselet": Gardiner covets all and loses all, including his life.

Here Sedgwick borrows a historical detail from Winthrop's *History*. Karcher's edition of *Hope Leslie* notes that Sedgwick bases the explosion, in which Gardiner, Rosa, Jennet, and many others die, on Winthrop's description of the loss of Chaddock's ship (397n).<sup>34</sup> Karcher does not mention this crucial detail, however: that in that historical event, just one body, "that man who was the cause of it [the explosion]," is not found (Winthrop II. 153). The same is true of Sedgwick's fictional Gardiner; his body alone is not found and therefore receives no burial. By observing this historical detail, Sedgwick further reminds readers that the Puritans, not surprisingly, would have read this event as a sign "that Satan had seized upon that [Gardiner's body] as his lawful spoil" (Karcher ed. 369; Kelley ed. 348).

Through Gardiner's fate, Sedgwick fulfills the moral of "Le Lai de L'Oiselet," just as through Hope and Everell's alliance she projects a better future for the harmony of love and God in the New England colony, because the villein, not the garden, of the poem is destroyed. The match of Hope and Everell demonstrates the seamless union of the poem's lines, that "God loves good sense and respect," "God hates pride and falseness," "God loves honor and courtliness," "Love loves loyalty," and so on (Karcher ed. 389n; Kelley ed. 362n). Surely as long as these values are upheld, the Puritan garden will thrive. But might other villeins, not so obvious as Gardiner, threaten this future? Is there another bird in the garden whose tune changes when the villein enters?

Magawisca also can be fruitfully compared with a bird in the novel, and like Hope, she embodies a spirit of liberty, one threatened first when she is put under Winthrop's guardianship and later when she is imprisoned. The figure of Magawisca has

prompted a wide variety of interpretations, each privileging some aspect of her heroism, her culture, or her gender. To Bell, "Magawisca stands in the romance for the dangers of wild nature" ("History and Romance" 219). Gould and Karafilis focus on Magawisca as a mediating figure, "a wavering heroine in the tradition of Sir Walter Scott" (Gould 80); in the sacrificial loss of her arm, she embodies the "heavy price for shifting alliances and multiple allegiances" as she moves between her Native American and white families (Karafilis 331). Magawisca, as a lyrical voice for her people, tells the young Everell the story of the massacre of her village and opens his awareness to the Indian perspective on the colonial brutalities committed in the Pequod War: her people also had claims, rights, families. Later, she explains why she cannot live with Hope and Everell, why she must move farther west into the forest. Her explanation unmistakably underscores the impossibility of co-existence with whites: "My people have been spoiled—we cannot take as a gift that which is our own," "the Indian and the white man can no more mingle, and become one, than day and night" (Karcher ed. 349; Kelley ed. 330).

Considering "Le Lai de L'Oiselet" from a Native American point of view, the Massachusetts Bay colonists, the villeins who have purchased the noble manor and its garden, have spoiled it with their avarice, their desire to possess that which cannot or should not be possessed. They have captured the bird, meaning to kill him, and then released him; all the while, they have misunderstood his song and failed to learn his lessons. So, when the bird flies—Magawisca to the western forests—it foretells the ruin of the natural world displaced by the colony. When Magawisca speaks of the world to which she intends to go, she uses terms similar to those of the bird in the "Le Lai," calling

upon the elements of nature that embody the Great Spirit: "I hear him in the rushing winds—in the summer breeze—in the gushing fountains—in the softly running streams. I see him in the bursting life of spring—in the ripening maize—in the falling leaf" (Karcher ed. 351-2; Kelley ed. 332). This view of nature is precisely the wilderness that is, at the historical moment of the novel's setting, being tamed or destroyed in Massachusetts Bay. As in the poem, when the bird flies from the garden, destruction follows; the villein now possesses a ruined, barren landscape.

The questions involving possession, of person as well as property, are also central to the history of the Massachusetts Bay colony. The pretext of the Gorton case, the legality of his ownership of a prime piece of land, is one example. Another is the colonists' jurisdiction over Magawisca, but she explicitly denies it: "I am your prisoner, and ye may slay me, but I deny your right to judge me. My people have never passed under your yoke—not one of my race has ever acknowledged your authority" (Karcher ed. 302; Kelley ed. 286). The colonists, of course, would not agree, for various sachems and lesser sachems had placed themselves under the protection of Massachusetts Bay as tribal alliances shifted and Indian populations diminished. But Magawisca, the chief representative of Native Americans, and Nelema, the elderly healer, deny the colonists their claims of superiority in religion and their right to possession.

To express a Native American perspective, as closely and as accurately as she could, Sedgwick read widely, as demonstrated in her notes that describe Native American culture, customs, beliefs, and behavior. Sedgwick's primary sources for representing Native Americans are John Heckewelder's *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian*

*Nation*, Roger Williams's *Key into the Language of the Indians of New-England*, and Daniel Gookin's "Historical Collections"; also significant are passages from Frances Higginson's *New-England's Plantation* and William Morrell's "Poem on New England." Some of these texts provide small details of Native American villages and homes, while others permeate Sedgwick's descriptions of Indian spiritual beliefs and medical practices; very few notes relate to the Pequod War or other conflicts.<sup>35</sup>

On occasion, Sedgwick adds questions to her notes; these instances merit consideration, since nowhere else in her notebooks does she respond to her readings. Following excerpts from Chapter XXXI, "Of Their Religion" of Roger Williams's *Key into the Language*, Sedgwick comments, "W [Williams] says they [Native Americans] acknowledge God in all the accidents in life," and then adds this question of her own in parentheses: "Are not those who live without plan more apt to feel the presence of Provi<sup>cc</sup> [Providence]?" (Notes and Anecdotes; corresponds to Williams *Key* 226). In reference to Williams's discussion of the Indian concept of the soul, she asks, "Is not their notion good of giving no home to the wicked soul" (corresponds to Williams *Key* 228; Notes and Anecdotes). Williams's thoughtful examination of the Native American belief system seems to have prompted Sedgwick to consider its value not as a mere historical curiosity but as a spiritual truth.

Such respect for Native American faith appears in *Hope Leslie*. For example, when Hope and Magawisca meet near their mothers' graves, Hope finds "something thrilling in Magawisca's faith" as Magawisca explains that the Great Spirit, as she conceives him, embraces Indian and all Christian sects and is found in all of nature as

well as within her heart (Karcher ed. 197; Kelley ed. 189). Magawisca again demonstrates the strength of her belief when she explains to Hope and Everell, at the close of the novel, that when she goes to the western forests, she will go with the Great Spirit, that "there is no solitude in me" (Karcher ed. 351; Kelley ed. 332).<sup>36</sup> The idea of the presence of the Great Spirit in all things, persons, and places corresponds to the depiction of Native American belief presented in Heckewelder, Williams, and Gookin.

Sedgwick also understands the discrepancy between the expressed faith and the actions of the Puritan community, and thus the impact of the discrepancy on Native Americans. She records a remark from John Eliot's 1682-83 letter to the Honorable Robert Boyle, a financial supporter of Eliot's Christianizing efforts, in which Eliot says that "In the late war their [Indians'] souls recd [received] a wound" that has made missionary work yet more challenging (Notes and Anecdotes; corresponds to Eliot 181). Sedgwick also asks, in response to "Observations of the Indians of North America," "Why should the Indians believe in the sincerity of their enemies' relig<sup>n</sup> when they [the Puritans] violated the law of the Great Spirit who had given to the Is [Indians] this cont [continent]?" (Notes and Anecdotes). The likelihood of such suspicions is hardly surprising to readers who did not participate in the settlement of the American colonies, but only a few writers who left contemporary accounts, such as Eliot and Williams and later Heckewelder, seem aware of the Native American ability to recognize (and lament) the hypocrisies inherent in the Puritan errand. In *Hope Leslie*, however, both Magawisca and Nelema point them out.

Both women understand the violence being done to their communities as the white settlers move further inland from the coast, establishing settlements as they go, clearing the forest, decimating the native population, and corrupting its cultural traditions. Nelema is the last surviving member of her family; she considers herself too frail and aged to exact the vengeance she would like to wreak on the whites who have destroyed her family. Although Nelema tells Martha Fletcher that "I can neither harm thee, nor help thee" (Karcher ed. 38; Kelley ed. 37), she repays Martha's kindnesses by warning her about the impending Indian attack, curing Master Cradock, and travelling westward to fulfill her assurance to Hope that the sisters will see each other once more. And Nelema does help the Fletchers' extended family, though she is correct in saying that she cannot help them against Mononotto's revenge. Nelema's assistance is consistent with Heckewelder's observation of the Native American concept of friendship: "How often, when wars were impending between them and the whites, have they not forewarned those among our frontier settlers whom they thought well disposed towards them, that dangerous times were at hand, and advised them to provide for their own safety, regardless of the jealousy which such conduct might excite among their own people?" (277).

Nelema drops this warning at Martha's feet: "an arrow, and the rattle of a rattle-snake enveloped in a skin of the same reptile" (Karcher ed. 38; Kelley ed. 38). Magawisca interprets each piece, respectively, "the symbol of death," "the warning voice that speaketh of danger near," and "the unseen and silent approach of an enemy" (Karcher ed. 40; Kelley ed. 39). Mononotto's murder of Martha and her youngest children and his

capture of Everell and Faith will fulfill the warning. Sedgwick borrows this foreboding detail from history; her notes from Edward Winslow's "Good News from New England: Or a Relation of Things Remarkable in that Plantation" refer to the "bundle of new arrows, lapped in a rattle-snake's skin" delivered by Conauacus's messenger, and the governor's response, to return the skin "stuffed . . . with powder and shot" (Winslow 240; Diary, 1811-1812). Martha cannot return a threat of violence; she can only try to be more vigilant against the threat.

Years later, Nelema responds to Hope's plea to help Cradock, who has been bitten by a rattlesnake on their excursion to Mount Holioko. Nelema does not restrain herself from noting the irony: "now am I, the last of my race, bidden to heal a servant in the house of our enemies" (Karcher ed. 108; Kelley ed. 104). Sedgwick draws from her notes from Heckewelder's chapters, "Physicians and Surgeons" and "Doctors or Jugglers," as well as Daniel Gookin's "Historical Collections," to create the scene in which Nelema heals Cradock, particularly the physical exertions and contortions. When William Fletcher, in his discussion with Hope, says that "these powows are factors for the devil" and describes the "diabolical spells mutterings and exorcisms," he quotes Gookin from notes recorded in Sedgwick's notebook (Karcher ed. 111; Kelley ed. 107; Gookin 154; Sedgwick Diary, 1811-1812). Such behavior, despite the good news that Cradock is cured, result in Nelema's arrest on charges of witchcraft, knowledge about which Sedgwick recorded from the 1641 "Abstract of the Laws of New-England" (Sedgwick Diary, 1811-1812; see appendix). Other notebook entries that suggest Sedgwick's interest in the Puritans' charges of witchcraft against women include the legal charges

against Mary Osgood in 1692 ("Grand Jury's Bill against Mary Osgood") and Thomas Hutchinson's remark that Sir William Phipps's wife secured the release of a woman charged with witchcraft (Hutchinson II. 46n; Sedgwick Diary, 1811-1812). Hope, of course, is instrumental in Nelema's escape (with considerable help from Digby); in thanks for her release, Nelema promises Hope that she will see her sister again, no matter the effort required to achieve this end.

Yet the aged Nelema must leave the fulfillment of her promise to Magawisca, a young woman no less aware of the price of the Puritan settlement. In fact, Magawisca may be even more aware, for she does not have Nelema's memories of sons and grandsons in a pre-colonial world. She has only her childhood memories, and these memories are torn between images of violence and those of kindness, both delivered by the Puritan settlers. Magawisca has the unenviable position of being able to see both sides, to understand their motivations, and, perhaps worst of all, to realize the essential powerlessness of her people against the relentless march of Puritan settlement. Magawisca has witnessed her mother's death and effectively lost her father, for he is not the powerful sachem he was after the Bethel massacre and Magawisca's sacrifice of her arm. Her brother Oneco is no leader; he remains child-like and single-minded in his devotion to Faith, the white captive who becomes his wife. Since Everell, the one person Magawisca deems worthy above all others, is both white and partnered with Hope, Magawisca's future appears to be a solo journey into the western forest—away from the world that she was born into. Magawisca provides a witness to the history of the Pequot War and the destruction of her family; she brings home for Everell the nature of that

massacre, just prior to his own participation in its twin, Mononotto's attack on Bethel. After Magawisca gives her arm so that Everell might live, she seals her valorized position as the novel's figure of *the* Native American: strong, unyielding, stoic, heroic. Accordingly, she represents the myth of the noble savage. She also fulfills Heckewelder's concept of Indian friendship, for "there is no Indian, who would not blush at being reproached that after boasting that a particular person was his friend, he had acted the coward when his friendship was put to the test, and had shrunk from venturing his own life, when there was even a chance of saving that of the man whom he professed to love" (280).

But as much as the novel represents Magawisca in exemplary terms, Sedgwick does not argue against the "inevitable" loss of Native American rights and tribal lands to the steady process of white settlement. Her notes from Reverend John Bulkley's "An Inquiry into the Right of the Aboriginal Natives to the Lands in America, and the Titles Derived from Them" (1724) focus on the central point that "the Indians made little use of the earth but to walk on it" (a paraphrase of Bulkley 170; *Notes and Anecdotes*), in which case the ownership of the colonists was made by virtue of the "skill and labor we have bestowed" in improving the land (Sedgwick *Notes and Anecdotes*). Paraphrasing Jeremy Belknap and Jedidiah Morse's "Report of a committee of the board of correspondents of the Scots society for propagating Christian knowledge, who visited the Oneida and Mohekunuh Indians in 1796," Sedgwick records "a common saying [is] that an Indian cant [sic] work" (*Notes and Anecdotes*; Belknap and Morse 19-20). Sedgwick does not comment on these notes, and *Hope Leslie* supports a belief in the whites' right to possess

the continent and to "civilize" Native Americans, to erase their culture and replace it with white culture, even though the novel provides dialogical, perhaps romanticized, evidence of Native Americans living noble lives in harmony with the natural world.

*Hope Leslie* participates in this erasure of individual Native American tribes. Even though Sedgwick's Indians are New England Indians, more specifically Pequot, Sedgwick draws heavily from Heckewelder's descriptions of the Lenni Lenape, or Delawares, in *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations* to depict her Pequot's belief system, homes, and customs. She constructs a composite "Indian" from her extensive notes and her own knowledge of the Stockbridge Indians, mentioned in chapter three. This composite is supposed to be at once representative of all tribes (which resonates with the early nineteenth-century national debate over Indian removal) and yet individualized, in the persons of Magawisca and Nelema, in ways that belie the stereotypes and moderately object to the mistreatment of Native Americans.<sup>37</sup>

In their relationships with the white world, Nelema and Magawisca extend their trust only to the Fletcher family (including Hope and Faith), but even this is not an incorruptible trust, for instance, when Magawisca suspects that Hope might reveal their secret meeting or when Magawisca believes that Everell has abandoned her to her fate in the prison. The Native American men of the novel, Mononotto and Mianntunomoh, never trust the Puritans, though they admire an individual such as Everell, suggesting that these men have never sealed friendships with the whites as Nelema and Magawisca have. Likely, they failed to do so because their interactions with the whites were military or political in nature, not the personal connections made among the women and children,

white and Native American. In the context of *Hope Leslie*, the events of the Pequod War work to set the scene for Native American-white relations, but their interactions are largely personal rather than political. Sedgwick circumvents many of the possible military and political engagements of the period, even in her research. Occasional brief entries on the shifting alliances among the Pequods, the Mohawks, and other tribes appear in her notes, but the bulk of the information entails characteristics of Native American culture. For Sedgwick, the military issues are less central to the disappearance of Native Americans than is the Bay colony's inability to enact cultural accommodation.

The Puritan settlement rejects Native American culture or any connection with it. Authorities arrest and seek to execute Nelema because they interpret her healing as witchcraft. When Faith Leslie, married to Oneco and converted to Catholicism, is recaptured and returned to Winthrop's household, her Native American dress repels them; in return, their English dress and speech either confuse or agitate her. Similarly, Magawisca is a central point of concern from the moment she arrives at the Fletchers and resists their attempts to Christianize her. Later, her sacrifice to save Everell gains her honor among the Fletchers but not among the magistrates who fear her tribal connections. The Massachusetts Bay colonists are curious about the Indians, but this curiosity cannot override a basic mistrust of their motives and non-Christian culture. They are viewed merely as pagans, despite Eliot's efforts to Christianize them. Some of the children of the new generation—Everell, Faith, Oneco, Magawisca—can overcome this distrust, but as Hope's repulsed reaction to her sister's Native American-ness suggests, most cannot.

*Hope Leslie's* three historical issues involving Gorton, Gardiner, and Native Americans entail central moments of religious and cultural controversy during the first two decades of the Massachusetts Bay colony's existence. Sedgwick points out the threats, internal and external, to the development of Massachusetts Bay and the fulfillment of its federal covenant. One potential threat, that of Catholicism, appears in *Hope Leslie* as benign, but it deserves attention as part of the real and fictionalized colony. Gardiner's Catholicism claims a critical part of his deception, and the Puritans react against it when it is revealed, but his Catholicism does not account for Sedgwick's destroying him. In fact, Gardiner is the only negatively portrayed Catholic character. Rosa, Gardiner's mistress, is also Catholic; her faith sustains her at the same time that it reinforces the hopelessness of her situation: rejected, tainted, sinful, perhaps beyond redemption. Gardiner's plan to ask Magawisca to take Rosa to a place where she might be conveyed to the French Catholic mission, the Hotel Dieu, is based on a real possibility for Rosa's redemption, her return to the protection of her faith (Karcher ed. 270; Kelley ed. 257). Sedgwick would have learned of the Hotel Dieu and its benefactress Madame Bullion from her reading in Pierre Francois Xavier de Charlevoix's *History and General Description of New France* (1744) (III. 27). Rosa, however, will never find her way back to the convent, for she dies in the explosion that she triggers at the close of the novel. Faith Leslie's conversion to Catholicism is not a matter of great concern for her family either, for, to them, it means that her marriage has received a Christian blessing. That the Christianity is Catholic rather than Protestant does not concern them, given their relief at finding her alive and well; her adoption of Native American dress and language is more

frightening to them than her Catholicism. Finally, a Catholic, Antonio, rescues Hope from the drunken pursuit of the rest of Chaddock's crew; he believes her to be a visitation of a Catholic saint, and she does not dissuade him from this idea. In fact, she plays the part to encourage his delusion and thereby ensure her rescue. Later, Antonio attempts another rescue as he delivers a warning to Winthrop of Gardiner's plot to capture Hope. Hope even "sportively" calls for Esther's secrets to be revealed—"fancy me to be the priest, and yourself the penitent. Confess freely, daughter—our holy church, through me, her most unworthy servant, doth offer thee full absolution"—which can only be answered by Esther's reproof that Hope "not trifle with holy words, and most unholy rites" (Karcher ed. 140; Kelley ed. 134-135). In general, the novel establishes Catholicism as a small but positive part of the new colony, rather than as the threat that both the Puritans and even Sedgwick's own contemporaries might have believed it to be.

