airiti Library

本文章已註冊DOI數位物件識別碼

Sentimental Killing: Truth, Sympathy, and Translation in Catharine Maria Sedgwick's Hope Leslie

柔情屠殺：真相、同情與翻譯－論凱薩琳・薩菊克的《荷普・萊斯理》

doi:10.6153/2009.22.06

NTU Studies in Language and Literature, (22), 2009

作者/Author： 鄧秋蓉(Chiou-Rung Deng)

頁數/Page： 133-168

出版日期/Publication Date：2009/12

引用本篇文獻時，請提供DOI資訊，並透過DOI永久網址取得最正確的書目資訊。

To cite this Article, please include the DOI name in your reference data.

請使用本篇文獻DOI永久網址進行連結:

To link to this Article:

http://dx.doi.org/10.6153/2009.22.06

DOI是數位物件識別碼（Digital Object Identifier, DOI）的簡稱，
是這篇文章在網路上的唯一識別碼，
用於永久連結及引用該篇文章。

若想得知更多DOI使用資訊，

請參考 http://doi.airiti.com

For more information,

Please see: http://doi.airiti.com

請往下捲動至下一頁，開始閱讀本篇文獻

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

最完整的學術整合查詢平台—華藝線上圖書館 ● http://www.airitilibrary.com ● Find more academic articles on Airiti Library

airiti

NTU Studies in Language and Literature
Number 22 (Dec 2009), 133-168

Sentimental Killing: Truth, Sympathy, and Translation in Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*[*]

Chiou-Rung Deng
Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, Center for Humanities Research

National Science Council

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the politics of truth, the rhetoric of sympathy and the controversy of translation in Catharine Maria Sedgwick's sentimental novel, *Hope Leslie*. With the focus shifting to the marginal character, Magawisca, rather than the white heroine Hope Leslie, it is found that the Indian girl Magawisca is functional in many senses. Magawisca is the racial other, who speaks of the other side of the Pequot war, whose loss of one arm for love of the English boy, Everell, wins the reader's sympathetic tears and whose role as a translator between the Indians and the English settlers negotiate the linguistic, cultural and racial differences. Granted that Sedgwick's revisionary history of the Pequot war is progressive, Magawisca's voicing of the suppressed "truth" endows the white, female author with authority, rather than leading to racial justice. Despite the fact that her representation of Magawisca subverts the literary stereotypes of the Indians, Sedgwick's Indian story is still contentious, since the Indian removal is not challenged, and Magawisca's sacrifice for love sentimentalizes the Indian girl and makes interracial romance tantalizing but impossible. More significantly, translation in Sedgwick's novel is intended to cross the barrier of difference but ends up reiterating the untranslatability of otherness and justifying the removal of the other from social imaginings. Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* reveals its narrative anxiety and ambivalence about difference, sympathy and translation. Whether

[*] My thanks go to the editors and the anonymous reviewers for their comments and constructive suggestions. Also, I would like to extend my grateful thanks to Prof. Stacy Hubbard and Prof. Robert Daly for their encouragement and feedback on the draft of this essay.

sympathy can be a vehicle for identification with the other and whether translation can be an ethical way of understanding difference are questions to ask. Or, after all, radical otherness is expelled in sympathy and translation.

Keywords : sentimental novels, *Hope Leslie*, revisionary history, sympathy, translation, difference

airiti

airiti

柔情屠殺：真相、同情與翻譯
——論凱薩琳・薩菊克的《荷普・萊斯理》

鄧秋蓉
國科會人文學研究中心博士後研究

摘 要

本文探討十九世紀美國女作家凱薩琳・薩菊克的情感小說《荷普・萊斯理》，分析眞相的政治性、同情的敘事策略、及翻譯的爭議性。當焦點放在邊緣的角色，即原住民女孩——瑪佳維絲嘉，我們發現，在種族上、性別上，做爲「他者」的瑪佳維絲嘉，具有多重敘述功能。從邊緣發聲，她說出印地安屠殺歷史的另一面眞相；爲英國情人犧牲一條手臂，她贏得讀者同情眼淚；穿梭在英國殖民者與原住民族人之間，她也是語言、文化、種族差異的翻譯者。雖然作者形塑瑪佳維絲嘉的角色，突破原住民角色的刻板形象，但值得爭議的是，白人、女性作家的權威因爲「他者」說出歷史眞相而建立，而同時，原住民被剝奪土地的事實並未被質疑；此外，贏得讀者同情的印地安女孩，成爲心甘情願爲愛犧牲的角色，仍舊是情感小說的窠臼；更重要的，翻譯在小說中，凸顯「差異」如何被同質化，以便主流文化瞭解，又不斷被標示爲無法理解而不被接受，正當化去除差異的目的。雖然薩菊克的小說具有時代進步性，但就種族文化差異而言，《荷普・萊斯理》透露許多文本焦慮與擺盪不定：究竟差異可否透過同情而認同、經由翻譯而理解，或者，同情與翻譯終究導致根本不同的「他者」被排除。

