

“Monstrous Errors” and “Sound Judgments” in Resisting Legitimate Authority: Martineau and Sedgwick’s *Redwood* and *The Linwoods*

Masahiro Nakamura

In “Miss Sedgwick’s Works,” published in *The London and Westminster Review* in 1838, Harriet Martineau, who equates fiction with “a transcript of actual life,” coupled with “the feeling heart” and “the analytical power,”¹ claims Catharine Maria Sedgwick’s novels in the 1820s and 1830s as belonging to “the specimens in the middle class fiction” (“SW,” 45) in “the third rank of fictions” (“SW,” 46), because they draw on “extraordinary adventures” (“SW,” 46) instead of “the new principles on which society is founded, and of the new relations under which it grows up” (“SW,” 45). Of the five “political”² novels published in the two decades, Martineau devotes a more detailed critical discussion to *Redwood* and *The Linwoods* than *A New-England Tale* and *Hope Leslie*.³ She sees the chief object of *A New-England Tale; or, Sketches of New-England Character and Manners* to be “to contrast a pharisaical with a genuine religion” (“SW,” 47), which is “old, and as difficult as disagreeable in the treatment” (“SW,” 47), rather than “the presentation of sketches of life and manners in New England” (“SW,” 46). On the strength of her disapproval of Sedgwick’s tendency toward “improbable” (“SW,” 55) adventures, she estimates highly Sedgwick’s delineation of the agony and humiliation of a black slave Africk in her criticism of *Redwood: A Tale* as being “well told, and all too probable in its woes” (“SW,” 50); and yet, for all that, she judges “the unbelief of Redwood, brought into contrast with the fanaticism of the Shakers” to be “of a kind which exists nowhere but in books” (“SW,” 49).⁴ Admiring *Hope Leslie; or, Early*

Times in the Massachusetts greatly for “many characters of which English fiction affords no precedent”(“SW,” 55) like the Puritans and the Native Americans drawn from the history of the first days of Massachusetts,⁵ she criticizes Sedgwick for selecting in *The Linwoods; or, “Sixty Years Since” in America* such great historical personages as George Washington and Marquis de La Fayette on the basis of her judgment that it takes historical great figures “ages” to become “fit” subjects for fiction in which “there are no affections, no associations of reality in readers’ minds to be offended by the substitution of an author’s conceptions for theirs” (“SW,” 58). A closer look at *Redwood* and *The Linwoods*, the two works of Sedgwick’s that invited Martineau’s seemingly arbitrary critical responses, in conjunction with close interaction between Sedgwick and Martineau in terms of appropriateness of resistance to authority, can bring some decisive evidence to bear upon the advisability and/or expediency of resistance in the form of abolitionism that demanded deep contemplation from Sedgwick in those two decades, extending into the controversy between liberalism and republicanism.⁶

Sedgwick’s political novels, as Susan Harris observes, represent not only “contemporary debates over race, gender, and class,” but also the debate about “resisting legitimate authority—when resistance is appropriate, who has the ‘right’ to undertake it, and what its limits and consequences should be.”⁷ The appropriateness of resistance to “legitimate authority,” however, is conditioned by the question of whether authority, *de jure* or *de fact*, can be incontestably and securely established as such in the United States, in which Sedgwick saw noticeable differences in social values and norms developed in geographically and culturally diverse regions. Sedgwick’s and Martineau’s view of resistance, therefore, is inevitably involved in “the incorporation of the historicity and the historic contingency of conflict.”⁸

After a long visit to the United States for two years in 1834-1836, Martineau published *Society in America* in 1837, propounding her critical views on political, social, and moral issues of the country. In the work of “a compound of philosophy and fact”⁹ she confesses as a preliminary to a realization of the “danger of not fully apprehending the principles” on which American society is constructed and of “erring” in applying “the facts which came under my notice” (*SA*, iv) to them, but her strong disposition to admire democratic institutions induces her to find “how far the people of the United States lived up to, or fell below, their own theory” (*SA*, vi). While supposing the United States as “the daughter of England,” freed from “a military despotism” (*SA*, 8), which established “a true theory of government, by reasoning from the principles of human nature, as well as from the experience of governments” (*SA*, 2-3) and demonstrated “the capacity of mankind for self-government” (*SA*, 6), she is so “strongly convinced of anything, in opposition to the opinion of any or many others,” as to “entertain a suspicion that there is more evidence on the other side than I see” (*SA*, 354). As regards “every argument that can possibly be adduced in vindication or palliation of slavery, under any circumstances now existing,” she declares that she knows “the whole of its theory;—a declaration that I dare not make with regard to, I think, any other subject whatever” (*SA*, 354). She avows openly that “nothing rational” can be offered in extenuation or justification of “the protraction of slavery” (*SA*, 354) in the United States, thus guaranteeing that her social realism will look beneath “a wide superficiality of argument which will no more bear a touch than pond-ice, on the last day of thaw” (*SA*, 355).¹⁰ For her there are only two alternatives between which one has to choose concerning abolitionism: the Divine will or a human compact. She saw the Sedgwick’s attitudes toward slavery as “constitutionally timid,”¹¹ condemning them for worshipping the Act of Union, “a human decree which contravenes the laws of Nature” (*HMA*, 1: 376).¹²

Sedgwick, in contrast, who paid a fifteen-month visit to Europe in 1839-40, revealed herself to be “thoroughly republican and New-Worldish”¹³ in her way of looking at the Old World in *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*, published in 1841. She criticizes the English for “tilling another’s land,” “a blind submission to a transmitted faith and an imposed priest,” and “an inevitable obedience to absolute rulers and oppressive laws,”¹⁴ but she put her hand to the plow with the preliminary remark, as if to remonstrate herself, that “Travellers should be forgiven their monstrous errors when we find there are so few on whose sound judgments we can rely, of the character of their own people and the institutions of their own country”(LAKH, 100). Tellingly, she places “monstrous errors” that travelers make dogmatically as if they were objective observers, in juxtaposition with a warning against too much self-confidence and self-conceit in “sound judgments” that natives tend to form concerning the character of their own people and the institutions of their own country.

Sedgwick saw her own country, not as a society that fully demonstrated “the capacity of mankind for self-government” as Martineau presupposes in *Society in America*, but as “the land where the most thorough and hopeful experiment of the capacity of the human race for knowledge, virtue, happiness, and self-government is now making” (LAKH, 102). As she observes in the Preface of *Redwood*, her country is “beyond parallel, free, happy, and abundant,” but “no Arcadia.”¹⁵ She has “little sympathy with that narrow-minded patriotism which claims honours that are not yet merited” (*R*, I: xi); she feels “a deep and heart-felt pride” and “a just pride” in “the increasing intelligence, the improving virtue, and the rising greatness of our country,” because she locates there “something which more excites the imagination and interests the affections in expanding energy and rapid improvement, than even in perfection itself, were that attainable on this earth” (*R*, 1: xi). In her

exploration of “expanding energy and rapid improvement” of the country three issues excited her imagination and interested her affections resulting from her social and family background: abolitionism, federalism, and Unitarianism, the first encompassing the latter two. They had influenced her view of the politics and culture of her own country to a notable degree before she set out as an author of the aforesaid political novels.

