

University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Puritans and Native Americans in C. Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*

Nikola Bajerová

Batchelor thesis

2023

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2020/2021

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Nikola Bajerová**
Osobní číslo: **H19402**
Studijní program: **B0231A090018 Anglický jazyk**
Specializace: **Anglický jazyk pro odbornou praxi**
Téma práce: **Puritans and Native Americans in C. Sedgwick's Hope Leslie**
Téma práce anglicky: **Puritans and Native Americans in C. Sedgwick's Hope Leslie**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Závěrečná bakalářská práce se bude věnovat románu *Hope Leslie* americké autorky Katherine M. Sedgwickové. V úvodu práce studentka nejprve s použitím relevantní sekundární literatury stručně nastíní dobový historický (případně politický) a literární kontext a zvolené dílo do něj zařadí. Jádrem práce bude analýza románu především z hlediska způsobu, jímž prezentuje mezirasové vztahy, stereotypy, puritánské osídlení, Indiány, konflikty mezi puritány a původními obyvateli, apod. Ve svých analýzách bude studentka dokládat svá tvrzení ukázkami z románu a opírat je či konfrontovat s kritickými zdroji. Závěrem analýzy přehledně shrne a vysloví obecnější závěr o ne/tradičnosti obrazu puritánů a Indiánů v *Hope Leslie*.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Rozsah grafických prací:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Bell, Michael Davitt. "History and Romance Convention in Catharine Sedgwick's 'Hope Leslie.'" *American Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (1970): 213–221.

Damon-Bach, Lucinda L. and Victoria Clements. *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*. Boston: UPNE, 2003.

Emerson, Amanda. "History, Memory, and the Echoes of Equivalence in Catharine Maria Sedgwick's Hope Leslie." *Legacy* 24. (2007): 24–49.

Han, K. M. *Hope Leslie: Novelistic Rewriting of American History*. Ohio State UP, 2013.

Hankins, L. V. "The voice of nature: Hope Leslie and Early American Romanticism." *Legacy* 31, no. 2 (2014): 160–182.

Higonnet, Margaret R. "Comparative Reading: Catharine M. Sedgwick's Hope Leslie." *Legacy* 15, no. 1 (1998): 17–22.

Insko, Jeffrey. "Anachronistic Imaginings: Hope Leslie's Challenge to Historicism." *American Literary History* 16, no. 2 (2004): 179–207.

Kalayjian, P. L. Revisioning America's (literary) Past: Sedgwick's Hope Leslie. *NWSA Journal* 8, no. 3 (1996): 63–78.

Pelegri, Teresa Requena. "Catharine Sedgwick's Hope Leslie (1827) and the Revision of the Puritan Past." *Coolabah* 3 (2009): 136–42.

Schenck, Andrew. "Deconstructing Puritan Values in Hope Leslie: A Statement of Individualism or Unity." *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 135 (2019): 223–243.

Weierman, Karen Woods. "Reading and Writing 'Hope Leslie': Catharine Maria Sedgwick's Indian 'Connections.'" *The New England Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (2002): 415–443.

Zagarell, Sandra A. "Expanding 'America': Lydia Sigourney's Sketch of Connecticut, Catharine Sedgwick's Hope Leslie." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 6, no. 2 (1987): 225–245.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

doc. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **1. května 2021**

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **2. května 2022**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D. v.r.

děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D. v.r.

vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2021

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem Puritans and Native Americans in C. Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 21.3.2023

Nikola Bajerová

Acknowledgment

I would like to sincerely express my gratitude to my supervisor, doc. Mgr. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D., for providing all the invaluable advice and guidance. Additionally, I would like to thank my fiancé for his endless support and cheerful words during my studies.

ANNOTATION

The bachelor thesis focuses on the novel *Hope Leslie* by Catherine M. Sedgwick. It examines the portrayal of interracial relations, stereotypes, and conflicts between Puritans and Native Americans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The thesis discusses the traditional elements of the frontier novel and compares the author with the more famous writer, James Fenimore Cooper. It also examines the depiction of women and their defiance of patriarchal authority. The aim is to ascertain whether Sedgwick abandoned the stereotypes connected to the mentioned cultures.

KEY WORDS

Catharine Maria Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, Puritans, Native Americans, colonial America, Pequot war

NÁZEV

Puritáni a indiáni v románu Katherine M. Sedgwickové *Hope Leslie*

ANOTACE

Tato bakalářská práce se zaměřuje na román *Hope Leslie* autorky Katherine M. Sedgwickové. Práce zkoumá způsoby, jimiž prezentuje mezirasové vztahy, stereotypy a konflikty mezi puritány a indiány. Dále pojednává o tradičních prvcích hraničářského románu a porovnává autorku se slavnějším spisovatelem, Jamesem Fenimore Cooperem. Zkoumá také vyobrazení žen a jejich vzdor vůči patriarchálním autoritám. Cílem práce je zjistit, zda autorka upustila od stereotypů, které jsou se zmíněnými kulturami spojovány.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Katherine Marie Sedgwicková, *Hope Leslie*, puritáni, indiáni, koloniální Amerika, Pequotská válka

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction..... | 8 |
| The Perspective of Colonial Americans and the American Novel..... | 9 |
| The Perception of Women in <i>Hope Leslie</i> | 17 |
| Equality or Superiority?..... | 24 |
| Conclusion..... | 39 |
| RESUMÉ..... | 41 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 45 |

Introduction

Hope Leslie or Early Times in Massachusetts, is a historical novel written by Catharine Maria Sedgwick and was published in 1827. The novel, which tells the story of a Puritan family and their life challenges, focuses on two fundamental issues. The first is the relations between New England's Puritans and Native Americans. The second is the role of women in society and the dominance of patriarchy which rules the female characters' life.

The first chapter of the thesis aims to discuss the perspective of the Puritans of Colonial America and how it led to the interracial conflicts concerning the Native Americans. Regarding the history of Colonial America, the thesis will give reasons for Sedgwick's decision to write *Hope Leslie*, namely the critique of the Puritan oppressive tendencies and the need for creating new, uniquely American literature which wanted to be independent of the European literary tendencies. It will also examine the aspects of the new American literary genre – the frontier romance and identify the differences between traditional narratives of this genre and Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*.

The second chapter examines the perception of women in the novel. Although Sedgwick focuses on courageous and independent female protagonists of both Puritan and Native American origins, who are not forced to atone for the freedom of their spirit and continuously defy the dominance of patriarchy, she portrays rather a wide range of female characters.

The final chapter aims not to discuss the true origins of the plot and the history itself but rather to examine the characters of both Puritan and Native American origins, their similarities, differences, and conflicts between the two cultures. It looks at the landscape and the possible distinction between the colony of Massachusetts and the Native American territory. Moreover, the aim is to focus on whether Sedgwick decided to abandon the stereotypes which are connected to the mentioned cultures, whether she managed to show the reader an untraditional view on the topic of Puritan-Native American relations and discuss how it deals with the American Puritans and their problematic relationship with New England's Native Americans.

The Perspective of Colonial Americans and the American novel

The story opens in London, but it follows the journey of William Fletcher and “drawing on seventeenth-century Puritan histories by John Winthrop, William Bradford, and William Hubbard, *Hope Leslie* presents an alternative history of the victories of God’s new chosen people over the ‘savages’” in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.¹ The colony was founded in 1628 by “a band of true believers”, who were “possessed of a conviction of absolute and invincible righteousness.”² Yet, looking back at the history of colonial America, the tension, violence, and destruction between these two races were significant. From my studies, I have learned that the English hunger for territory and power and the perhaps blinding beliefs of the Christian religion made it impossible for the colonizers to cooperate peacefully with native people, wherever on Earth. Therefore, the New England Puritans “saw the world as an arena where forces of light and holiness” fought those of “sin and darkness”.³ This philosophy “provided Puritan colonists with a theory for interpreting cultural differences between themselves and the native people whom they encountered in the New World.”⁴ The Native Americans were therefore believed to be the worshipers of the devil or malicious practitioners of witchcraft. At the same time, the Puritans saw themselves as the righteous forces of holiness. Because of such a mindset, New England’s first interracial war broke out – the Pequot War of 1636-37. According to Puritan chroniclers, the Pequot war was a deliberately intended conflict and slaughter of civilians when “many of them burned alive when their homes were put to the torch by English troops.”⁵ Yet, in most accounts of the war, it were the Pequots who “were portrayed as the aggressors.”⁶

The reasons why Sedgwick chose to write about this topic might be simply because it was fascinating or because it was ever-present. But her evident dissatisfaction with the Anglo-American society might also be the reason. As Andrew Schenck points out, *Hope Leslie* is an attempt to undermine classical republicanism, a conservative patriarchal system that represses not only Native Americans but women as well.⁷ The novel seems to criticize not only the bad relationship and intolerance between Puritans and Native Americans but by inconspicuously

¹ Karen Woods Weierman, “Reading and Writing ‘Hope Leslie’: Catharine Maria Sedgwick’s Indian ‘Connections.’” *The New England Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (2002): 416.

² Michael Zuckerman, “The Social Context of Democracy in Massachusetts.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 25, no. 4 (1968): 525.

³ William S. Simmons, “Cultural Bias in the New England Puritans’ Perception of Indians.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (1981): 56.

⁴ William S. Simmons, “Cultural Bias”, 56.

⁵ Alfred A. Cave, *The Pequot War*, (Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 2.

⁶ Cave, *The Pequot War*, 4.

⁷ Andrew Schenck, “Deconstructing Puritan Values in *Hope Leslie*: A Statement of Individualism or Unity.” *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 135 (2019): 226.

shifting the focus on gender, also the position of women in society and social justice. “Hope Leslie opposes the dominant culture specifically in two regards: first, by contesting the cultural construction of female identity, and second, by challenging the perception of and political response to Native Americans.”⁸ Although the central part of the story takes place years after the Pequot war, Magawisca still reflects on it throughout the story. She talks about her memories of the Pequot tribe, especially those of her family being massacred. She describes her fear and the powerlessness of the Native Americans against the colonizers and their weapons, which were advanced in comparison to those of their own. By that, she gives an alternative interpretation of the war, as most witnesses are Anglo-American. She challenges both Everell’s and the reader’s perspectives on the violence performed on the Native Americans. Magawisca’s influence on Everell was probably so strong that even after the battle at Bethel, when Magawisca’s and Oneco’s father, the chief of the Pequots, Mononotto, attacked Bethel and killed Everell’s mother and his siblings, his view of the Native Americans stayed relatively unchanged. He understood why they took such cruel actions and kept his mind open to distinguish the bad and evil, not based on race.

Furthermore, as the Puritan settlement increased in size and the Native American tribes were gradually forced to go westward, Sedgwick’s interest in this part of colonial history may have stemmed from her awareness of the forthcoming Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the controversy surrounding it as tens of thousands of Native Americans were forced to relocate. According to Karen Woods Wierman, not only does Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie* treat the removal of the Pequot tribe in the seventeenth century, but she foreshadows the removal concerning the Stockbridge tribe in the eighteenth century and the removal of Cherokees, which have promoted awareness of the Indian Removal controversy during the period of her life.⁹ “Expelled from their own lands and reduced to a chaotic and cataclysmic element, the Indians had finally become a theme for an artist who intended to integrate them into a new American myth.”¹⁰

And as the United States was defining itself, writers aimed to create genuinely American literature. Since the themes of Sedgwick’s novels range from conflicts between seventeenth-century Puritans and Native Americans to “a dissection of a Jacksonian America dominated by commercialism”, Sedgwick belongs among the most influential authors of the first half of the

⁸ Patricia L. Kalayjian *Revisioning America's (literary) Past: Sedgwick's Hope Leslie*. *NWSA Journal* 8, no. 3 (1996): 64.

⁹ Weierman, “Reading and Writing”, 415.

¹⁰ Martin Procházka, David Robbins, “AMERICAN LITERATURE: Beginnings to 1914” In *Lectures on American literature*, ed. Justin Quinn (Praha: Karolinum, 2011), 68.