Sedgwick thus borrows from her wide reading in the available histories to construct a character of the Massachusetts Bay colony—one that is in some ways true to its history, as this discussion of its historical figures suggests, yet in others progressive, as the previous chapter's consideration of its fictional characters shows. She works with the historical accounts as well as ideas of the federal covenant and nineteenth-century readings of it to establish a "history" that is illustrative rather than definitive. In some ways, Sedgwick minimizes the frictions in her colonial Massachusetts, in order to create the heterogenous Winthrop household, for instance, while emphasizing others, such as the dissent that the household contains or that actual persons enacted. Overall, Sedgwick suggests a long-range outcome for Puritanism in America—the eventual decline of its

most restrictive qualities and the rise of a new federal covenant in the form of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution. As so many scholarly readings of *Hope Leslie* agree, Everell and Hope pre-figure the generation that will lead the American Revolution and establish American democracy. Moreover, in Sedgwick's view, they lead the way to a revitalized and altered Puritanism in the rise of liberal Unitarianism. In recommending Hope and Everell's liberal religious position and Esther's religious devotion, Sedgwick suggests the centrality of religious practice to the success of the new nation.

## Chapter Six: Conclusions and Future Considerations

In developing this intertextual study of *Hope Leslie*, I have approached Sedgwick and her work from an angle that highlights the archival resources of the Massachusetts Historical Society—Sedgwick's and others' correspondence and her notebooks. This method has led not only to the first documentation of Sedgwick's creative process but also the first detailed study of her use of the historical record to express her views on religious tolerance in national history. The controversies over religious tolerance and the challenges to Massachusetts Bay authority, expressed throughout *Hope Leslie*, show Sedgwick's interest in projecting a more tolerant future nation, while at the same time preserving elements of the Puritans' legacy in the New England character.

Sedgwick was aware of the Puritans' failings; the historical evidence of this would be as difficult for her to ignore as were the inadequacies (for her) of the Congregational doctrine in the church of her youth. She broke with that faith when she converted to Unitarianism, but she could not (or did not want to) complete the break with the Puritan legacy—which after all provided the ground for her chosen faith and the history of her nation. Sedgwick's authorship gave her agency to participate in what Buell calls "the consensus legend of New England and American's Pilgrim-Puritan origins" (201), based on an understanding "that many of the founders were 'republicans in principle' and "showed democratic tendencies from the start" (198). Through her authorship, Sedgwick influenced the projects of establishing a national literature and promoting Unitarian

ideals, both of which embraced this consensus view of New England history, a view most prominently advanced in Sacvan Bercovitch's *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*.

For a better understanding of Sedgwick's use of historical detail and her merging of history and fiction in *Hope Leslie*, I examined the unpublished documentary evidence, including Sedgwick's notebooks and correspondence, in order to chart the development of the novel and to identify her sources of information. The notebooks show that Sedgwick undertook research seriously, thoroughly examining the published accounts available to her. The completed novel includes extensive use of her sources in historicizing fictional characters and adapting historical persons and events to her fictional ends. An important part of her use of history in *Hope Leslie* centers on the Puritans' covenant theology, as the previous chapters have established.

Even as the main actions of the novel serve to undermine the original proponents of the federal covenant and to expose its weaknesses, Sedgwick still claims the centrality of the idea of the federal covenant—America as a redeemer nation, a promised land. To this end, she works to establish a sense of the Puritans' mission and to emphasize their sacrifice. Early in *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick relates Fletcher's decision to join the migration to New England: "Hundreds in that day resisted all that solicits earthly passions, and sacrificed all that gratifies them, to the cause of God and of man—the cause of liberty and religion" (Karcher ed. 10; Kelley ed. 12). The passage sets forth a hard truth of the Puritan's sacrifice, as does a later passage appearing just after the Bethel massacre, while Fletcher mourns the loss of his family and awaits word on his captured son. Here, Sedgwick identifies the Puritans as "the chosen servants of the Lord," enduring all

manner of suffering in order to establish "this promised land of faith" and "to restore man—man oppressed and trampled on by his fellow; to religious and civil liberty, and equal rights—to replace the creatures of God on their natural level" (Karcher ed. 75-76, 75; Kelley ed. 73).

Sedgwick's emphasis on "the cause of God and of man—the cause of liberty and religion" first suggests federal covenant theology (the commitment of God and humanity to the covenant) and then links liberty, the by-word of the American Revolution, with religion, the key motivation of the Puritans' original errand. These tendencies would be fulfilled in the founding of the United States; in regard to religion, the First Amendment would secure the free exercise of religion and prevent a state-established religion. Yet even with these legal safeguards, religious liberty or tolerance was not—or would not be—a settled issue, as Sedgwick knew, for she was living through the storms of the Jacksonian era and the Second Great Awakening (as well as her personal struggles with faith and religious tolerance). So even though Sedgwick lauds the Puritans for their sacrifices and their covenant theology, she cannot ignore the Old Testament, Calvinist severity of their theocracy or fail to consider the impact of that legacy.

In fictionalizing the historical moment of the early 1640s (or, more precisely, 1643, which also happens to be the moment of the Confederation of the Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven colonies), Sedgwick reviews the conflicts within New England. Foremost is the seeming dominance of Puritanism in the colony, a dominance which is critiqued and subverted in significant ways over the course of the novel, whether through religious dissent (as in the Gorton case), the limitations of the

idea of visible sanctity as well as the threats of commercial competitors (Gardiner), ignorance (of the value of Native Americans), or, most tellingly, the unwillingness of citizens to be yoked to a mandated set of beliefs (William Fletcher, Hope, Everell, Digby, Grafton). Once Massachusetts Bay's intolerance, rigidity, and errors are revealed, its motives are suspect—even though the Puritans' initial sacrifices must be respected. Because of their narrowness, Sedgwick therefore casts the Puritan patriarchs as less worthy typological models of the republic's founding fathers. They may have had some democratic leanings, but they surely valued their own liberty over the liberty of others. Who, then, will step into their place as the proper role models? Who will anticipate the course of American history? Who will ensure that future generations value religious tolerance over state control? These questions lead to Sedgwick's displacement of history with fiction.

Sedgwick chooses Hope Leslie, Everell Fletcher, and Esther Downing for this mission, and she has prepared each for just this purpose. Hope and Everell are mediating figures, they do not belong wholly to Puritanism or the Church of England, but their parents have exposed them to both traditions. Their integration into Massachusetts Bay is not seamless; both resist the prevailing orthodoxy, again and again. Though Hope is initially less open to Magawisca's faith than is Everell, she comes to recognize the beauty and truth of her Native religion. Neither Hope nor Everell is inclined to follow the rules simply because they are rules; instead, they follow their consciences, their "natural" inclinations to do good for others. In sharp contrast to Hope and Everell, Esther is a strict adherent of her Puritan faith, and though such adherence can be read as unquestioning

compliance, it more likely denotes a deep embrace of her faith. The discrediting of some aspects of Puritanism, then, does not mean that that it cannot add value to the community. Collectively, these three characters suggest a possible course for religious tolerance in the United States. Esther fulfills the covenant of works; she proselytizes for her faith—visiting Magawisca in her prison cell, counseling Hope in their private room, acting for the benefit of the larger community when she returns to New England. Hope and Everell create a household that embraces their family and reaches out to care for others, their long-time friends. The three project a future in which religious difference can be tolerated. Of course, that religion is clearly Protestant in nature, a limitation reflective of the nineteenth-century white Protestant culture to which Sedgwick belonged.

Sedgwick's account of the colony and the origins of New England character predicts a national course toward individual and political independence, including the establishment of a free practice of religion. Through the fiction of *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick works to reconcile the Puritans' intolerance and the futility of some of their efforts toward complete social and political control with her understanding of the importance of their legacy: the ultimate establishment of the United States. Thus, the romance is marked with an ambivalence toward the Puritan heritage—especially as it relates to religious tolerance and social control in the early republic. Maria Karafilis notes that "the close of the novel reinforces an ambivalence that we have seen throughout the text" (342). Her interest is in the ways that "Sedgwick complicates the dichotomy between the individual and the communal" (330) in order to explore the responsibilities of citizenship in the early national period and especially the text's inscription of

Jacksonian era Indian removal policies. Karafilis's analysis recognizes "Sedgwick's desire to get beyond polarities" of individualism and communitarianism as well as the difficulty, perhaps impossibility, of a reconciliation between the two (330). Sedgwick negotiates another set of polarities—and is similarly conflicted—when she represents the theocratical element of *Hope Leslie* and considers its legacy.

This study has focused on the development of Sedgwick's authorship and the writing and research involved in creating *Hope Leslie* in order to establish an alternate interpretation of the romance, one that foregrounds Sedgwick's concern with religion and religious tolerance. This reading does not counter the existing interpretations, most of which privilege the novel's political tensions (Puritan versus Native American, Puritans as precursors of the American Revolutionaries). In fact, it supports these and provides another perspective on Sedgwick's representation of the nation, for religious liberty is one of the key achievements of the United States, safeguarded in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Further, Sedgwick promotes an ideal of good citizenship in the young nation, one specifically influenced by religious principles and practice and the idea of the federal covenant. Such points are evident in the ways in which *Hope Leslie* works out an idea of a Puritan legacy moderated by its succeeding generations so that the best traits of Puritanism survive to enrich the young nation—though, as so many commentators have noted, the novel fails to offer a better than elegiac farewell to Native Americans.

Sedgwick's experience of liberal Unitarianism led to such a view of the nation and to her participation in the Unitarian literary project. Daniel Howe describes their goal, "to supply the moral and spiritual needs of their society," and notes that "Liberal

Christians were among the leaders in that campaign to develop an American literary culture which followed the formation of the new nation" (175). While Sedgwick scholars have often noted, in passing, the influence of Sedgwick's conversion and her response (in *Home*, 1835, and later works) to the Reverend Henry Ware's invitation to join in his Unitarian-oriented series of novels, the evidence suggests that Unitarianism was a very strong and early influence not only on Sedgwick's authorship but on her choice of themes and materials. Considerable work remains to be done in analyzing the themes of religious tolerance and religious principles in Sedgwick's other novels and further considering the implications for reading her work not only as nationally or historically but also as religiously centered. In this effort, Sedgwick might also be considered in context with the lesser known writers who were also working to promote the liberal Unitarian agenda. The work of her close friend Eliza Cabot Follen, who contributed the poem "Sachem's Point" as *Hope Leslie's* epigraph is one possible subject; the work of Sedgwick's sister-in-law Susan Ridley Sedgwick is another. Future studies might also consider Sedgwick's and other women's writing alongside that of their male Unitarian counterparts as a means to arrive at a better understanding of the complete context of the liberal Unitarian project.

The continuing development of feminist scholarship, pivotal in the re-appearance of Sedgwick and other women writers and in the breaking-down of binary oppositions between male and female, such as "separate spheres" ideology, has opened the possibilities for more fully contextualized studies of women's authorship. For instance, future studies might continue to deepen the inquiry into women's roles in researching and

writing their national histories. In this vein, lesser known but historically informed works such as Lydia Maria Child's *The First Settlers of New-England; or, Conquest of the Pequods, Narragansets and Pokenokets: As Related by a Mother to Her Children, and Designed for the Instruction of Youth* (1829) might be useful in reconstructing women writers' conversations—in correspondence or across texts—about their representations of the national experience.

In such efforts toward achieving a fuller understanding of Sedgwick, professional authorship, historical fiction, and the Unitarian project in the early republic more generally, archival research will continue to provide an indispensable tool. The evidence located in such research supports this study in ways that secondary sources could not, for an immersion in the author's primary documents, particularly private ones, reveals threads and continuities that may not be otherwise noticeable or available. The present study offers an introduction to the significant range of materials contained in the Catharine Maria Sedgwick and Sedgwick Family Papers at the Massachusetts Historical Society, remarkable for their quantity—five substantial collections within the Sedgwick Family Papers and three within Sedgwick's own papers—as well as their comprehensiveness in charting Sedgwick's, her parents, her siblings', and others' correspondence. These holdings, along with other smaller collections, provide a nexus for the study of nineteenth-century authorship, for several of Sedgwick's contemporaries and fellow authors are also represented in the collections. Through archival research in such substantial holdings, the conditions of authorship, the creative process, the writer's research, and the range of responses to the published work can be documented; the first-

hand accounts will guide and support scholarly conclusions. For the present study, such research was integral, for Sedgwick's own notes and correspondence guided me to her sources, to my reading of the Puritan historical moment that she inscribes in Hope Leslie, to my understanding of her authorship as a purposeful choice, her participation in the representation of the nation's past, and her interest in charting a course for the nation's future.

### Appendix: Sedgwick's Sources

To date, the only widely available information about Sedgwick's sources for *Hope Leslie* comes from internal references in the work and items identified by the editors of the two most recent editions (Mary Kelley, 1987; Carolyn Karcher, 1998). The published accounts most often cited include William Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*; John Heckewelder, *Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations*; William Hubbard, *A Narrative of the Indian Wars in New-England* and *A General History of New England, from the Discovery to MDCLXXX*; Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*; Edward Johnson, *The Wonder-working Providence of Sions Savior in New England*; Benjamin Trumbull, *A Complete History of Connecticut, Civil and Ecclesiastical*; Nathaniel Ward, *The Simple Cobler of Aggawam in America*; Roger Williams; *Key into the Language of America*; and John Winthrop's journal, *The History of New England from 1630-1649*, as prepared for publication in 1825-1826 by James Savage. Yet these are not the only sources used in *Hope Leslie*. This appendix details the results of a close study of the evidence of Sedgwick's "patient investigation of all the materials that could be obtained" (Karcher ed. 3; Kelley ed. 5) to create her historical-fictional portrayal of the Puritan's New England settlement.

The most extensive collection of archival materials relating to Sedgwick is held within the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I, II, and III of the Massachusetts Historical Society archives. In addition to correspondence, several of Sedgwick's notebooks are held in this collection. Among the several notebooks in the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I, three focus on note-taking; the others are journal-diaries of daily life or

travelogues.<sup>38</sup> The two notebooks of interest to this project, for references to the Puritan settlement and Native Americans abound within them, are identified within the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I as Notes and Anecdotes, n.d. and Diary, 1811 – 1812, and Notes.<sup>39</sup>

As physical evidence of her work, the notebooks verify Sedgwick's own claims of her haphazard approach to writing and to research. There does not seem to be any linear or other discernible organization of the entries within the notebooks; entries from the same volume of a work, for instance, may appear in multiple locations. Sedgwick evidently used them over long periods of time, jotting down notes on multiple occasions; therefore, the archival dates assigned to them are not helpful in identifying the exact points of Sedgwick's use of the notebooks. The inside covers of both notebooks, Notes and Anecdotes and Diary, 1811-1812, and Notes, record a jumble of names, both European and Native American (primarily Algonquin) as well as fragmentary notes. Scattered within the notebooks' pages are brief quotations and fragments as well as sustained excerpts from a wide variety of published works related to the colonial and Revolutionary periods. In some instances, Sedgwick records an author's name or an abbreviated title beside an excerpt; in others, the note contains enough detail to determine its original source. On occasion, notes without either of these qualities can be identified by checking them against sources that have already been identified; success with this approach suggests that Sedgwick's attention may have been caught by various items as she flipped through the pages of a particular work or that she may have continued reading from one entry to the next in a volume.

The first step in my investigation of Sedgwick's research centered on identifying her sources. In my detailed examination of *Notes and Anecdotes and Diary, 1811-1812*, and *Notes*, I found that the principal sources of information in these notebooks are the twenty published volumes of the First and Second Series of the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, in which appeared the most notable Puritan writings and a fair amount of now obscure texts. For instance, Sedgwick's excerpts from Edward Johnson's *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Savior in New-England, 1628-1651*, published in 1654, are likely taken from the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Volumes 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 of the Second Series, published between 1814 and 1819) rather than any other edition of the work. Sedgwick's notes prove also that she drew upon such works as John Winthrop's *History of New England from 1630-1649* (1825-1826), edited by James Savage, and Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* (1702).<sup>40</sup>

After establishing a comparison of Sedgwick's notebooks and published sources available to her, I next studied *Hope Leslie* to locate the points at which the information recorded in *Notes and Anecdotes and Diary, 1811-1812*, and *Notes* appear within the novel. At the same time, I searched the novel for references to published sources that had not been identified in the Karcher or Kelley editions of *Hope Leslie* but that I had identified in my study of Sedgwick's notebooks. Through comparison and analysis, I have identified with certainty the sources from which Sedgwick drew nearly all of her notes as well as nearly every place in which these notes or other references to published sources appear in the finished novel.<sup>41</sup> With a few exceptions, such as Ward's *Simple*

*Cobler*, the quotations in *Hope Leslie* come from published sources referred to in Sedgwick's notebooks.

This appendix organizes these layers of notes, sources, and applications to make Sedgwick's reading in history accessible to researchers. Given the relative inaccessibility of the notebooks (as well as the difficulty of identifying a single note's precise location within the notebooks), I have organized the reference list of source materials by author or title of the published work and then specified its relationship to Sedgwick's notebooks and to *Hope Leslie*. This method, which cross-references the source to the appropriate notebook and to the novel, seems a most useful tool for scholars who would like to interpret *Hope Leslie* from an historical-literary perspective.

The references in this appendix are limited to those sources that either relate specifically to *Hope Leslie* or indirectly to the colonial period in America, and to those references which appear in *Notes and Anecdotes*; *Diary, 1811-1812*, and *Notes*; or the novel itself. Additional materials are available in the notebooks, but I have omitted these from this study. I have also omitted Sedgwick's notes that relate to the American Revolutionary period.<sup>42</sup> Sedgwick's brief notations from such authors as Lord Byron, Thomas Gray, Victor Hugo, Michel de Montaigne, Plutarch, Alexander Pope, and Sir Walter Scott have also been omitted when they do not clearly bear upon *Hope Leslie*. Other omitted items include Sedgwick's excerpts from *Extreme Manifestations, History and Mission of the Shakers, Book: The Testimony of Christ's Second Appearing* (1810), which likely contributed to the portrayal of the Shakers in *Redwood* (1824), and

Sedgwick's notes on her interview with Captain Stewart Dean, fictionalized in "A Chivalric Sailor" (also known as "Modern Chivalry") (1826).

This appendix is organized in three sections:

- I. Published source material appearing in the notebooks, including references to the appearance of the material in *Hope Leslie*.
  - II. Published source material appearing in *Hope Leslie* but not in the notebooks and not identified in Kelley's or Karcher's editions.
  - III. Notebook entries appearing to bear on the invention or drafting of *Hope Leslie* but not appearing specifically in the novel
- I. Published source material appearing in the notebooks, including references to the appearance of the material in *Hope Leslie*.

"An Abstract of the Laws of New-England, as they are now established. Printed in London in 1641" (*Coll MHS, First Series, Vol. 5, 1798, 171-187*),<sup>43</sup> introduced as "A very curious Tract, and the only one I ever saw of it," with further discussion of the attribution of the Laws to a collaboration of John Cotton and Sir Henry Vane. Sedgwick excerpts just one section of this document, that defining witchcraft as "fellowship by covenant with a familiar spirit, to be punished with death" (182), listed with other capital crimes (Diary). This likely provides the basis for the charges brought against Nelema after she has cured Cradock of his rattlesnake bite.

Sedgwick characterizes the punishment of Fletcher's servant Hutton and others "who have been violating the law of God and the law of our land, by meeting together in merry companies, playing cards, dancing, and the like" as "twenty stripes well laid on" (Karcher ed. 34; Kelley ed. 34; source not suggested in either edition); Sedgwick may have drawn on the clarification in the "Abstract" that "stripes are not to be inflicted, but when the crimes of the offender are accompanied with childish or brutish folly, or with lewd filthiness, or with stubborn insolency, or with brutish cruelty, or with idle vagrancy; but when stripes are due, not above forty are to be inflicted" (185).