Slavery and abolitionism arrested the Sedgwicks’ attention as one of the most conspicuous among the issues involving the establishment of the United States. Elizabeth Freeman, or Mumbet, for instance, who became acquainted with the Bill of Rights and the issue of the new Massachusetts Constitution, called on Catharine’s father Theodore for help to sue for freedom, which she gained in 1781 before Massachusetts passed the act to prohibit slavery. She stood out in Sedgwick’s memories as a woman who had “a clear and nice perception of justice, and a stern love of it, an uncompromising honesty in word and deed, and conduct of high intelligence,” so that she was “a remarkable exception to the general character of her race” whose moral sense was confounded by “[i]njustice and oppression.”¹⁶

Sedgwick’s private knowledge of slavery that was not easily incorporated into the theoretical framework of clear-cut dichotomization as in Martineau’s was connected to another seemingly unrelated political issue, the conflict between Federalists and Democrats, prompting her to take a cautious attitude toward radical political or social change. She confesses in her recollections of childhood that she “entered fully, and with the faith and ignorance of childhood, into the prejudices of the time,” saying that she thought every Democrat was “grasping, dishonest, and vulgar” (*LLCS*, 65), but her view of dogmas in politics stayed tempered by much caution, often doubt or skepticism as well. “A Reminiscence of Federalism,” published in *The Token* in 1834, for instance, corroborates

her skeptical attitude toward being too exclusively dogmatic and one-sided in ways that preclude “sense and reason.”¹⁷ Inscribed as “Humble Expression of the Respect and Affection of the Author” to Martineau, the short story delineates one of “the subjects that have broken the world” into “opposed and contending parties” (“Reminiscence,” 10).¹⁸ Seeing unprincipled dogmas in religion or politics as liable to create “hatred, enmity, and strife” among men, Sedgwick compares the debate which breaks the world into opposition and contention to “a snag” that interposes “unbroken surface” of a stream but that eventually “chance or time” will sweep away in its “natural unruffled union” (“Reminiscence,” 9-10)

Lastly, Unitarianism urged Catharine to caution against unprincipled action. In 1821, shortly before his death Theodore converted to Unitarianism, engaging his daughter Catharine and her brothers Henry and Robert in the tenet of gradual abolition, advocated by William Ellery Channing. In contrast to William Lloyd Garrison and other radical abolitionists, Channing advanced the cause of anti-slavery as “a moral crusade.”¹⁹ Unlike Martineau, a Unitarian who was “a thorough-going partisan of the Garrisonian wing of abolitionism,”²⁰ the Sedgwicks acted in concert with the Unitarians who developed “an evolutionary (or historical), not a static, view of human and social development whereby they stressed the importance of reason, free will, discipline, and arduous study as aids to improve the mental and moral capacities and, indeed, the spiritual development of human beings.”²¹ Martineau tolerated no other views about American identity but her own that “the American nation is composed almost entirely of the vast majority who coarsely boast, and the small minority who timidly despair, of the Republic” and that “a few wise men, under solemn and inspiring influences, laid down a loftier political programme than their successors were able to fulfill” (*HMA*, 2: 120).²² Catharine in turn criticized

Martineau for her attitude toward slavery and abolitionism as dogmatical. With “a single eye to general good” and “the light of philosophy and religion on her path,” she observes in her journal for 1835 when Martineau returned from her Southern and Western tour and visited Stockbridge, that Martineau devotes herself to “mak[ing] bread more plentiful in the husbandman’s dwelling,” and to “still[ing] the cry of hunger forever in the poor man’s cottage, and with the bread that perisheth to give him that which cometh down from heaven,” (*LLCS*, 241), while her enthusiasm is “not always manifestly supported by reason, now and then bordering on the dogmatical,” and “like all travelers” she is “liable to false judgments from one-sided views” (*LLCS*, 242).

Redwood and *The Linwoods* unfold Sedgwick’s American-style approaches to the conflict between the Divine will and a human compact, contingent on what Martineau calls “the liberties of the republic” (*HMA*, 1: 377) that precluded too hasty pursuit of a settlement. The germ of Sedgwick’s idea of gradual progress can be traced to as early as *A New-England Tale*, a tragic rendering of a New England family deteriorated by the Puritan doctrine of predestination, along with her depiction of Robert Lloyd as a Quaker, and crazy Bet as a middle-aged woman who reminds readers of Mumbet in her reference to Shays’ Rebellion and her words directed at a black slave Sukey.²³ In the furtherance of the connection between the Quakers who are “foremost and most active in efforts for the abolition of slavery”²⁴ and Mumbet, Sedgwick addresses the issue of slavery more demonstratively in her next novel *Redwood*.

Redwood was the inevitable choice Sedgwick made to grapple squarely with slavery and abolitionism. It delineates the psychology of the protagonist Henry Redwood, son of a wealthy planter in Virginia, a state where “the patrician rank has escaped in the greatest degree, the leveling principle of republicanism” (*R*, 1: 43). Baffled and frustrated in

his search for “the beauty” and “the moral sublime” (*R*, 1:44) by the death of a black slave on his father’s plantation, Henry then goes on a trip in the North, by which he plans to set his daughter Caroline free from “indolence, caprices, and tyranny” (*R*, 1: 78), when he comes across another type of religious fervor typified by the Shakers, whose outposts, as Sedgwick puts it, “advanced to the frontiers of civilization—to Kentucky—Ohio—and Indiana” (*R*, 2: 35). Sedgwick’s introduction of the “enthusiast” Edmund Westall, whose “interest in the happiness of others often led him to a singular forgetfulness of himself” (*R*, 1: 195) and of Shakers into the story which unfolds around the pivot of Henry is of great importance to the understanding of the different attitudes toward abolitionism manifested by Sedgwick and Martineau, because it discloses Sedgwick’s primary focus on civic order and property rights as an essential issue in dealing with abolition in this work.

Henry’s innate love of the virtues that “illustrate the pages of the moralists” and “the examples of heroism” (*R*, 1: 44) is most fully sharpened and harmed by one incident: his seeing a black slave in agony on his father’s plantation. At first he attempts to escape from the real world of the Southern plantation system embodied by his father, by associating with Edmund, son of a neighboring planter whose virtue and human love for all strike a chord with him, but incidents involving a Southern plantation expose to his view the tragic life of Africk, a black slave who, once torn away from his wife and two daughters at a slave auction where Henry’s father bought him, kills his own son to cut “the cord that bound [the latter] to captivity” and endures “the galling of his own chains” (*R*, 1: 50-51). A Christian faith, inspired by a homily delivered with Henry’s father’s permission, subsequently brings him, forlorn and forsaken, back to “the human family” (*R*, 1: 51), uniting him with others. Yet it encourages him to keep long vigils after hard labor, resulting in his physical condition taking a turn for the worse and leading

to whipping and abatement of his daily food ordered by Henry's father. Repulsed by "the intolerable oppression" (*R*, 1: 52) inflicted on Africk, Henry entreats his father to deal with him more tenderly. Eventually, Africk's rescue of a female slave from whipping leads to his own brutal scourging by the overseer, and then to his sudden escape from the plantation. Henry seeks for him in the premises of Westall's plantation where he sees Africk express his thanks for Edmund's "combination of faith, hope, and charity" (*R*, 1: 55) and breathe his last, begging Edmund to pray to God to save him when his "fair lands [are] drenched" with the blood of his wife and little ones among "the cry of revenge" (*R*, 1: 56).

Edmund's response to the slavery question to stop its tragedy is one proposed as more radical than a Washington-Jefferson type of emancipation. He grows up to be a planter and emancipates many of his own slaves during his lifetime and leaves a will in which he orders the liberation of all other slaves after his death, giving them freedom to remain in the plantation if they want to. He implements his will to free his family from "the curse" (*R*, 1: 56) of slavery, selling his own plantation to send his wife and son to the North. Henry says to her daughter Caroline, who scoffs at what he calls "the curse of slavery" (*R*, 1: 183) and emphasizes the danger of "the freed slaves" (*R*, 2: 183): "in resigning [Edmund's] property in [the slaves] he merely restored to them a natural right which they had received from their Creator, and which he had only withheld in the hope of fitting them to enjoy it, but which he would not leave in the power of any one to detain from them" (*R*, 1: 184).²⁵