19th century and is often ranked as a founder of her nation's literature among James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, and William Cullen Bryant.¹¹ Aiming at creating a distinctly American novel, namely the western myth, she combines the captivity narrative and the frontier romance while exploring the issues of American society during a time of profound change. Furthermore, she interweaves four separate plots in order to achieve such a purpose. Those are the captivity subplot of Faith renamed as White Bird and the intermarriage of her and Oneco; the love subplot concerning Everell, Esther, and Hope; the dishonorable antagonist Sir Philip Gardiner and his attempt to seduce Hope; and the subplot regarding Magawisca and the Pequot tribe which, rather untraditionally, gives voice to the Native Americans and shows them in a sympathetic light. Therefore, as one of the first American, female writers, Sedgwick told complex stories which simultaneously supported the American Puritan ideal, while portraying diverse characters regardless of gender and placing strong and independent heroines at the center of her novels. This, according to Schenck, is her attempt to promote the desired new American identity, while simultaneously supporting democratic, individualistic principles that encourage racial equality and feminism.¹²

According to Laurel Hankins, Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* contains elements of the early burgeoning American Romanticism, which is apparent from her choice of chapter epigraphs that quote Eliza Lee Cabot Follen, William Cullen Bryant or Fitz-Greene Halleck and their poetry.¹³ "American Romanticism (1820s-1860s) was not only a time when American Literature received formative impulses from Europe (from English and German literature, philosophy and aesthetic thought – Scott, Wordsworth, Coleridge)", it was also the period when genuinely American literature emerged by dealing with the colonial past.¹⁴

Taking a closer look at *Hope Leslie*, Theresa Requena Pelegrí draws attention to the combination of genres, specifically the historical romance, the sentimental tradition, and the captivity narrative.¹⁵ "By fusing Puritan historical accounts with fiction, Sedgwick's narrative technique succeeds in foregrounding the partiality of historical accounts in opposition to their supposedly objective exposition of facts and in this way the text manages to challenge Puritan self-righteous historiography."¹⁶

¹¹ Mary Kelley, "Catharine Maria Sedgwick (1789-1867)." *Legacy* 6, no. 2 (1989): 44.

¹² Schenck, "Deconstructing Puritan Values", 223.

¹³ Laurel V. Hankins, "The Voice of Nature: Hope Leslie and Early American Romanticism", 161.

¹⁴ Procházka, Robbins, "AMERICAN LITERATURE", 23.

¹⁵ Teresa Requena Pelegrí, "Catharine Sedgwick's Hope Leslie (1827) and the Revision of the Puritan Past.", *Coolabah* 3 (2009): 138.

¹⁶ Pelegrí, "Catharine Sedgwick's Hope Leslie", 138.

The frontier romance, a uniquely American genre that combines elements of the captivity narrative with the major features of the English historical romance, emerged in the 1790s and declined in the 1850s.¹⁷ The main conventions of frontier romance are

(1) a racist-nationalistic philosophy of white-Indian relations; (2) captivity as the central plot episode; and (3) stereotyped Native American characters”...”; (4) a passive, imperiled white heroine who is the object of white and Indian attempts to possess her; and (5) a white hero who rescues the heroine from captivity.¹⁸

Other conventions that are incorporated into the story of *Hope Leslie* “include a white hero and heroine of aristocratic lineage, who are married at the end of the novel, and a grounding in historical data and the use of historical personages.¹⁹ Regarding the fifth convention, rather than relying on a traditional male hero, Sedgwick chooses Hope and Magawisca as the heroines of the story and not Everell, even though he tries to follow his heroic tendencies. During the three major events of the story, it is never Everell to successfully rectify the situations despite his efforts. When captured and facing near death, he is unable to flee Mononotto. It is Magawisca who successfully rebels against her father and, by her planned intervention, saves Everell’s life. Then, when Magawisca is imprisoned, he tries to free her by removing the bars from her prison window but fails to complete his mission. It is Hope, who, with the help of Master Craddock, smuggles her from imprisonment. Lastly, when Hope fights for her freedom after the reunion with her long-lost sister and the complex events following it, Everell plays no part in her triumphal escape.

Unlike traditional captivity narrative, it is Sir Philip Gardiner who tries to abduct Hope and therefore is the originator of the captivity plot. As Leland Person argues, it is Hope Leslie, who is in far greater danger from the white, civilized Gardiner and not her sister, who faces abduction from the Native Americans.²⁰ “If Hope’s experience is any indication, in fact, Faith’s captivity and marriage to Oneco is a rescue, a liberation from the designs of a patriarchal society.”²¹

Sedgwick not only uses historical personages, such as John Winthrop, but she undeniably draws inspiration from her personal life in numerous aspects of the novel. When Magawisca jumps in front of Everell when he is about to be killed by Mononotto, she loses an arm. There is an

¹⁷ Cheri Louise Ross, ““(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE: CATHARINE MARIA SEDGWICK’S ‘HOPE LESLIE.’” *CLA Journal* 39, no. 3 (1996): 322.

¹⁸ Cheri Louise Ross, ““(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE””, 322.

¹⁹ Cheri Louise Ross, ““(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE””, 322.

²⁰ Leland S. Person, “The American Eve: Miscegenation and a Feminist Frontier Fiction.” *American Quarterly* 37, no. 5 (1985): 680.

²¹ Person, “The American Eve”, 680.

undeniable similarity to the legend of Pocahontas and John Smith in this act of bravery and the intended sacrifice for a white male. Still, there might have been another event behind the inspiration for Magawisca, and that is Mumbet. In 1780, Mumbet, an enslaved woman who was abused by her mistress, approached Theodore Sedgwick and begged him for protection.²² One day, her abusive mistress wanted to injure another enslaved person with a shovel but Mumbet interfered, placing her outstretched arm in front of the slave.²³ With the help of Theodore Sedgwick, Mumbet later gained her legal freedom in court and changed her name to Elizabeth Freeman, a direct ancestor of W. E. B. DuBois.²⁴ Mumbet's past, however, stayed with Sedgwick, and we can see it in *Hope Leslie* not only through Magawisca's defensive act but also by the "repeated liberations of oppressed minority women."²⁵

According to Patricia Larson Kalayjian, another person behind the inspiration for the novel is Eunice Williams, a distant relative of Sedgwick, who was captured by the natives at an early age and who later married an Indian, refusing to be returned to civilization.²⁶ In the novel, Hope's sister Faith also gets kidnapped by the Native Americans. She spends the rest of her life with Oneco, her Native American husband, rejecting assimilation into her Puritan family's society, even after reuniting with her sister Hope. Therefore, we can presume that Sedgwick drew inspiration from this story as Eunice's and Faith's fates resemble each other.

When comparing the works of James Fenimore Cooper and Catharine Maria Sedgwick, there are some parallels and variances in terms of colonial Americans' preconceptions of Native Americans. Both authors opted to focus their efforts on the Native Americans. But "in James Fenimore Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans*, a white protagonist named Hawkeye concludes that 'Indians know the nature of the woods, as it might be by instinct!'"²⁷ In this quote, you can see a common 19th-century misconception that shows Native Americans as wild savages united with nature. According to Schenk, this idealized notion of people, who are one with nature, fails, however, to show their humanity.²⁸ Sedgwick's novel *Hope Leslie* manages to describe the Native Americans in a more complex and realistic way. Scratching under the surface, she presents the Pequot tribe as competent since numerous native characters interact with their

²² John Matteson, "Introduction to the Dover Edition", *Hope Leslie* Or, Early Times in Massachusetts (Dover Publications, Inc., 2011), vii.

²³ Matteson, "Introduction", vii.

²⁴ Matteson, "Introduction", vii.

²⁵ Matteson, "Introduction", vii.

²⁶ Kalayjian, "Revisioning America's (literary) Past", 70.

²⁷ Schenk, "Deconstructing Puritan Values", 223.

²⁸ Schenk, "Deconstructing Puritan Values", 224.

Puritan neighbors without difficulty, being able to adapt themselves while simultaneously being true to their own culture. And although the native characters are what we would call “people of the forest”, their personalities are quite complex and surpass this stereotype. The perfect example is Magawisca, the Pequot princess who acts bravely as she defies both the Puritans and Native Americans when she and her moral compass disagree with their actions. Through these actions, she is showing the “courage and dignity of her soul.”²⁹ It would be anticipated that when under imprisonment, Magawisca would be at mercy of her capturers. But her inner strength and pride set her apart. Before her trial, she, “rejecting with disdain the Governor’s offer of an English dress”, dresses in a costume of her people, which is genuinely showing us her pride in the Native Americans.³⁰ Yet, she does not seem to be out of her element in the Puritan colony. Sedgwick even compares her to Admiral Nelson. At her trial, Magawisca manages to confidently contradict the antagonist of the story, Sir Philip Gardiner and she easily advocates for her rights and freedom. This makes her an active participant in the story.

According to Patrick Colm Hogan, another aspect that makes Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie* progressive and barely occurs in Cooper’s novels is the lack of rejection of intergroup anger and the assumption that the members of the minority group wish to be accepted by the dominant group.³¹ “The Indians of North America are, perhaps, the only race of men of whom it may be said, that though conquered, they were never enslaved. They could not submit, and live. When made captives, they courted death, and exulted in torture”.³² Their “high-souled courage and patriotism” is the cause of misunderstanding from the Puritans’ viewpoint who, because of this misunderstanding, regarded them as “surly dogs who preferred to die rather than live, from no other motives than a stupid or malignant obstinacy.”³³

Furthermore, Sedgwick focuses mainly on the defiance of women, such as Nelema and Magawisca. In comparison with Cooper’s novels, Edward Foster says that Cooper’s works “never center primarily on women – or ‘females’ as he often called them” and that “he had a decided preference for passive rather than self-reliant women”.³⁴ When Mrs. Fletcher speaks with Nelema and tries to argue that the reason why she sees the world as a rough place is because

²⁹ Catherine M. Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie Or, Early Times in Massachusetts* (Mineola, Dover Publications, Inc., 2011), 292.

³⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 292.

³¹ Patrick C. Hogan, *American Literature and American Identity a Cognitive Cultural Study From the Revolution Through the Civil War*. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), 67.

³² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 4.

³³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 4.

³⁴ Edward Halsey Foster, *Catharine Maria Sedgwick* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974) 93.

she is old “and the days have come to her that have no pleasure in them” bidding her to look at her happy son Everell.³⁵ Not only she refuses to learn from his innocent happiness, but she gives reason for her stance by saying:

I had sons too – and grandsons; but where are they? They trod the earth as lightly as that boy; but they have fallen like our forest trees, before the stroke of the English axe. Of all my race, there is not one, now, in whose veins my blood runs. Sometimes, when the spirits of the storm are howling about my wigwam, I hear the voices of my children crying for vengeance, and then I could myself deal the death-blow.³⁶

As she evidently suffered a great loss and not one of her family members is alive because of the Puritans’ violence, hatred towards all the Puritans and the desire for collective punishment could be anticipated. Yet Nelema acknowledges different individuals and the particular relationship with Mrs. Fletcher by saying “fear me not, I have had kindness from thee, thy blankets have warmed me, I have been fed from thy table, and drank of thy cup”, recognizing the difference between the Fletchers and the people who are responsible for the death of her family.³⁷ She, however, expresses the lack of help Mrs. Fletcher would receive from her if vengeance were to come her way and gives reason to her stance:

They spared not our homes; there where our men spoke, where was heard the song of the maiden, and the laugh of our children; there now all is silence, dust and ashes. I can neither harm thee, nor help thee. When the stream of vengeance rolls over the land the tender shoot must be broken, and the goodly tree uprooted, that gave its pleasant shade and fruits to all.³⁸

It is evident that Nelema suffered too significant a loss and that her broken spirit demands justice but she leaves it to the hands of a greater power.