關鍵詞：情感小說、《荷普・萊斯理》、歷史修正、同情、翻譯、差異

airiti

Sentimental Killing: Truth, Sympathy, and Translation in Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*

Chiou-Rung Deng

In the late 1970s, feminist scholars started to recover early nineteenth-century American women's works from the long neglect by literary critics.[1] The most influential work to recuperate antebellum American women writers is Jane Tompkins's *Sensational Designs* in 1985. Tompkins claims that women's writing, a significant part of cultural work, exercises "sentimental power" from the domestic sphere.[2] On the other hand, more and more critics have focused on the complexities of the cultural, sentimental power, exercised by white women. For example, Laura Wexler terms the sentimental power of white, middle-class women as "tender violence" and draws critical attention to the neglected "expansive, imperial project of sentimentalism," which aims at the subjection of different classes and races (15). In her essay, "Manifest Domesticity," Amy Kaplan shifts the boundary of the domestic and stresses that the idea of "manifest destiny" in the national expansion, prevailing in the nineteenth century, is a process of domesticating foreign territories and peoples (585). Nineteenth-century domestic women could not be innocently extricated from the imperialist project. As Kaplan argues, a woman's role is contradictorily empowered, as their influence is enhanced beyond the domestic sphere, "to police domestic boundaries against the threat of foreignness" (585). Both Wexler and Kaplan call critical attention to the suppressed presence of racial otherness in antebellum American women's works.

The criticism of Catharine Maria Sedgwick's historical romance, *Hope Leslie*, is also divided into two modes. On the one hand, some critics celebrate the politics of revisionary history and resistance in *Hope Leslie*, which challenges conventional views on gender and race. The eponymous, white

[1] Among others, Nina Baym's *Women's Fiction* (1978) initiates the attempts to redefine the significance of early nineteenth-century American women's novels.

[2] As an example of domestic women's cultural work, Tompkins interprets the sentimental power of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. See *Sentimental Design*, Chapter 5.

airiti

heroine is described as transcending the prejudices of her era, daring to defy the conventions, and acting out of conscience when judging right from wrong. Hope Leslie is even applauded as the model for nineteenth-century American citizenship, for she exercises the power of sympathy, engages in public affairs, and questions the justice of the authorities.[3] Sedgwick is also applauded for representing the Indians in a sympathetic light and rewriting history from an Indian's point of view. On the other hand, *Hope Leslie* is criticized for the divergence in its treatments of race and gender.[4] While the white heroine is endowed with subjectivity, the marginal Indian character, Magawisca, is designated as the object of sympathy and deployed to vanish voluntarily from the narrative and from national imaginings.[5] Maria Karafilis forcefully asserts that Magawisca's displacement shows "the pernicious appropriation of Native Americanness that undergirds and nationalizes Hope's enactment of the text's model of ethical political action and ironically makes Sedgwick's egalitarian model of political behavior subordinate to the consolidation of a national literature" (340). These two oppositional modes of criticism alert the reader to the tendency of the rhetoric of sympathy to consolidate white women's subjectivity and obliterate racial otherness in *Hope Leslie*. This essay seeks to delve into the problematic representation of the racial other by focusing on the marginal, but signifying, character, Magawisca, in the hope of showing what complicates the rhetoric of sympathy in Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*.

Published in 1827 and set in the early seventeenth-century colonial settlement, *Hope Leslie* recounts the early history of the Puritan settlement in New England and at the same time addresses the issue of Indian removal in Sedgwick's era. To lay out what is involved in the political policy of Indian removal, Sedgwick creates an Indian girl, Magawisca, the daughter of the Pequot chief, Mononotto. Magawisca is taken as a captive by the Puritans in

---

[3] For discussions of *Hope Leslie* in terms of rebellion and independence, see Erica R. Bauermeister; in terms of women as the model of nineteenth-century citizenship, see Susan K. Harris; in terms of women's conscience, authority and legitimate intervention in public affairs, see T. Gregory Garvey; in terms of women's political power, their civil duty and disobedience, and the conflict between individual and community, see Suzanne Gossett and Barbara Ann Bardes.