By contrast, the alternative approach to the peculiar institution that Henry is allowed to adopt at Edmund's "instigation" to bring "benefit" to the other negroes (*R*, 1: 60) never paves the way for a "professed dislike of slavery," so "deep-rooted and unconquerable" (*R*, 1: 184) as to put a southern plantation "much in the condition of a cart without a horse" (*R*, 1: 185). When Henry carries the body of Africk back to his father's

plantation and admonishes his harsh treatment of the slaves, the latter yields to the former's arguments because of the prospect of greater economic gain. Although the scene of Africk's last moments haunts his imagination "like a voice from Heaven" (*R*, 1: 58), Henry eventually fails to maintain "some enthusiasm in the cause of benevolence" (*R*, 1: 60), due to "the most perfect indolence at home" of his father and his mother's lack of "courage to assert the rights of virtue, or power to impress them on her children" (*R*, 1: 44). In the Southern social environment lacking in the leveling principle of republicanism, he even hesitates to disclose to his parents his secret marriage to Mary Erwine, an "innocent, and beautiful, and religious" woman without "fortune" or "connexions" (*R*, 1: 61). To find his way out of the difficult situation caused by what he calls the "rash indulgence of boyish passion" (*R*, 1: 61), he just hopes to seek "an unforeseen accession of fortune, political advancement, or any of the thousand chances that happen to fortune's favourites" (*R*, 1: 63). His infirmity of purpose goes further; he is instigated into going on a tour to Europe by Alsop, a college friend affected by "reckless and busy infidelity" (*R*, 1: 45), at the expense of the money borrowed from his father on the promise that he will marry his cousin. After his departure Mary reads a letter intended for Alsop but inadvertently sent to her by Henry, leaves Virginia for some retreat in the North in "an abyss of hopeless misery" (*R*, 1: 67), and gives birth to Ellen Bruce in Philadelphia. After his return to the United States, Henry marries his cousin Maria Manning, "the idol of fashion and the favourite of fortune" (*R*, 1: 77) so that he will not "disappoint" his father's "favourite project" and "provoke his most inveterate prejudices" (*R*, 1: 62). Thus, despite an orientation to good and conscience, his indetermination and inadvertency caused by the linked issues of slavery and inheritance of property in the South deprive him of all opportunity of becoming "the benefactor of his country, its ornament and blessing" (*R*, 1: 43).

Sedgwick produces a Northern trip to come up with a quite different solution to Henry's predicament caused by the Southern institution. To find a way out of the *cul-de-sac* of the Southern way of life for his daughter by marrying her to Edmund's son Charles, Henry goes on a trip with her in the North, where he meets with an accident and gets injured, which puts him in a heterogeneous cultural environment. Through his contact with the Lenoxes, a family of New-England farmers who help him recover from injury, he comes to know his other daughter Ellen Bruce, and Mrs. Allen, a woman who brought her up after her mother's death. Henry's self-alienation caused by his thwarted aspirations is restored to normal by the abiding faith in God shown by Ellen, but this regeneration is interwoven into a number of episodes surrounding the inheritance of property, connected with each other by the issue of the Shaker community in the North.

The issue of inheritance of property and civic order is a key to a full understanding of Sedgwick's true intent in her introduction of Shakers into the story instead of Quakers as specimens of efforts for the abolition of slavery. While describing in *A New-England Tale* Robert Lloyd, a Quaker who helps protagonist Jane Elton out of a religious and economic plight created by the Wilsons, as a "disinterested" man who could "weave the happiness of others" by "imitat[ing] the Parent of the universe" (*A New-England Tale*, 120), she represents Anne Lee in *Redwood* as being "by the charitable deemed an enthusiast—by those of severer judgment, an impostor" (*R*, 1: 129). Just as she observes in her journal for 1835 when Martineau returned from her Southern and Western tour and visited Stockbridge, that the latter devotes herself to "mak[ing] bread more plentiful in the husbandman's dwelling," and to "still[ing] the cry of hunger forever in the poor man's cottage, and with the bread that perisheth to give him that which cometh down from heaven" (*LLCS*, 241), she deduces in *Redwood* that Lee couples "practical wisdom" with "the

wildest fanaticism,” adding that the founder of Shakerism deceives herself that she “proved that she understood the intricate machine of the human mind, when she declared that temporal prosperity was the indication and should be the reward of spiritual fidelity” (*R*, 2: 37).²⁶

Sedgwick goes beyond the admiration for “many valuable contrivances by which toil is lightened and success insured” into an insightful analysis of “some of the absurdities of the shaker faith” by which “foreigners and strangers from all parts of our union” are “shocked or disgusted” (*R*, 2: 37). Not defining the Shakers’ “absurdities” explicitly, she sets her focus on evaluating the “prosperity” (*R*, 2: 37) of their agriculture. She mentions about “the results of their industry, ingenuity, order, frugality, and temperance” that their skillful cultivation preserves them from many of “the disasters that fall like a curse” on “the world’s people,” such as frosts, blast, mildew, “mischievous” daisies, and “bristled” Canada thistles (*R*, 2: 37-38). Then to sum up the whole matter into a single vivid sentence, she quotes from the Bible concerning spiritual life, coupling the wrath of God on the earth with assurance of salvation that comes from leaving one’s family and giving up worldly wealth:

It is sufficiently manifest that this felicity is the natural consequence and appropriate reward of their skill, vigilance, and unwearied toil, but they believe it (or affect to believe it) to be a spiritual blessing—an assurance of peculiar favour, like that which exempted the Israelites from the seven Egyptian plagues—an accomplishment of the promise that every one that “hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or *wife*, or children, or lands for my name’s sake, shall *receive an hundredfold.*” (*R*, 2:38)

In her detailed account of the emotions of Emily Allen, who comes to find the lack of “natural feeling” (*R*, 2: 44) in the “dungeon” (*R*, 2: 18) of the Shaker village and doubt the existence of the Shaker society by “prescriptive divine right” (*R*, 2: 57) through her contact with a frank gardener, Sedgwick makes an ironical comment on the Shakers in the above quotation who, in order to protect themselves from the seven plagues, quoted from Revelation 16:1-21 and closely connected with ten calamities inflicted on Egypt in Exodus 5, presuppose the breakup of familial love and relationship, based on Matthew 19:27-29. She prompts readers to compare the italicized part of her reference to Matthew 19 quoted above with what Anne Lee says to allure Emily’s aunt Susan Allen into her society: “ye shall have in this world an hundred fold, and in the world to come, life everlasting” (*R*, 2: 29). Henry’s leaving Ellen’s mother Mary stranded without resources, and the failure of Lee’s words via Susan to assure Emily of the Shaker society’s “divine impulse” (*R*, 2: 57) underline the ironic gap between “panegyric” bestowed by Sedgwick on the “moral conduct” of the “harmless, just and upright” Shakers (*R*, 2: 40) and their “assurance of peculiar favour.”²⁷

Abolition of private property and the traditional family propounded by the Shakers as a prerequisite of abolishing “the cause of greed and violence,”²⁸ is counterposed by “the spirit of our blessed religion” with no “bigotry to any of the forms with which accident, pride, or prejudice has invested it” (*R*, 1: 157): Ellen Bruce’s “spirit of love and of reconciliation” (*R*, 1: 94). Born out of wedlock and orphaned by the death of her mother, she experiences “the holy ministration” of “our human affections” (*R*, 1: 131), such as her adoption by Mrs. Allen and an offer of adoption by Mrs. Harrison. She is, in turn, “exclusively occupied with the sufferings of others,” and “lit up with that divine expression of tender compassion, which, to a religious imagination, is the peculiar attribute of an angel’s face” (*R*, 1: 112). For instance, when she goes sketching the landscape,

she chooses out of many a little hut and a “half-withered” tree, where she finds Peggy, an orphan whose eyesight is damaged by measles, living with her aunt, an Englishwoman who came from Canada, and teaches her sewing, hymns and songs for three or four hours every day, and then goes so far as to help her to restore her sight by operation. This episode spurs Henry Redwood, who comes to know it during his walk while staying at the Lenoxes, to feel himself influenced by “the obscure virtues” (*R*, 1: 262) of her religion that “neither ask nor expect earthly notice or reward” (*R*, 1: 263).