In the case of Magawisca, her stance is more balanced. Hogan draws attention to “the moral complexity of situations faced by many Native Americans”.³⁹ Such a morally complex situation can be seen when Magawisca is uncertain whether to warn Mrs. Fletcher about the plotted attack on Bethel, but by doing so, endanger her father’s life. Although she does not warn her about the oncoming danger, she, repeatedly, tries to revolt against her father by, at first, trying to persuade him not to attack and later abduct Everell, urging him to rethink his vengeful plans. When Mononotto resists her urging, he says that “cries and screams are for children and cowards.”⁴⁰ But she is persistent “and I am a coward”,..., “if to fear my father should do a

³⁵ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 37.

³⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 37.

³⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 37.

³⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 37-38.

³⁹ Hogan, *American Literature and American Identity*, 68.

⁴⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 77.

wrong, even to an enemy, is cowardice.”⁴¹ Then, when she fails to persuade him, she defies him by jumping in front of Everell when he is about to be executed, enabling him to flee his preservers and claiming that she bought his life with her own.

When put on a trial conducted by Puritans and pressed to defend herself, she denies the legitimacy of the court, which has, by force, enforced its jurisdiction. “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 acknowledge your authority.”⁴² Furthermore, she questions the Puritans’ principles of truth from the Bible when saying “I know that it contains thy rule, and it may be needful for thy mixed race; but the Great Spirit hath written his laws on the hearts of his original children, and we need it not”.⁴³ She seems to voice the unnecessary and invalidity of the Bible while claiming herself one of God’s original children. Commenting on these quotes, Jeffrey Insko argues that “the native Magawisca becomes a protonationalist, less an enemy than a source of founding principles”.⁴⁴ This would explain not only why Magawisca is proudly dressed in her native gown, manifesting her national pride, but “why her first words to the judges echo the political philosophy of the Declaration of Independence”.⁴⁵

After emphasizing that the Puritan rule is perhaps needful for them but not for her, she is however proclaimed a being of Satan’s heritage by Sir Philip Gardiner. According to Schenck, Sedgwick, indeed, challenges historical accounts which portray Native Americans as inferior beings.⁴⁶ This can be seen in Magawisca’s demand for “death or liberty” as she impatiently begs her capturers rather to kill her than to imprison her.⁴⁷ Starting with Everell exclaiming “In the name of God, liberty!”, everyone responds to this demand by shouting “liberty!-liberty! Grant the prisoner liberty!”⁴⁸ Because she considers imprisonment worse than death, she implores the council not to prolong the trial, waiting for her father’s testimony, and proclaims herself an enemy of the Puritans, declaring “The sun-beam and the shadow cannot mingle”.⁴⁹ She tries to remind Governor Winthrop of his promise to her mother that her children would be treated with kindness. All these acts of Magawisca’s defense relent the Governor, making him

⁴¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 77.

⁴² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 297.

⁴³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 298.

⁴⁴ Jeffrey Insko, “Anachronistic Imaginnings: Hope Leslie’s Challenge to Historicism.” *American Literary History* 16, no. 2 (2004): 179.

⁴⁵ Insko, “Anachronistic Imaginnings”, 179.

⁴⁶ Schenck, “Deconstructing Puritan Values,” 226.

⁴⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 303.

⁴⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 304.

⁴⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 303.

turn away to hide his tears so that he does not show that his heart was touched. His awakening is, however, disrupted by one of the judges who exclaims:

For whom would you stop the course of justice? For one who is charged before you, with having visited every tribe on the shores and in the forests, to quicken the savages to diabolical revenge!--...--for one who hath entered into an open league and confederacy with Satan against you! – for one, who, as ye have testimony within yourselves, in that her looks and words do so prevail over your judgement, is presently aided and abetted by the arch enemy of mankind!⁵⁰

After expressing the stereotypical notion that the Native Americans are the children of the devil, he then calls upon the Governor to adjourn the trial, to which Governor Winthrop agrees, ignoring Magawisca's insistence and the previously mentioned promise. Although Magawisca's defense caused some to be infuriated, she managed to gain the respect of the audience. "She seems to be making the American nation possible, forcing the Puritan community to become a conglomeration of individuals who may very well each have their own opinions and, importantly, emotions about Magawisca's trial"⁵¹. Although she is a Native American, seen by the majority of the Puritans as evil heathen, she manages to evoke emotions and sympathy in the Puritans.

The Perception of Women in *Hope Leslie*

Sedgwick opens the story in England, introducing a young William Fletcher, an uncle and an heir to an eminent Sir William Fletcher, who wishes to marry his only daughter, Alice, to his nephew. When his plan to make these two young characters fall in love is successful, he tries to force his nephew to forego his Puritan inclinations as he demands "that the boy be taught unquestioning and unqualified loyalty to his sovereign – the Alpha and Omega of political duty."⁵² In his opinion, the Puritans are seditious, mischief-brewing, mad canting fools and misdoers. The young Fletcher, however, refuses to disavow Puritanism and flees the temptation of Alice's love by taking passage to the colony of Massachusetts. As claimed by Christopher Castiglia, "Sedgwick shows Puritanism breaking the patrimony of traditional English values" as "the greedy and manipulative uncle William portrays Puritanism in terms of a

⁵⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 304.

⁵¹ Gustavus Stadler, "Magawisca's Body of Knowledge: Nation-Building in *Hope Leslie*?" *Yale Journal of Criticism* 12.1 (1999): 52.

⁵² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 5.

matrilineage”.⁵³ Such can be seen in the quote “Liberty, what is it! Daughter of disloyalty and mother of all misrule – who, from the hour that she tempted our first parents to forfeit paradise, hath ever worked mischief to our race.”⁵⁴ According to Judith Fetterley, labeling liberty as female enables Sedgwick to propose her own theory for the origins of America in female terms, rather than those of her contemporaries who gendered the origins of the American nation in intensely masculine terms.⁵⁵ “Sedgwick, a woman whose central literary concern was the issue of autonomy, discovered in colonial Indian history not only a story worth telling but also a struggle that in many ways paralleled the cultural experience of Anglo women.”⁵⁶

As stated by Sally McMillan and Connie Wilson Anderson, the rise in popularity of the separate spheres ideology, which held that women and men were best suited for different realms of influence had an impact on the development of women’s culture.⁵⁷ Based on this ideology, men should concentrate on national politics and the economy, while women should be concerned solely with domestic issues and the duties of motherhood. Mary Kelley argues that Sedgwick does not seem to demand that all women’s political and economic duties should be equal to those of their men counterparts. She states that “Sedgwick’s model of gender relations presumed different roles for women and men.”⁵⁸ Yet others, such as Pelegrí say that Sedgwick does in fact criticize “the Puritan wives’ blind obedience”.⁵⁹ She draws evidence from the characters of Hope and Magawisca and their participation in their trial. “By allowing them to speak in their trial and thus publicly occupy a space that had been traditionally banned to women and female characters, Hope and Magawisca experience the same transition that was taking place for women writers in early nineteenth-century.”⁶⁰ Traditionally, “unless, like Anne Hutchinson, they had committed transgressions, women’s voices were silenced in these male-authored chronicles.”⁶¹ But in *Hope Leslie*, Sedgwick builds the story on strong and independent women, whose voices are heard, thus she diametrically opposes the experience of the characters to what real women experienced. “By creating progressive white and Native

⁵³ Christopher Castiglia, “IN PRAISE OF EXTRA-VAGANT WOMEN: HOPE LESLIE AND THE CAPTIVITY ROMANCE.” *Legacy* 6, no. 2 (1989): 6.

⁵⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 6.

⁵⁵ Judith Fetterley, “‘My Sister! My Sister!’: The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie*” *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (1998): 493.

⁵⁶ Kalayjian, “Revisioning America’s (literary) Past”, 64.

⁵⁷ Sally McMillan and Connie Wilson Anderson, “Novel Identities: Catharine Maria Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie* as a Mentoring Framework for Curriculum Studies and Life Journeys.” *Journal of Thought* 44, no. 3–4 (2009): 82.

⁵⁸ Mary Kelley, Catharine Maria Sedgwick, “Negotiating a Self: The Autobiography and Journals of Catharine Maria Sedgwick.” *The New England Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (1993): 368.

⁵⁹ Pelegrí, “Catharine Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie*”, 141.

⁶⁰ Pelegrí, “Catharine Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie*”, 141.

⁶¹ Cheri Louise Ross, “‘(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE’”, 332.

American female characters, Sedgwick inserted women and Native Americans into the body politic”.⁶²

Both Hope and Magawisca are suppressed by the men of their communities. This is because “the hierarchy and deference under assault in the social and political relations of the early republic had also characterized gender relations in colonial society.”⁶³ No matter the social status, women were always seen as men’s subordinates. They were bound by coverture, which legally submerged the wife’s property to her husband’s, and they were not allowed to participate in the nation’s body politic.⁶⁴ Concurrently, however, women were provided with more learning opportunities which slowly helped to erase the inequality in literacy between men and women because it was expected from them to “foster the necessary elements of virtue in their sons and to encourage the same in their husbands.”⁶⁵ There is a possible parallel between Native Americans and the English women and that is the social dilemma they were faced with – “they had to either submit to the dominant culture or be demonized by the white males.”⁶⁶ Yet, Both Hope and Magawisca take actions to “redress the wrongs of their separate but equally male-dominated societies” as they “both defy patriarchal authority and risk their lives to rescue captives of the other race.”⁶⁷ Moreover, Hope Leslie might be advocated as an exception to the traditional female inferiority when it comes to education. Throughout the novel, it is evident that Hope is not only one of the best-educated characters but she is also quick-witted. She, however, falls short because of her gender. Hope is often ruled by passion and acts independently, despite her family member’s convictions. Her unconventional opinions and actions are constantly questioned and it is her charisma that helps her escape tricky situations. With the help of her charisma, she manages to make a successful plan to help Magawisca escape prison when Everell’s attempt fails.

Before going any further, it is essential to stress the importance of incorporating letters into the narrative of Hope Leslie. Only in letters, do the characters reveal their “true” identity. This can be proved by Sir Philip’s letters, as only after reading those, the reader discovers his real self and becomes aware of attempt to manipulate the Puritan characters. “Introducing Hope Leslie

⁶² Shelby L. Crosby, “THE BODY POLITIC AND CULTURAL MISCEGENATION IN SEDGWICK’S ‘HOPE LESLIE: OR, EARLY TIMES IN THE MASSACHUSETTS.’” *CLA Journal* 54, no. 4 (2011): 338.

⁶³ Kelley, Sedgwick, “Negotiating a Self”, 373.

⁶⁴ Kelley, Sedgwick, “Negotiating a Self”, 373.

⁶⁵ Kelley, Sedgwick, “Negotiating a Self”, 374.

⁶⁶ Kalayjian, “Revisioning America’s (literary) Past”, 64.

⁶⁷ Cheri Louise Ross, ““(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE””, 333.

through letters authenticates her character, giving the reader grounds for believing that she really is what she appears to be.”⁶⁸

When writing to Everell about her successful persuasion of her father to become one of the men set forth to climb a nearby mountain, Hope Leslie claims that America “develops faculties that young ladies, in England, were unconscious of possessing”.⁶⁹ By this, Sedgwick indicates the difference between the “New” and the “Old” world. Fetterley states that “young women in England possess the same faculties as young women in America, but England keeps women unconscious and therefore undeveloped.”⁷⁰ Whereas America allows women, such as Hope Leslie, “to recognize in herself the same faculties developed and promoted in her ‘brother’ – namely, those quintessential American virtues of independence, self-reliance, and self-determination.”⁷¹ By allowing women to think critically, as can be seen in the case of Hope, they act upon their own moral compass, challenging authority if necessary. “Like the bird that spreads his wings and soars above the limits by which each man fences in his own narrow domain”, Hope “permitted her mind to expand beyond the contracted boundaries of sectarian faith.”⁷² She not only defies authorities in regard to her physical freedom, “she insists on intellectual freedom as well, having learned from the arguments of those around her to doubt all dogma”.⁷³ By organizing Nelema’s and Magawisca’s escapes, she seriously challenges the decisions in matters involving the Puritan colony and the public good. This shows that Hope, as the characters are forced to decide whether to listen to the voice of authority or to the voice of their conscience, choosing to act ethnically rather than according to their own social norms, is willing to commit treason when plotting against the decisions of the magistrates. “Witty, smart, compassionate, gutsy, Hope Leslie is a lover of self and a challenger of arbitrary authority who, while insisting on her physical and intellectual freedom, is willing to take extreme risks for what she believes.”⁷⁴ According to John Matteson,

Sedgwick interweaves this personal conflict with the essential political problem of a colonial society: does that society behave best when it merely carries on the principle it has brought from the mother country, or must it necessarily absorb the influences of the colonized territory, thereby arriving at a new concept of what constitutes the moral, good life?⁷⁵

⁶⁸ Fetterley, “‘My Sister! My Sister!’”, 496.