[4] For example, Douglas Ford questions that the novel negotiate race and gender in different ways and to different ends (81); Philip Gould notes that "Sedgwick's portrayal of the racial 'other' reveals simultaneously a rejection of and entrapment in this classical republican ideology" (644).

[5] For instance, Dana Luciano argues that Sedgwick employs Magawisca's character "as a tool for contesting familiar narratives of American history but ends by turning her into an instrument of sentimental pedagogy, using her to provide a lesson in 'feeling right' for whites as she vanishes off the historical stage" (48).

airiti

the Pequot[6] war and works as a servant in the Fletcher household. While a captive in the Fletcher family, Magawisca is treated with compassion by the Fletchers, who are nevertheless on the alert for the imminent revenge by Magawisca's father. During Magawisca's captivity in the Fletcher household, a close, sympathetic relationship between her and the English boy, Everell Fletcher, is developed to the extent that the potential for interracial romance worries Everell's mother, Mrs. Fletcher. Before long, Magawisca's father launches an attack on the Fletcher family at Bethel, rescuing his children, Magawisca and Oneco, and taking Everell and Hope Leslie's sister as captives. Eventually, Everell is rescued by Magawisca from her father's plan to execute him and released at the cost of Magawisca's arm, which is chopped off by her father, whose blade is originally aimed at Everell. Sedgwick creates the Indian character, Magawisca, to explore not only the conflict but also the possibility of romance between the Indians and the Puritans. However, what is revealed is the ambivalence of the colonial power toward the racial other; while the desire for the other is imagined, the ensuing anxiety is also projected upon the character of Magawisca.

The character of Magawisca is functional in many senses. Though a suppressed voice from the periphery, Magawisca is assigned the mission by the author to narrate the other side of the historical event, the Pequot war, to unveil the "truth," and thus truth endows not only the racial other but also the white, female author with textual authority. Magawisca is the vehicle employed in the narrative to arouse sympathy with a view to reconciling the white with the Indians, but, inevitably, Magawisca is also made a sentimental heroine with unfulfilled love, in order to satisfy the reader's need for sentimental stories. As a racial other, Magawisca is positioned as the object of the narrative gaze, while the narrative tends to simultaneously assimilate and estrange Magawisca. Magawisca is, in addition, the translator, which is essential to the contact between the English self and the racial other. This triangular relationship of the translator, the English self, and the racial other would lead us to consider the question of ethics in dealing with the other, since translation concerns the other, or the foreignness. As Walter Benjamin states in "The Task of the Translator," "all translation is only a somewhat provisional way of

---

[6] I use the modern spelling "Pequot," instead of "Pequod" in my analysis. As Carolyn L. Karcher notes, the spelling Pequod was prevalent before the twentieth century but modernized as Pequot. Still, in the passages I quote from *Hope Leslie*, the original spelling Pequod will be kept. See Catharine Maria Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie, or, Early Times in the Massachusetts*, edited with an Introduction and notes by Carolyn L. Karcher, Note 2, 373- 74.

airiti

coming to terms with the foreignness of languages. An instant and final rather than a temporary and provisional solution of this foreignness remains out of the reach of mankind" (75). In translation, one has to deal with the foreignness of the linguistic and cultural other. By making the foreign known to the translator's audience, translation involves suppressing the untranslatability of the foreignness. In the case of Magawisca as a translator between the Indians and the English, she is both an insider and an outsider. As a translator, she has to face not only the task of what G. C. Spivak refers to as inhabiting "the many mansions, and many levels, of the host language" ("Translating into English" 95), but also the suspicion resulting from inhabiting the language she translates. Magawisca herself is a foreigner to the audience for whom she translates. I will argue that Magawisca's translation is ultimately frustrated, since Magawisca's audience does not accept the untranslatability of the foreignness but makes it a barrier to mutual understanding. In Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*, the politics of truth, the rhetoric of sympathy, and the ethics of translation converge in the character of Magawisca. Magawisca is assigned the mission of telling the truth of the Pequot war, kindling the reader's sympathy, and translating the cultural, racial difference for the English settlers. As I hope to demonstrate, truth is entangled with sympathy in *Hope Leslie* and translation is in parallel with sympathy. Like sympathy transports one's feelings to another person, translation aims to transport one's mind across linguistic boundaries. How Magawisca is constructed and represented in these three dimensions is the central concern to this essay.