It is worth noting here that Sedgwick’s characterization of Ellen’s “tender compassion” goes hand in hand with her emphasis of the usefulness of inherited property. For instance, Ellen cares for Mrs. Allen, an adoptive parent who suffers from Emily’s joining the Shakers as well as from the debt that her husband Justin has left due to his fruitless endeavor to cover up the loss because of the damage from fire on their house by embarking on “a mercantile enterprise” to get “easy acquisitions of trade” (*R*, 1: 158). She makes “the best use” of her “little inheritance” in “appropriating” it so that Mrs. Allen can redeem “a valuable portion of her property” (*R*, 1: 163).

Deborah Lenox, an Amazon with the spirit of independence as well as benevolence, whom Martineau highly praises as “capital—drawn to the life” in “Miss Sedgwick’s Works,” helps and guides Ellen through adversity with her “earnest words,” the “living pathos” of her deeds and “a deep repose” (“SW,” 50), one instance of which exemplifies her attitudes toward property. When asked by Henry, who cannot escape his destiny of “feel[ing] right” and “act[ing] wrong” (*R*, 1: 266), about “an easy rule” to become “god-like on the earth” (*R*, 1: 210), she advises that he make “the cause of the poor thine own” (*R*, 1: 210), inducing him to give five hundred dollars to Ellen. When on their “crusade” (*R*, 1: 261) to the village of Shakers to rescue Emily out of “her unnatural seclusion” (*R*, 1: 260) Ellen

refuses to accept the sum, Deborah cautions against Ellen's decline of Henry's offer that she afforded an incentive to. Admitting Ellen's "meek and quiet spirit" (*R*, 1: 233) as "the best riches" (*R*, 2: 187), she observes that "there's neither quails nor manna now-a-days, and one must look a little to the needful" (*R*, 2: 187). Significantly, in her letter to Ellen given at the end of the story she verifies the latter's decline of property as due to her prayer like "Agur's prayer—give me neither poverty nor riches," not to the fact that she "despised" property (*R*, 2: 289). Sedgwick seemingly attempts to temper her ironical criticism of the Shakers by saying in the same letter to Ellen that Emily has learned "many prudent and prospering ways" among the Shakers that will make "a first-rate wife," but inevitably reveals her true intent: "if [the Shakers] could be prevailed on to turn their settlement into a school to bring up young folks for the married state, they would be a blessing to the world, instead of a spectacle to show how much wisdom and how much folly may be mixed up together" (*R*, 2: 283).

Sedgwick seeks the reconciliation between Ellen and Caroline, Henry's half-daughters and symbols of the North and the South respectively, through transference of property by inheritance. When Caroline elopes with Captain Fitzgerald near the ending of the story and her wiles are brought to light, Ellen urges Charles to take Caroline back to Henry, and then forgives her, when she returns, for her "slights" and "insults" (*R*, 2: 270). Caroline inherits the Redwood fortune, with Henry in custody, which comes from Caroline's mother Maria Manning. Despite Ellen's declining Caroline's generous offer to convey a large portion of her fortune to Ellen, the story ends with the premature death of Caroline in the West Indies after her marriage to Fitzgerald, and Ellen's taking charge of educating her half-sister's daughter. The ending of *Redwood* suggests the negation of a Northern replacement of the Southern institution in the form of Shakerism by implying the

inheritance of Maria Manning's property from Henry through Caroline to Ellen.²⁹

The importance of the inheritance of property is underlined by its inclusion as a main theme of the story involving other important characters around Ellen. Grace Campbell, with whom Ellen gets confidential on her way to the village of Shakers, says to the latter that she loathes inheriting her uncle's property, because she has been brought up among the Moravians, who stressed the importance of living an ethical Christian life and took an early lead in challenging slavery; she insists that receiving "the rich inheritance" requires "the hardest slavery, the slavery of the mind, the complete subjection of the will" (*R*, 2: 191). Yet, in attempting to keep out of her uncle's control by sharing his property with her cousin Fenton Campbell, she comes to know the latter's virtue of "thriftiness" (*R*, 2: 197) and loving support for his family, while her acts deeply impress him, motivating him to appear as Howard, a Bostonian. Their sympathetic understanding of each other resulting from their loathing of inheritance leads them to their union based on shared inheritance. By contrast, Reuben Harrington, an elder Shaker who abuses Emily mentally and kidnaps her to marry, turns to his own advantage the Shakers' supposition of "communal life in which all property is held in common ownership"³⁰; he absconds with their funds by saying that "The Israelites were commanded to spoil the Egyptians, and we are . . . ordered, to take of the lucre (which belongeth equally to our brethren and to us) in order to help us forward in our blessed mission, and to reward our labours" (*R*, 2: 48). If "the religious principle, with all its attendant doubts, hopes, fears, enthusiasm, and hypocrisy," as Sedgwick observes in the Introduction, is "a mighty agent in moulding human character," and if it finds with "propriety" "a place in a work whose object it is to delineate that character" (*R*, 1: ix), "the perfection of earth and the beauty of heaven built up and fitly framed together" (*R*, 2: 288), shown in

Ellen's restoration of her father's serenity, connotes the necessarily interwoven relation between the religious fervor and the inheritance of property.

After turning in *Clarence* (1830) to a tragic unfolding of racial amalgamation and the antithesis between nature and artificial society, Sedgwick takes a dauntlessly explicit step to the issue of slavery in *The Linwoods* correlated with the nascent idea of federalism during the embryonic years of nationhood. The work offers "a representation of heroes," contrary to Martineau's literary warning, whose "living voice has scarcely died away upon the ear of the existing generation" ("SW," 58), revealing her strong devotion to federalism to demonstrate the possibilities of Americans' "shared heritage."³¹

In the rendering of the embryonic years of the country Sedgwick does not set up a rigid dichotomy in the work concerning regional differences but addresses herself to "the ties that bind together the human family," exhibited in "new force and beauty"³² through the antithesis between liberty and arbitrary rule. The work offers "a representation of heroes" ("SW," 58), revealing her strong association of democracy with federalism. The characters in the story can be roughly divided according to this scheme into two groups. One group, which includes Eliot Lee, a New Englander, and Herbert Linwood, a New Yorker, represents the independence and self-government of the Patriots, and the other, which includes Herbert's father Robert Linwood, and Herbert and Eliot's mutual friend Jasper Meredith, supports loyalty to Great Britain.

Into the clash between these two groups Sedgwick interweaves the "romance" of "purity of the institution of marriage," so as to "value the soul and its high offices above all earthly consideration" (*L*, 2: 286), setting up another strand of the plot involving Eliot's sister Bessie, whose mission is "to keep alive and tend with vestal fidelity the fires of charity and love" (*L*, 1: 60), Herbert's sister Isabella, a "rebel chieftainess" (*L*, 1:

32) with “what our Shaker friends would call a *leading gift*” (*L*, 1: 33-34), and Jasper’s fiancée Anne Seton, an “independent, true, and kind-hearted” (*L*, 2: 68) English lady who eventually adopts “the true *American order of merit*” (*L*, 2: 275). To fuse these two strands of plot to reinforce each other, Sedgwick offers a vivid representation of heroes, contrary to Martineau’s warning, whose “living voice has scarcely died away upon the ear of the existing generation” (“SW,” 58); George Washington functions in Sedgwick’s scheme to strengthen the “ties” of sympathy and fraternity between Eliot and Herbert, while La Fayette serves to help Bessie carry out her difficult journey to New York, where Jasper’s relationships with Bessie, Isabella, and Anne are explored through his contrast with Eliot and Herbert.

Sedgwick represents Eliot Lee as being born and raised in Westbrook near Boston, propounding the idea of the landing of the Mayflower at Plymouth as the fundamental American political symbol; Americans have not been “goaded to resistance by oppression,” nor “fretted and chafed, with bits and collars, to madness,” she maintains, but estimated “the worth of independence and the right of self-government,” sacrificing themselves for “the prospective good of their children” (*L*, 1: 102). The unfolding of the story reveals her intention to show how the spirit of independence, or “the transmitted spirit of freedom, sown at broadcast by our Pilgrim fathers” (*L*, 1: 102), began to take root in American regions.