Sedgwick may also have referred to this "Abstract" when Gardiner suggests, in a letter to his friend, the possible punishments should his true relationship to Rosa be revealed and again during Magawisca's trial; "pollution of a woman known to be in her flowers, to be punished with death. Lev. 20.18, 19," (183) or "forcing of a maid, or a rape, is not to be punished with death by God's law, but" with lighter punishments, including marriage or "corporal punishment of stripes" (184). One mentioned by Gardiner, "a public whipping of poor Rosa," seems unlikely, based on my reading of these laws (Karcher ed. 209; Kelley ed. 200; source not suggested in either edition).

"Additional Memoir of the Moheagans, and of Uncas, Their Ancient Sachem" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 9, 1804, 77-90). Sedgwick records a brief notation on Uncas (discussed in the "Memoir" 81-85), simply that he was a Pequot, "rebel<sup>d</sup> ags<sup>t</sup> Sassacus – and became the head of a distinct tribe [the Moheagans]"; further,

Sedgwick notes that the Narragansetts so feared Sassacus "that they said 'He is all one God, no man can kill him'" (Notes; *Coll MHS* 84, n. 45, referring readers to Trumbull's *History of Connecticut*). Sedgwick uses this last quotation in *Hope Leslie*, in Magawisca's recital of the Pequod War (Karcher ed. 50; Kelley ed. 48; source not identified in either edition).

"Bacon and Ingram's Rebellion" (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 1, 1814, 27-80) is briefly referred to in Sedgwick's Notes and Anecdotes: "a witty narrative of Bacon & Ingram's proceedings in the 1<sup>st</sup> Vol. 2 series of the Collections of MHS" (Notes). On the last page of this journal, Sedgwick records this fragment from the opening of the manuscript, entitled "The Indians Proseedings": "Empty bellies make weake hearts which always makes an unfit serving man to waite on the God of War" (Notes; corresponds to 27-28). Perhaps the amusing anecdote is this note, commenting on the Indian's destruction of "all things in the fort, that might be servisable to the English, they [the Indians] boldly, undiscovered slip through the league (leaving the English to prosecute the seige, as Schogin's wife brooded the eggs that the fox had suck'd)" (28-29), recorded in an abbreviated form in Sedgwick's notes and identified by "B & I" (Notes). The jailer Barnaby Tuttle refers to this as Hope and the disguised Magawisca leave the prison and he wants to identify the departing visitors: "It is a rule I always observe in such cases, lest I should be left to 'brood the eggs the fox has sucked'" (Karcher ed. 330; Kelley ed. 313; source not identified in either edition). Next, Sedgwick notes "ware requires a darke store," leaving out the adjective "bad" from the original (from "Bacons

Proceedings" 45; Notes); Sedgwick gives this line (with "bad" included) to Digby, during his and Everell's nightwatch at Bethel, an addition to his comment that "I like not her secret ways" (Karcher ed. 57; Kelley ed. 55; the line appears in single quotation marks within Digby's speech, but is not identified in either edition).

Sedgwick next takes the closing lines from "Upon the Death of G. B.," part of "Bacons Proceedings": "Death keep him close / *We have too many Divells still goe loose*" (60; Notes). The final notation from this work comes from "Ingrams Proceedings," a portion of the explanation of this remark, "That a compleate Generall ought to be owner of these 3 induments [sic]: Wisdom to foresee, Experience to chuse, and Curage to execute" (69). Sedgwick takes just a portion of a sentence: "like your young doctors who but grope in the dark or strike at guesses" (Notes; corresponds to 70).

Jeremy Belknap and Jedidiah Morse, "The report of a committee of the board of correspondents of the Scots society for propagating Christian knowledge, who visited the Oneida and Mohekunuh Indians in 1796," signed by Jeremy Belknap and Jedidiah Morse, July 1796 (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 5, 1798, 12-32). Sedgwick copies a variety of notes from these series of questions and answers. Among these are "A proverbial tradition among the Indians is that that the G Spirit gave the W Man a plough & the red man a bow & arrow (corresponds to 20) – a common saying that an Indian cant work – Them [?] were made for war & hunting Squaws and hedgehogs to scratch the ground" (19-20) – 'Oneida Stone' of a cylindrical shape weighting 100 #s – 'Follows the Indians in all their removals

(14) – They worship the winds clouds & thunder (14) – The Oneidas first visited by french Jesuits" (15; Notes).

"Biographical Memoir of Father Rasles," unattributed (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 8, 1819, 250-257). Sedgwick evidently summarized the content of the first page of this work (250), noting only that "the lan [language] spoken through<sup>l</sup> NY [New York] was [illegible] the same," marking this note with the title and location of her reading: "Biog<sup>l</sup> Mem<sup>r</sup> of Father Ralles Vol 8 2 series," using a common variant spelling of Sebastien Rasles's name (Notes).

Rev. John Bulkley, "An Inquiry into the Right of the Aboriginal Natives to the Lands in America, and the Titles Derived From Them. Written in 1724, by the Rev. John Bulkley, Minister of Colchester in Connecticut" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 4, 1795, 159-181). Sedgwick's first paraphrases Bulkley: "The Indians made little use of the earth but to walk on it" (170; Notes). She then re-states his case: "Reason against the title of the Is [Indians] – Are we not all commoners of nature and is there any indv<sup>l</sup> property till by skill or labor we have bestowed something of our own upon the earth – whose are the fish in nature's great common, the sea – till they are caught?" (Notes).

Pierre Francois Xavier de Charlevoix, *History and General Description of New France* (1744). A number of entries (covering about 5 pages) are taken from Charlevoix's work, prefaced by Sedgwick with the note "Some extracts from Charlevoix" (Diary). These are written in a mix of English and French (sometimes alternating language within the same sentence, an indication of her

facility with French). Among the major topics is the story of "Catherine Tegahkonita, an Iroquois orphan converted by le Pere Jacques de Lamberville" (Diary; Charlevoix Vol. 6). Sedgwick probably drew her information regarding the French Catholic settlements from this work, including the details Gardiner offers for his plan to rid himself of Rosa: "you may take her to your western forests, and give her to a Romish priest, who will guide her to the Hotel Dieu, which our good lady of Bouillon has established in Canada" (Karcher ed. 270; Kelley ed. 257; source not identified in either edition). Charlevoix writes that "Madame de Bullion gave 62,000 livres; Mr. de la Doversière, Lieutenant-general in Presidial of la Flèche, devoted to it a part of his property, and by his advice they selected, for the direction of the hospital, nuns of the Hotel-Dieu, in that city [Montreal], whose institute has since been erected into a religious order by the Holy See" (3: 27); this passage is identified as happening in the year 1659. A current record of Angèlique Bullion dates her donation to the year 1643, the year after the hospital and orphanage's founding; the mismatch of dates may be owing to the fact that Bullion's identity as benefactress was not revealed until after her death ("Angèlique Bullion").

"Copy of a MS. Letter, giving a full and candid account of the delusion called Witchcraft, which prevailed in New-England; and of the judicial trials and executions at Salem, in the county of Essex, for that pretended crime, in 1692. Written by Thomas Brattle, F.R.S. and communicated to the Society by Thomas Brattle, Esq. of Cambridge," dated October 8, 1692 (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 5, 1798, 61-

80). Sedgwick takes two pages of notes from this letter regarding the courts' examination of suspected witches and their victims. In regard to individuals involved in the proceedings, Sedgwick identifies Simon Bradstreet, Thomas Danforth, Major N. Saltonstall, Francis Foxcroft, and Thomas Graves as "to the persecution opposed" (Diary; names given on 75), and she records a footnote to this letter, that "John Hathorne and Jonathan Curwin were the most active" of the justices (62; Diary).

John Davis, "Discourse before the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, December 22, 1813, at their Anniversary Commemoration of the First Landing of our Ancestors at Plymouth, in 1620" (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 1, 1814, i-xxxii).

The notes to Davis's lecture include a reference to Lady Arabella Johnson and other women who made the perilous trip from England to New England. He writes: "the instances of female magnanimity, which adorn our early history, remind us of the memorable address, made by the lady of P. Arias, who was appointed Governour of Darien, in 1514, by Ferdinand King of Spain. It is recorded by Peter Martyr in his second Decade. Part of it is subjoined in the translation of Richard Eden, made in the reign of queen Mary I" (xxiv).

Sedgwick uses this portion of the quotation that follows in order to illustrate in *Hope Leslie* the existence of "the tenderest human affections" among the Puritans, as part of her discussion of Esther's love for Everell while both are in England: "'Withersoever your fatall destinie,' she said to her husband, 'shall dryve you, eyther by the furious waves of the great ocean, or by the manifolde and horrible

dangers of the lande, I will surely beare you company'" and so on through the end of Sedgwick's quotation (Karcher ed. 143; Kelley ed. 137; source not identified in either edition; corresponds to Davis xxiv). Davis also offers a history of Governor's Island, referenced in chapter four of this study.

John Eliot, "Letters from Rev. John Eliot of Roxbury, to Hon. Robert Boyle" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 3, 1794, 177-188). Sedgwick notes that "In the late war their [Indians'] souls recd a wound" (Notes), a point made by Eliot in his letter of March 15, 1682-3 (fourth in the series), that "The Lord's word still goeth on among them, and though many of the younger sort, since the wars (where their souls received a wound) have declined [. . .] yet now (through the grace of Christ) they are on the repenting and recovering hand" (181).

Sedgwick next takes two notes from the sixth letter in this series. The first is: "It is a sickly and moral time with us," (183; Notes; in Eliot, the word is "mortal," however); Sedgwick retains the error of "moral" in Jennet's speech, when Jennet accepts a coin from Gardiner in exchange for her silence (Karcher ed. 315; Kelley ed. 299; source not identified in either edition). Sedgwick also paraphrases Eliot: "If my apology have failed (being deep in years) then be pleased to draw a curtain of love over all my failures" (Notes; corresponds to 182-183). Finally, Sedgwick notes, "'I am drawing home,' says E in his last letter," followed by his specific requests for the disbursement of monies given to him by Boyle some time before (187; Notes). These letters focus on the urgency of Eliot's mission work and especially the need for financial support for printing a

Bible written in the Indian language and the continuance of missionary work after his death.

Sedgwick's use of Eliot's description of the hair style of Native American women near Boston as the "'maiden veil'" does not appear in these letters or other known sources consulted by Sedgwick (Karcher ed. 205; Kelley ed. 196).

"Extracts from the Records of the Province of Maine" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 101-104). Sedgwick takes "We present Charles Potum for living an idle lazy life" from the subsection "Certain presentments of Grand Juries" (103; Notes).

Daniel Gookin's "Historical Collections of the Indians of New England" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 141-227). A set of notes marked "Gookin" includes "sweet, toothsome, & hearty" nokake, a staple food for Indians when travelling (150) and the shape and size of their pots and pails (151) (Notes). These notes, as well as those in Higginson (below), evidently provide background for Sedgwick's description of the sick elderly woman's habitation, from which Magawisca eventually makes her escape; Sedgwick particularly notes the use of birch bark pails, an example given in Gookin (Karcher ed. 92-93; Kelley ed. 88-89; source not identified in either edition). The rest of this block of writing includes excerpts from Lincoln and Bulkley (see separate entries).

In a different journal, Sedgwick takes extensive notes on the Mawhawks, or Maquas, including the boundaries of their traditional territory, the "corrupt principles" taught by the Catholic priests among them, and the fear the Mohawks

instilled in other tribes (156; paraphrased in Diary). The apostasy of Josiah, or Chekatabutt, from a "catechised Indian" to "a back friend to religion," part of a larger anecdote of the battles between the Maquas and the eastern tribes that Gookin identifies as "our Indians," is also recorded (166; paraphrased in Diary).

Sedgwick also borrows Gookin's notes on the Pequots, noting the range of their territory and their sachems' "dominion over divers petty sagamores" (147; Diary). Some of this information, on the Mohawks in particular, likely informs Hope's report to Everell that Magawisca and Faith are living within this nation (Karcher ed. 114; Kelley ed. 110; source not identified).

Next to this note is one on the meetinghouse in Natick, with an upstairs corner reserved for John Eliot's bedstead (181; Diary); this quotation actually comes from Neal's *History of New England*, one of the manuscripts used to fill in for a missing page of Gookin's manuscript.

Sedgwick also provides an extensive description of the powows' methods of treating the sick. The phrase "these powows are factors for the devil" (Gookin 154) appears twice in Sedgwick's journal (Diary), once paired with another phrase from the same page, "diabolical spells mutterings and exorcisms." Both lines appear, unidentified in both editions, in *Hope Leslie* (Karcher ed. 111; Kelley ed. 107), in William Fletcher's questioning of Hope, following Nelema's healing of Master Craddock. Sedgwick's paraphrase of Gookin tends to de-emphasize Gookin's point, that the powows "hold familiarity with the devil" (154; Diary). Sedgwick may also have used this as background information for Gardiner's

description of the motions he claims to have seen Magawisca make in the cemetery (on the night she met Hope) (Karcher ed. 301; Kelley ed. 285-286). "Grand Jury's Bill against Mary Osgood," 1692 (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 7, 1800, 241), finding her guilty of making a "diabolical covenant" with the Devil and thus "become a detestable Witch"; Sedgwick precisely copies the published version of the stylized format of a legal charge and the full text of the charges (241; Diary).

Rev. John Heckewelder, *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighbouring States*, first published in 1818.

Sedgwick's notes synthesize large portions of Heckewelder's work dealing with the mysteries and rites of healing. Sedgwick identifies the first portion of her notes from Heckewelder as "Initiation of Boys by medicines bewildering them" (Notes), which appears to be a longer version of the title of Heckewelder's Chapter XXXIII, "Initiation of Boys." Sedgwick's notes, however, are drawn from a number of other chapters and not at all from the "Initiation of Boys."

Sedgwick first makes use of Heckewelder's Chapter XXXII, "Doctors or Jugglers," in which Heckewelder distinguishes between the characteristics of the "Physicians and Surgeons" of the previous chapter (seen as legitimate practitioners of healing) and the "doctors or jugglers" who "are a set of professional impostors, [and] who, availing themselves of the superstitious prejudices of the people, acquire the name and reputation of men of superior knowledge" (231). Sedgwick focuses in this section on the methods of the "jugglers" in influencing their patients, particularly noting an elaborate and

convincing bear costume witnessed by Heckewelder (corresponds to Heckewelder 235-236).

Sedgwick next records parts of Chapter XXXII, "Superstition," in which Heckewelder discusses the weakness (in his view) of Native Americans: "Great and powerful as the Indian conceives himself to be, firm and undaunted as he really is, . . . the American Indian has one weak side, . . . a childish apprehension of an occult and unknown power" that is witchcraft (239). Sedgwick takes from this chapter part of Heckewelder's description of the sorcerer's method, as it has been explained to him by the Indians: "the sorcerer makes use of a 'deadening substance,' which he discharges and conveys to the person that he means to 'strike,' through the air" (240; closely paraphrased in Notes).

Immediately following this note, Sedgwick summarizes a lengthy narrative about the Quaker trader John Anderson's attempt to convince his Indian trade partners "that there was no such thing as witchcraft" by allowing two sorcerers "to try their art on his person, and do him all the harm that they could by magical means" (Heckewelder 241; Notes). The first declined to try to charm a good person (Anderson), and the second, failing in his attempts to affect Anderson, claimed "'that the Americans eat too much salt provisions; that salt had a repulsive effect, which made the powerful invisible substance that he employed recoil upon him'" (Heckewelder 243).

On the following page of this journal, Sedgwick excerpts "an amusing anecdote" from Heckewelder's Chapter XXXIV, "Indian Mythology" (Notes). In

this chapter, Heckewelder discusses Native American creation stories, with particularly emphasis on the Indian's strong belief in their tribal connection to animals. The anecdote that Sedgwick records is given in two parts on the same page, the relationship between the two identified with a heavily marked "B" (so that the "B" serves as a reminder that another portion of this note exists, at the bottom of the same page, after an interpolated note). Sedgwick copies, nearly verbatim, the monologue (witnessed by Heckewelder) of "a Delaware hunter" against the bear that he had injured but not killed: "'Had you conquered me, I would have borne it with courage and died like a brave warrior; but you, bear, sit here and cry, and disgrace your tribe by your cowardly conduct'" (qtd. in Heckewelder 255). The second portion of Sedgwick's note concerns Heckewelder's reaction and the hunter's response: "I asked him how he thought that poor animal could understand what he said to it? 'Oh!' said he in answer, 'the bear understood me very well; did you not observe how ashamed he looked while I was upbraiding him?'" (Heckewelder 255).

The portions of this anecdote are interrupted first by a note also taken from Chapter XXXIV, "Indian Mythology," that "the Is [Indians] hold themselves related to some animals whom they will not injure the wolf – the rabbit [sic] – the hedgehog – the <sup>rattle</sup> snake is their grandfather" (Notes). These notes correspond to Heckewelder's discussion (251-253, especially 252). Sedgwick then turns to the main point of the first page of Heckewelder's Chapter XXXV, "Insanity – Suicide": "the Is [Indians] treat insane persons with the greatest tenderness" (257;

Notes); this behavior may serve as a basis for the Sedgwick's assertion that Mononotto's people deferred to him subsequent to his loss of reason after the Bethel massacre (Karcher ed. 203; Kelley ed. 194; source not suggested in either edition). As an example, Sedgwick paraphrases Heckewelder's account of "a trading Jew, named Chapman" who in 1763 was tortured by his Indian captors, preparatory to his execution; scalded by the broth of "his last meal," Chapman threw the liquid in the face of one of his captors (Heckewelder 257-258; Notes). This act was interpreted as madness, and Chapman was released from his captivity.

Another note, "The Indian women interweave the feathers of wild geese and wild turkeys ~~feathers~~ very ingeniously with twine made of the bark of the wild nettle" (Diary), corresponds to Heckewelder's Chapter XXV, "Dress, and Ornamenting of Their Persons," in which he describes blankets made in this fashion (203). Such a description is made of Faith Leslie's dress when she and Hope are reunited on Governor's Island (Karcher ed. 239; Kelley ed. 228; source not identified in either edition).

Sedgwick might also have taken the elderly Native American healer Nelema's name from Heckewelder's list of Indian Words, Phrases, Etc. of the Lenni Lenape, or Delaware Indians. The word Nelema appears in two phrases in this list: "Nélema ta! *not yet!*" (439) and "Nelema n'gischambila niwash! *I have not yet done tying up my pack!*" (Heckewelder 439). Heckewelder also uses the

term "Yengees" as the Indian word for "English" (142-143); this is the word used by Faith Leslie when she encounters her sister Hope.

Heckewelder's Chapter XLIV, "The Indians and the Whites Compared" (328-345) in which he distinguishes between the peaceable behavior of most Indians to the violence and malfeasance of most white settlers could provide background for Eliot's defense of Magawisca (Karcher ed. 298; Kelley ed. 283; source not suggested in either edition). Heckewelder's tone throughout his work is very respectful toward Native Americans (more so than the excerpts of Eliot likely available to Sedgwick), so it seems likely that she might have reshaped Heckewelder's ideas and given them to Eliot for this speech. Sedgwick notes that Magawisca's comment, that her people have no need of a book for their laws, is from one of her sources; Karcher identifies the source as Heckewelder, in chapter XXIII, "General Observations of the Indians on the White People" (Heckewelder 187; Karcher ed. 303).