While Sedgwick adopts the rhetoric of sympathy with a view to ameliorating race relations between the English and the Indians, it cannot be ignored that the rhetoric of sympathy causes different effects on the agent and the object of sympathy and is complicated by the power structure. More specifically, while Magawisca, as the object of sympathy, is constantly placed under the narrative gaze to be examined so as to make sympathy operate, for Hope, the subject of sympathy, sympathy becomes a virtue and functions as a venue for the self to reach out to the other. Further, we should explore those issues that problematize Sedgwick's rhetoric of sympathy. First, the connection between truth and sympathy is essential to Sedgwick's narrative of the Indian story, in that the claim to truth engenders the reader's sympathy and the author's authority. Second, in constructing Magawisca sympathetically, Sedgwick sentimentalizes Magawisca as an object of desire and makes interracial romance tantalizing but impossible. Third, ambivalence is inherent in the rhetoric of sympathy. Especially, the characterization of Magawisca oscil-

airiti

lates between difference and sameness. Finally, in *Hope Leslie*, translation is deeply connected to the operation of sympathy. Translation inevitably inscribes a structure of power. As Eric Cheyfitz discusses in *The Poetics of Imperialism*, translation is the fundamental facet of European imperialism.[7] Translation is not merely a way of bringing the foreignness into the Empire by making it the same, but also a way of ostracizing the untranslatable, instead of recognizing and accepting the untranslatability of the foreignness.

It is important to note that Sedgwick does not explicitly manifest a sympathetic stance in dealing with the Indian question; rather, truth is the principle that Sedgwick holds on to. We should begin with the preface, in which Sedgwick explains her goal to illustrate "the character of the times" (3).[8] Crucial to Sedgwick's representation of the character of the times is not just the portrayal of the first settlers of New England, but also that of North American Indians. As Sedgwick puts in the preface,

> 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. These traits of their character will be viewed by an impartial observer, in a light very different from that in which they were regarded by our ancestors. In our histories, it was perhaps natural that they should be represented as "surly dogs," who preferred to die rather than live, from no other motives than a stupid or malignant obstinacy. Their own historians or poets, if they had such, would as naturally, and with more justice, have extolled their high-souled courage and patriotism. (3-4)

Implicitly, an impartial observer would see what is suppressed or stigmatized about the Indians in the Puritan history. In suggesting that an "impartial observer" would be able to present the character of the Indians in a different light, Sedgwick points to what is involved in the process of representing and interpreting the past, that is, the standpoint whereupon one views the past. In other words, as Sedgwick states in the preface, what motivates her writing is not so much what happens in the past as how the history of the early settle-

---

7 As Cheyfitz stresses, the imperialist mission is one of translation: "the translation of the other into the terms of the empire" (112).

8 Catharine Maria Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie, or, Early Times in the Massachusetts* (New York: Penguin, 1998). Further references to this edition will be cited parenthetically in the text.

airiti

ments can be viewed. That Sedgwick's novel does not mean to compete with history in terms of authenticity is manifest from the outset. However, history, as a record of real events, invites different points of view, as Sedgwick implies that if historians and poets were impartial observers, they would render a different story. Paradoxically, what Sedgwick fails to recognize is that an impartial observer cannot but be a subjective reader. Beyond the objective stance to record objectively the actual happenings, Sedgwick, after immersing herself in all the materials available to her, brings her own sentiments and sympathy into the reading of the past history.

Indeed, an impartial observer is not far from a subjective reader, since both are entrenched within the historical context, subjected to discourses and informed by their own desire. Writing *Hope Leslie* in the 1820s, Sedgwick was undoubtedly faced with the mounting concern over the Indian removal, as the Indian Removal Act was signed into law in 1830. Although incorporating an Indian character into the plot is nothing new, what is radical about Sedgwick's characterization of the Indian heroine is the attempt to "inscribe an impartial observer," to use Douglas Ford's word (83), an attempt to transcend the historical accounts, which, allegedly authentic, "naturally" produce prejudiced images of the Indians. This "impartial observer" is, as Ford claims, embodied by the English heroine, Hope Leslie (84), but more than that, the "impartial observer" is the position where Sedgwick desires to be, for this position also signifies a certain amount of authority that Sedgwick covets in the literary production, since, by implication, the "impartial" and "enlightened" observer would be able to disclose "truth" and "truth" engenders power and authority. Though Sedgwick claims in the preface that her novel cannot be "a substitute for genuine history" (4), truth is upheld as the result of her impartial investigation of the early history. "Truth" is not the word used in Sedgwick's preface, but the intention to counter the authority of the accounts left by Puritan ancestors is explicit.[9] Claiming the truth not only places Sedgwick in opposition to the authorized, Puritan historians, but it also, to a large extent, endorses Sedgwick's narrative and makes it legitimate for Sedgwick to resist authority and rewrite history.[10]