Putting “the worth of independence and the right of self-government” over “the angry impatience of overburdened animals” is demonstrated most compellingly by Herbert Linwood. Being early disposed toward “love of self-direction” (*L*, 1: 33), he develops “the germe of his whiggism” (*L*, 1: 33) into the spirit of independence, by studying in New England, a region which “has from the first been a favourite school for the youth from the middle and southern states” (*L*, 1: 33). Yet in maintaining “the dignified resolve of thinking beings” (*L*, 1:102), he is alienated from his

family in New York, where his father Robert openly avows that he would prefer to starve to death rather than tasting “a crumb of bread that was the reward of rebellion” (*L*, 1: 62), and others are “unduly excited” by the “monstrous” tales of the atrocities that the New Englanders have performed on the tories (*L*, 1: 255). He is tormented by a sense of dishonoring his father, or what Isabella calls breaking “the third commandment” (*L*, 1: 60).

Eliot’s mission given by Washington to meet Sir Henry Clinton spurs Herbert to strike a balance between fulfilling his filial duty and pursuing the cause of independence, and then Isabella to commence political action against the British. When Eliot is sent to New York on a mission given by Washington to meet Sir Henry Clinton, Herbert follows him under the guise of Kisel without Eliot’s noticing it to see his family. He is arrested as a whig, but his rash acts transform Isabella into a sympathizer of the independence and self-government of the Patriots. At first she attributes “self-originating prejudices,” pervading the country, against “the legitimate rights of the mother country over her wayward, ungrateful child” (*L*, 1: 64), to the “all-sufficient, self-sufficient, and *insufficient*” (*L*, 1: 65) New Englanders, but in a struggle to release Herbert from imprisonment she perceives “the folly of measuring American society by a European standard” and of “permitting its vigorous youth to be cramped and impaired by transmitted manacles and shackles,” and seeks to use the “faculties” Heaven has endowed her with “freely and independently” (*L*, 1: 210), culminating in “enthusiasm in the American cause” (*L*, 2: 261).

As well as functioning as a link between Eliot and Herbert, Washington, who observes that “[Americans] extent of territory and gradual settlement, will enable them to maintain something like a war of posts, against the invasion of luxury, dissipation, and corruption,”³³ motivates the story to develop the antithesis between “the true *American order of merit*” and “the artificial and vicious society of Europe.” The

quest for liberty is further reinforced by the antithesis between democracy and aristocracy or feudalism. Jasper Meredith plays the role of the antagonist that questions the American cause and values. In the character of a man “of the privileged order” and “connected with many a noble family in the mother country” (*L*, 1: 41), whose tastes are “aristocratic and feudal” (*L*, 1: 68), he holds in low esteem Bessie’s virtue as coming from “a seclusion almost equal to that of Prospero’s isle” (*L*, 1: 76), devastating what is “all sentiment, refinement, imagination” (*L*, 1: 54). When he fails to capture the affection of Isabella due to her distrust of “his miserable vanity” (*L*, 2: 190), he exerts himself to contract a marriage with Anne Seton, but his ambition is utterly shattered by Seton’s breaking away from “the artificial and vicious society of Europe” where “youth and beauty” are bartered for money for “the merely legal union of persons and fortunes” into the American advocacy of “holy and most precious bonds with right motives and right feelings” (*L*, 2: 286).³⁴

Through the marriage of Eliot Lee and Isabel Linwood, preceded by that of Herbert Linwood and Ann Seton, which is approved by Mrs. Washington under “the orders of the commander-in-chief” (*L*, 2: 265), industry and frugality, New England characteristics, are presented as a model that should be cultivated by people in “a country that is sure to smile upon these qualities, and reward them with as much worldly prosperity as is necessary to happiness, and safe for virtue” (*L*, 2: 286). Sedgwick argues in the form of the advice of Mary Archer to her niece Isabella, that the ongoing antagonism between people in the North and the South only “disturbs the sweet accords of nature, sacrilegiously severs the bonds by which God has united man to man, and breaks the human family into parties and sects of people” (*L*, 1: 256). In Mary’s “fairer point of view” (*L*, 1: 257), the Southerners’ tendency to “look with contempt on the provident, frugal sons of the Puritans,” and the Northerners’, “blinded in their turn,” to “see nothing but the swollen pride

of slave-owners and hard-heartedness of slave-drivers in their brethren of the south” (*L*, 1: 256-57), are “earthborn vapours” (*L*, 1: 256), compared to the occupation of the British, “aliens to the soil” trained to “the inhuman trade of war” who have “neither ‘built houses nor tilled lands’ here” (*L*, 1: 257). The aristocracy and feudalism of Great Britain is replaced here by new American values underlying various localities.

In the drama of the quest for liberty, thus forcefully demonstrated, to achieve the common property of the Union African Americans are portrayed as servants, not as slaves; in the then province of New York, Sedgwick says, Black slaves were “almost the only servants” (*L*, 1: 221). They are provided with two kinds of roles in the story which are allocated according to sex. One of them is positively represented and played by Rose, a female servant and mainstay of the family who is allowed a chance to participate in the war, while the other, represented by Jupiter, is destined to be deprived of any power and ousted from any participation, familial or political. The former assumes the nurse role in the Linwoods, provided with every kind of gift to demonstrate their high evaluation of her. More important, when Isabella is eight years old, she forces her father to release Rose from slavery, since she hears her say that any gift given her to show their gratitude never frees her from the consciousness that she is under “a yoke” which “galls” her, making her feel that she can be “bought and sold like the cattle” (*L*, 1: 221). When Rose cries that she would “die to-morrow to be free to-day” (*L*, 1: 221), Isabella’s “spirit of truth and independence” (*L*, 1: 222) responds to Rose’s cravings, spurring her to work hard to get a prize in school for the best French scholar and resulting in the acquisition of the deed of manumission for Rose.

The restoration of Rose’s “natural rights” (*L*, 1: 224), which frees her from “galling shackles” (*L*, 1: 224), qualifies her in the capacity of a staunch ally for the deliverance of Herbert from the confinement by the British. When his family attempt to help him to escape out of the prison

in which he is held after entering New York City and having his identity revealed, Rose plays a major part in the plan by switching places with him. After visiting the prison to see him for several days, she succeeds in relaxing the wariness of the British, and on a day of decisive action she helps him disguise as a black woman to go out of the prison. Putting on a cloak, a mask which Ann and Isabella worked on, and a wig of a black person's hair, he exclaims: "I know some *wool* that covers a far better head than mine—more capable, more discerning; and God never created a nobler heart than beats under one black skin" (*L*, 2: 232). Her heroism goes beyond that. She surpasses Cunningham, a British provost marshal, in physical strength, getting him down when he has found Herbert gone to make good the latter's escape. She finally goes out of the prison unflustered warning Cunningham to keep silent so that nobody would know he was immobilized by a black woman.

It is important to note that black participation in the Revolution is limited only to Rose in *The Linwoods*. Other blacks are excluded from it. When Mary Archer says at an early stage of the story that it will be troublesome for Bessie to experience a New York lifestyle where many whites are served by black servants, Isabella answers that she needs no other black servants than Rosa. Mary replies, "I believe you would, Belle, happier and better too; for the energy which sometimes finds wrong channels now, would then be well employed" (*L*, 1: 35). This does not mean that both of them support abolitionism, but that all black servants except for Rosa are just "plagues" (*L*, 1: 38).