⁶⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 102.

⁷⁰ Fetterley, “‘My Sister! My Sister!’”, 499.

⁷¹ Fetterley, “‘My Sister! My Sister!’”, 499.

⁷² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 126-127.

⁷³ Fetterley, “‘My Sister! My Sister!’”, 499.

⁷⁴ Fetterley, “‘My Sister! My Sister!’”, 501.

⁷⁵ Matteson, “Introduction”, 4.

Despite this defiance, she is described as infallible. This can be seen in the following quote by Aunt Grafton: “It’s what everybody knows, who knows Hope, that she never did a wrong thing.”⁷⁶ But as the story progresses, the male authorities find themselves troubled by her lawlessness. According to Governor Winthrop, Hope lacks “that passiveness that, next to godliness, is a woman’s best virtue.”⁷⁷ As a solution, they try to immobilize her with marriage. This patriarchal tool is, however, later found faulty, because Sir Philip, the man that Hope is supposed to get married to, is the antagonist of the story.

When writing to Everell, Hope admits her self-will by declaring “As you already know, Everell, therefore it is no confession, I love to have my own way”.⁷⁸ Such can be seen when she insists on staying alone overnight on an island with Digby, the former servant at Bethel. Digby addresses her aspiration to have her own way in the context of America “Why this having our own way, is what everybody likes; it’s the privilege we came to this wilderness world for”.⁷⁹ Yet, Fetterley states, that “he also subtly undercuts the legitimacy of Hope’s insistence by suggesting the potential irresponsibility of her willfulness”.⁸⁰ She bases this on Digby saying “I always said, Miss Hope, it was a pure mercy you chose the right way, for you always had yours”.⁸¹ Furthermore, as the story progresses, it is apparent that Hope does not always choose the right way as implied by Digby. Hope finds herself in situations where the use of manipulation is required, otherwise, she would seriously endanger the lives of herself or her loved ones. For instance, when in need of getting past Barnaby, a jail supervisor, she relies on her feminine charisma and bursts into tears, knowing not only that “men’s hearts melt in women’s tears”, but also that he will not be able to resist the “one who had been an angel of mercy to his habitation”.⁸² “Such deep distress by his refusal of a favor makes him believe that “there could be no harm in granting” it.⁸³

Throughout the story, Everell Fletcher seems to be highly desired by all the young female characters. A “love quadrangle” develops between Hope, Magawisca, Ester, and Everell. The question that arises is, whether girls desire him based on their romantic feelings or because he portrays a desired state of being. Fetterley argues that Everell functions as a “mirror”, enabling

⁷⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 183.

⁷⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 158.

⁷⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 117.

⁷⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 231.

⁸⁰ Fetterley, ““My Sister! My Sister!””, 502.

⁸¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 231.

⁸² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 319-320.

⁸³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 319-320.

women in America to imagine themselves as “men”.⁸⁴ Even with Hope, “this need is not the need of romantic love, of opposites attracting and completing each other; rather, it is the need to discover someone just like her, someone who will identify with and be identical to her, who will mirror and support her.”⁸⁵ Cheri Louise Ross voices the fact, that Everell and Hope do not hold conventional Puritan beliefs, yet they do share many mutual attitudes.⁸⁶ Everell, unlike Hope, fails to execute his plans successfully. Nonetheless, he does not feel bitter because of it and respects Hope as his equal. Hope sees Everell’s positive traits and given her strong need for independence, she does not wish to be with a strong-willed man who would desire to dominate her. She falls for him because he respects and supports her when others blame her for being irrational and disobedient.

Although the focus is mainly on the two main heroines – Hope Leslie and Magawisca, two young women who represent the ideals for women in the 19th century, as “they are participatory, less subservient and more involved in the process of leadership”, Sedgwick presents us quite a wide range of female characters.⁸⁷ Looking back at the story of Alice Fletcher, who was forced to stay in the mother country and marry a man of her father’s choosing, Sedgwick shows the fate of biological women in a country where they have no chance of becoming equal to men, as they are “subject to patriarchal control”.⁸⁸

Another important female character is Esther Downing, who seems to be the complete opposite of Hope Leslie. When Hope relies on herself, Esther submits to her elders and trusts them blindly. “You do allow yourself too much liberty of thought and word; you certainly know that we owe implicit deference to our elders and superiors; - we ought to be guided by their advice, and governed by their authority.”⁸⁹ Esther does not seem to trust her own judgment and opinion as Hope does, and if not, she chooses not to voice her disagreement. Hope, opposing the passive Esther, voices her opinion on submitting to authority when saying she “would not be a machine, to be moved at the pleasure of anybody that happened to be a little older” than her, but reveals that she is willing to submit to Mr. Fletcher, as “he never requires submission.”⁹⁰

⁸⁴ Fetterley, ““My Sister! My Sister!””, 498-499.

⁸⁵ Fetterley, ““My Sister! My Sister!””, 497.

⁸⁶ Cheri Louise Ross, “(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE”, 331.

⁸⁷ Schenck, “Deconstructing Puritan Values”, 237.

⁸⁸ Fetterley, ““My Sister! My Sister!””, 494.

⁸⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 186.

⁹⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 187.

In the story, Esther is described as “a reserved, tender, and timid cast of character”.⁹¹ These qualities are the foundation of a perfectly submissive woman who is compliant and devoted to authoritative figures. However, as the story is ending, Esther decides not to marry, rejecting the common conviction that a woman must have a husband and children in order to have a fulfilled life and to be an essential part of the Puritan community. Shelby L. Crosby calls this decision an act of pure rebellion and proclaims Esther the most rebellious character of the story as she, by remaining single, defies societal standards of womanhood.⁹² Through the narrator, we discover that Esther’s singlehood is not due to the lack of suitors as “her hand was often and eagerly sought”, but she came to a discovery “that marriage is not *essential* to the contentment, the dignity, or the happiness of woman.”⁹³ Sedgwick justifies Esther’s rebellion by asserting that her singlehood helped her to stay attentive, avoiding the distractions of married life and motherhood and that, by being able to focus on her devotion many “might have rejoiced that she did not give to a party what was meant for mankind.”⁹⁴ Here, Sedgwick once again draws inspiration from her personal life as she, “in contrast to nine out of ten women in the nineteenth century”, also stayed unmarried.⁹⁵

Regarding the historical situation of Puritan women, they were expected to be meek and submissive, just as can be seen with Mrs. Fletcher or Mrs. Winthrop. Without any legal rights to own land, pursue education, or find employment without their husband’s consent, their responsibility was to take care of the children while maintaining their homes.⁹⁶ But Esther opposes this belief by choosing to be an independent, self-sufficient woman.

Similar to Esther, Rosa, the supposed page of Sir Philip Gardiner, also submits to the male authority, while viewing religion and romance to be the primary concern of her life. “Though superficially Rosa appears the opposite of the severe, chaste, and religious Esther, their equal susceptibility to romantic love, with its attendant addiction to masculine authority and consequent lack of self-reverence, links them and distinguishes them from Hope.”⁹⁷ Although Sir Philip mistreats her, she loves him unconditionally and is very jealous of Hope. She sees Hope as a rival because her master fancies her, and wants to marry her, but as Hope does not reciprocate his feelings, he intends to abduct her and force her into marriage.

⁹¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 138.

⁹² Crosby, “The Body Politics”, 343.

⁹³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 363.

⁹⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 363.

⁹⁵ Mary Kelley, “Negotiating a Self”, 384.

⁹⁶ Crosby, “The Body Politics”, 344.

⁹⁷ Fetterley, ““My Sister! My Sister!””, 503.

Overall, Mrs. Fletcher seems to represent the “old blood” – an old generation of women that are submissive and view men as superior. They are meek, obeying the husband whereas Hope Leslie represents “young blood”. She is not afraid to follow her own principles, she is not submissive but acts bravely according to her moral beliefs. “Mrs. Fletcher received his decision as all wives of that age of undisputed masculine supremacy (or most of those of our less passive age) would do, with meek submission.”⁹⁸ Mrs. Fletcher seems to be the perfect example of a Puritan wife who is, at all times, passively obedient to her husband and who does not under any circumstances question him. If she does question someone, it is in fact her herself and she relies on her husband, Mr. Fletcher, to show her the right path or to give her the answers. She will not express herself but sits silently even though she sees her husband visibly disturbed because “her habitual deference prevented her inquiring into the cause of his discomposure.”⁹⁹ She also relies on her husband to make decisions and considers him as the wiser of the two, which is evident in her quote: “your presence, my honoured husband, will soon relieve me from all agitating, and repair all the faults of my poor judgement”¹⁰⁰.

Equality or Superiority?

In regards to the landscape, Sedgwick seems to draw inspiration from her childhood which she, being exposed to the world of nature on her father’s property in the Housatonic Valley of western Massachusetts, spent exploring, wandering, bathing in the calm river which flowed through his meadow, picking nuts and berries.¹⁰¹ When we are first introduced to Mr. Fletcher’s residence and the landscape surrounding it, Sedgwick draws our attention to a river that “indented the meadow by one of those sweeping graceful curves by which it seems to delight to beautify the land it nourishes”.¹⁰² She continues to paint a lovely picture of the river being “fringed with all the water-loving trees” surrounded only by colorful meadows leaving the reader with a peaceful illusion of a fairy-tale-like landscape.¹⁰³ This peaceful image is, however, intruded on by a few elms and sycamores which have been spared by the Native Americans and which, by tradition, have been consecrated as a place of councils and revels. This is the first time the reader feels a certain cultural tension.

⁹⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 15.

⁹⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 18.

¹⁰⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 35.

¹⁰¹ Matteson, “Introduction”, 5.

¹⁰² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 17.

¹⁰³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 17.

From the beginning of the novel, there is a clear distinction between the civilized and the savage worlds and their way of living. The Massachusetts colony is portrayed as a bright place with illuminated spots and shining lights along the coast, while the wilderness, the territories of the Native American nation, are shown as dark and turbulent places. “On one side, as we have described, lay an open and extensive plain; within view was the curling smoke from the little cluster of houses about the fort – the habitation of civilized man; but all else was a savage howling wilderness”.¹⁰⁴ According to Marita Wenzel, it is important to point out that the spatial boundary is more than a difference in personal lifestyle as it represents a metaphor for value systems.¹⁰⁵ These boundaries, however, become blurred once Mr. Fletcher decides to fix his residence “a mile from the village, deeming exposure to the incursions of the savages very slight, and the surveillance of an inquiring neighbourhood a certain evil.”¹⁰⁶ By deeming the Puritan neighborhood evil, while not fearing the exposure to the Native Americans and the possibility of captivity, he blurs the concept of good and evil and the nationally racist stereotype that Anglo-Americans view the Native Americans as demonic savages. Schenck adds that “by suggesting that life in civilized society has some kind of inherent evil, traditional views of white superiority are surreptitiously assaulted”, as, “the prying eyes of Puritan society yield a potential for danger.”¹⁰⁷

The first settlers copied the behavior of the Native American tribe, Wigwams, learning from them that they should settle on the borders of rivers as they are the nourishing power of nature and a fertile site for gardening. They built themselves “a few log houses, planted around a fort, defended by a slight embankment and palisade.”¹⁰⁸ The difference between people of higher and lower status could be recognized by their dwellings. “The mansions of the proprietors were rather more spacious and artificial than those of their more humble associates.”¹⁰⁹ Mr. Fletcher’s house is described as a modest structure with a low roof but sufficient enough to provide ample space for a patriarchal family so that both the family and its servants or even dependents could be sheltered under the roof of their master.