George Herbert, "Church Militant." Lines from Herbert's "Church Militant" appear in Gookin's "Historical Collections" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 160), and this is likely where Sedgwick found the line "for gold & grace did never yet agree" (Notes). This line re-appears in *Hope Leslie* in Emmanuel Downing's letter to Winthrop: "Nor do I think, with some of our brethren, that 'gold and grace did never yet agree'" (Karcher ed. 158; Kelley ed. 151; source not identified in either edition). Here, the line describes Hope Leslie and softens Downing's repetition of the rumors that Fletcher might seek a marriage between Hope and

Everell in order to bolster the Fletcher family's estate. Downing's indication that his fellow Puritans agree with an Anglican poet is further suggestive of dissension within Puritan ranks.

Francis Higginson's *New-England's Plantation; or, A Short and True Description of the Commodities and Discommodities of that Countrey. Written in the year 1629, by Mr. Higgeson, Reverend Divine, now there resident. Whereunto is added a Letter, sent by Mr. Graves, an Enginere, out of New-England. Reprinted from the third edition, London, 1630 (Coll MHS, First Series Vol. 1, 1792, 117-124)*, identified in the table of contents as "New England's Plantation, a Description of New England in the year 1629." Sedgwick's notes, marked "M<sup>f</sup> Hig<sup>son</sup> 1629," include descriptions of Native American hair and styles ("generally blacke, and cut before, like our gentlewomen, and one locke longer than the rest, like our gentlemen, which fashion I thinke came from hence into England" (123)) and Native American homes,<sup>44</sup> ("verie little and homely, being made with small poles pricked into the ground, [. . .] matted with boughs and covered on the roof with sedge and old mats" (123)) (Diary). The latter portion of this note, regarding the Indian homes, appears in altered form in *Hope Leslie's* description of the native village where Everell is held captive (Karcher ed. 89; Kelley ed. 86; source not identified in either edition).

Sedgwick's notebook then includes this quotation from Higginson: "For their dealing with us we neither fear them nor trust them for fourtie of our

musketeers will drive 500 of them out of the field – They come into our houses sometimes – but ask or take nothing but what we give them"(123; Diary).

Sedgwick may have borrowed Higginson's assertion that "Excellent vines are here up and downe in the woods. Our Govenour hath already planted a vineyard with great hope of encrease" (119), as evidence of the island's "horticultural experiments" and the backdrop to Hope's desultory examination of a drooping vine and the subsequent conversation with Gardiner (Karcher ed. 226; Kelley ed. 216; source not suggested in either edition).

"The Historical Account of John Eliot, the First Minister of the Church in Roxbury.

Collected from Manuscripts, and Books Published the Last Century. By One of the Members of the Historical Society," (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 8, 1802, 5-35). Sedgwick takes brief notes, some of which duplicate the information taken from Mather's *Magnalia*, but the language quoted identifies this set of information on Eliot as taken from "The Historical Account of John Eliot" (Notes). "The Historical Account" cites Mather and Daniel Neal's *The History of New-England Containing an Impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country to the Year of Our Lord, 1700* (1720, 1747), which itself draws heavily from Mather's *Magnalia*. Very likely, Sedgwick read both Mather and this account of Eliot since the notes appear in separate journals.

Sedgwick paraphrases this comment from "The Historical Account": "He has been frequently styled an Evangelist—the *Apostle of America*, which touched his modesty when he heard it, and which he desired might not be fixed upon him"

(11; Notes). Her other notes include Eliot as "the first Protestant minister to the Indians"; "quaint titles" of books about Eliot; his endurance of hardships; his leathern girdle "an external badge of humility, and not used as the Catholics as bodily mortification"; and his preference for water over wine (Notes; corresponds to 11, 12, 14, 25).<sup>45</sup>

Other portions of this work appear in *Hope Leslie*, most notably in Sedgwick's description of Sir Philip Gardiner's appearance: "his hair, so far from being permitted the 'freedom of growing long,' then deemed 'a luxurious feminine prolixity,' or being covered with a wig, (one of the abominations that, according to Eliot, had brought on the country the infliction of the Pequod War,) was cropped" (Karcher ed. 129; Kelley ed. 124; source not identified in either edition). Sedgwick neatly turns around a quotation from "The Historical Account": "And in the written account of Cotton Mather, it is said that he [Eliot] thought it a 'luxurious, feminine protexity [sic] for men to wear their hair long'" (27). Of course, Sedgwick could also have taken this quotation from Mather's *Magnalia*.

William Hubbard's *A General History of New England*, published in 1682, and available to Sedgwick in the *Coll MHS, Second Series*, Vols. 5 and 6, both published in 1815. Sedgwick records a lengthy passage concerning Sir Christopher Gardiner, much of it exact quotation, from Hubbard's record (Vol. 5, 149-150; Diary). Most of this passage concerns the colonists' suspicions of Gardiner, his capture by the Indians, and his and Morton's charges against the colony. An internal reference to Hubbard ("This Gorton, whome Hubbard calls, 'a prodigious minter of exorbitant

novelties") signals Sedgwick's use of his account in *Hope Leslie* (Karcher ed. 170; Kelley ed. 163; noted in each edition). Sedgwick borrows a part of a letter by Thomas Morton (quoted both in Winthrop 2:190-191 and Hubbard *General History* Vol. 6, 428-430) in a letter from her fictionalized Gardiner to his friend Wilton (Karcher ed. 207; Kelley ed. 198; identified as Winthrop in both editions; Savage indicates the reference to Hubbard). Karcher identifies a quotation from Hubbard (204), but Kelley (195) references Hubbard's *Narrative* for this same quotation; the quotation regards Mononotto's negotiations to create a Native American alliance against the Puritans.

William Hubbard's *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England* (1677).

Sedgwick writes "It is ill fighting with a wild beast in his own den" (Diary; corresponds to Hubbard 1:87, New York: Kraus, 1969 reprint). In *Hope Leslie*, this line is given to one of Everell's would-be rescuers, as these men approach the river bank near the Indians' and captives' resting place (Karcher ed., 81; Kelley ed. 78; source not identified in either edition). Sedgwick also notes that "The Captors of Rowlandson's wife & children offered no wrong to their chastity – being no doubt, says Hub<sup>d</sup>, restrained as Abimelech was by the hand of God" (Diary; her paraphrase corresponds to I. 167, 1969 reprint).

Thomas Hutchinson's *History of the Colony of Massachusetts*, 3 vols. (Vol. I, 1764; Vol. II, 1767; Vol. III, 1828). Sedgwick's note from Hutchinson follows those on the "Grand Jury's Bill Against Mary Osgood" and Brattle's letter on the 1692 withcraft trials; such proximity suggests a period of interest in these events. In

this entry, prefaced by "The following is a note from Hutch<sup>n</sup> acc<sup>t</sup> [Hutchinson's account] of the S.W. [Salem Witchcraft]", Sedgwick records, nearly verbatim, a footnote regarding Sir William Phipps's wife's intervention in one of the Salem witchcraft cases (II. 61n; Diary). In this instance, Mrs. Phipps "granted and signed a warrant for the said woman's discharge, which was obeyed by the keeper"; of interest perhaps to readers of *Hope Leslie*, "the keeper was discharged from his trust and put out of his employment," evidently without further repercussion from the authorities (II. 61, 46). Sedgwick might also have read "Samuel Gorton's defence against the charges upon him in Morton's Memorial," Number XX in the appendix to the first volume of Hutchinson's *History* (I. 549-553).

Edward Johnson's *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Savior in New-England, 1628-1651*, published in 1654 and again in Vols. 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 of the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series* (Vol. 2 (1814, 49-95); 3 (1815, 123-161); 4 (1816, 1-51); 7 (1818, 1-58); and 8 (1819, 1-39). Sedgwick prefaces a number of excerpts with the notation "Some extracts from Wonder-Working Providence or Sions Savior in NE." The first of these excerpts comes from Chapter VII of Book II, "Of the first synod holden in New England, whereby the Lord in his mercy did more plainly discover his ancient truths, and confute those cursed errors that ordinarily dogg the reforming Churches of Christ" (Vol. 7, 1-6): "Many crafty close couched errors whose first foundation was laid cheke by joule with the most glorious, heavenly and blessed truths, to dazle the

eyes of the beholders, and strike terrour into the hearts of those should lift up their hands against them, for feare they should misuse them, and hit their stroke upon the blessed truth" (Vol. 7, 3; Diary records this with regularized spelling).

The second excerpt concerns "a servant being sent by her master from Roxbury to Boston for a barber chirurgeon to draw a tooth" (Diary), which summarizes a passage from Chapter XV, Book II of *Wonder-Working Providence*, entitled "Of further supply for the Church of Christ at Waterton, And a sad accident that fell out in Boston Towne" (Vol. 7, 19-20). The deaths of the servant and the barber in a terrible snowstorm illustrate the Lord's punishment of sinners; further, "the example is for the living, the dead is judged of the Lord alone" (Vol. 7, 20; Diary).

The third and final entry of this grouping takes notes from Chapter XIX, Book II, "Of the first promotion of learning in New-England, and the extraordinary providences that the Lord was pleased to send for furthering of the same" (Vol. 7, 25-31). Sedgwick notes that "Cambridge being then under the soul flourishing ministry of &c" (Diary; Johnson's text continues this passage, identifying this ministry as belonging to Mr. Thomas Shephard (Vol. 7, 28), and then picks up a few pages later, recording Johnson's assessment of college president Henry Dunstar, "an able Proficient, in both Hebrew, Greek, and Latine Languages, an Orthodox Preacher of the truths of Christ, very powerful through his blessing to move the affection" (Vol. 7, 31, recorded nearly verbatim, though not identifying Dunstar by name, in Diary with regularized spelling).

An entry from Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* interrupts Sedgwick's notes from *Wonder-Working Providence*. She then records this passage, a mix of paraphrase and direct quotation from Johnson's Book I, Chapter XXV (Vol. 3, 126-128), "Of the Lords gracious protection of his people, from the barbarous cruelties of the Heathen": "During the raging of the smallpox among the Indians, some of the english having entered one of their wigwams found there a most sad spectacle death having smitten all save one poore infant, which lay on the ground sucking the breast of its dead Mother – seeking living nourishment from her dead breast" (128). Sedgwick then copies parts of the next chapter, XXVI, Book I, "Of the gracious provisions the Lord made for his people" (Vol. 3, 128-133): "Let no man make a jest at pumpkins, for with this fruit the Lord was pleased to feed his people to their good content (Vol. 3, 132; Diary).

The next passage comes from Chapter XXVIII, Book I, "Of the Eighth Church of Christ, gathered at Cambridge, 1633" (Vol. 3, 136-139): "The Lord was pleased to refresh their spirits for temple-work," (Diary), a paraphrase of this passage from Johnson, "Here minde I must the Reader of the admirable acts of Christs Providence toward this people, that although they were in such great straites for foode, that many of them eate their Bread by waight, and had little hopes of the Earths fruitfulness, yet the Lord Christ was pleased to refresh their spirits with such quickning grace, and lively affections to this Temple-worke, that they did not desert the place [Cambridge]," nor were these people harmed by the nearby Native American population (Vol. 3, 138).

Immediately following, Sedgwick briefly paraphrases a section of Chapter VI, Book II, "Of the gracious goodnesse of the Lord Christ, in saving his New England people, from the hand of the barbarous Indians" (Vol. 4, 42-51): "During the Pe't [Pequot] War – The En'h [English] entering some wigwams & firing them with brands the squaws cried out much win it English [in Johnson, "oh much winn it Englishman" (Vol. 4, 48)] – whereupon they spared their lives – whereupon a young man calls out 'I squaw – I squaw'" (Diary) in hopes of being spared as well.

The final passage in this section of the notebook appears in Chapter XXVI, Book II, "Of the military affairs, the forts of Boston, and Charles, the Castle erected anew by the six nearest Towns, with the manner of putting the Country in a posture of war, to be ready upon all occasions" (Vol. 7, 52-58). Here Sedgwick records almost exactly the praises heaped on her ancestor, Robert Sedgwick, "the first Sergeant Major chosen to order the Regiment of Essex" (Vol. 7, 54; Diary), as part of the early colony's preparation for defense.

The following item is not suggested by Sedgwick's notes but rather by internal evidence in the novel: Sedgwick quotes Johnson's description of Fort-hill, giving his name in the text; just prior to this attributed quotation, Sedgwick mentions the "store of great artillery," which comes from the same chapter, XX, "Of the fourth church of Christ, gathered at Boston, 1631" (Vol. 2, 91; Karcher ed. 133; Kelley ed. 129).

"Le Lai de L'Oiselet, an Old French Poem of the Thirteenth Century." The title of the poem and the lines used in *Hope Leslie* appear in Sedgwick's notes (Karcher ed.

227; Kelley ed. 217; Notes; source not identified in either edition). The lines used in *Hope Leslie* (151-156) correspond to versions C and D in Lenora D.

Wolfgang's comparison of versions of "Le Lai de L'Oiselet," though with several variant spellings. Wolfgang notes that this passage "varies most in terms of vocabulary," but the meaning across versions is the same: "God and love are in accord, and if you heed what they love and hate, you will succeed" (109). This portion of the poem is recited by Sir Philip Gardiner to Hope in Digby's garden, just prior to his betrayal of her plan to meet her sister Faith. Out of the context of "Le Lai," the poem seems just another of Gardiner's courtly pleas for Hope's hand or perhaps even an attempt to appear to comfort her in the loss of Everell to Esther. However, the passage is more suggestive of his duplicity than at first appears. Wolfgang's synopsis of the poem closes with this moral: "He who covets all loses all" (3). See chapter five of this study for a close consideration of the poem's significance.

"A Letter from Rev. Gideon Hawley of Marshpee, containing an Account of his services among the Indians of Massachusetts and New-York, and a Narrative of his Journey to Onohoghwage, July 31, 1794" (*MHS Coll, First Series* Vol. 4, 1795, 50-67). Early in *Diary*, 1811-1812, and *Notes*, Sedgwick records names important to Hawley's account, including Mr. Ashley and his wife Rebecca Kellogg Ashley, identified in the journal by her Indian name Wausaunia (*Diary*). Rebecca Ashley served as Hawley's interpreter among the Iroquois, with whom she lived after being captured as a child from Deerfield in 1703 (57). Another

note records Hawley's description of sacrifice rocks, and in particular the large monument of small stones between Stockbridge and Great Barrington (59; Diary). While not specifically mentioned in the notes, Hawley's discussion of Sedgwick's grandparents in relation to the Stockbridge Mission probably also drew Sedgwick's interest. "Some acct of Stockbridge in 1753 to be found in a letter from Maj<sup>r</sup> Hawley 1753 in the Mass<sup>ts</sup> His<sup>l</sup> Coll for 1795" appears at the top of the first page of the Notes and Anecdotes journal, but Sedgwick does not appear to have taken any notes on this or other pages of the journal (Notes).

"Letter of R. Ludlowe to Mr. Pincheon," 1637 (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 8, 1819, 235-237), from which Sedgwick copies only the greeting of the letter: "To his honoured friend the worshipful William Pincheon Esq. at Agawam be these delivered" (235; Notes). Sedgwick adds "Supers<sup>n</sup> [superscription] of a letter" (Notes); her knowledge of such an example perhaps lends the impression of authenticity to the letters in *Hope Leslie*. The letter itself concerns a caution to Pincheon "to be careful and watchful that you be not betrayed by friendship," in a time of troubles when Ludlowe would be unable to provide any help (235).

"A letter sent from New-England, by Master Graves, Engynere, now there resident" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 124), immediately follows Higginson's *New-England's Plantation*. Sedgwick marks this passage, "Description of N-England" and closely paraphrases it: "I am bold to say of this countrie, as it is commonly said in Germany of Hungaria, that for cattel, corne, and wine it excelleth" (124; Diary).

"Life of the Rev. President Chauncy, written at the request of Dr. Stiles, by the Rev. Dr. Chauncy of Boston, May, 23, 1768" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 10, 1809, 171-180). Sedgwick records an excerpt from Chauncy's last will: "These are still fresh before me, my many sinful compliances with, and conformity unto vile human inventions, will-worship, superstition, and patcheries stiched into the service of the Lord, which the English mass-book, I mean the book of common prayer, and the ordination of priests, &c. are fully fraught withal" (173; Diary).

"The Marriage of Sir Gawain," likely known to Sedgwick from *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, by Bishop Thomas Percy (1765; available through The Camelot Project at the University of Rochester, <http://www.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/percyll.htm>). The lines, "On magic ground that castle stoode / And fenced with many a spelle," appear in Sedgwick's notes and again in *Hope Leslie* (Diary; Karcher ed. 186; Kelley ed. 178; source not identified in either edition). In the novel, these lines are part of the description of Everell's reverie in considering whether Hope could be true, or if she has fallen for Gardiner's charms. The fuller story of Sir Gawain's marriage, that he marries the woman who reveals to King Arthur the truth of what women want ("all women will have their wille"), has interesting implications for study of Hope, a woman who insists upon having her way.

Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*, 1702, available to Sedgwick either in its first edition, or the second (edited by Thomas Robbins in 1820); references here are to the 1967 reprint of the 1852 edition. Sedgwick copies parts of Mather's

discourse on Governor John Winthrop (I. 118-131) and on the first ministers to New England (I. 242-243), particularly on John Cotton (I. 246, 252-286) and John Eliot (I. 526-562).

Sedgwick's notes on John Eliot include his wearing of "a leathern girdle about his loins," that "his prejudice were so strong against wigs that he prayed & preached against them that even the Indian wars might be traced to the use of them," his generosity to the poor, as well as brief notations regarding his ministry and family (Diary). Sedgwick may have drawn on Mather's account of Eliot's personality and bearing to create her physical description of him at Magawisca's trial: the "deep set and thoughtful eye, pale brow, ascetic complexion, and spare person" (Karcher ed. 297; Kelley ed. 282; source not suggested in either edition).

Immediately following the notebook's entries from Johnson's *Wonder-Working Providence*, so closely that they might be mistaken to come from that work, Sedgwick records several lines of Mather's chapter on John Winthrop, including a paraphrase of Mather's history of Winthrop's ancestors ("descended from a long line of honorable ancestors – distinguished for their attachment to reform and religious liberty" (paraphrases Mather I. 118-119). Sedgwick further records exact transcriptions and close paraphrases of Mather's discussion of Winthrop's birth and education, his multiple virtues, his emigration to New England, Mather's typing of Winthrop as Moses, and Winthrop's governorships, in addition to his role as "the first member who joined in forming the Congregational church" and "fixing the Metropolis [?] at B— [Boston] (Diary).

This information on Winthrop appears in *Hope Leslie* in a number of instances. A lengthy passage regarding the first-generation of Puritans, and in particular Winthrop, borrows from Mather's chapter, noting the value of Winthrop's English estate and Thomas Morton's nickname for Winthrop, "John Temperwell" (Karcher ed. 150; Kelley ed. 144; Morton is identified, but not the source in Mather I. 120). Sedgwick exchanges Mather's characterization of Morton as "a certain troublesome and malicious calumniator" (I. 120) for the much different "a contemporary witty satirist" (Karcher ed. 150; Kelley ed. 144). Sedgwick also adapts the providential story of Winthrop's generosity in giving out the last of his cornmeal just as a ship arrives to re-supply the colony, altering the event into table conversation on the evening that Everell and Gardiner first arrive at Winthrop's household; Sedgwick's source is Mather (I. 122; Karcher ed. 153; Kelley ed. 147)<sup>46</sup>.

Sedgwick mentions Winthrop's reputation for charity elsewhere in the novel, as when hospitality is offered to the disguised Oneco (Karcher ed. 320; Kelley ed. 303; source not suggested in either edition). The discussion regarding the colonial ban on toasting, or drinking healths, as one of the laws changed since Everell's absence appears in Mather (I. 128-129) as well as in Winthrop I. 324 (Karcher ed. 156; Kelley ed. 149), but not in the exact language of either of these probable sources.