---

[9] In fact, the word "truth" is used by Sedgwick in having Magawisca recite the Pequot war in the novel, which illustrates Sedgwick's goal of presenting the "truth." This point will be further discussed in my analysis.

[10] Susan K. Harris analyzes *Hope Leslie* in terms of political resistance to legitimate authority, and I extend this politics of resistance to Sedgwick's politics of writing about the Indians, which is itself a mode of resistance. See Susan K. Harris.

airiti

Indeed, the narrative itself presents an impasse that undermines Sedgwick's claim to be an impartial observer. Significantly, the narrative about the Indians relies on the rhetoric of sympathy more than anything else, and sympathy, like truth, depends on the point of view. The passage, in which Magawisca recounts the Pequot war from the Indian perspective and, in doing so, "enlightens" Everell and Sedgwick's reader with "the wand of feeling" (56), makes it clear that sympathy is kindled by Magawisca's performance. On the night when Everell and Digby, the white servant in the Fletcher household, follow Magawisca, who is suspected of communicating with her father to conduct an attack, Everell is urged by Digby to question Magawisca whether she has met with any of her tribe. Indeed, the encounter between Magawisca and Everell is imbued with sympathy, and it is sympathy that facilitates an understanding on the part of Everell. Seeing Magawisca burst into tears,

> [Everell] felt reproached and touched by her distress, but struck by the clew, which, as he thought, her language afforded to the mystery of her conduct, and confident that she would in no way aid or abet any mischief that her own people might be contriving against them, he followed the natural bent of his generous temper, and assured her again, and again, of his entire trust in her. (47)

It is not that Everell has no clue to suspect Magawisca, but that Everell deliberately chooses not to scrutinize Magawisca's intention. Everell's being touched by Magawisca's tears may be a common scene in sentimental fiction, but sympathy is kindled by the tears. In fact, the tears in this scene of their encounter function to "blur" Everell's vision so as to prepare Everell with a different perspective.

After Magawisca's tears refresh Everell's sympathetic vision, Magawisca can begin her recital of what happens on the night of the Pequot massacre, which begins with a warning: "when the hour of vengeance comes, if it should come, remember it was provoked" (48). Again, this warning is intended to solicit the listener's sympathy, asking the listener to exchange his/her position with the sufferer, to imagine when violence is unleashed and vengeance is provoked. What ensues is indeed Magawisca's "performance" (Gould 653), as "she paused for a few moments, sighed deeply, and then began the recital of the last acts in the tragedy of her people; the principal circumstances of which are detailed in the chronicles of the times, by the witnesses of the bloody scenes" (48). Here, Magawisca is not an impartial ob-

airiti

server or merely a witness, who records the bloody scenes without showing personal emotion. The dramatic effect is strengthened as Magawisca shows emotion:

> Magawisca paused; she was overcome with the recollection of this scene of desolation. She looked upward with an intent gaze, as if she held communion with an invisible being. "Spirit of my mother!" burst from her lips. "Oh! That I could follow thee to that blessed land where I should not more dread the war-cry, nor the death-knife." Everell dashed the gathering tears from his eyes, and Magawisca proceeded in her narrative. (51)

Indeed, Everell, as well as Sedgwick's reader, receives a lesson about history from Magawisca, which inspires his understanding of the conquered. As the narrator concludes from Magawisca's narrative,

> Everell had heard [all the circumstances] detailed with the interest and particularity that belongs to recent adventures; but he had heard them in the language of the enemies and conquerors of the Pequods; and from Magawisca's lips they took a new form and hue; she seemed, to him, to embody nature's best gifts, and her feelings to be the inspiration of heaven. This new version of an old story reminded him of the man and the lion in the fable. But here it was not merely changing sculptors to give the advantage to one or the other of the artist's subjects; but it was putting the chisel into the hands of *truth*, and giving it to whom it belonged. (55, emphasis mine)