¹⁰⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 17.

¹⁰⁵ Marita Wenzel, “Appropriating Space and Transcending Boundaries in *The Africa House* by Christina Lamb and *Ways of Dying* by Zakes Msa” *Journal of Literary Studies*, vol. 19, no. 3-4, (2003), 316.

¹⁰⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 17.

¹⁰⁷ Schenck, “Deconstructing Puritan Values,” 230.

¹⁰⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 16.

¹⁰⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 16.

The Pequots of this story live in huts that are described as “the simplest structures of human art.”¹¹⁰ The reader, however, can also distinguish the standing of individual families based on their dwellings. Some more prominent, some smaller, all were made from poles that were fastened at the top. The difference was seen in the way the structure was covered - either with branches and coarse mats or with bark which required more labor and skill and was dedicated to the Native Americans of a higher status. They do not sleep in beds but on mats on the ground, which in the Puritan eye, might evoke inferiority.

Great complexity is shown in the portrayal of faith. When comparing the two religions, the significant difference between Puritan and Native American culture is their attitude toward the experience of personal revelation. The Puritans “knew their God through the pages of the Bible and the reasoned words of their ministers, and did not believe that he communicated with seventeenth-century mortals by direct revelation, whether through visions, voices, tongues, dreams, possession, or trance.”¹¹¹ But the Native Americans “who received such revelations were accorded great honor in their community.”¹¹² Magawisca gives a clear explanation of her perception of her god by saying that

the Great Spirit, and his ministers, are everywhere present and visible to the eye of the soul that loves him; nature is but his interpreter; her forms are but bodies for his 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.¹¹³

Yet Puritans consider gods who communicate directly with mortals as a devil in disguise, therefore they regard Native Americans as sinful worshipers of the devil.

When introducing Magawisca’s mother, Mr. Fletcher corrects his wife’s proposition that she perished in her sins by saying:

This poor savage’s life, as far as it has come to our knowledge, was marked with innocence and good deeds; and I would gladly believe that we may hope for her, on that broad foundation laid by the apostle Peter: ‘In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him.’¹¹⁴

Later, before bidding a final farewell, the narrator tells us that both, Everell and Hope, “remained immovable, ..., every feeling for themselves was lost in the grief of parting for ever from the admirable being, ..., one of the noblest of the works of God – a bright witness to the

¹¹⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 89.

¹¹¹ William S. Simmons, “Cultural Bias”, 59.

¹¹² William S. Simmons, “Cultural Bias”, 59.

¹¹³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 345.

¹¹⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 21.

beauty, the independence, and the immorality of virtue.”¹¹⁵ Both these quotes are suggesting that Native Americans are not either morally or spiritually inferior to the Puritans. This sense of equality, which gratified her ethical pride, is the source of Magawisca’s affection towards Everell.

Christian portrayal of God is, however, depicted as dominant to the tribal one. This is evident from Hope’s “thought that a mind so disposed to religious impressions and affections might enjoy the brighter light of Christian revelation – a revelation so much higher, nobler, and fuller than that which proceeds from the voice of Nature.”¹¹⁶ Ester even tries to convert Magawisca in hopes of her remaining in Puritan society with the catechized Native Americans but is unsuccessful. “I set before her, her temporal and her eternal interest – life, and death. I prayed with her – I exhorted her – but, oh! Everell, she is obdurate; she neither fears death, nor will believe that eternal misery awaits her after death!”¹¹⁷ Hogan states that “the elevation of Christianity over Native American beliefs is related to Sedgwick’s clear imagination of the nation as European.”¹¹⁸ This is suggested by her praise of pilgrims as “our” forebears, who chide us because “we forget that the noble pilgrims lived and endured for us”.¹¹⁹ Sedgwick continues to praise the Pilgrims by calling them

an exiled and suffering people, they came forth in the dignity of the chosen servants of the Lord, to open the forests to the sun-beam, and to the light of the Sun of Righteousness – 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 – to bring down the hills, and make smooth the rough places, which the pride and cruelty of man had wrought on the fait creation of the Father of all.¹²⁰

Characters, such as William Fletcher and John Winthrop, are described with respect as “men selected of Heaven to achieve a great work.”¹²¹ This suggests that the crimes in the Pequot village were justifiable as they were, in fact, acts of Righteousness. She continues by explaining that their only reward was the joy of pushing Native Americans from their territories - forests, giving place to “pleasant villages and busy cities”, “the consecrated church” being “planted on the rock of heathen sacrifice”.¹²²

¹¹⁵ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 347.

¹¹⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 345-346.

¹¹⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*,

¹¹⁸ Hogan, *American Literature and American Identity*, 70.

¹¹⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 75.

¹²⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 75.

¹²¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 7.

¹²² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 75.

Although Sedgwick suggests that all people have the potential to behave immorally, Puritanism itself is not portrayed as ethically wrong, as can be seen in characters such as Everell. “Alone with his God, he realized the sufficiency of His presence and favour. He appealed to that mercy which is never refused, nor given in stinted measure to the humble suppliant”.¹²³ Schenck asserts that this “passage reveals that institutionalized forms of religion will not lead to salvation” but “only through having a personal relationship with God can someone be saved.”¹²⁴

Sedgwick seems even to be asserting intellectual equality with her epigraph quoting the founder of the Rhode Island colony, Roger Williams, in the second chapter which reads: “For the temper of the brain in quick apprehensions and acute judgements, to say no more, the most High and Sovereign God hath not made the Indian inferior to the European.”¹²⁵ This quote not only opposes the dominant ideology proclaiming the Native Americans wild animals, but it conveys God’s approval of such equality.

When, before Magawisca’s arrival, Mrs. Fletcher doubts the use of an Indian servant, Mr. Fletcher corrects her by claiming that “these Indians possess the same faculties that we do.”¹²⁶ According to him, Magawisca “hath rare gifts of mind – such as few of God’s creatures are endowed with.”¹²⁷ By this statement, he, once again, provides a divine approval of the equality of Native Americans and Puritans. Magawisca, at just fifteen years old, seems to speak and understand English fluently as she learned the language from an English captive who had resided with the Pequot tribe. With her skillful knowledge of the English language, she grabbed the attention of the Puritan traders and served as their interpreter.

Later in the story, when Hope’s sister, Faith, is kidnaped and forced to assimilate into the Pequot tribe, she learns to speak the native language but she almost completely loses the ability to speak English except for a few simple phrases. When she and Hope reunite, Hope begs her sister to talk to her but all she says is “No speak Yengees” exhausting all the English she remembers.¹²⁸ As Hogan points out, by reversing the position of the Puritans and Native Americans, Sedgwick seems to be, once again, criticizing the cultural bias.¹²⁹ The contrast of Faiths’ and Magawisca’s language skills is evident. By having Faith distanced from the Puritan colony and therefore forgetting the language, Sedgwick seems to be basing the difference

¹²³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 91.

¹²⁴ Schenck, “Deconstructing Puritan Values,” 236.

¹²⁵ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 14.

¹²⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 20.

¹²⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 20.

¹²⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 234.

¹²⁹ Hogan, *American Literature*, 60.

between the two races on the environment and not solely on the innate abilities. According to the traditional preconceptions of Native Americans, it is Magawisca, who should be less capable to develop a fluent speaking abilities.

Another critique can be seen in the way the Native Americans were dealt with after they lost the war as they became the spoils of war for the soldiers. “Some by a Christian use of money, were redeemed; and others, I blush to say it, for ‘it is God’s gift that every man should enjoy the good of his own labour’, were sent into slavery in the West Indies.”¹³⁰ According to Hogan, “here, Sedgwick adopts the common technique of contrasting genuinely Christian actions (freeing the captives through charitable giving of funds) and hypocritical, un-Christin behavior (enslaving the captives).”¹³¹ Mr. Fletcher then continues to describe Monoca and the way her kind actions towards the white traders ensured a better future for her children as the “dignity and modesty of her demeanor” won the favor of the governor of Boston.¹³² “She would not even consent that the holy word should be interpreted to her; insisting in the pride of her soul, that all the children of the Great Spirit were equal objects of His favour”.¹³³ While emphasizing and promoting equality under God, it is her good deeds which are proof that “savages” can behave in the same manner that would be praised by Puritan settlers. With this recognition, Mr. Fletcher hopes that “on the broad foundation laid by the apostle Peter: ‘In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him.’”¹³⁴ By this quote, he uncovers “the power of righteous behavior, which may serve as a pathway to salvation regardless of race, gender, or social standing”.¹³⁵

According to Mellisa J. Homestead’s *The shape of Catharine Sedgwick’s career*, “She wrote in order to promote a particular vision of morality.”¹³⁶ This would explain why, although Sedgwick seems not to support the cultural bias and preconceptions towards the Native Americans, she makes the majority of the Puritans see themselves as superior. “You should receive it as a signal of mercy, child, that you have been taken from the midst of savage people, and set in a Christian family.”¹³⁷ Based on their personality traits, generally, the Puritan characters treat the Native Americans poorly – some by hints and suggestions just as we can

¹³⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 21.

¹³¹ Hogan, *American Literature*, 60.

¹³² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 21.

¹³³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 21.

¹³⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 21.

¹³⁵ Schenck, “Deconstructing Puritan Values,” 232.

¹³⁶ Melissa J. Homestead, “The shape of Catharine Sedgwick’s career”, *Faculty Publications -- Department of English* 181. (2012), 188.

¹³⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 23.

see in Mrs. Fletcher's quote above, where she practically scolds Magawisca, who had been taken away from her family and her home, after witnessing the cruel crimes performed on her native village. Magawisca and Oneco become captives and are forced into servitude but the residents of Bethel think of it as a much-needed help to the degree that they feel like they rescued the siblings from the wild and are offering them a much-needed religious salvation. The siblings grow affectioned to certain members of the family and appreciate the kind treatment because they realize that their situation could be much worse. However, they cannot deny the lack of freedom and fully realize that they are held captive. This can be seen in Magawisca's message to Mononotto: "Tell him his children are servants in the house of his enemies."¹³⁸

Some are openly vulgar towards the native characters which we can see in Jannet's manner of speech when addressing Nelema or Magawisca. Jannet behaves immorally, discourteously, and almost villainously in some parts of the story. "If Master Everell was mine, I would sooner, in faith, cast him into the lion's den, or the fiery furnace, than leave him to this crafty offspring of a race that are the children and heirs of the evil one."¹³⁹ Her outrage and aversion to the Native Americans are evident as she thinks it would be best to cast them into prison for being heathen witches.

In Mrs. Fletcher's letter to her husband, she writes of her children's fondness of Oneco claiming that "the boy is a favourite with all the young ones and greatly aideth me by continually pleasuring them."¹⁴⁰ Here we can see, that children are like a blank canvas. They are not afraid of Oneco, nor feel any kind of superiority to him because they do not acknowledge the difference between the two cultures and they have not yet been controlled by fear of the unfamiliar as are the adult characters.

"They are a kind of beast we don't comprehend – out of range of God's creatures - neither angel, man, nor yet quite devil."¹⁴¹ In this quote, Digby appears to be more careful when talking about the Native Americans in comparison to Jannet, yet he also sees them as evil creatures, who, he claims, cannot be comprehended by the Puritans. Digby's statement is, however, challenged by Everell. "I think you have caught fear, Digby, without taking its council ..., which does little credit to your wisdom; the only use of fear, being to provide against danger."¹⁴²

¹³⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 26.

¹³⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 39.

¹⁴⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 33.

¹⁴¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 43.

¹⁴² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 43.