Later in the journal, Sedgwick paraphrases parts of Mather's "Remarks, especially upon the first class, in our catalogue of ministers," particularly sections

V, VI, VII, and XI, including an excerpt from "a sermon preached unto the General Court of the Massachusetts-colony, at one of their anniversary elections": "Let all mankind know, that we came into the wilderness, because we would worship God without that *Episcopacy*, that *common-prayer*, and those unwarrantable *ceremonies*, with which the 'land of our forefathers' sepulchres' has been defiled" (emphasis in Mather I. 240-241; Diary). The other notes are brief: "There was no reading of liturgies, they were sons of Jacob who could wrestle and prevail with God" (a paraphrase of Mather quoting Firmin in 1681, I. 242); "There was one who first a seeker became almost a Quaker" (Sedgwick's emphasis, paraphrasing Mather I. 243).

The next notations are taken from Mather's "Johannes in Eremo" (I. 245-331); Sedgwick's notes concern John Cotton. The first: "Mr Cotton might say of Boston that he found it little better than a wilderness & left it a famous town with 2 churches in it" (paraphrases Mather I. 246; Diary). Next, Sedgwick notes that Cotton "was offered the liberty of his ministry and great preferment in it also if he would but conform to the scrupled rites, though but in one act, and but for one time" (near exact transcription of Mather I. 259; Diary) and "So powerfully did he preach on the 6<sup>th</sup> Comm<sup>t</sup> that a woman one of his auditors who had been married 16 years to a 2<sup>d</sup> husband confess<sup>d</sup> to the murder of the first" (paraphrase of Mather I. 259; Diary).

Such notes appear to inform Sedgwick's characterization of the Puritan errand. Early in *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick paraphrases Mather: "In the quaint

language of the time, 'the Lord sifted three nations for precious seed to sow the wilderness'" (Karcher ed. 7; Kelley ed. 9; source not identified in either edition; corresponds to Mather I. 249). In a conversation in the Winthrop household regarding the appropriateness of laughter, Sedgwick borrows from Mather's description of Cotton to create Master Cradock's description of his devotions: "I 'sweeten my mouth always before going to bed'" with the words of Calvin (Karcher ed. 220; Kelley ed. 210; source not identified in either edition). Mather reports this anecdote of Cotton: when asked "why in his latter days he indulged *nocturnal studies* more than formerly, he pleasantly replied, 'Because I love to sweeten my mouth with a piece of Calvin before I go to sleep'" (I. 274).

Sedgwick further borrows from Mather's comments on William Blackstone, giving Digby the opportunity to suggest to Hope that greater dissension against strict Puritan government exists than might be thought (and that liberty is on the rise): "I can tell them [the leadership], that there are many who think what blunt Master Blackstone said, 'that he came not away from the Lords-bishops, to put himself under the Lord's-brethren'" (this close paraphrase corresponds to Mather I. 243; Karcher ed. 235; Kelley ed. 225; source not identified in either edition).

"Morrell's Poem on New England, Latin and English" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 125-139) immediately follows Higginson's *New England's Plantation*. Sedgwick identifies the passages as "Extracts from a poem by Wm Morrell an epis cler<sup>n</sup> [Episcopal clergyman] 1623" (Diary). She includes a number of verses:

"Those well seene natives in grave natures hests, / All close designes conceale in their deepe breasts:" (130-131) / [ . . . ] "Whose hayre is cut with greeces, yet a locke / Is left; the left side bound up in a knott:" (131) / [ . . . ] "Of body straight, tall, strong, mantled in skin / Of deare or bever, with the hayre-side in; / An otter skin their right armes doth keepe warme / A girdle set with formes of birds or beasts, / Begirts their waste, which gentle gives them ease. / (131) [ . . . ] "The first is by descent their lord and king, / Pleas'd in his name likewise and governing: / The consort of his bed must be of blood / Coequall, when an offspring comes as good" (132)<sup>47</sup> / [ . . . ] "Their kings give lawes, rewardes to those they give, / That in good order, and high service live. / The aged widow and the orphanes all, / Their kings maintaine, and strangers when they call." (132) [ . . . ] "The next in order are their well seene men / In herbes, and rootes, and plants, for medicen, / With which by touch, with clamors, teares, and sweat, / With their curst magicke, as themselves they beat, / They quickly ease:" (133)<sup>48</sup> [ . . . ] "They may not marry nor tobacco use, / Till certain yeares, least they themselves abuse. / At which yeares to each one is granted leave, / A wife or two, or more, for to receive. / By having many wives, two things they have; / First, children which before all things to save / They covet, 'cause by them their kingdomes fild, / When as by fate or armes their lives are spild. / Whose death as all that dye they sore lament, / And fill the skies with cries:" (134)<sup>49</sup> [ . . . ] "Their dead wrapt up in mats to th' grave they give / Upright from th' knees with goods whilst they did live, / Which they best lov'd: their eyes turn'd to the east, / To which after much time to

be releast / They all must march, where all shall all things have / That heart can  
 wish, or they themselves can crave. / A second profit, which by many wives /  
 They have, is corne, the staffe of all their lives. / All are great eaters; he's most  
 rich whose bed / Affords him children, profit, pleasure, bread. / But if fierce Mars  
 begins his bow to bend, / Each king stands on his guard, seekes to defend /  
 Himselfe, and his, and therefore hides his graine / In earth's close concaves, to be  
 fetch'd againe, / If he survives" (134)<sup>50</sup> [ . . . ]

"Whose beautie<sup>51</sup> is a beauteous blacke laid on / Their paler cheeke, which  
 they most doat upon: / Inricht with graceful presence, and delight; / Deriding  
 laughter, and all prattling, and / Of sober aspect, grast with grave command: / Of  
 man-like courage, stature tall and straight, / Well nerv'd with hands and fingers  
 small and right. / Their slender fingers on a grassie twyne, / Make well form'd  
 baskets wrought with art and lyne; / A kind of arras, or straw-hangings, wrought /  
 With divers formes, and colours all about." [ . . . ] "Rare stories, princes, people,  
 kingdomes, towers, / In curious finger-worke, or parchment flowers" (135) [ . . . ]  
 "Thus without art's bright lampe, by nature's eye, / They keepe just promise, and  
 love equitie" (137).

The first two lines above, "Those well seene natives . . .," appear as the  
 epigraph to Chapter II of Volume II, in which Hope reveals to the readers her  
 meeting with Magawisca (Karcher ed. 190; Kelly ed. 182; source identified in  
 both editions). The last two lines above, ". . . without arte's bright lampe," are

used to describe the Magawisca that Hope knew from Everell's descriptions (Karcher ed. 194; Kelley ed. 186; source identified in both editions).

"New England's First Fruits in Respect of the Progress of Learning, in the College at Cambridge," first published in 1643 (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 242-250). This work is not attributed to any single author. Sedgwick synthesizes parts of items 10 and 11 of a list: "the country stored with diverse people eminent for godliness there is now but little degeneracy from those good and primitive times when as one of our ancestors said – you might live from year to year and not hear an oath or see a beggar" (248; Diary). In another journal, Sedgwick records these lines, referring to Master Corlet: "he hath well approv<sup>d</sup> himse'f for his dex [dexterity] & painfullness in teaching" and Master Dunster, Harvard's president, "trained up his pupils in the tongues & arts" (Notes; corresponds to 243).

"Non-Conformist's Oath," identified as found in "a manuscript volume of Thomas Danforth," with a note that "The transcriber has appended, 'these be copies of some verses sent from England, 1666'" (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 4, 1816, 104-106). From this poem, Sedgwick takes these lines, marking them "1666": "I am no Quaker, not at all to swear; / Nor Papist to swear East & mean West; / But am a Protestant & will declare / What I cannot & what I can [will, in Sedgwick's version] protest"; "I'll pray that all his subjects may agree, / And never more be crumbled into parts; / I will endeavor that His Majesty / May not be King of clubs but King of Hearts" (Sedgwick's emphasis); "I dare not swear church government

is right, / As it should be; but this I dare to swear, / If you will put me to it, that  
Bishops might / Do better and be better than they are" (105; Notes).

"Note on Ezekiel Cheever. By William Lyon Esq. of New Haven" (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 7, 1818, 129-133), from which Sedgwick takes an excerpt from the note's quotation of Cotton Mather's sermon on the death of his schoolmaster, Ezekiel Cheever (131; Diary).

"Observations of the Indians of North-America; Containing an Answer to Some Remarks of Doctor Ramsay, Published in the Collections of the Historical Society for 1795, Page 99; in a Letter from General Lincoln to the Corresponding Secretary" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 5, 1798, 6-12). Lincoln's remarks are a response to "Observations on the Indians in the Southern Parts of the United States, in a Letter from the Hon. Dr. Ramsay, Corresponding Member of the Historical Society. March 10, 1795" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 4, 1795, 99-100), in which Ramsay presents his "belief that they [Native Americans] will ere long cease to be a people" despite government efforts to "introduce agriculture and civilization among them" (99). Lincoln's objective is to discuss yet other reasons for the diminishing Native American population. Among these is his point that "A knowledge of the fire arm may justly be considered as a CURSE to them [. . .] and has operated greatly as a check on their population [by frightening wild game]" (Lincoln 7; paraphrased in Notes).

Sedgwick poses these questions, suggested by her reading: "Why should the Indians believe in the sincerity of their enemies' relig<sup>n</sup> when they violated the

law of the Great Spirit who had given to the Is [Indians] this cont [continent]?" (Notes; corresponds to Lincoln 9). Notes from this item could easily be mistaken to be part of the notes taken from Gookin, as the remarks continue without a break in the page and extend through Lincoln to John Bulkley's "Inquiry into the Right of the Aboriginal Natives to the Lands in America" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 4, 1795, 159-181).

Stephen Parmenius, "Memoir of Stephen Parmenius" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 9, 1804, 49-52), appears just prior to "A Poem of Stephen Parmenius of Buda, in Celebration of the Voyage of the Illustrious and Valiant Knight, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Undertaken for the Purpose of Conducting a Colony to the New World" (56-75). From the memoir, Sedgwick takes a quotation, identified by Parmenius as "his [Gilbert's] own generous maxim" (52) and adds biographical detail on Gilbert: "He is not worthy to live at all," says Sir Humphrey Gilbert, one of the parents of the Eng plan<sup>n</sup> in Am<sup>a</sup> [plantation in America] and half brother to Sir W [Walter] Raleigh, who for fear or danger of death shunneth his country's service or his own honor since death is inevitable & the fame of virtue immortal" (Notes; corresponds to 52). Sedgwick uses Gilbert's words (in quotation marks) at the end of a lengthy exposition on the nation's Puritan forebears, detailing the hardships that made possible the "promised land of faith" enjoyed by Sedgwick and her contemporaries (Karcher ed. 75-76; Kelley ed. 73; Gilbert not identified in either edition).

John Robinson, a letter "To the Church of God, at Plymouth in New England," 1621, appeared in Edward Winslow's "Hypocrisie Unmasked" (1646) and Willam Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation* (not published in its entirety until 1856). It also appears in Thomas Prince's *Annals of New England*, but not in the portions of the *Annals* published in the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series*, Vol. 7 (which include Prince's Vol. II, No. I; Vol. II, No. II, and Vol. II, No. III; these are paginated separately from the other items in this volume of the *Coll MHS*). The letter does not appear in "Mourt's Relation," identified as "A Relation or Journal of a Plantation Settled at Plymouth in New England, and Proceedings Thereof: First Printed in 1622, and Abbreviated in Purchas's Pilgrims, Book X. Chap. IV. London. 1625" in the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series* Vol. 8 (203-239). Sedgwick might have had access to Bradford's manuscript or to some other published version of Robinson's letter. Sedgwick notes that "Robinson says in a letter to the Church at Plymouth – 'In a battle it is not looked for but that divers should die – it is thought well for a side if it get the victory tho with the loss of divers – if it could be mended with lamenting it c<sup>d</sup> not be suffi<sup>y</sup> [sufficiently] bewailed'" (Notes).

"The Settlement of the First Churches in Massachusetts. Account of Ministers who were fixed in Salem, Charlestown, Dorchester, and Boston, Watertown, and Roxbury. Controversy with Roger Williams and Mrs. Hutchinson. Synod in 1637; and State of Religion to the Year 1647," authorship unattributed, identified in the table

of contents and by a running title of "Ecclesiastical History of Massachusetts" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 9, 1804, 1-49).

The brief notation "Westminster Cat 1643" (Notes) likely refers to the pages discussing the assembly that developed the catechism (39-45), just prior to the source of the following anecdote. Sedgwick paraphrases this passage:

"During the course of this year [1643], Mr. Bennet, a gentleman from Virginia, arrived at Boston, and represented the state of the churches in that colony to be truly deplorable" as well as the Biblical passage embedded in this commentary:

"The words of the Psalmist were then literally fulfilled: 'The boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it'" (45, paraphrased in Notes).

Sedgwick's notes further include this remark: "wherever they felled trees they planted churches" (Notes; corresponds to 45-46). This statement is part of a larger commentary, immediately following the anecdote of the Virginian, on the irreligious nature of the Virginia colony: "They [Virginians] cared for none of those things which occupied the sole attention of the more northern settlers, who had come over to America to enjoy the privileges of the gospel, and who had planted churches wherever they had felled the trees, or by hard labour obtained subsistence from the soil" (45-46).

Roger Williams, *Key into the Language of the Indians of New-England*, 1643 (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 3, 1794, 203-239). Sedgwick's note-taking from this work focusses on Williams's reports on Native American fair-mindedness, generosity,

religious sensibilities and practices, language, animal and plant husbandry, and domestic arrangements.

Sedgwick copies a number of fragments from the *Key*: "They [Indians] are careful not to exceed in taking from others bey'd the proportion of their own loss" (Chapter XI, "Of Travel" 217; Notes); parts of Williams's description of the use of chestnuts, acorns, and walnuts and the deliciousness of strawberries (Chapter XVI, "Of the Earth and the Fruits thereof" 220, 221; Notes); just the words "Sesek; *the rattle snake*" (Chapter XVII, "Of Beasts" 223; Notes); the names and characteristics of some common birds, including the turkey, partridge, heath-cock, and blackbirds, and the Indian method of protecting their corn from these birds (Chapter XV, "Of Fowl" 219; paraphrased in Notes) as well as the sachim (Chapter XV "Of Fowl" 220; paraphrased in Notes); the coats and skins which the Indians wear and sleep in (Chapter XX, "Of their Nakedness and Clothing" 225; paraphrased in Notes).

Of Williams's Chapter XXI, "Of their Religion," Sedgwick records lengthier portions: "I have received in my converse with them many confirmations of those two great points, Heb. zi. 6. viz. 1. That God is. 2. That he is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek him" (226; paraphrased in Notes). Sedgwick also paraphrases an anecdote of an Indian "man stabbed by an Eng<sup>h</sup> rapier cry'g to his God Muckquachuckquand who had app<sup>d</sup> [appeared] to him when young & bid him call on him in his distress" (Notes; corresponds to Williams 227). After returning to earlier chapters for a few notes, Sedgwick

summarizes the early paragraphs of this chapter thus, and adds her own comment: "W [Williams] says they acknowledge God in all the accidents of life (Are not those who live without plan more apt to feel the presence of Provi<sup>ce</sup> [Providence]?)" (Notes; corresponds to 226).

Sedgwick also summarizes a passage on Williams's discussion with the Indians about their fire God; the Indians' habit "at the apprehension of any excellency in men, women, birds, beasts, fish, &c to cry out, Manitto, that is, it is a God," and to make the same claim about "English ships and great buildings, of the ploughing of their fields, and especially of books and letters"; and further "a strong conviction natural in the soul of man, that God is filling all things" (227; Notes). Magawisca cries "'Manitto!—Manitto!'—he is a God" as she reflects on Everell's excellence (Karcher ed. 276; Kelley ed. 263; source identified in each edition). Sedgwick next summarizes Williams's characterization of the Indian belief that "there are many Gods, or divine powers within the body of man; in his pulse, his heart, his lungs, &c" (228; Notes).

Next, Sedgwick summarizes Williams's discussion of the gift-giving practices at Native American feasts. She records this statement: "By this feasting and gifts the devil drives on their worships pleasantly (as he doth all false worships, by such plausible earthly arguments of uniformities, universalities, antiquities, immunities, dignities, rewards unto submitters, and the contrary to refusers)" and offers this shortened version of the next paragraph: "They have a modest religious persuasion not to disturb any man in his conscience or worship"

(Notes; corresponds to Williams 228). Sedgwick then paraphrases Williams's discussion of the Indian words and etymology for the soul and comments thus: "Is not their notion good of giving no home to the wicked soul" (228; Notes). Her final entry from Williams concerns the Indians' close observation of the English and this comment: "I have heard them say to an Englishman, who being hindered, broke a promise to them, 'You know God; will you lie, Englishman?'" (228-229; shortened in Notes). Sedgwick may borrow this idea regarding truthfulness, or others expressed in the *Key* (214, 215), when Magawisca is offended that Hope asks if Magawisca "will interpret truly for me" (Karcher ed. 238; Kelley ed. 228; source not suggested in either edition). The sense in Williams, however, is that Native Americans suspect the English of potential treachery, rather than the reverse.

Several pages later in the Notes and Anecdotes journal, Sedgwick returns to Williams's *Key*, this time to its introduction and his discussion of the descent of the Native Americans and their particular belief system. Sedgwick notes that "Roger W<sup>ms</sup> says the natives believe their God holds his court in the southwest – there are their forefa<sup>rs</sup> [forefathers]– thither they go – thence their corn & beans &c – " (Notes; corresponds to 206); Magawisca, at her trial, notes that "my people are gone to the isles of the sweet south-west" (Karcher ed. 302; Kelley ed. 287; source not identified in either edition).

Sedgwick's notes then pick up with excerpts from Chapter I, "Of Salutation," "'The In<sup>s</sup> are not apt to salute but upon salu<sup>n</sup> [salutation] resalute

loving<sup>y</sup>" (Notes; corresponds to 207) and "They believe in the immortality of the soul but not the resurrec<sup>n</sup> [resurrection] – 'I have acknow<sup>d</sup> [acknowledged] among them a heart sensible of kind<sup>s</sup> [kindness] – and have reap<sup>d</sup> kind<sup>s</sup> again from many when I had forgotten 7 years after" (Notes; corresponds to 208).

The next notes follow from Chapter II, "Of Eating and Entertainment," paraphrasing Williams's description of parched meal as a staple along the trail (Notes; corresponds to 208). The next note comes from Chapter III, "Concerning Sleep and Lodging: "I have known them to sleep abroad to give the Eng<sup>h</sup> a place" (Notes; corresponds to 209). This information is delivered by Winthrop in *Hope Leslie*, as he recognizes Miantunnomoh's right to be seated at the governor's table since "our friend Roger Williams, informed us, that he hath known him, with his family, to sleep abroad to make room in his wigwam for English visitors" (Karcher ed. 152; Kelley ed. 146; source not identified in either edition).

Sedgwick then moves to Chapter VI, "Of the Family and Business of the House," paraphrasing Williams: "The inside of their best houses hung with embroid<sup>d</sup> [embroidered] matting – They mark time by pointing to the sun – stars – Instead of shelves they put their household stuff in baskets – They occasion'y bewail for a year after a friend's death – they dress themselves for mourn'g not [illegible – beauty?] & hold it profane to play – the mean have a tobac bag with a pipe at their back –" (Notes; corresponds to 211-212).