Typical of "plagues" in the story is Jupiter, "an irreclaimable gossip" and "a useless piece of lumber" (*L*, 2: 202), who is driven out of the Linwoods, because Rose "declared that it exceeded the ability of her commissary department to supply his rations" (*L*, 2: 102). Like his friend "general," who argues that there is nothing left but death to rebels who fight for freedom and that if the British were driven away there

would be “no balls, no races, no t’eatres, no music, no cast-off rigimentals” (*L*, 1: 225), Jupiter plays the role of one of the “lazy, slavish loons” (*L*, 1: 226). Rose lashes out at his skeptical attitudes toward black participation in the Revolution, when he so cynically relates to her how Herbert once upheld liberty by saying “all men were born free and equal” as to presume it better to say “all men were born white and tall” (*L*, 1: 226).

Jupiter is excluded from the American cause for freedom and independence as soon as the story starts. Isabella and Bessie are accompanied by him on their visit to Effi to ask for their fortune, when he advises them to retrace their steps because it is drawing toward sunset. Isabella, who sees him as “a desperate coward” (*L*, 1: 16), in her turn, scares him by bringing up a story about an old slave insurgency in New York. She points at the hill where the gallows are to remind him of the execution of slaves who were involved in the plot. He alludes to the loss of his grandmother and aunts, but she is indifferent to his feelings. *The Linwoods* gains impetus when Jupiter runs away from the two girls frantically.

Jupiter’s inappropriateness as a potential ally for the achievement of freedom and independence is corroborated by the scene toward the end of the story where he comes along before the people of the Linwoods, who are watching the triumphant entry of the Patriots. Robert Linwood forces himself to believe in “almost any extravagance of the levelling Americans” (*L*, 2: 279), but feels disgusted at the idea of “agrarianism” (*L*, 2: 279) on listening to Jupiter, who says he will dine with General Washington, while Isabella responds to their former servant by saying “New-York will no longer be a place for idlers of any degree” (*L*, 2: 280). Jupiter retorts that “I’m afraid there’ll be too much work and ’fusion for me,” adding that he will retire to “the manor,” with “all complacency in a classification which sorted him with those whom he styled the genteel” (*L*,

2: 280), and bows and passes on. Sedgwick only briefly refers here to “agrarianism,” “manor” and “genteel,” but readers are invited to read Jupiter as an ironic advocate of Washington’s agrarianism that “The innate desire for freedom and self-rule makes farming the activity most suited to human nature,”³⁵ since Jupiter refuses any laboring, whether on farms or in workshops.

Sedgwick’s exclusion of Jupiter and other African-American males from the cultures of the United States functions as a stratagem that seeks to establish them as an ineffective element of subversion beyond question.³⁶ The Conspiracy of 1741, also known as the Negro Plot of 1741 or the Slave Insurrection of 1741 in New York, arose from whites’ fear of African Americans and made New York “hostile toward slavery as an institution” as a reaction from the outrage against African Americans.³⁷ By refashioning a black rebellion into the past in her characterization of Jupiter and by setting down hostility toward slavery as an institution as an incontrovertible fact by Isabella’s “moral crusade” for manumission of Rose, Sedgwick proceeded on her new approach to the issue of slavery and abolition in *The Linwoods*, limiting her discourse to “the ties that bind together the human family” in the country by allotting such non-American values as “artificial and vicious” tendency to barter anything holy and human for “money” to Jasper and the British.

In 1834, when Lydia Maria Child presented Sedgwick with *An appeal in favor of that class of Americans called Africans* (1833) and urged her to contribute an article to an antislavery gift book *Oasis*, Sedgwick wrote to her that she did not think “immediate abolition is best for the slaves,” demanding prerequisites of conditions suitable for slaves’ freedom and self-governing, and pronounced her opinion that “it is the part of wisdom to find [slavery as a crime] the safest way to escape the consequences.”³⁸ Child blamed Sedgwick for being “very deficient in

moral courage,”³⁹ but the latter never wavered in her resolve never to be labeled as an advocate of abolitionism until her death.

In her letter of 10 March, 1860 to Susan Channing Sedgwick confessed that she had refused Eliza Follen’s offer to join her at a meeting of national Anti-slavery movement, though she unwillingly attended an antislavery fair in Boston in 1856. She wrote that she felt “heartily in the great question of humanity that agitates our people,” but hastened to add that “so much had been intemperately said, so much rashly urged on the death of that noble martyr, John Brown, by the Abolitionists, that it was not right to appear among them as one of them” (*LLCS*, 378). In her letter of 5 January, 1861 to Penelope Russell she expressed her innermost feelings by saying that “I cling to the Union as an unweaned child does to its mother’s breast” (*LLCS*, 388-89), and observed that “it seems to me we should stand in awe, and only pray that God’s will may be done in this great matter” (*LLCS*, 389), forcing herself to admit that God “will permit the Southern suicidal madness to rage and *prevail* to the great end of blotting slavery from the land it poisons,” because the United States is dominated by “abolition fanaticism” as well as “ultra concession and conservatism” (*LLCS*, 389). She resigns herself here to the fate of her country moving in a different direction from what she thought would be. Sedgwick’s approach is, as Dan McKanan argues, to “expand the liberal constituency through familial affection and sentimental identification rather than to sharpen partisan lines dividing liberals from their enemies,”⁴⁰ but her sentimental and human-interest stories corroborate her stoic criticism of the nation which takes its way against her expectations.

In a letter of February of the same year to Mrs. Channing, Sedgwick wrote that “The Cotton States may remain out,” but added that “I have not yet come down to the level of the despairing of our country” (*LLCS*, 389). She had “strong hopes, perhaps confidence in the future,” and

went so far as to say that “I have faith in the farther development, of the effect of our institutions,” because they are “seed sown by the righteous—sown in love and justice to the whole family,” adding that “We are making the first experiment of the greatest happiness to the greatest number, and Providence will not permit it to fail short of consummation” (*LLCS*, 389). She saw “the elements of life and health” in her country, since it was “in harmony with the great natural laws” (*LLCS*, 389).

Martineau forced the Sedgwicks to choose between the Divine will and a human compact, but it was too much of an antinomy in terms of social and political progress in the United States to be solved in a doctrinarian and dogmatic manner. Starting with *Redwood* in grasping the essentials of abolitionism in terms of civic order and property rights, Sedgwick argued back against Martineau in rendering the colonial mindset and the actual events in *The Linwoods* that marked the beginning of cultural, social and political values of the United States.

Notes

1. Harriet Martineau, “Miss Sedgwick’s Works,” *London and Westminster Review*, vol. 30 (October 1838), 43; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as “SW.”
2. For a view of Sedgwick as a political novelist rather than a novelist of manners, see Carolyn L. Karcher, “Catharine Maria Sedgwick in Literary History,” in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Lucinda Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements (Boston: Northeastern UP, 2003), 5-15, and Susan K. Harris, “The Limits of Authority: Catharine Maria Sedgwick and the Politics of Resistance,” in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, 272-85.