Here, Sedgwick hints at the important theme of fear suppressing empathy and understanding. At the beginning of the novel, Digby fears all the Native Americans – even Magawisca. His attitude towards them, however, changes as the novel progresses. He comes to understand the mistreatment of the Native Americans and even helps Nelema and Magawisca escape prison.

Commenting further on Sedgwick's critique in *Hope Leslie*, Hogan advocates that "the most powerful criticism of the demonic model comes with her treatment of witchcraft accusations."¹⁴³ When Master Cradock gets bitten by a snake and seems to be facing an inevitable death, the despair of his close ones forces them to seek help from the old Native American woman, Nelema. She, despite the horrors she experienced, agrees to help the poor, dying Puritan and with her methods of traditional healing, cures Master Cradock. But because her healing methods differ from those of the Puritan characters, her good deed is not met with gratitude. Jannet, once again, begins to voice her racist thoughts, calling Nelema a heathen witch because she cannot read the Bible, claiming that it would be better to die, rather than to live thanks to the devil's help. After spying through the peephole, she runs to tell Mr. Fletcher about Nelema's demonic gestures and incantations. Although Hope intends to justify Nelema by any means, Mr. Fletcher decides "that it was time to look grave when a pow-wow dared to use her diabolical spells, mutterings, and exorcisms, beneath a Christian roof".¹⁴⁴ Nelema is then charged with witchcraft and after her trial, to a death sentence which again proves the lack of understanding of different cultures than their own and the blinding effect that fear has on people.

The events following Nelema's sentence only add to the Puritan's conviction that she indeed is a servant of Satan. Before revealing the circumstances, the reader is informed about Nelema's escape from prison. "Some could smell the sulphur from the outer kitchen door to the door of the cell, others fancied that there were on the ground marks of slight scorching – a plain indication of a visitation from the enemy of mankind."¹⁴⁵ Although the modern reader finds these events ridiculous and unbelievable, the Puritan characters, affected by fear, seem to be generating delusions that cloud their judgment, making them believe that although Satan usually gets his servants into trouble, this time, he got one of them out of trouble. But later, it is revealed that it was Hope Leslie and Digby who helped Nelema escape and therefore saved

¹⁴³ Hogan, *American Literature*, 64.

¹⁴⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 110.

¹⁴⁵ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 116.

her life, and not Satan. Digby comes to such lengths to rectify his past attitude towards the Native Americans that he claims that Nelema, rather than by Satan, was freed by an angel.

In the novel, love is described as a controlling passion that, together with fear, guides the characters' behavior. However, it does not necessarily lead the characters to commit exclusively good deeds. Bad deeds are also common throughout the story. Bad deeds are usually connected to some sort of loss. Such a change of character's behavior can be seen in Hope Leslie, who is usually respectful towards the Native Americans. However, when she and Faith meet after years of separation, and after her overwhelming discovery of Faith's union with Oneco, she becomes revolted by the idea of her Puritan sister being now a part of the Native American tribe. "Since up to this point Hope's interactions with Indians have fallen within the liberal humanist and unitarian position of respect, recognition of essential sameness, and, in the case of Nelema, . . . , even covert identification."¹⁴⁶ Hope tries to persuade her sister with material goods and jewels to return to the Puritan colony but her desperate attempt is unsuccessful as Faith does not belong to the Puritan world anymore. "Sedgwick presents cultural identity as malleable."¹⁴⁷ This can be seen in the case of Faith Leslie and her bond with Oneco as it seems to stem from her early youth which can be seen by the way she springs to Oneco when Bethel is under attack rather than running to her mother's arms as her siblings do. Her bond with a Native American is so strong that Magawisca says "she and my brother are as if one life-chord bound them together".¹⁴⁸ Their affection leads to Faith's assimilation into the Native American culture and results in successful intermarriage. Karen Woods Weierman, however, argues that their union is not to be considered a true "marriage of cultures", as Faith, by being abducted at a very young age, lost her own, Puritan culture and replaced it with the Native American one because it has grown familiar to her.¹⁴⁹ Therefore, Faith proves that culture is not innate and that it is conditioned by the social environment.

The captivity of Faith differs from the traditional captivity tale portrayals. Traditionally, "the captivity narrative revolves around the captives' longing to return to their community and families and their dislike for their captors."¹⁵⁰ But Faith evidently loves both her husband and her life and shows no desire to be rescued. Before Oneco rescues her from Bethel after she was forced to return to her family, she is visibly unsaddled, and sorrowful and behaves indifferently

¹⁴⁶ Fetterley, "'My Sister! My Sister!'", 504.

¹⁴⁷ Hogan, *American Literature*, 64.

¹⁴⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 198.

¹⁴⁹ Weierman, "Reading and Writing", 418.

¹⁵⁰ Crosby, "The Body Politics", 341.

towards her biological family. When we combine Faith's reluctance to return to the Puritan community with Magawisca's decision to part with Everell and Hope at the end of the novel, the outcome evidently implies that Native American life offers "a freedom at which Sedgwick hints, a freedom suggestive of spiritual superiority".¹⁵¹ Such outcome is questioning the Puritan superiority and their understanding of freedom.

"In contrast to stereotypes excluding Native Americans from social relationships with Anglo-American counterparts, Magawisca develops a mutually affectionate relationship with Everell."¹⁵² Even though Magawisca's romantic feelings for Everell might be obvious, as she sacrificed her body in a desperate need to save him from being killed by her father, Everell's affection for Magawisca, although evident in many situations, changes throughout the novel. At first, he begins to have strong feelings for Magawisca even though the two are entirely different. Yet it appears that the differences make each other and their mutual affection grow. This is revealed during Magawisca's recollection of the Pequot war when she enlightens Everell in the unrighteous massacre of the tribe. To Everell, "she seemed, to him, to embody nature's best gifts, and her feeling to be the inspiration of heaven."¹⁵³ Furthermore, his distress during Magawisca's trial is evident, as he cannot bear to watch her being judged and while anxiously awaiting the verdict, he involuntarily closes his eyes and utters a cry of agony. But when Hope enters the story, he realizes that their differences are far too significant. Thus, his affection for Hope becomes stronger and Magawisca is seen rather as a friend. "I might have loved her - might have forgotten that nature had put barriers between us".¹⁵⁴

Although Magawisca's romantic affection is not reciprocated, at the end of the novel, a possibility of a genuine friendship between the Puritans and the Native Americans arises as Magawisca blesses Hope's and Everell's bond by saying "may the chains by which He, who sent you from the spirit land, bound you together, grow brighter and stronger till you return thither again."¹⁵⁵ Praising Magawisca's nobility, the Puritan couple fears she will be wasted in the solitude of wilderness, demanding that she will come back to the Puritan society and dwell with them. She, however, sees the situation more realistically, rather than romantically, and responds with: "The Indian and the white man can no more mingle and become one, than day and night."¹⁵⁶ "She, unlike her Puritan friends, realizes the limitations of the relationship

¹⁵¹Kalayjian, "Revisioning America's (literary) Past", 68.

¹⁵² Schenck, "Deconstructing Puritan Values," 225.

¹⁵³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 55.

¹⁵⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 221.

¹⁵⁵ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 344.

¹⁵⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 343.

between Puritans and Native Americans.”¹⁵⁷ According to Hogan, “this is at least in part because Sedgwick wishes to represent the defiance and determination of Native Americans” as “she does not wish to present them as anxiously seeking the favorable opinion of Europeans.”¹⁵⁸ By agreeing to their offer, Magawisca would lose her true identity and values.

Nonetheless, by Everell’s and Hope’s demanding that Magawisca stays with them, it is evident that they both realize their reliance on her. What is intriguing, is that the reason why Everell urges her to return to them, is his desire for the discovery of happiness based on independence and he implies that Magawisca is the perfect teacher of such happiness “without human help or agency.”¹⁵⁹ Paradoxically, it is a Native American, who is forced to leave her homeland and who had to experience an act of genocide committed against her tribe, and subsequently serve as a captive, that has discovered happiness, which individuals of the superior nation cannot seem to grasp on their own. Nevertheless, although hope for establishing cultural pluralism is suggested at the beginning of the novel through Everell’s and Magawisca’s affection, it is rejected at the end by Magawisca’s refusal of remaining a participant in the Puritan society.

Even though Hope Leslie praises the inborn royalty of Magawisca’s soul, she also, like all the other Puritan characters, is flawed and has racial prejudice towards the Native Americans. When Magawisca mentions that Faith is married to Oneco, Hope exclaims “God forbid!”, “shuddering as if a knife had been plunged in her bosom.”¹⁶⁰ And although Magawisca starts to proudly defend her race and Oneco by saying “Yes – an Indian, in whose veins runs the blood of the strongest, the fleetest of the children of the forest, who never turned their backs on friends or enemies, and whose souls have returned to the Great Spirit, stainless as they came from him”, indicating not only a great national pride and strength of her brother’s spirit but also the quality of his character, Hope does not calm down. Even after Magawisca’s reassurance that Faith is cherished and worshiped by Oneco “as if all good spirits dwelt in her”, she finds relief only after finding out that Faith bows to the crucifix.¹⁶¹ With her intuition, Magawisca senses Hope’s disgust and inquires whether Hope feels her blood being corrupted “by mingling with this stream”.¹⁶² Sedgwick circles back to this feeling of disgust once again, later in the novel, when Hope sees her sister after many years apart, dressed “in her savage attire, fondly leaning on

¹⁵⁷ Crosby, “The Body Politics”, 359.

¹⁵⁸ Hogan, *American Literature and American Identity*, 65.

¹⁵⁹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 346.

¹⁶⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 194.

¹⁶¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 194-195.

¹⁶² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 195.

Oneco's shoulder."¹⁶³ To this image she reacts with "a sickening feeling" and "an unthought of revolting nature", which prevents her from clasping her in her arms.¹⁶⁴ To Hope, seeing her sister this way is so revolting, that she cannot bear to look at her and while averting her eyes, she presses her hands to her heart, overwhelmed by the situation. Hogan advocates that Hope is not only ironized in such events as we can see above but that the use of irony, which Sedgwick uses for criticizing "racial out-grouping within America" can as well be seen in connection with spirituality.¹⁶⁵ This is evident when Hope is first familiarized with Faith's integration into the Pequot tribe by marrying Oneco, exclaiming "Oh God! Restore my sister to the Christian family", to which Magawisca inquires:

Think ye not that the Great Spirit looks down on these sacred spots, where the good and the peaceful rest, with an equal eye? Think ye not their children are His children, whether they are gathered in yonder temple where your people worship, or bow to him beneath the green boughs of the forest?

while pointing out that her mother is also buried there, hinting at the good character of both mothers.¹⁶⁶

Although the supposed equality is hinted numerous times throughout the story, the majority of the Puritan society seems to have little or no respect for the Native American culture although a mutual respect might have been accomplished if the Puritans had not violated their agreement and massacred the entire native village. By having Magawisca recollect this massacre led directly by Puritans, Sedgwick not only challenges the morality of the American nation, but Crosby claims that Magawisca is Sedgwick's tool by which she successfully integrates the Native American experience into the national politics and shows how the country contributed to the parish of the Native Americans in a way that even Jefferson was unable to.¹⁶⁷ Sedgwick also gives a clear sense of why Mononoto changes from a reasonable and kind chief, who once counseled peace and alliance with the Puritans, to a bitter one, blinded by anger and hungry for revenge. "If he hath shown the dove's heart to the English when he believed them friends, he will show himself the fierce eagle now he knows them enemies."¹⁶⁸ According to Crosby, it was the savageness of the Puritans which made Mononotto into a savage, as the destruction of his family has driven him mad.¹⁶⁹ "Life for life" says the Pequot chief, demanding justice for

¹⁶³ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 233.

¹⁶⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 233.

¹⁶⁵ Hogan, *American Literature and American Identity*, 65.

¹⁶⁶ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 195.

¹⁶⁷ Crosby, "The Body Politics", 346.

¹⁶⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 51.