The next notes come from Chapter VII, "Of their Persons and Parts of Body": "Some cut their hair close round like the sober [Sedgwick's emphasis]

Eng<sup>h</sup> [English] – I never saw [any] so forget nature in such excessive length & monstrous fashion as now to their shame I see my countrymen have degenerated unto – 'For the temper of the brain in quick apprehen<sup>s</sup> [apprehension] and accu<sup>te</sup> [accurate] judgments to say no more the most High High [sic] and sov<sup>n</sup> [sovereign] God of creation hath not made them inferior to the Europ<sup>ns</sup> [Europeans]" (Notes; corresponds to 213-214). Further, "They have great skill in sev'ring the head from the body – They delight after battle in hang'g up the hands & heads of their ene<sup>s</sup> [enemies] – a com<sup>n</sup> [common] express<sup>n</sup> [expression] 'my heart is good'" (Notes; corresponds to 214).

From Chapter VIII, "Of Discourse and News", Sedgwick paraphrases: "they sit to hear news in a cir<sup>le</sup> [circle] three or 4 deep – when a speech 'as [?] pleas'g they say 'you speak true' – Canon<sup>s</sup> [Canonicus] broke a stick in 10 pieces to illustrate the broken prom<sup>s</sup> [promises] of the Eng<sup>h</sup> [English]" (Notes; corresponds to 214-215). From Chapter XI, "Of Travel," Sedgwick takes the following: ""They are so exquisitely skill<sup>d</sup> in all the body & bowels of the country by reason of their hunts that I have often been guided 20 – 30 yea sometimes 40 miles thru the woods a straight course out of any path" (Notes; corresponds to 217). Sedgwick then notes "turn back – 2 pages," reminding herself of the continuation (in reverse of their presentation here) of her notes from Williams (Notes).

Roger William's letter to Major John Mason, June 22, 1670 (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 275-283) is identified in the notes as "Extract from Roger W<sup>ms</sup> letter to

Major Mason" (Diary). Sedgwick extracts three passages: "Alas, Sir, in calme midnight thoughts, what are these leaves and flowers, and smoke, and shadows, and dreams of earthly nothings, about which we poore fools and children, as David saith, disquiet ourselves in vain? Alas, what is all the scuffling of this world for but, *come will you smoke it?*" (280); "Besides, Sir, the matter with us is not about these children's toys of land, meadows, cattell, government, &c" (280); and "And as to myself, in endeavoring after yor [sic] temporall and spirituall peace, I humbly desire to say, if I perish, I perish – It is but a shadow vanished, a bubble broke, a dreame finish't; eternitie will pay for all" (283) (Diary).

Edward Winslow's "Good News from New England: Or a Relation of things remarkable in that Plantation" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 8, 1802, 239-276). Sedgwick's notes refer to the "bundle of new arrows, lapped in a rattle-snake's skin" delivered by Conauacus's messenger, and the governor's response, to return the skin "stuffed . . . with powder and shot" (240) (Diary). Sedgwick borrows this symbolism early in *Hope Leslie*, when Nelema drops "a little roll, which she [Martha Fletcher] found on examination, to be an arrow, and the rattle of a rattle-snake enveloped in the skin of the same reptile" (Karcher ed. 38; Kelley ed. 38; source not identified in either edition). Magawisca later explains its significance, not as a sign of war specifically (as in Winslow) but as a sign of danger and an enemy nearby (Karcher ed. 40; Kelley ed. 40; source not identified in either edition).

John Winthrop, *The History of New England from 1630-1649* (2 vols., ed. James Savage, 1825-1826). The internal evidence of *Hope Leslie* suggests that Sedgwick drew heavily from Winthrop's *History*, but her journal reveals only a brief notation: "W [Winthrop] says I [Indians] – vol 2 p. 16 'He (Miantannomoh) did speak with our Committees and us by a Pequod maid who did speak Eng<sup>h</sup> perfectly'" and "Man<sup>h</sup> refuses to eat at the 2<sup>d</sup> table W I [with Indians?] – vol. 2 p. 82 –" (Notes). These notes match Savage's edition of Winthrop exactly. Sedgwick uses this incident in which Native Americans visitors seek to be seated at the same table in *Hope Leslie* (Karcher ed. 152; Kelley ed. 146; identified in both editions by Sedgwick's note).<sup>52</sup>

In *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick further mentions Roger Williams's statement, in his *Key*, of the Indians' hospitality to the English, a sentiment that Winthrop acknowledges in correcting his error (see Williams, *Key* above). The discussion regarding the colonial ban on toasting or drinking healths as one of the laws changed since Everell's absence appears in Winthrop (I. 324) as well as Mather's *Magnalia* (128-129) (Karcher ed. 156; Kelley ed. 149; source not identified in either edition).

Sedgwick draws from Winthrop's account of Samuel Gorton and his associates; in his *History*, such discussion appears in II. 57-59 and II. 142-148 (Karcher ed. 172 attributes a quotation from Winthrop; Kelley ed. 164 does not). Sedgwick's reference to Gorton's response to the service, that he "refuted and attacked, and proved (to his own satisfaction), 'that all ordinances, ministers,

sacraments, &c. were but men's inventions—silver shrines of Diana" (Karcher ed. 172; Kelley ed. 164; source not identified in either edition), was probably drawn from Winthrop's account of the same as the language is quite close to that original (I. 143). Sedgwick gives the first portion of the fictionalized service to Mr. Wheeler (occasioning Hope's remark on the likely length of the service), while Winthrop reports only the Rev. John Cotton's role in the service. In Sedgwick's version, Cotton does deliver the benediction as well as an announcement regarding the sumptuary laws.

Sedgwick also acknowledges Savage's notes (Karcher ed. 170; Kelley ed. 163; Savage identified in both editions, in particular those notes in Winthrop II. 57-59). Savage's additional notes (II. 142-143, 145-149) may also have contributed to Sedgwick's portrayal of the Gorton affair. Savage directs readers to an excerpt from the Danforth Papers ("A copy of a petition by Gorton and his company to the king's commissioners," *Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 8, 1819, 68-70) and a portion of *Account of Providence, Rhode Island*, attributed to Stephen Hopkins (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 9, 1822, 199-201), as Savage writes that "both [these and Winthrop's account] must be read by him who would know the whole truth" (II. 147 n.1). Continued references to Gorton in *Hope Leslie* appear to be drawn from later discussions in Winthrop (II. 156).

The internal evidence of *Hope Leslie* shows that Sedgwick adapted much from Winthrop, even though the notebooks reflect just a few notations. In Hope's letter to Everell, most of which reports the events related to charges of witchcraft

against Nelema, Hope mentions that Digby has been "publikly reproved for expressing himself against their [the magistrates'] proceedings" and warned of the Providential punishments that might strike such dissenters (Karcher ed. 113; Kelley ed. 109). In this list is the reminder of "poor Austin of Quinnepaig, taken into Turkish captivity" (Karcher ed. 113; Kelley ed. 109; source not identified in either edition), a name mentioned in Winthrop's journal as one of many instances of the "judgment of God upon these scornors of his ordinances and the ways of his servants" (II. 12-13). This is Austin's story, in brief: he and his family had emigrated to Connecticut in 1638, but, unhappy there, attempted to return to England via Spain; they were captured en route and sold into slavery in Algiers.

The explosion of the *Mary Rose* in Charlton, also discussed in this section of Winthrop's journal, likely provides background for the explosion that takes the lives of Rosa, Jennet, and Gardiner later in the novel; Karcher references the description in Winthrop II. 150. The end result of the explosion, that one survivor's body was never found, also seems to have served as inspiration. Winthrop characterizes the person thus: "that man who was the cause of it, who professed himself to have skill in necromancy, and to have done some strange things in his way from Virginia hither, and was suspected to have murdered his master there [. . .] this man was never found" (I. 153). In the fictional case, Gardiner's body is never recovered (Karcher ed. 369; Kelley ed. 348; source not identified in either edition, though both are aware of that Sedgwick fictionalizes the ship's explosion).

Sedgwick borrows a part of a letter by Thomas Morton (quoted both in Winthrop II. 190-191 and Hubbard *General History Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 5, 149-150) in a letter from her fictionalized Gardiner to his friend Wilton (Karcher ed. 207; Kelley ed. 198; source identified as Winthrop in both editions; Savage indicates the reference to Hubbard).

Her author's notes in *Hope Leslie* credit Winthrop's *History* for the original of the anecdote of the mouse gnawing on the Book of Common Prayer; she gives the reporting of this story to Dame Grafton, who offers an alternate interpretation of it (noted in Karcher ed. 221; Kelley ed. 211; corresponds to Winthrop II. 20).

The information for the current state of affairs in New England, expressed by the ship's pilot as Everell and Gardiner sail into Boston, also likely comes from Winthrop's *History*. Sedgwick refers to what is likely the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 (Karcher ed. 129-130; Kelley ed. 125; not identified in either edition) before referring to the troubles regarding Endicott's removal of the red cross from the King's flag; her descriptions of the ensign ("the Pope's gift,' 'a relique of papacy,' 'an idolatrous sign,' &c.") are close to the terms used in Winthrop ("the red cross given to the king of England by the pope, as an ensign of victory, and so a superstitious thing, and a relique of antichrist" (Winthrop I. 147; Karcher ed. 130; Kelley ed. 125; source not identified in either edition)).<sup>53</sup> The reference to the Governor's distance from the debated issue of tobacco use, in this same conversation, seems curious (Karcher ed. 130; Kelley ed. 125; not identified in either edition); Winthrop notes the passage of "many laws against tobacco and

immodest fashions, and costly apparel" at the 1634 (I. 143; also I. 140), but without stating his own position.<sup>54</sup>

Sedgwick also adapts Winthrop's description of Chaddock's crew to set the stage for Hope's encounter with them and subsequent rescue by Antonio (Winthrop II. 149-150; Karcher ed. 250; Kelley ed. 238; source identified in Karcher).

Sedgwick's discussion of the shifting Native American alliances and the concerns expressed by the Connecticut settlements seems drawn from Winthrop as well (II. 80-81), particularly since her description of Miantunnomoh is close to that of Winthrop's in this section (Karcher ed. 261; Kelley ed. 249; connection to Miantunnomoh identified in both editions). Also identified by Karcher is Sedgwick's information about the war between Miantunnomoh and Uncas (Winthrop II. 129-134; Karcher ed. 362; Kelley ed. 341).<sup>55</sup>

Roger Wolcott, "A Brief Account of the Agency of the Honourable John Winthrop, Esq. in the Court of King Charles the Second, Anno Do. 1662; When He Obtained a Charter for the Colony of Connecticut. Written by Roger Wolcott, Esq. His Successor in the Government of Connecticut, from 1751 to 1754" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 4, 1795, 262-298), a poem that also traces the history of the Indian wars. Sedgwick copies these lines: " Before the breach an unappalled band / Of warlike Pequots with bow & arrows stand / [ . . . ] Then gallantly the English they assail / With winged arrows like a shower of hail / These ours endure and with like violence / Sent lead and sulphur back in recompence" (287); "Prince

Mononotto sees his squadrons fly / And on our general having fixed his eye, / [. . .] Then to his god and father's ghosts he prayed / Hear! Oh immortal powers, hear me, he said, / Will you forsake your altars and abodes / To those contemners of Immortal Gods?" (289) (Notes).

William Wordsworth's "The Excursion" (1814). Sedgwick takes these lines, "In such access of mind, in such high hour / Of visitation from the living God, / Thought was not" and then "Rapt into still communion that transcended / The imperfect offices of prayer and praise" (Notes). These last two lines appear in *Hope Leslie*, part of the description of Everell's state of mind as he awaits Mononotto's blow (Karcher ed. 96; Kelley ed. 92; poem identified in Karcher).

In addition to these items, positively identified, Sedgwick likely noticed other items that appear in close proximity to those she extensively excerpted. These include "Mr. [John Thornton] Kirkland's Answer to Queries, respecting Indians," February 1795, the selection immediately following Hawley's letter above (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 4, 1795, 67-74), which might have provided further background for *Hope Leslie's* discussions of Native American affairs. Sedgwick might also have consulted "A Letter from Gov. Shute to Rallé the Jesuit" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 5, 1798, 112-119), for Rallé's name appears early in *Diary, 1811-1812*, and *Notes*, along with a number of Native American names. Sedgwick likely also read "Mourt's Relation," identified in the *Collections* as "A Relation or Journal of a Plantation settled at Plymouth in New England,

and Proceedings thereof" (1622), a companion piece to Winslow's "Good News," but not authored by Winslow (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 8, 1802, 203-239).

II. Published source material appearing in *Hope Leslie* but not in the notebooks and not identified in Kelley's or Karcher's editions.

Pietro Metastasio is identified as the author of the headnote to Chapter XIV, Volume II; it seems likely that the Italian passage at the end of the previous chapter was also taken from Metastasio (Karcher ed. 346; Kelley ed. 328; not identified in either edition).

John Milton, *The Works of John Milton*. 18 vols. New York: Columbia UP, 1931.

Sedgwick characterizes Jennet's "housewife skills" as like "'neat-handed Phillis' of poetic fame," a reference to Milton's "L'Allegro" (line 86; Vol. I Pt.1, 34-39; Karcher ed. 312; Kelley ed. 295; not identified in either edition).

From *A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle, 1634* (85-123), Sedgwick borrows not only the headnote for Vol. II, Ch. 6 of *Hope Leslie*, but also these quotations. The first describes Hope Leslie's journey in Oneco's canoe after her abduction: "But heaven seemed determined to frustrate his purpose, and to show her how idle were all human hopes and fears, how vain to 'cast the fashion of uncertain evils'" (line 359; Karcher ed. 248; Kelley ed. 237; not identified in either edition). Another line from the *Mask* describes Hope's reaction to Chaddock's men: She "thought any fate would be better than 'To meet the rudeness and swilled insolence / Of such late wassailers'" (corresponds to lines

177-178; Karcher ed. 250; Kelley ed. 239; not identified in either edition; Sedgwick's emphasis). Later in the novel, Sedgwick claims that there could not be "a more infernal plot against an 'innocent and aidless lady' than Gardiner's plot to capture Hope (rewording of line 573; Karcher ed. 334; Kelley ed. 317; not identified in either edition). Sedgwick then characterizes evil persons, like Gardiner, as "demons, whose 'monstrous rout are heard to howl like stable wolves'" (slight rewording of lines 532-534; Karcher ed. 339; Kelley ed. 322; not identified in either edition).

From *Paradise Lost* (Vol. II, Pt. I) Sedgwick uses line 609 of Book I ("millions of spirits, for his fault amerc'd of Heav'n") in Gardiner's contemplation of Rosa's desolation (Karcher ed. 213; Kelley ed. 203; not identified in either edition though Sedgwick identifies the sentiment as belonging to Milton). Adapting lines 274-275 from Book II, Sedgwick writes "'our torments' cannot 'become our elements'" as she describes the need for humans to obey the laws of God and conscience (Karcher ed. 339; Kelley ed. 322; not identified in either edition). From Book IV, line 30, Sedgwick adapts a description of Gardiner's look at Magawisca as "such a look at Satan eyed the sun in his 'high meridian tower'" (Karcher ed. 270; Kelley ed. 257; not identified in either edition).

Alexander Pope, "Epistle I, To Sir Richard Temple, Lord Viscount Cobham, " 1733.

(*Epistles to Several Persons (Moral Essays)*. Ed. F. W. Bateson. *Poems of Alexander Pope*. Vol. 3. Pt. 2. London: Methuen, 1961.) Sedgwick observes that Dame Grafton "undoubtedly believed 'a saint in crape' to be 'twice a saint in

lawn," borrowing these lines from Pope (Karcher ed. 28; Kelley ed. 28; not identified in either edition; corresponds to Pope 21).

William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Ed. David Bevington. London: Scott, Foresman, 1980. Sedgwick borrows part of a line from Polonius to Laertes as Hope's revelation of Everell and Esther's upcoming marriage is described: "Thus had Hope Leslie, by rashly following her first generous impulses, by giving to 'an unproportioned thought its act,' effected that . . . the whole colony and world beside, could never have achieved" (*Hamlet* I.3.60; Karcher ed. 225; Kelley ed. 216; not identified in either edition). A reference to *Hamlet* later in this same chapter is identified by Karcher (229, but not in Kelley 219).

Sedgwick adapts lines from Shakespeare's *A Mid-summer's Night Dream* when Gardiner "determined to ascertain if the 'bolt of Cupid,' had fallen on this 'little western flower,'" Hope (II.1.165-166; Karcher ed. 221; Kelley ed. 212; not identified in either edition). The lines, "do wander every where, / Swifter than the moone's sphere," appears in Hope's letter to Everell; these lines belong to the Fairy in *A Mid-Summer's Night Dream* (II.1.6-7; Karcher ed. 104, Kelley ed. 100; not identified in either edition). Hope later in this letter identifies Shakespeare as Everell's "favorite."

Gardiner believes that the crucifix presented at court by Magawisca "would prove a "confirmation strong" to Winthrop (*Othello* III.3.328: Karcher ed.

313; Kelley ed. 297; not identified in either edition). This quote also appears in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, attributed there to Shakespeare.<sup>III</sup>

Queen Elizabeth I. Sedgwick offers this quote from Queen Elizabeth's correspondence:

"No man should be suffered to decline either on the left or on the right hand, from the drawn line limited by authority, and by the sovereign's laws and injunctions"

(Karcher ed. 6; Kelley ed. 8; not identified in either edition). I have not yet identified Sedgwick's source for this quotation.

Nathaniel Ward, *The Simple Cobler of Aggawam in America*, 1647. Ed. P. M. Zall.

Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1969. While no notes from Ward appear in Sedgwick's notebooks, references and quotations appear in *Hope Leslie*. Karcher and Kelley identify two (Karcher ed. 28; Kellye ed. 28; corresponding to Ward 26-27). Further, Sedgwick borrows from Ward in a description of Esther Downing's physical beauty: "That young ladies were then indulged in a moderate degree of personal embellishment, we learn from one of the severest pilgrim satirists, who avers, that he was 'no cynic to the due *bravery* of the true gentry,' and allows that 'a good text always deserves a fair margent'" (Karcher ed. 140; Kelley ed. 135, not identified in either edition). This parallels Ward: "It is known more then enough, that I am neither Nigard, nor Cinick, to the due bravery of the true Gentry: if any man mislike a bullymong drossock more then I, let him take her for his labour: I honour the woman that can honour her selfe with her attire: a good Text alwayes deserves a fair Margent" (26).

III. Notebook entries appearing to bear on the invention or drafting of *Hope Leslie* but not appearing specifically in the novel

Tradition of Monument Mountain, as related by an aged Squaw. Sedgwick relates the legend of a young Indian woman who, after the sexual advances of her cousin and the shame of such an encounter, throws her self from the precipice to end her suffering and lamentation over her ruined reputation (Diary).

A lengthy speech between a Pilgrim and Indian Maid. Here Sedgwick models a dialogue similar to the exchanges among Magawisca, Hope, and Everell, in which the maiden expresses the fundamentals of Native American belief, details the wrongs the whites have committed, and questions the need for Indians to study the Bible, for their religion is complete for them; the Puritan/Pilgrim expresses his own disappointment over these actions, but most of the dialogue belongs to the Indian maid (Diary).

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Baym finds "between 1792 [...] and 1864 [...] upwards of fifty women published more than seventy-five such novels or novellas [that is, historical]" (153).

<sup>2</sup> Avallone and Banks have presented these arguments in both print form (essays in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Lucinda Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements, Northeastern UP, 2003) and at conference venues including the 2002 MLA convention, as part of a panel sponsored by the Sedgwick Society.