3. In her discussion of Sedgwick's works Martineau makes no mention of *Clarence; or A Tale of Our Own Times*, published in 1830, probably due to Sedgwick's rendering of the tragic ends of Gertrude Clarence's grandfather Edmund Clarence's marriages. Edmund marries twice in the story, first Mary Temple, a white Englishwoman, and then Eli Clairon, "tinged with African blood" (*Clarence; or, A Tale of Our Own Times*, eds. Melissa J. Homestead and Ellen A. Foster [Petersborough, Ontario: Broadview, 2012], 85). By his first marriage, which ends in separation due to Mary's infidelity, he has Charles Carroll (aka Charles Clarence), Gertrude's father; he is taken away to the United States by John Savil, Edmund's clerk who tries absconding with the money remitted to England for the benefit of Charles' health, but eventually taken out of the orphanage in New York and brought up by the Roscoe family. By contrast, Edmund's second marriage ends with the suicides of Eli and their child Marcellini in the West Indies, regardless of the former's love for Edmund and the latter's "rare talent" (*Clarence*, 62) and showing his "attachment" (*Clarence*, 63) to his father. Also, Sedgwick's view of the Southern culture makes the tension between nature and artificial society or aristocracy, the work's main theme, fraught with ambivalence. The Marions from Virginia are delineated by her as "the very reverse" of the character that is "often ascribed by northern prejudice and bigotry to our southern brethren": "The blood of English nobles," as she puts it, "ran in their veins, and was not, in their estimation, less honorable for having, in its transmission to them, warmed the hearts of pure republican patriots" (*C*, 216). Martineau surely classified it as not deserving even a brief mention in her criticism of Sedgwick's novels. For reviews of *Clarence*, see *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, 101-3; and *Clarence*, eds. Homestead and Foster, 453-63.
4. For favorable reviews that *Redwood* earned for its lack of extravagance, see Lucinda L. Damon-Bach, "To 'Act' and 'Transact': *Redwood's*

- Revisionary Heroines,” in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, 56-57.
5. For Sedgwick’s espousal of white civilization’s values, see Masahiro Nakamura, “Versions of *Yamoyden*: Native Americans in Early Nineteenth-Century Narratives,” *Arizona Quarterly*, vol. 70, no. 3, (Autumn 2014), 140-44.
 6. As Richard C. Sinopoli rightly observes, there is hardly any clear-cut dichotomization between liberalism and republicanism in terms of civic virtue, in contrast to revisionist readings in the recent decades that see liberalism as “a selfish philosophy destructive of community” that “undermines community by emphasizing the rights of the individual over the ends and values people create as citizens who share and act upon a conception of the common good” (*The Foundations of American Citizenship: Liberalism, the Constitution, and Civic Virtue* [New York: Oxford UP, 1992], 20). Both Federalists and Anti-Federalists “considered in some depth the social and psychological bases of civic motivations” (Sinopoli 157). For Federalists’ view of “the proper role of the citizen in the American polity” (Sinopoli 158), see Sinopoli 87-99.
 7. Harris, 273. Harris argues that “for Sedgwick the Revolution laid the basis for a society in which social and political relationships would eventually lead to the perfectibility of man” (273), but my essay aims to focus on Sedgwick’s persistent, unflagging struggle to reconcile “social and political relationships” with “the perfectibility of man” in her view of the character and institutions of her own country.
 8. Arturo Casas, “Antagonism and Subjectification in the Poem of Resistance,” *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*, vol. 6, no. 2 (2010), 72.
 9. Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, vol. 1 (London: Saunders and Otley, 1837), xi; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as *SA*.

10. Martineau's campaign against slavery was so vehement that she fell into the fallacy of thinking that she had herself once warned against; to extend the range of "philosophical knowledge," she observes in "Essays on the Art of thinking", "we must be careful that our minds are so disciplined as to receive new ideas without prejudice, that they are strengthened for the formation of new conceptions, prepared to apply well-known truths in their proper places, and to leave them behind when we enter on unexplored and extended regions" (Martineau, "Essays on the Art of Thinking," in *Miscellanies*, vol. I [Boston: Hilliard, Gray and Company, 1836], 74. For Martineau's "social realism," see Robert K. Webb, *Harriet Martineau, a Radical Victorian* (New York: Columbia UP, 1960), 40.
11. Martineau, *Harriet Martineau's Autobiography*, ed. Maria Weston Chapman, 2 vols. (Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., 1877), 1: 376; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as *HMA*.
12. For the rivalry and diversity among the states of the American nation, used as a strategy of logic of heterogeneity against taking a one-sided view of slavery by an American who was "rather more of an abolitionist in feeling than in principle," see Masahiro Nakamura, "Henry Hughes and Hawthorne: The South in the Social Dynamics of Controversy," *The Bulletin of Aichi University of Education*, vol. 51, (March 2002): 89-98.
13. A review of *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*, published in *London Examiner*, qtd. in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, 209.
14. Sedgwick, *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1841), 1: 250; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as *LAKH*.
15. Sedgwick, *Redwood: A Tale* (New York: E. Bliss and E. White, 1824), vol. 1, x-xi; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as *R*.
16. Sedgwick, *Life and Letters of Catharine M. Sedgwick*, ed. Mary E. Dewey (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1871), 41; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as *LLCS*. Mumbet, or Freeman, devoted herself to the service

of the Sedgwicks as “the main pillar of our household,” and Catharine grew, while her father was away in the Congress and in other political positions, not only under her care but also among “the favorite servants,” including Grippy, who “enlisted in the army of the Revolution,” Sampson Derby, “the cook, a runaway slave,” Lady Prime, and “various others who, to my mind’s eye, are still young, vigorous, and alert” (*LLCS*, 41). Sedgwick’s love for Freeman never changed. On 29 November, 1829, one month before Freeman’s death, she represented her as “characterized by a clear mind—strong judgment—a quick and firm decision—an iron resolution—an incorruptible integrity—an integrity that never for a moment parleyed with temptation—a truth that never varied from the straight line—an unexceptionable fidelity to her engagements” (Mary Kelley, ed. *The Power of Her Sympathy: The Autobiography and Journal of Catharine Maria Sedgwick* [Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993], 125). She was, as Sedgwick writes in “Slavery in New England,” published in *Bentley’s Miscellany* in 1853, “a guardian to the childhood, a friend to the maturity, a staff to the old age of those she served” (“Slavery in New England,” *Bentley’s Miscellany*, vol. 34 [1853]: 424). For Sedgwicks’ views on slavery, see Jonathan H. Earle, *Jacksonian Antislavery and the Politics of Free Soil, 1824-1854* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2004), 52-54. For Theodore’s attitude toward abolition on a national level, see Ivy Schweitzer, *Perfecting Friendship: Politics and Affiliation in Early American Literature* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006), 237.

17. Sedgwick, “A Reminiscence of Federalism,” in *Tales and Sketches* (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Blanchard, 1835), 36.
18. Sedgwick does not make a clear allusion to the issue of abolition in the story, but the plotline makes readers realize that it “offers a critique of abolition and warns of the dangers this debate poses to national union” (John Austin, “The Collection as Literary Form: Sedgwick’s *Tales and*

Sketches of 1835,” in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, 164). In Carrington, a Vermont village where “all qualities and relations” are “merged in the political attribute,” and even a horse is “converted into a political instrument” (“Reminiscence,” 24), a local congressional election takes place. The story demonstrates how Randolph, whose father is a Southern planter, is taken over by his grandfather Hayford, a Democrat who hates Southern slavery, along with how he finds himself in a predicament, torn between his loyalty to his grandfather and his doubt about giving a vote to “an unprincipled demagogue” (“Reminiscence,” 35), as well as his love for Fanny Atwood, daughter of a Federalist.

19. David Robinson, ed. *William Ellery Channing: Selected Writings* (New York: Paulist, 1985), 26. In a lecture given in Lenox on 1 August 1842, in which he addressed the audience, “unmasked, uninvited” (*William Ellery Channing*, 269) Channing mentions “the wrongs and abominations” of slavery that “does all that lies in human power to unmake men, to rob them of their humanity, to degrade men into brutes” (*William Ellery Channing*, 271), adding that he has long since “deplored the insensibility of the North to the evils of Slavery and inquired by what means it might be removed” (*William Ellery Channing*, 269).
20. Webb, *Martineau*, 23.
21. Richard O. Curry and Karl E. Valois, “The Emergence of an Individualistic Ethos in American Society,” in *American Chameleon: Individualism in Trans-National Context*, eds. Richard O. Curry and Lawrence B. Goodheart (Kent: Kent State UP, 1991), 35.
22. Hearing the story of Elizabeth Freeman from the Sedgwicks, Martineau mentioned her in *Retrospect of Western Travel* (1841). She wrote about how Freeman came to obtain her freedom from Colonel Ashley of Sheffield through the assistance of Theodore Sedgwick, and how the “village of Stockbridge, in the absence of the gentlemen, depended on Mum Bett for its safety” (Martineau, *Retrospect of Western Travel*, vol. II [London:

Saunders and Otley, 1838], 47), adding that Freeman was buried in the graveyard of the Sedgwicks. Yet Freeman did not serve Martineau as an exceptional nor typical instance of people under slavery. As she observes, “As far as energy and talent are concerned, I should hesitate to say that in her own sphere Mum Bett ‘had no superior nor equal:’ and the same may be said about the quality of fidelity” (49). Slaves are, in her eyes, “more or less degraded by slavery in proportion to their original strength of character, or educational discipline of mind,” and that “[t]he lowest order prefer release from duties and cares to the enjoyment of rights and the possession of themselves,” while “the highest order have a directly opposite taste” (44). The stories of the latter, she adds, are “as various as the characters and fortunes of the heroes of them,” and “[m]any facts of this nature became known to me during my travels, most of which cannot be published, for fear of involving in difficulty either the escaped heroes, or those who assisted them in regaining their liberty” (45). Later in “Slavery in New England,” citing Martineau’s account of Freeman as having been published in *Society in America*, Sedgwick commented on it as “but partial, and by a stranger” (“Slavery in New England,” 418fn). For Sedgwick’s “serious reservations about Garrisonian methods,” see Karen Woods Weierman, “A Slave Story I Began and Abandoned: Sedgwick’s Antislavery Manuscript,” in *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, 132.

23. Sedgwick describes Robert Lloyd, a Quaker who helps protagonist Jane Elton out of a religious and economic plight created by the Wilsons, as a “disinterested” man who could “weave the happiness of others” by “imitat[ing] the Parent of the universe” (Sedgwick, *A New-England Tale*, [New York: Penguin, 2003], 120). In a scene where Jane describes the achievements of Lloyd’s sect in the presence of jealous Edward Erskine, Sedgwick represents the Quakers as “foremost and most active in efforts for the abolition of slavery” (127). Crazy Bet, a watcher by the side of a

grave “where twenty years before were deposited the remains of her lover, who was drowned on the day before they were to have been married” (14), recounts Lucy Willett’s heartbreaking story, and mentions Shays’ Rebellion in her account of Lucy’s death. We can read in her Mumbet, protector of the property of the Sedgwicks’ from looters in Shays’ Rebellion in 1786 and 1787. Crazy Bet also criticizes Mrs. Wilson for her tendency to discrimination; she tears at the bedclothes at Mrs. Wilson’s because the latter refused to let her stay at her house, and when Sukey, a black servant at the Wilsons’, tries to stop her from doing so, Crazy Bet advises the servant to “look in the glass, and you’ll see how white you’ll be in heaven; the black stains will all be washed out there!” (89) Scholars have noted a resemblance between Crazy Bet and “a well-known Berkshire eccentric of the early 1800s” (Timothy Kenslea, *The Sedgwicks in Love: Courtship, Engagement, and Marriage in the Early Republic* [Boston: Northeastern UP, 2006], 32), and Kenslea supposes Pamela Sedgwick, Catharine’s mother, to be the model of the character (32), but it is important to note that Sedgwick mentions her as “Mumbet (mamma Bet)” in *Life and Letters* (41). Sedgwick owes the tragic rendering of a New England family deteriorated by the Puritan doctrine of predestination to Channing’s “The Moral Argument against Calvinism,” published one year before her conversion to Unitarianism, in which he insisted on “the testimony of our rational and moral faculties against Calvinism” (*William Ellery Channing*, 117).

24. Sedgwick, *A New-England Tale*, 127.
25. For Southern proslavery argument involving emancipation, see Masahiro Nakamura, *Visions of Order in William Gilmore Simms: Southern Conservatism and the Other American Romance* (Columbia, SC.: U of South Carolina P, 2009), 7-12.
26. Religion in the South, by contrast, delineated as “fanaticism” and typified by “amiable madmen” such as “a zealous methodist or moravian,”

- functions to stimulate Africk both to “human communion or sympathy” (*R*, 1: 51) and to relief from the misery of his life, or, as in Edmund’s case, it spurs a slaveholder on to free all slaves.
27. Martineau downplayed the celibacy of the Shakers to their having “no other interesting subject of thought beyond their daily routine of business; no objects in life, no wants, no hopes, no novelty of experience whatever” (*SA*, 1: 313).
 28. Elisa Sobo and Sandra Bell, *Celibacy, Culture, and Society: The Anthropology of Sexual Abstinence* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2001), 114. The Shakers saw “greed, murder, and other sins” as issuing from “the existence of private property,” and private property as “based on the family and on inheritance along one line of descent or another” (Sobo and Bell, 114). As for the Shakers’ differences from Quakers, see also Lynn Bridgers, *The American Religious Experience: A Concise History* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006), 84-86.
 29. For “the contrasting effects of a Southern and a Northern upbringing” on Henry’s daughters, leading to his repentance of “his errant ways,” see Karcher, “Catharine Maria Sedgwick,” 8-9.
 30. Sobo and Bell, 114.
 31. Weierman, “A Slave Story,” 134. Weierman suggests in her discussion of “A Slave Story I Began and Abandoned” that it is “quite possible” that Sedgwick “looked back to the Revolution” due to her inability to “write solutions to this brewing regional conflict” (133), but Sedgwick’s publication of “A Reminiscence of Federalism” the year before that of *The Linwoods* corroborates her strong devotion to federalism rather than her inability to “craft a satisfactory ending or peaceful resolution that would offer a model for the nation” (Weierman, “A Slave Story,” 133).
 32. Sedgwick, *The Linwoods; or, “Sixty Years Since” in America* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835), 1: 163; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as *L*.

33. Bruce S. Thornton and Victor Davis Hanson, “‘The Western Cincinnatus’: Washington as Farmer and Soldier,” in *Patriot Sage: George Washington and the American Political Tradition*, eds. Gary L. Gregg II and Matthew Spalding (Wilmington: ISI Books, 1999), 47.
34. Tellingly, Sedgwick gives an adequate, well-balanced appraisal of Southern agrarianism in her rendering of Ruthven, a friend of Washington’s from childhood. He is, as she puts it, “marked by the general characteristics, physical and moral, of a Virginian: the lofty nature, strong and well-built frame, the open brow, and expression of nobleness and kindness of disposition, and a certain something, not vanity, nor pride, nor in the least approaching to superciliousness, but a certain happy sense of the superiority, not of the individual, but of the great mass of which he is a component part” (*L*, 1: 130).
35. Thornton and Hanson, 47.
36. Stephen P. Knadler observes that by displacing “traditionally ‘feminine’ defects of character” like “effeminacy and luxury” onto the black man, “Sedgwick persuades her readers of the white woman’s fitness for service in the formation of the national character” (*The Fugitive Race: Minority Writers Resisting Whiteness* [Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2002], 15). For the fear of black male agency within the antebellum middleclass home, see Knadler, 14-5.
37. Cleveland Rogers and Rebecca B. Rankin, *New York: the World’s Capital City: Its Development and Contributions to Progress* (New York: Harper, 1948), 51. For the rising fear of slave riots combined with the national movement of abolitionism, see Charlene Avallone, “Catharine Sedgwick’s White Nation-Making: Historical Fiction and *The Linwoods*,” *ESQ*, 55, vol. 2 (2009): 101-5. For the sources of anxiety about rebellions other than those by African Americans, see Maria Karafilis, “Introduction” to *The Linwoods: or, “Sixty Years Since” in America* (Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 2002), xxv, and Robert Daly, “Reading Sedgwick Now: Empathy

- and Ethics in Early America,” *Literature in the Early American Republic: Annual Studies on Cooper and His Contemporaries*, vol. 2 (2010), 137.
38. Quoted in Weierman, “A Slave Story,” 133.
39. Lydia Maria Child, *An Appeal in Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans*, ed. Carolyn L. Karcher (Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1996), XLIV.
40. Dan McKanan, *Identifying the Image of God: Radical Christians and Nonviolent Power in the Antebellum United States* (New York: Oxford UP, 2002), 19.