¹⁶⁹ Crosby, "The Body Politics", 356-357.

the death of his son when he takes Everell as a hostage and intends to kill him after his attack on Bethel.¹⁷⁰ Mononotto's attack is cruel yet not unreasonable as the Fletchers took Magawisca and Oneco, his two children, and his remaining family, as servants, forcing them to live and serve the Puritan family. His wish for Everell's death is also not unreasonable as he intends to kill Everell "by a single stroke, for thus was my boy cut off."¹⁷¹

While recollecting Samoset's fate, as he was held captive in hopes of leading the Puritans to their strongest holds but he refused and thus was executed, Magawisca also suggests "the most serious obstacle to the progress of the Christian religion", the contradiction between the divine principles and the doings of its worshippers by pressing Everell to tell her whether "the book of your law is better than that written on our hearts, for ye say it teaches mercy, compassion, forgiveness – if ye had such a law and believed it, would ye thus have treated a captive boy?"¹⁷² By this, Magawisca does not deem the divine Christian principles as evil but she directly criticizes the Puritans and the evil within them. Schenck suggests, that through this way of religious examination, "Sedgwick compels the reader to understand that evil is not imbued within Christianity itself, but the worldly behavior of mankind."¹⁷³

Taking a closer look at the battle which Magawisca describes above, we discover that it was an unfair fight. Because the Pequot village was located on the level summit of a hill and therefore the people could see "as far as the eye would stretch", it would be impossible to attack unnoticed.¹⁷⁴ For that reason, the Puritans came at night when all the Native Americans were asleep, surrounding the village and opening fire. To that Everell inquires "did they so rush on sleeping women and children?", challenging Magawisca's narration as he, at first, believes, that his people had all honor of the fight as he heard the story from the perspective of the Puritan victors. However, when Magawisca proceeds to undermine the Puritan idea of a fair conflict, both Everell and the reader gradually come to realize that her tale is fundamentally unlike the one that Puritans praise. According to Crosby, as Everell grew up hearing tales of the Pequot War from other members of the Puritan community, he has to reimagine the conflict via Magawisca's retelling because his affection towards her allows him to hear her and her story.¹⁷⁵ After contemplating over the differences between the two accounts, Everell wisely suggests that the conflict between Puritans and Native Americans resembles the fable of the Man and

¹⁷⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 96.

¹⁷¹ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 96.

¹⁷² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 52.

¹⁷³ Schenck, "Deconstructing Puritan Values", 231.

¹⁷⁴ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 48.

¹⁷⁵ Crosby, "The Body Politics", 353.

the Lion, referring to Aesop's fable. This particular fable teaches us that "we can easily represent things as we wish them to be."¹⁷⁶ Therefore Everell is implying that the Puritan victors claimed the right to tell the story of the Pequot war and that they purposely misrepresented it.

Sedgwick, furthermore, makes Magawisca focus mainly on the suffering of their mothers and children by saying that the air was filled with "the piteous cries of the little children - the groans of our mothers, and, oh! worse – than all – the silence of those that could not speak", making the reader feel compassion and sympathy for the Native Americans.¹⁷⁷ When the reader cannot feel more horribly towards the Puritans, the Pequots start to win. To that the Puritans respond by setting the Pequot huts on fire and in consequence of that, hundreds of Pequots die. The narrator comments on this contradiction through Magawisca by saying that it "instead of always being a medium for the light that emanates from our holy law, is too often the darkest cloud that obstructs the passage of its rays to the hearts of heathen men."¹⁷⁸ In this statement, the narrator reveals that not only does Magawisca deem the Holy Law of the Puritans as valid, but she believes that she "is kept from receiving by improper behavior" of the Puritans.¹⁷⁹ Then, commenting on "the history of the times" they say that "the number destroyed was about four hundred;" and "it was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fire, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and the horrible scent thereof; but the victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the praise thereof to God", once again quoting William Bradford.¹⁸⁰ As Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz explains, this type of war, "war whose purpose is to destroy the will of the enemy people or their capacity to resist, employing any means necessary but mainly by attacking civilians and their support systems, such as food supply – was common regarding Native Indian conflicts in the early American history."¹⁸¹

None of the Native Americans are behaving like wild animals although the widely spread preconception claims them this title and villainizes them. Everell himself is surprised when hearing Magawisca's side of the story of the Pequot war. No Native American seems to crave violence on its neighbors except when it is based on revenge and in order to satisfy the feeling of justice as can be seen in the case of Mononotto, whose, at first counsels alliance but his behavior changes entirely after the Puritan attack on the native village and the captivity of his

¹⁷⁶"The Man & the Lion", Library of Congress, Accessed 28th March 2023, <https://read.gov/aesop/107.html>

¹⁷⁷ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 50.

¹⁷⁸ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 52.

¹⁷⁹ Schenck, "Deconstructing Puritan Values", 231.

¹⁸⁰ Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 55.

¹⁸¹ Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (USA: Bacon Press, 2014), 58.

remaining family. Magawisca gives evidence of this by saying that her father “had been the friend of the English; he had counselled peace and alliance with them; he had protected their traders; delivered the captives taken from them, and restored them to their people.”¹⁸²

The problem, however, is, that the reader is more likely to feel empathy for the dead of Bethel, although the number of killed is significantly smaller than the one of the Pequot village. This is due to the lack of information about the native victims. In consequence, the reader cannot familiarize themselves with them and as the story is focused predominantly on the Puritan family, the reader sympathizes with the survivors while seeing Mononotto and the rest of the Native Americans as the stereotype claims them – evil and violent. Hogan supports this by explaining that by individuating the Puritan characters, the reader is more likely to have an emotional connection to them, the perfect example being the death of Everell’s infant brother which “is likely to be far more salient and emotionally consequential than the deaths of the anonymous children indicated by Magawisca’s account of the British attack”, suggesting that “it is European policies of violence against Native Americans that have given rise to stereotypical Native American violence.”¹⁸³

¹⁸² Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie*, 51.

¹⁸³ Hogan, *American Literature and American Identity*, 67.

Conclusion

This bachelor thesis aims to analyze the Puritans and Native Americans in the novel *Hope Leslie*, written by Catharine Maria Sedgwick. The first part of the thesis is concerned with defining the reasons for Sedgwick's decision to write the novel in terms of the history of Colonial America and the problems that society faces when interacting with the Native Americans as *Hope Leslie* evidently criticizes the interracial conflicts between the Puritans and the Native Americans. Aiming to create genuinely American literature, authors like Catharine Maria Sedgwick, James Fenimore Cooper and Washington Irving started integrating Native Americans into their novels, creating the captivity narrative and the frontier romance. Unlike the traditional frontier romance, Sedgwick bases the novel on strong female characters who do not need to be rescued by a white male character. Although Everell possesses heroic tendencies, he never succeeds in executing them.

In comparison with James Fenimore Cooper's presentation of the Native American nation, Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* is a remarkably progressive novel that opposes the cultural prejudice which portrays Native Americans as wild, unintelligent worshipers of the devil because of their divine revelations and visions and their inability to read and speak the English language. She manages to show the humanity of the Native Americans and to presents the Pequot tribe as highly competent and makes Magawisca one of the most intelligent characters. Furthermore, she gives voice to Magawisca in order to represent the Pequot war from the Native American perspective and the unjustified violence, and with reference to the fable of *The Lion and the Man*, suggests that the testimonies of the war were manipulated by the Puritan victors, who told the stories of the war. Therefore, she attempts to portray the Native Americans in a sympathetic light. Hence, when recounting the attack on her native village, the courageous Magawisca focuses mainly on the suffering of women and children, which undoubtedly inspires sympathy in the reader.

The thesis discusses the "separate spheres" ideology according to which men and women were best suited for different realms of influence. Traditionally, men were concerned with politics and economy, while women focused on domestic issues. While both Hope and Magawisca are suppressed by the men of their communities, they try to defy the patriarchal authorities and are portrayed as independent, intelligent and self-reliant. They think critically and act upon their moral judgement, therefore they differ from the traditional portrayals of the passive Puritan women. Forced to decide whether to obey the voice of her conscience or the

voice of authority, Hope seriously questions decisions in matters concerning the Puritan colony and the public welfare. By her successful execution of Nelema's and Magawisca's escape from prison, Hope commits treason.

The third part deals with the question of equality between Puritans and Native Americans. From the beginning of the novel, the difference between the two worlds is clear because the Puritan colony is portrayed as a bright place, while the Native American territory is portrayed as a dark place. From my thesis, it is apparent that Sedgwick seems to imply an intellectual equality of Puritans and Native Americans. This is evident in her epigraph in which she quotes the founder of the Rhode Island colony, Roger Williams. This epigraph states that God did not make the Native American worse than the European, and is therefore rejecting the inferiority of the Native Americans. Such equality is further demonstrated by Faith and Magawisca. The native Magawisca is supposed to be less intelligent than the rest of the Puritan characters according to traditional racist ideologies. However, Magawisca is one of the most intelligent characters of the novel. At the age of fifteen, she is fluent in the English language, which she learned in harsh conditions from her captors. Whereas Faith, who was kidnapped at a young age, loses her ability to speak English. Thus, Sedgwick reverses the position of the Puritans and the Native Americans and she indicates the importance of the environment in which an individual develops.

Moreover, Sedgwick indicates the importance of fear, and the role that fear plays in suppressing empathy and understanding. This is demonstrated by Digby, who initially feared all the Native Americans – even Magawisca. His attitude towards them, however, changed because he came to understand the mistreatment and the miscomprehension of the Native Americans.

Although Sedgwick indicates the equality of Puritans and Native Americans, she portrays the Puritans as superior by force. Even the best-intentioned Puritans, such as Hope Leslie, show racist behavior. Therefore, even though a genuine friendship might have sprung between Hope, Everell, and Magawisca, Sedgwick makes Magawisca retreat from the Puritan colony because the cruelty and the resultant intolerance of both sides are far too big. Moreover, by staying in the Puritan colony, Magawisca would lose her identity, and her national pride prevents her from integrating into the Anglo-American culture.

RESUMÉ

Cílem této bakalářské práce je analyzovat puritány a indiány v románu *Hope Leslie*, jehož autorkou je americká spisovatelka Catharine Maria Sedgwicková, která spolu s Jamesem Fenimore Cooperem, Washington Irvingem a Williamem Cullen Bryantem patří mezi zakladatele americké literatury. Příběh se otevírá v Londýně, dále však sleduje cestu mladého Williama Fletchera do americké kolonie v Massachusettském zálivu. Tato kolonie byla založena v roce 1628 skupinou oddaných věřících, kteří byli přesvědčeni, že jsou vyvoleným lidem Božím.

První část práce se zabývá vymezením důvodů, které Sedgwickovou vedly k rozhodnutí napsat tento román, a to z hlediska historie koloniální Ameriky a problémů, kterým tato společnost čelila při interakci s indiány, neboť *Hope Leslie* evidentně tyto mezirasové rozpory mezi puritány a indiány kritizuje. Puritáni viděli svět jako arénu, ve které bojují síly dobra proti silám zla. Sebe, jakožto vyvolené viděli jako síly dobra a světla, kdežto indiány viděli jako síly zla a temnoty. Indiáni byli považováni za vyznavače d'ábla, či čarodějnictví, zatímco puritáni se považovali za spravedlivé síly svatosti. Kvůli tomuto smýšlení vypukl v letech 1636-37 v Nové Anglii první mezirasový konflikt – Pequotská válka. Přestože byl tento konflikt záměrným vyvražďováním indiánských civilistů, indiáni byli vyliceni jako agresori.

Ve snaze oprostit se od literárního vlivu Evropy, začali autoři, za cílem vytvoření čisté americké literatury, do svých románů začleňovat indiánské obyvatele a jejich osídlení. Tím vytvořili romány s příběhy o zajetí indiány a hraničářskou romanci. Tradiční hraničářská romance vznikla v 90. letech 18. století a upadla v 50. letech 19. století. Jejími hlavními prvky je rasistická filozofie bělochů a indiánů zobrazující stereotypické, indiánské postavy, pasivní angloamerická hrdinka, která je jak pod nadvládou mužských autorit, tak předmětem zajetí indiány, a bělošský hrdina, který dívku ze zajetí vysvobodí. Na rozdíl od tradiční hraničářské romance staví Sedgwicková příběh na silných ženských postavách, které nepotřebují mužského hrdinu, aby se vysvobodil z nesnází. Everell, hlavní mužský hrdina, má sice hrdinské sklony, avšak nikdy se mu je nepodaří úspěšně vykonat.