<sup>3</sup> Parenthetical documentation of unpublished correspondence will identify authors and correspondents within the Sedgwick family by initials: CMS, Catharine Maria Sedgwick; CS, Charles Sedgwick; ES, Elizabeth Sedgwick; HDS, Henry Dwight Sedgwick; JMS, Jane Minot Sedgwick; RS, Robert Sedgwick; TS, Theodore Sedgwick II. Eliza Cabot Follen will be identified as ECF, Lydia Maria Child as LMC. Unpublished correspondence is listed on the Works Cited by author's full name, with corresponding detail of the item's location within the holdings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts.

<sup>4</sup> Theodore's qualms might have been well founded. An October 1826 review of the book, in *The North American Review* offers quite a few suggestions to its author, but overall recommends the book. Sedgwick's purpose, according to this reviewer, was "to show that a moral and instructed yeomanry are the great and stable blessings of a nation" (467).

<sup>5</sup> The charge of "LaFayetteism" is interesting for the contemporary context; LaFayette had toured the United States in 1824-1825 to much acclaim; a modern comparison might be the response to the Beatles' first American tour.

<sup>6</sup> See especially Edward Halsey Foster, Michael Davitt Bell, Mary Kelley, Carolyn Karcher, and Karen Woods Weierman.

<sup>7</sup> The Appendix to this study provides the specific details of Sedgwick's notes, these primary sources, and *Hope Leslie*. Sedgwick most likely accessed Williams's *Key* through the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*, Vol. 3, 1794, 203-239 and Gookin's "Historical Collections" from Vol. 1 of the same series, 141-227.

<sup>8</sup> I am indebted to Linda Smith Rhoads, co-editor of *The New England Quarterly*, for introducing me to this and other letters held in the Francis James Child Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society. The only other appearance of this information, that I am aware of, is in Weierman's article, "Reading and Writing *Hope Leslie*."

<sup>9</sup> Hubbard's *General History* was published in the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Second Series, Vols. 5 and 6, both published in 1815.

<sup>10</sup> When Howe died in January 1828, Sedgwick described him in her journal:

On Sunday the 20<sup>th</sup> of this month our friend Sam'l Howe died in Boston – Thus have we lost our oldest truest & best friend – He was the classmate of my brothers H & R – He pursued a part of his professional studies in my father's office & from our youth he has been domesticated in our family – He ~~onee~~ gave me the greatest proof a man can give of his confidence - & he has been uniformly a most

affectionate & interested friend – Our private loss is deplorable –" (1827-1830 Journal).

<sup>11</sup> My thorough investigations of the Sedgwick Family Papers and Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers at the Massachusetts Historical Society and the private collection of books at the private residence of the Sedgwick family in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, have located no further record of books owned by or borrowed by Sedgwick or her family. Occasional references to readings in fiction or European history appear in the correspondence but do not provide any substantive information regarding the family's or Sedgwick's book buying or borrowing habits.

<sup>12</sup> "Here stood the Indian chieftain, rejoicing in his glory! / How deep the shade of sadness that rests upon his story: / For the white man came with power—like brethren they met-- / But the Indian fires went out, and the Indian sun has set! // And the chieftain has departed—gone is his hunting ground, / And the twanging of his bow-string is a forgotten sound:-- / Where dwelleth yesterday? and where is Echo's cell? / Where has the rainbow vanished? – there does the Indian dwell." An "E.", for Eliza, denotes its authorship.

<sup>13</sup> In separate research, Lucinda Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements have also concluded that this poem is by Eliza Cabot, based on a hand-written version of the poem found in papers in a private collection. Their and my conclusion, without details, was published in the Fall 2004 issue of *The Catharine Maria Sedgwick Society Newsletter*.

<sup>14</sup> This letter may not survive. It was not located in the Sedgwick-Channing correspondence held by the Massachusetts Historical Society.

<sup>15</sup> The inconsistency in Leslie's first name might be one of the errors that a more thorough proofreading of the manuscript could have corrected. See later discussion of Sedgwick's assessment of the faults of the romance. Parenthetical references to *Hope Leslie* provide the page references to both of the currently available editions, those edited by Carolyn Karcher and Mary Kelley.

<sup>16</sup> Sedgwick was evidently impatient for her family's response to the book. Her brother Charles, writing in a letter sent by his sister-in-law Susan, offers this admonition in June 1827:

I rec'd yr letter yesterday & was surprised to hear you say that I had not spoken of the book, the half of which I read on the boat the afternoon Sco. left me – If I have said nothing to you, it has been to avoid formality & all that I can say abt it now is that in the midst of the afflictions which are brought upon us all by our dear brother it is a consolation to think that it will be a source of delight, of pride & delight to us all – but now to talk of anything or think of anything but what can be done for our Harry seems as incongruous or to dance on the grave of the dead" (Susan Sedgwick to CMS 10 June 1827).

Sedgwick mentions the concerns about Harry's deteriorating physical and mental health in much of the correspondence, including a letter to Lydia Maria Francis Child.

Sedgwick's letter to Charles, initiating this response, is not part of the Massachusetts Historical Society collections.

<sup>17</sup> In her correspondence with Cabot, Sedgwick is quite open about her feelings about her work, perhaps finding in Cabot, also a writer, a kind of kinship that she did not share with

her brothers and sisters-in-law. Further, Sedgwick and Cabot viewed each other as equals, unlike the kind of mentor-mentee relationship between Sedgwick and Lydia Maria Francis Child. After Cabot's marriage to Charles Follen, a German immigrant and Unitarian minister, in 1828, Sedgwick's letters to Eliza seem restrained, perhaps because she and Eliza no longer shared the common ground of singlehood. This change in feeling following a friend or family member's marriage is common with Sedgwick, who chose not to marry but continually lamented her position as "first to none." In this same letter, Sedgwick asks to use part of Cabot's poem "Sachem's Point" as the epigraph to *Hope Leslie*.

<sup>18</sup>In *Hope Leslie* and her other works, family and friends discuss potential reviewers in terms of those who are most likely to present the work in a most positive light. Samuel Howe writes to Sedgwick: "I hope the review of this work will fall into the hands of some one who is competent to the task & who will be disposed to do it justice" (S. Howe to CMS, 1 July 1827).

<sup>19</sup>As other readers of these letters have noted, Sedgwick probably had her humorous revenge years later in *Clarence; or, A Tale of Our Own Times* (1830), through her portrayal of a supposedly mannered but quite unlikeable British writer, perhaps modelled on Hall, who visits *Clarence's* American household and commits multiple faux pas in his misunderstanding of American society.

<sup>20</sup>Perry Miller defines the covenant of grace: "If a man can believe, he has done his part; God then must needs redeem him and glorify him" (*The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* 377). The covenant of works then was "the rule of righteousness,"

good behavior and good works (Miller 384). The covenant of works is subsumed within the covenant of grace, for "covenant-faith has in the law a way prescribed for it to walk in, and faith as the fulfillment of a covenant obliges the believer so to walk, whereas unsophisticated piety naively supposes that faith in itself is adequate for salvation regardless of how it walks" (Miller 385).

<sup>21</sup> The name Jeremy Austin does not appear in any of Sedgwick's sources, so it may be that he is, in fact, a person unknown to the Puritans and thus Sedgwick's fictional creation.

<sup>22</sup> This incident appears in Winthrop's *History* (II.82); Sedgwick noted the incident in her notebook (Notes and Anecdotes). Both Karcher's and Kelley's editions identify the source of the anecdote.

<sup>23</sup> Winthrop, as Deputy-Governor, was accused of over-stepping in powers in intervening in a case over the leadership of the Hingham militia and ultimately acquitted. Following his acquittal, Winthrop offers a lengthy discourse to the assembly. He notes that "to be publickly and criminally charged in this court, is matter of humiliation, (and I desire to make right use of it,) [...]. The great questions that have troubled the country, are about the authority of the magistrates and the liberty of the people. It is yourselves who have called us to this office, and being called by you, we have our authority from God" (II. 228). Further, in regard to civil liberty, Winthrop writes, "This liberty is the proper end and object of authority, and cannot subsist without it; and it is a liberty to that only which is good, just and honest. This liberty you are to stand for, with the hazard (not only of your goods, but) of your lives, if need be" (II.229). After a discussion of the controversy,

Mather emphasizes the strength of Winthrop's position in the community overall: "the people would not afterwards entrust the helm of the weather-beaten bark in any other hands but Mr. Winthrop's until he died" (*Magnalia* II.128). Winthrop's full account of the case appears in his *History* (II.221-233).

<sup>24</sup> This moment in the romance is also coincident with Magawisca's arrival. She too will challenge Puritan law.

<sup>25</sup> This reference to lawfulness can be interpreted in a number of ways. Hope is recommending a rejection of the Word, the Law, in order to assert her higher knowledge—a knowledge based on apocryphal authority as far as Digby and the others are concerned. Further, perhaps because of a fear for their own lives or a fear of using 'The Wonders of the Crusades' as an authority, none of the men intervene to help Cradock. They would prefer that he die, evidently, than risk lawlessness in any degree.

<sup>26</sup> Self-interest is also at work in Hope's rescue of Nelema. As she writes to Everell, "When she [Nelema] is gone, you will never again hear of Magawisca. I shall never hear more of my sweet sister" (Karcher ed. 114; Kelley ed. 110).

<sup>27</sup> Thomas Prince's *Annals of New England*, published in the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Second Series, Vol. 7, 1818, notes that on 3 April 1632, "Conant's-Island demised to Gov Winthrop [upon certain Terms] and the Name is changed, and is to be called the Governor's-Garden" (Part II, Sec. 2, 58). John Davis's "Discourse before the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, December 22, 1813, at their Anniversary Commemoration of the First Landing of our Ancestors at Plymouth, in 1620" (*Coll MHS*, Second Series Vol. 1, 1814, i-xxxii 1813) notes that "Governour's

Island was the property of Governour Winthrop, and has never been alienated from the family. It was called, in early times, the Governour's Garden" (xxxix).

<sup>28</sup> David Reynolds, in discussing Sedgwick's *A New-England Tale*, suggests that "while using these visionary devices [such as angels] to suggest her anti-Calvinist characters' divine nature and closeness to God, Sedgwick represents orthodoxy as a tyrannical system" (51).

<sup>29</sup> Sedgwick provides an author's note to this passage, directing readers to Winthrop's *History*.

<sup>30</sup> This sense of Faith and Oneco as child-like persists into their adulthood. This can be read as a negative comment on either Catholicism or Native American belief—that neither of these systems allow maturation or embrace rational thought. However, the romance offers the counter-examples of strong Native Americans, such as Magawisca and Nelema, and the Catholic Antonio's two attempts to rescue Hope. Perhaps, in political terms, Oneco's and Faith's child-like nature suggests their inability to lead, to withstand the rigors of nation-building. Oneco's case supports this, as his father Mononotto passes over Oneco, the only surviving male heir, to place his confidence in his daughter, Magawisca, the child who has shown vigor, courage, and tenacity. *The Linwoods*, Sedgwick's other historical romance, offers a similar story line in which the weaker member of the family simply cannot cope with the upheaval or demands of the Revolution and so weakens and dies.

<sup>31</sup> While information on Gorton does not appear in Sedgwick's existing notebooks, internal references in *Hope Leslie*, including Sedgwick's reference to Hubbard, suggest

that Hubbard's *General History* and Winthrop's *History* are her primary sources. Sedgwick also likely followed Savage's notes in Winthrop to documents that offer Gorton's and his co-defendants' perspective on the case. These are an excerpt from the Danforth Papers, "A copy of a petition by Gorton and his company to the king's commissioners," *Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 8, 1819, 68-70) and *Account of Providence, Rhode Island*, attributed to Stephen Hopkins (*Coll MHS, Second Series* Vol. 9, 1822, 199-201). Both items were easily available to Sedgwick; notes from other items within these volumes appear in her notebooks. Since Hubbard based his account on Winthrop's, here I refer to Winthrop's version rather than to both writers'.

<sup>32</sup> According to Hopkins, Pomham sold Gorton the land and then later "put himself and his lands under their [Massachusetts Bay's] protection" (199).

<sup>33</sup> In his notes, Savage offers a defense for Gorton, reminding readers that "there was a universal dread of having any ministers, who had not been regularly educated, and some allowance must be made for the opinions of Winthrop and the rest of the magistrates on this account" (Winthrop II. 145 n. 2).

<sup>34</sup> Chaddock's crew plays other roles in the novel, including Hope's narrow escape when she interrupts their drunken stupor and Antonio's rescue of her. On the evening of the explosion and Magawisca's escape, Antonio delivers to Winthrop a warning of Gardiner's plan to capture Hope. The drunken revels of Chaddock's crew have a basis in history. Winthrop reports that "as soon as they came on shore, they fell to drinking, &c." (II.149).

<sup>35</sup> The Appendix details the cross-references among the historical record, Sedgwick's notes, and the fictional appearance of the historical details. For a detailed study of Sedgwick's revision of the Pequod War, see Gould, *Covenant and Republic*.

<sup>36</sup> The line in Kelley's edition reads "Hope Leslie, there is no solitude to me" (332).

<sup>37</sup> Of the native Americans present throughout the novel in one form or another, Magawisca's father is largely a background figure, and her brother Oneco is portrayed as an ineffectual speaker on behalf of native American interests. The historical Miantunomoh appears in the novel, but he does not become a character in the way that other historical figures do.

<sup>38</sup> In physical terms, the notebooks are similar: thin volumes of about forty unlined pages with covers of slightly heavier paper than the leaves, similar to composition notebooks available today (but not so sturdy).

<sup>39</sup> The third notebook, French Exercises, Copies of Letters and Extracts, c. 1821, is primarily filled with homework and sample translations, though it also contains some notes that could be significant for a study of Sedgwick's interest in the American Revolutionary period.

<sup>40</sup> Internal evidence in *Hope Leslie*, referring to Savage as the editor of the volume, verifies that Sedgwick used this version of Winthrop's *History*. Sedgwick likely used the 1820 edition of Mather's *Magnalia*.

<sup>41</sup> A handful of notebook entries remains unidentified. In some cases, the notes are so general (in language or idea) as to make identification virtually impossible; in others, the source may be so long out of print as to be outside our current abilities to find it. I am

convinced, however, that these unidentified entries, as well as items in quotation marks in *Hope Leslie* but not yet identified, did in fact come from published sources as Sedgwick consistently identifies borrowed material (with quotation marks). These published sources may be pamphlets or books, available to Sedgwick but now rare.

<sup>42</sup> I plan a future study of these notes and other materials related to Sedgwick's 1835 historical romance, *The Linwoods*.

<sup>43</sup> The location of individual works within the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, the published editions distributed to the Society's membership, will be identified by the abbreviation *Coll MHS* and further identified by series, volume number, year of publication, and inclusive page numbers. Page numbers within the discussion of an individual item refer to the location of the quotation within the individual document. I also provide the location of the quotation in Sedgwick's journals by referring to Notes and Anecdotes, n.d., as Notes and Diary, 1811-1812, as Diary in the in-text citations. The full bibliographic citation for these manuscript documents appears in the Works Cited under Catharine Maria Sedgwick's listings. The full series of the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* also appear on the Works Cited list; individual items referenced within the body of the present study also appear on that list. Full bibliographic information for items referred to only in this appendix appears only in the appendix.

<sup>44</sup> A nearly identical description of Native American homes appears in Gookin, *Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 1, 1792, 149-150, the same volume in which Higginson's work appears.

<sup>45</sup> Though the title "Food for saints, and Fire for sinners" does not seem to refer to any actual book, Sedgwick may have been inspired by the samples of Eliot's titles. "Food for saints" is the book recommended to Jennet by Gardiner (Karcher ed. 315; Kelley ed. 299; source not suggested in either edition).

<sup>46</sup> Sedgwick might have found discussion of the ships Lyon and Blessing of the Bay, part of this same conversation, in any of several different sources, including Winthrop.

<sup>47</sup> These lines are paraphrased by Sedgwick: "Rank is regarded among them – the kind (Saggamore) must be matched only with royal blood – The descent from any other is deemed illegitimate" (Diary, 1811-1812, and Notes).

<sup>48</sup> Sedgwick paraphrases these lines before reverting to quotation: "Their physicians are next in rank to their king 'with their curst magic as themselves they beat, they quickly ease" (Diary, 1811-1812, and Notes).

<sup>49</sup> Again, Sedgwick closely paraphrases these lines before reverting to quotation.

<sup>50</sup> This passage begins in direct quotation and moves to summary.

<sup>51</sup> Sedgwick inserts "(the women)" in her notes.

<sup>52</sup> Another incident in which Native Americans are seated at a separate table appears in Winthrop, II.122.

<sup>53</sup> Mather's *Magnalia* also includes this case, and Sedgwick might have drawn on his account. His language, however, is not as close to her notes as Winthrop's is. See Mather, *Magnalia*, II. 499-503. This account immediately precedes Mather's discussion of Samuel Gorton's conflict with the Massachusetts Bay government.

<sup>54</sup> The writer of "The Historical Account of the Rev. John Eliot," also referred to in the appendix, mentions "The prejudice against the use of tobacco, was not confined to the character of individuals. It was the prevailing sentiment of the people that it had a bad tendency, and may serve for an excuse for Mr. Eliot, who so often admonished persons who made too free with it. Governor Winthrop says: -- 'At this court (1634) were many laws made against tobacco, and immodest fashions, and costly apparel, &c. as appears from the Records' (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 8, 1802, 35). This note does not express Winthrop's opinion, but another mention of Eliot's distaste for tobacco use suggests that Sedgwick might have taken the attitude of the writer of "The Historical Account": "His [Eliot's] prejudices were as strong against the use of tobacco. He thought it was a sacrifice of precious time – a silly amusement, disgusting in itself; that Christians ought not to become slaves to such a pernicious weed, and besotted by its influence. But he might as well have preached to the moon, as to resist the tide of fashion; or fought with the stars in their courses, as to struggle with the pride of opinion, or the appetites of sense; and try to persuade men not to use a weed which carries a charm with it for its intoxicating quality; -- which equally tends to exhilarate their spirits and amuse their leisure hours" (*Coll MHS, First Series* Vol. 8, 1802, 27-28).

<sup>55</sup> Karcher identifies Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, as an additional source.

## Works Cited

- "Abstract of the Laws of New-England, as they are now established. Printed in London in 1641." Vol. 5 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 1798. 171-187.
- Aiken, Lucy. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 15 Sept. 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers II. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- "Angèlique Bullion." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2003. 23 June 2005  
<<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03052a.htm>>.
- Appleby, Joyce. *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2000.
- Baym, Nina. *American Women Writers and the Work of History, 1790-1860*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1995.
- . *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America, 1820-1870*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978.
- Belknap, Jeremy, and Jedidiah Morse. "Report of a Committee of the Board of Correspondents of the Scots Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge, who Visited the Oneida and Mohekunuh Indians in 1796." Vol. 5 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 1798. 12-32.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1975.
- Bell, Michael Davitt. *Hawthorne and the Historical Romance of New England*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.

- . "History and Romance Convention in Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *American Quarterly* 22.2 (Summer 1970): 213-21.
- Buchanan, Daniel P. "Tares in the Wheat: Puritan Violence and Puritan Families in the Nineteenth-Century Liberal Imagination." *Religion and American Culture* 8.2 (Summer 1998): 205-236. JSTOR. Clarion Univ. Libs., Clarion, PA. 23 June 2005 <<http://links.jstor.org/>>.
- Buell, Lawrence. *New England Literary Culture: From Revolution Through Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- . "The Literary Significance of the Unitarian Movement." *American Unitarianism, 1805-1865*. Ed. Conrad Edick Wright. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society and Northeastern UP, 1989.
- Bulkley, John. "An Inquiry into the Right of the Aboriginal Natives to the Lands in America, and the Titles Derived From Them. Written in 1724, by the Rev. John Bulkley, Minister of Colchester in Connecticut." Vol. 4 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 1795. 159-181.
- Castiglia, Christopher. "In Praise of Extra-vagant Women: *Hope Leslie* and the Captivity Romance." *Legacy* 6.2 (Fall 1989): 3-16.
- Charlevoix, Pierre Francois Xavier. *History and General Description of New France*. 6 vol. Trans. and ed. John Glimary Shea. Chicago: Loyola UP, 1870. 1962.
- Charvat, William. *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870*. 1968. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.

Child, Lydia Maria. *The First Settlers of New-England; or, Conquest of the Pequods, Narragansets, and Pokanokets, as Related by a Mother to her Children*. Boston: Munroe and Francis, 1829.

Clements, Victoria, ed. Introduction. *A New-England Tale*. By Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 1822. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.

*Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 10 vols. 1792-1809. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968.

*Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series*. 10 vols. 1814-1823. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968.

"A Copy of a Petition by Gorton and His Company to the King's Commissioners." Danforth Papers. Vol. 8 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series*. 1819. 68-70.

Coultrap-McQuin, Susan. *Doing Literary Business: American Women Writers in the Nineteenth Century*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1900.

Damon-Bach, Lucinda, and Victoria Clements, eds. *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2003.

----- Introduction. Damon-Bach and Clements xxi-xxxi.

"David Leslie." [Answers.com](http://www.answers.com). Wikipedia. Columbia U P. 2003. 11 June 2005  
<<http://www.answers.com/main/>>.

Davidson, Cathy N. *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Davis, John. "Discourse before the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, December 22, 1813, at their Anniversary Commemoration of the First Landing of our Ancestors at Plymouth, in 1620." Vol. 1 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series*. 1814. i-xxxii.

Dekker, George. *The American Historical Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Elbert, Monika M. Introduction. *Separate Spheres No More: Gender Convergence in American Literature, 1830-1930*. Ed. Monika M. Elbert. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2000. 1-25.

Eliot, John. "Letters from Rev. John Eliot of Roxbury, to Hon. Robert Boyle." Vol. 3 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. 1794. 177-188.

Fetterley, Judith. "'My Sister! My Sister!': The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *American Literature* 70.3 (Sept. 1998): 491-516.

----- . *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1978.

Foster, Edward Halsey. *Catharine Maria Sedgwick*. New York: Twayne, 1974.

----- . Foreword. *Hope Leslie; or Early Times in the Massachusetts*. By Catharine Maria Sedgwick. New York: Garrett, 1969.

Gee, Karen Richardson. "Women, Wilderness, and Liberty in Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *Studies in the Humanities* 19.2 (Dec. 1992): 161-70.

Gookin, Daniel. "Historical Collections of the Indians of New England." *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. Vol. 1. 1792. 141-227.

- Gossett, Suzanne, and Barbara Ann Bardes. "Woman and Political Power in the Republic: Two Early American Novels." *Legacy* 2.2 (Fall 1985): 13-30.
- Gould, Philip. *Covenant and Republic: Historical Romance and the Politics of Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- "Grand Jury's Bill against Mary Osgood." 1692. Vol. 7 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 1800. 241.
- Hall, Basil. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 2 Oct. 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers II. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Harris, Susan K. *Nineteenth-Century American Women's Novels: Interpretive Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Heckewelder, John. *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighbouring States*. 1819. 1876. New York: Arno Press, 1971.
- "Henry Fitzroy, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Grafton." [Answers.com](http://answers.com). Wikipedia. 11 June 2005 <[http://answers.com/topic/henry-fitzroy-1<sup>st</sup>-duke-of-grafton](http://answers.com/topic/henry-fitzroy-1st-duke-of-grafton)>.
- Rev. of *Hints to My Countrymen*, by an American [Theodore Sedgwick II]. *North American Review* 23.53 (October 1826): 467+. *Making of America*. Cornell U Library. 16 August 2005 <<http://cdl.library.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/moa/moa-cgi?notisid+ABQ7578-0023-40>>.
- Homestead, Melissa J. "Behind the Veil?: Catharine Sedgwick and Anonymous Publication." Damon-Bach and Clements 19-35.

- Rev. of *Hope Leslie; or, Early Times in the Massachusetts*, by Catharine Maria Sedgwick. *North American Review* 26.2 (April 1828): 403-20. Damon-Bach and Clements 75-77.
- Rev. of *Hope Leslie; or, Early Times in the Massachusetts*, by Catharine Maria Sedgwick. *North American Review* 26.2 (April 1828): 403-20. Proquest. Clarion Univ. Libs., Clarion, PA. 4 April 2005 <<http://umi.proquest.com>>.
- Hopkins, Stephen. "Account of Providence, R.I.[Rhode Island]." Vol. 9 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series*. 1822. 199-201.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861*. 1970. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1988.
- Howe, Samuel. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 1 July 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers II. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Hubbard, William. *A General History of New England from the Discovery to MDCLXXX*. 1815. 1948. New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Hutchinson, Thomas. *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay*. 3 vols. 1767. New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Karafilis, Maria. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: Fostering Radical Democratic Individualism in the New Nation." *ATQ* New Series 12.4 (Dec. 1998): 327-44.
- Karcher, Carolyn L. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick in Literary History." Damon-Bach and Clements 5-15.

- , *The First Woman in the Republic: A Cultural Biography of Lydia Maria Child*.  
Durham: Duke UP, 1994.
- Karcher, Carolyn. Introduction. *Hope Leslie; or Early Times in the Massachusetts*. By  
Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 1827. New York: Penguin, 1998.
- Kelley, Mary. Introduction. *Hope Leslie; or Early Times in the Massachusetts*. By  
Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 1827. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1987.
- Kelley, Mary. *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century  
America*. 1984. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2002.
- Lang, Amy Schrager. *Prophetic Woman: Anne Hutchinson and the Problem of Dissent  
in the Literature of New England*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.
- Mather, Cotton. *Magnalia Christi Americana; or, the Ecclesiastical History of New-  
England*. 2 vols. 1702. 1820. 1852. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.
- Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. 1939. Cambridge:  
Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1982.
- Nelson, Dana. "Rediscovery." Damon-Bach and Clements 286-293.
- Pomeroy, Thaddeus. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 30 March 1825. Sedgwick  
Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Prince, Thomas. *Annals of New England*. Vol. 7 of *Collections of the Massachusetts  
Historical Society, Second Series*. 1818. 1-96.
- Reynolds, David S. *Faith in Fiction: The Emergence of Religious Literature in America*.  
Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.

Savage, James, ed. *The History of New England from 1630 to 1649*. By John Winthrop.

2 vols. 1825-1826. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. 1826-1827 Journal. Ms. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers

I. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

----- 1827-1830 Journal. Ms. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I. Massachusetts

Historical Society, Boston.

----- 1830-1832 Journal. Ms. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I. Massachusetts

Historical Society, Boston.

----- 1834-1835 Journal. Ms. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I. Massachusetts

Historical Society, Boston.

----- *Clarence; or, A Tale of Our Own Times*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Carey and Lea,

1830.

----- Diary, 1811-1812, and Notes. Ms. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

----- Letter to Catherine Watson. 6 Jan. 1827. Sedgwick Family Papers IV.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

----- Letter to Eliza Cabot Follen. 14 January [1824?]. Catharine Maria Sedgwick

Papers I. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

----- Letter to Eliza Cabot Follen. 20 January 1826. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers

I. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

----- Letter to Eliza Cabot Follen. 25 March 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

- Letter to Eliza Cabot Follen. 25 July 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Eliza Cabot Follen. [1827?]. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Eliza Cabot Follen. 19 July 1829. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Henry Dwight Sedgwick. 28 July [1823?]. Catharine Maria Sedgwick  
Papers III. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Henry Dwight Sedgwick. 1 June [1825?]. Francis James Child Papers.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Henry Dwight Sedgwick. 14 Aug. [1825?]. Francis James Child Papers.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Jane Minot Sedgwick. 10 Feb. 1834. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers  
III. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Jane Minot Sedgwick. 20 Feb. 1834. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers  
III. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Lydia Maria Child. 8 Feb. 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers III.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Lydia Maria Child. 28 May 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers III.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Lydia Maria Child. 25 July 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers III.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

- Letter to Lydia Maria Child. 15 Sept. 1827. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers III.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Theodore Sedgwick II. 12 May 1826. Sedgwick Family Papers II.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Theodore Sedgwick II. 29 March 1835. Sedgwick Family Papers II.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- *Life and Letters of Catharine Maria Sedgwick*. Ed. Mary E. Dewey. New York:  
Harper and Brothers, 1872.
- Notes and Anecdotes, n.d. Ms. Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers I.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- *The Power of Her Sympathy: The Autobiography and Journal of Catharine Maria  
Sedgwick*. Ed. and Intro. Mary Kelley. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society,  
1993.
- Sedgwick, Charles. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 21 Feb. 1825. Sedgwick  
Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 1 Jan. 1827. Sedgwick Family Papers IV.  
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Sedgwick, Charles, and Elizabeth Sedgwick. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 28  
March 1827. Sedgwick Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society,  
Boston.
- Sedgwick, Elizabeth. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 22 Jan. 1827. Sedgwick  
Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

- Sedgwick, Henry Dwight. Letter to Theodore Sedgwick II. 26 March 1822. Sedgwick Family Papers II. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to William Minot. 22 April 1822. Sedgwick Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Letter to William Minot. 6 May 1822. Sedgwick Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Sedgwick, Jane Minot. Letter to Frances Watson. 9 April [1827?]. Sedgwick Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Sedgwick, Robert. Letter to Theodore Sedgwick II. 18 June 1824. Sedgwick Family Papers II. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Sedgwick, Susan. Letter to Catharine Maria Sedgwick. 10 June 1827. Sedgwick Family Papers IV. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Sedgwick, Theodore II. Letter to Theodore Sedgwick III. 12 June 1824. Sedgwick Family Papers II. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- "Sir Kelelm Digby." LoveToKnow 1911 Online Encyclopedia. 2004. 11 June 2005 <[http://53.1911encyclopedia.org/D/DI/DIGBY\\_SIR\\_KENELM.htm](http://53.1911encyclopedia.org/D/DI/DIGBY_SIR_KENELM.htm)>.
- Stadler, Gustavus. "Magawisca's Body of Knowledge: Nation-Building in *Hope Leslie*." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 12.1 (1999): 41-56.
- Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

- Vasquez, Mark G. "'Your Sister Cannot Speak to You and Understand You As I Do': Native American Culture and Female Subjectivity in Lydia Maria Child and Catherine [sic] Maria Sedgwick." *ATQ* 15.3 (Sept. 2001): 173+. Academic Search Premier. EBSCOhost. Slippery Rock University Library, Slippery Rock, PA. 1 July 2003 <www.epnet.com>.
- Ward, Nathaniel. *The Simple Cobler of Aggawam in America*. 1647. Ed. P. M. Zall. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1969.
- Weierman, Karen Woods. "Reading and Writing *Hope Leslie*: Catharine Maria Sedgwick's Indian 'Connections.'" *New England Quarterly* 75.3 (Sept. 2002): 415-443.
- Williams, Roger. *Key into the Language of the Indians of New-England*. 1643. Vol. 3 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 1794. 203-239.
- Winslow, Edward. "Good News from New England: Or a Relation of Things Remarkable in that Plantation." Vol. 8 of *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, First Series*. 1802. 239-276.
- Winthrop, John. *The History of New England from 1630 to 1649*. 2 vols. Ed. James Savage. 1825-1826. New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Wolfgang, Lenora D. *Le Lai de l'Oiselet: An Old French Poem of the Thirteenth Century, Edition and Critical Study*. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 80, Part 5. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1990.

## Works Consulted

- Bardes, Barbara, and Suzanne Gossett. *Declarations of Independence: Women and Political Power in Nineteenth-Century American Fiction*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1990.
- Barlow, Dudley. "Women's Indian Captivity Narratives / Hope Leslie, or Early Times in the Massachusetts." Book Review. *Education Digest* 64.6 (Feb. 1999): 79.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.
- Baym, Nina. "Delia Bacon, History's Odd Woman Out." *New England Quarterly* 69 (1996): 223-249.
- "Melodramas of Beset Manhood: How Theories of American Fiction Exclude Women Authors." *American Quarterly* 33.2 (Summer 1981): 123-139.
- "Mercy Otis Warren's Gendered Melodrama of Revolution." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 90 (1991): 531-54.
- Berlant, Lauren. *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.
- Bell, Michael Davitt. *The Development of American Romance: The Sacrifice of Relation*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Buell, Lawrence. "Circling the Spheres: A Dialogue." *American Literature* 70.3 (Sept. 1998): 465-90.
- *Literary Transcendentalism: Style and Vision in the American Renaissance*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1973.

- Coontz, Stephanie. *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families, 1600- 1900*. London: Verso, 1988.
- Daly, Robert. "Cooper's Allegories of Reading and 'the Wreck of the Past.'" *Readers in History: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Contexts of Response*. Ed. James L. Machor. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. 109-37.
- Davidson, Cathy N. "Preface: No More Separate Spheres!" *American Literature* 70.3 (Sept. 1998): 443-63.
- Degler, Carl N. *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford UP, 1980.
- Dobson, Joanne. "Reclaiming Sentimental Literature." *American Literature* 69.2 (June 1997): 263-288.
- Ellis, William. *The Theory of the American Romance: An Ideology in American Intellectual History*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989.
- Fess, G. M. "Catharine Sedgwick and Crèvecoeur." *American Literature* 15 (1943/1944): 420-421.
- Fick, Thomas. "Catharine Sedgwick's 'Cacoethes Scribendi': Romance in Real Life." *Studies in Short Fiction* 27.4 (Fall 1990): 567-576.
- Fliegelman, Jay. *Prodigals and Pilgrims: The American Revolution Against Patriarchal Authority, 1750-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Ford, Douglas. "Inscribing the 'Impartial Observer' in Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *Legacy* 14.2 (1997): 81-92.

- Foster, Edward Halsey. Foreword. *Redwood* by Catharine Maria Sedgwick. New York: Garrett, 1969.
- Garvey, T. Gregory. "Risking Reprisal: Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* and the Legitimation of Public Action by Women." *ATQ* New Series 8.4 (Dec. 1994): 287-98.
- Gould, Philip. "Catharine Sedgwick's 'Recital' of the Pequot War." *American Literature* 66.4 (December 1994): 641-662.
- Gussman, Deborah. "Inalienable Rights: Fictions of Political Identity in *Hobomok* and *The Scarlet Letter*." *College Literature* 22.2 (June 1995): 58-80.
- Harris, Sharon M., ed. *Redefining the Political Novel: American Women Writers, 1797-1901*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1995. vii-xxiii.
- Higonnet, Margaret R. "Comparative Reading: Catharine M. Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *Legacy* 15.1 (1998): 17-22.
- Holly, Carol. "Nineteenth-Century Autobiographies of Affiliation: The Case of Catharine Sedgwick and Lucy Larcom." *American Autobiography: Retrospect and Prospect*. Ed. Paul John Eakin. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991. 216-234.
- Kalayjian, Patricia Larson. "Cooper and Sedgwick: Rivalry or Respect?" *James Fenimore Cooper Society Miscellaneous Papers* 4 (Sept. 1993): 9-14.
- Kammen, Michael. *A Season of Youth: The American Revolution and the Historical Imagination*. New York: Knopf, 1978.
- Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity." *American Literature* 70.3 (Sept. 1998): 581-606.

- Kelley, Mary. "A Woman Alone: Catharine Maria Sedgwick's Spinsterhood in Nineteenth-Century America." *New England Quarterly* 51 (June 1978): 209-25.
- "Catharine Maria Sedgwick, 1789-1867." *Legacy* 6.2 (Fall 1989): 43-50.
- "Negotiating a Self: The Autobiography and Journals of Catharine Maria Sedgwick." *New England Quarterly* 66.3 (Sept. 1993): 366-98.
- Kerber, Linda et al. "Forum: Beyond Roles, Beyond Spheres: Thinking About Gender in the Early Republic." *William and Mary Quarterly Third Series* 46.3 (July 1989): 565-585.
- Kerber, Linda K. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980.
- Kilcup, Karen L., ed. Introduction. *Nineteenth-Century American Women Writers: A Critical Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998.
- Karen, Kilcup, ed. *Soft Canons: American Women Writers and Masculine Tradition*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1999.
- Kolodny, Annette. *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1984.
- *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience and History in American Life and Letters*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975.
- Krumrey, Diane. "On the Frontier of Natural Language with the Eloquent Indians: Hobomok and Hope Leslie." *The Image of the Frontier in Literature, the Media, and Society*. Ed. Will Wright and Steven Kaplan. Pueblo, CO: Society for the

- Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery, University of Southern Colorado, 1997. 261-65.
- Lamonaca, Maria. "“She Could Make a Cake as Well as Books. . .”: Catharine Sedgwick, Anna Jameson, and the Construction of the Domestic Individual." *Women’s Writing* 2.3 (1995): 235-249.
- Levin, David. *Forms of Uncertainty: Essays in Historical Criticism*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1992.
- . *History as Romantic Art: Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1959.
- Machor, James L. "Historical Hermeneutics and Antebellum Fiction: Gender, Response Theory, and Interpretive Contexts." *Readers in History: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Contexts of Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. 54-84.
- Mitchell, Domhnall. "Acts of Intercourse: ‘Miscegenation’ in Three 19th Century American Novels." *American Studies in Scandinavia* 27.2 (1995): 126-141.
- Nelson, Dana. "Sympathy as Strategy in Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie*." *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in Nineteenth-Century America*. Ed. Shirley Samuels. New York: Oxford UP, 1992. 191-202.
- Pessen, Edward. *Jacksonian America: Society, Personality, and Politics*. Rev. ed. 1978. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1985.
- Pessen, Edward, ed. *The Many-Faceted Jacksonian Era: New Interpretations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977.

- Romero, Lora. *Home Fronts: Domesticity and Its Critics in the Antebellum United States*. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.
- Rothman, Ellen K. *Hands and Hearts: A History of Courtship in America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1987.
- Ruttenburg, Nancy. *Democratic Personality: Popular Voice and the Trial of American Authorship*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
- Samuels, Shirley, ed. *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Samuels, Shirley. *Romances of the Republic: Women, the Family, and Violence in the Literature of the Early American Nation*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Saulsbury, Rebecca R. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick." *Nineteenth-Century American Woman Writers: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Denise D. Knight. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1997. 351-60.
- Scheick, William. *Authority and Female Authorship in Colonial America*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1998.
- Silverman, Kenneth. *A Cultural History of the American Revolution*. New York: Columbia, 1987.
- Singley, Carol J. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: Radical Frontier Romance." *Desert, Garden, Margin, Range: Literature on the American Frontier*. Ed. Eric Heyne. New York: Twayne, 1992. 110-22.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1973.

- Smith, Rogers M. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1997.
- Sollors, Werner. *The Invention of Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford UP, 1989.
- Stern, Julia A. *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997.
- Todd, Janet. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of The American Revolution*. New York: Knopf, 1992.
- Zagarell, Sandra A. "Expanding 'America': Lydia Sigourney's *Sketch of Connecticut* and Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *Redefining the Political Novel: American Women Writers, 1797-1901*. Ed. Sharon M. Harris. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1995. 43-65.