Autorka nejen tradičně využívá historických osobností, jako je John Winthrop, ale v mnoha aspektech románu se nepopíratelně inspiruje svým osobním životem. Pro postavu Magawisky nachází inspiraci v otrokyni Mumbet, která stejně jako Magawisca přišla o ruku při snaze zastat se slabších. Za inspiraci pro stvoření Faith Leslie najdeme Eunice Williamsovou, vzdálenou příbuznou autorky, která se po zajetí a následném provdání se za indiána, odmítla

vrátit do puritánské civilizace. Faith, stejně jako Eunice, stráví život se svým indiánským manželem. I po dlouhém naléhání její sestry Hope, se odmítne ke své puritánské rodině vrátit.

Ve srovnání s tím, jak James Fenimore Cooper představuje indiánský národ, je *Hope Leslie* pokrokovým románem, který se staví proti kulturním předsudkům, jež zobrazují indiány jako divoké, neinteligentní uctívače d'ábla, kvůli jejich božským zjevením, či vizím, dále kvůli jejich neschopnosti číst a mluvit anglickým jazykem. Představuje kmen Pequotů jako vysoce kompetentní a z Magawisky činí jednu z nejinteligentnějších postav. Dále dává Magawisce šanci, aby představila Pequotskou válku netradičně - z pohledu indiánů. Po vyslechnutí jejího svědectví, Everell chytrě usoudí, s odkazem na bajku *O člověku a o lvu*, že puritánští vítězové pozměnili události války a neprávem označili indiány za agresory. *Hope Leslie* se pokouší ukázat indiány v sympatickém světle. Proto se odvážná Magawiska při líčení útoku na jejich domorodou vesnici zaměřuje na utrpení indiánských žen a dětí, což ve čtenářích nepochybně vzbudí soucit.

Kromě rozporů mezi indiány a puritány kritizuje Sedgwicková také postavení žen v puritánské společnosti, čemuž se věnuje druhá část práce. Bez ohledu na společenské postavení byly ženy vždy považovány za podrízené mužů. V rozporu s ideologií „oddělených sfér“, podle níž se ženy a muži nejlépe hodí pro různé sféry vlivu - muži se tradičně zabývali politikou a ekonomikou, zatímco ženy se soustředily na výchovu dětí a obstarávání domácnosti, Sedgwicková zakládá svůj román na dvou aktivních ženských postavách. A i když jsou Hope i Magawisca utlačovány muži svých komunit, nezůstávají pasivní jako jejich současnice a snaží se vzepřít patriarchálním autoritám. Jsou vykresleny jako nezávislé a inteligentní, protože myslí kriticky a jednájí podle vlastního morálního uvážení. Nucena rozhodnout se, zda poslechne hlas svého svědomí, či hlas autority, Hope vážně zpochybňuje rozhodnutí ve věcech týkajících se puritánské kolonie a veřejného blaha. Tím, že úspěšně naplánuje a provede útěk Nelemy a Magawisky z vězení, Hope se dopouští zrady.

Když je Magawiska před soudem nucena k obhajobě, popře legitimitu soudu, který si násilím vynutil svou jurisdikci. I přes své oprávněné zpochybnění platnosti puritánských zákonů je však stereotypně prohlášena za dítě d'ábla. Magawiska však nepopírá dobrotu puritánství, nýbrž upozorňuje na zlo v puritánských jedincích a v jejich činech.

Třetí část se zabývá vyobrazením indiánů a puritánů a otázkou rovnocennosti. Od počátku románu je rozdíl mezi puritánským a indiánským světem zřetelný rozdíl. Puritánská kolonie je vylíčena jako krásné místo s rozzářenými světly podél pobřeží, zatímco indiánské území je

vyobrazeno jako temné a bouřlivé místo. Hranice mezi těmito světy se však začne slévat, jakmile se pan Fletcher rozhodne přestěhovat míli od vesnice, neboť považuje indiány za menší nebezpečí, než je zvědavost puritánského okolí. Tím, že ve svých puritánských sousedech vidí zlo větší, než v indiánských nájezdech, rozmazává pojem dobra a zla a následně i indiánsko-zaměřených rasistických stereotypů.

Autorka komplexně popisuje rozdíly v náboženství a v prožitku osobního zjevení. Puritáni sedmnáctého století znali svého Boha prostřednictvím Bible, ale nevěřili, že s nimi Bůh komunikuje prostřednictvím zjevení, či transu. Avšak indiáni, kteří takovéto duchovní zjevení zažili, se ve své komunitě těšili velké úctě. Magawiska vysvětluje indiánské vnímání boha, když říká, že Velký duch a jeho služebníci jsou viditelní pro všechny, který ho milují, a že příroda je pouze jeho duchovním tlumočníkem. Puritáni toto přesvědčení však netolerovali a považovali tedy indiány za hříšné uctíváče d'ábla.

Z mého rozboru se zdá, že autorka naznačuje intelektuální rovnost mezi indiány a puritány, což je patrné z jejího epigrafu, ve kterém cituje zakladatele kolonie Rhode Islandu, Rogera Williamse. Tento epigraf říká, že Bůh neudělal indiána horšího než Evropana. To nejenže odporuje převládající rasistické ideologii, která prohlašuje indiány jako méněcenné, ale vyjadřuje tak i Boží souhlas s touto rovnocenností. Tuto rovnocennost dokazuje autorka i pomocí Magawisky a Faith. Magawiska, indiánská princezna, by podle tradičních rasistických ideologií měla být méně inteligentní, než ostatní postavy puritánského původu. Avšak Magawiska je jedna z nejinteligentnějších postav celého románu. Ve svých patnácti letech plynule ovládá anglický jazyk, který se naučila od svých zajatců. Díky své obratné znalosti angličtiny upoutala pozornost puritánských obchodníků, kterým sloužila jako tlumočnice. Kdežto Faith, která byla v útlém věku unesena, téměř úplně ztrácí schopnost mluvit anglicky. Tímto autorka obrací pozici puritánů a indiánů a poukazuje na důležitost prostředí, ve kterém jedinec vyrůstá.

V neposlední řadě poukazuje autorka na důležitost strachu z neznámého, a roli, kterou tento strach hraje v potlačení empatie a porozumění. To dokazuje Digby, který se z počátku bál všech indiánů – dokonce i Magawisky. Jeho postoj k nim se však s porozuměním špatného zacházení s indiány změnil natolik, že jako jediný pomáhal Hope Leslie vykonat oba útoky při záchraně Magawisky a Nelemy.

Ačkoli autorka naznačuje rovnocennost puritánů a indiánů, puritány vykresluje jako silou nadřazené. Dokonce i puritáni s těmi nejlepšími úmysly, jako je Hope Leslie, vykazují

rasistické chování. Proto i když mezi Hope, Everellem a Magawiskou mohlo vzniknout opravdové přátelství, Magawiska musí odejít z puritánské kolonie, protože krutost, kterou obě strany zažily, a z ní plynoucí nesnášenlivost, je příliš velká. Kromě toho, pobytem v puritánské kolonii by Magawisca ztratila svou vlastní identitu a její národní hrdost jí brání v integraci s angloamerickou kulturou.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Castiglia, Christopher. "IN PRAISE OF EXTRA-VAGANT WOMEN: HOPE LESLIE AND THE CAPTIVITY ROMANCE." *Legacy* 6, no. 2 (1989): 3–16. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25679062>.
- Cave, Alfred A. *The Pequot War*. Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.
- Crosby, Shelby L. "THE BODY POLITIC AND CULTURAL MISCEGENATION IN SEDGWICK'S 'HOPE LESLIE: OR, EARLY TIMES IN THE MASSACHUSETTS.'" *CLA Journal* 54, no. 4 (2011): 337–63. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44325807>.
- Dunbar- Ortiz, Roxanne. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Spojené státy americké: Bacon Press, 2014.
- Fetterley, Judith. "My Sister! My Sister!": The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (1998): 491–516. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2902707>.
- Foster, Edward Halsey. *Catharine Maria Sedgwick*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974.
- Hankins, L. V. "The voice of nature: Hope Leslie and Early American Romanticism." *Legacy* 31, no. 2 (2014): 160-182.
- Homestead, Melissa J., "The shape of Catharine Sedgwick's career", *Faculty Publications -- Department of English* 181. (2012). <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs/181>.
- Hogan Patrick C. *American Literature and American Identity a Cognitive Cultural Study From the Revolution Through the Civil War*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2020, 58-72.
- Insko, Jeffrey. "Anachronistic Imaginings: Hope Leslie's Challenge to Historicism." *American Literary History* 16, no. 2 (2004): 179-207.
- Kalayjian, P. L. Revisioning America's (literary) Past: Sedgwick's Hope Leslie. *NWSA Journal* 8, no. 3 (1996): 63-78.
- KELLEY, MARY. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick (1789-1867)." *Legacy* 6, no. 2 (1989): 43–50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25679065>.
- Kelley, Mary, and Catharine Maria Sedgwick. "Negotiating a Self: The Autobiography and Journals of Catharine Maria Sedgwick" *The New England Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (1993): 366–98. <https://doi.org/10.2307/366002>.
- Library of Congress. "The Man & the Lion". Accessed 28th March 2023, <https://read.gov/aesop/107.html>.
- Matteson, John, "Introduction to the Dover Edition", Hope Leslie Or, Early Times in Massachusetts, III-XIV Dover Publications, Inc., 2011.

McMillan, Sally, and Connie Wilson Anderson. "Novel Identities: Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* as a Mentoring Framework for Curriculum Studies and Life Journeys." *Journal of Thought* 44, no. 3-4 (2009): 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jthought.44.3-4.77>.

Pelegri, Teresa Requena. "Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* (1827) and the Revision of the Puritan Past." *Coolabah* 3 (2009): 136-42.

Person, Leland S. "The American Eve: Miscegenation and a Feminist Frontier Fiction." *American Quarterly* 37, no. 5 (1985): 668-85. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2712615>.

Procházka Martin, Robbins David. "AMERICAN LITERATURE: Beginnings to 1914" In *Lectures on American literature*, edited by Justin Quinn, 13-169. Praha: Karolinum, 2011.

Ross, Cheri Louise. "(RE)WRITING THE FRONTIER ROMANCE: CATHARINE MARIA SEDGWICK'S 'HOPE LESLIE.'" *CLA Journal* 39, no. 3 (1996): 320-40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44322958>.

Schenck, Andrew. "Deconstructing Puritan Values in *Hope Leslie*: A Statement of Individuality or Unity." *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 135 (2019): 223-243.

Sedgwick Catharine M. *Hope Leslie or: Early Times in Massachusetts*. Mineola: Dover Publications, Inc., 2011.

Simmons, William S. "Cultural Bias in the New England Puritans' Perception of Indians." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (1981): 56-72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1916857>.

Stadler, Gustavus. "Magawisca's Body of Knowledge: Nation-Building in *Hope Leslie*?" *Yale Journal of Criticism* 12.1 (1999): 41-56.

Zuckerman, Michael. "The Social Context of Democracy in Massachusetts." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 25, no. 4 (1968): 524-44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1916797>.

Weierman, Karen Woods. "Reading and Writing 'Hope Leslie': Catharine Maria Sedgwick's Indian 'Connections.'" *The New England Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (2002): 415-443.

Wenzel, Marita. "Appropriating Space and Transcending Boundaries in *The Africa House* by Christina Lamb and *Ways of Dying* by Zakes Msa." *Journal of Literary Studies*, vol. 19, no. 3-4, (2003)