As it is intended, the lesson that Magawisca offers is the enlightenment of truth, which guarantees not only the author's authority but also that of the oppressed, i.e. Magawisca's authority. Again, it must be stressed that this enlightenment of truth cannot be possible without the listener's sympathy, i.e. Everell's. In other words, without Everell's sympathy and his gesture toward aligning with Magawisca, Magawisca's narrative would lose its power. Magawisca' narrative, indeed, underlines the paradox of Sedgwick's rhetoric. To the extent that truth relies on the listener's sympathy, truth can no longer maintain its claim to impartiality, objectivity, or self-evidence, but rather it denotes a certain degree of emotional involvement. While Sedgwick claims

airiti

truth, it is sympathy that facilitates the trajectory of the narrative. In fact, to some extent, truth and sympathy are intertwined in Sedgwick's novel.

Sedgwick's insertion of Magawisca's narrative to recount the Pequot war from an Indian woman's point of view has won critical acclaim for its historical revision and for its endowing the racial and sexual other with a voice, which has historically been silenced. For example, Carolyn L. Karcher praises the novel for presenting the past "through the eyes of Puritan and Indian women" and presenting the tragedies "through the eyes of their principal victims, women and children" (xi, xxi). Similarly, Carol J. Singley commends *Hope Leslie* for its "alternative history from a woman's perspective—a perspective also sympathetic to the plight of American Indians, who suffer a parallel oppression" (44). Also, Sandra A. Zagarell argues that Sedgwick's incorporation of the Indian into the national history and her representation of the massacre from an Indian woman's viewpoint demonstrate Sedgwick's radical politics, with its interest in confronting the Puritan founders' beliefs and policies (236). However, with regard to making Magawisca narrate the other side of the history, Maureen Tuthill has a different view and argues that

> [i]f Sedgwick were looking to pin blame on the Puritans, she might have achieved a more powerful effect if Hope's character, instead of Magawisca's, had described the violent acts of the white settlers. Admittedly, Sedgwick's alternative history expresses the sufferings of the Pequots, but the story of Puritan brutality is told in retrospect and through the subjective eyes of Magawisca; the tone is methodical, emotionless, punctuated slightly by the faint sounds of yelling and gunfire, the burning of huts and the images of Pequots throwing themselves into the fires. *It is set in flashback mode—painful, but distant.* (100, emphasis mine)

Tuthill raises a significant issue regarding the politics of truth and revisionary history. Simply put, Sedgwick's representation of the alternative version of the Pequot war, even if it is *the* truth, cannot undermine the policy of Indian removal in the early nineteenth century. If Sedgwick is to confront the political suppression imposed by the Puritans upon the Indians, the policy of Indian removal should be questioned. In telling the past event from the victim's viewpoint, Sedgwick seems to arouse sympathy in the reader, but such sympathy is safe, since the sufferings are rendered long past.

Granted that Sedgwick's alternative perspective does allow the subaltern a voice to speak up, it is worthwhile to delve into the politics of sympa-

airiti

thy with the oppressed. Dana Nelson's question deserves our consideration: does Sedgwick simply utilize sympathy "as an effective strategy to gain authorial advantage, or does she also employ it to proffer an alternative social vision" (192)? Nelson's question is valid, since obviously Magawisca's narrative is intended to present a neglected truth, which would, significantly, underwrite Sedgwick's claim to truth and therefore authority. Whether sympathy is merely a vehicle for authority or an alternative social vision cannot be determined without placing Magawisca's narrative in the text as a whole. Indeed, besides Sedgwick's authority being confirmed by presenting an alternative perspective, Magawisca's narrative establishes her as a character with a large amount of authority in the novel. While it is an unconventional act for Sedgwick to create a racially subordinated woman as a figure of authority, the extent of Sedgwick's narrative revolution depends on what this figure is mobilized to represent. Nina Baym's remarks pinpoint the politics behind Sedgwick's progressive attitude, arguing "[w]hatever protofeminist or pro-Indian daring [Sedgwick] manifests in allowing Magawisca to recite the Pequod narrative, she also neutralizes by making Magawisca the source of the most intransigent resistance to conciliatory white overtures" (*American Women Writers* 158). As Baym reminds us, the effect of the revisionary history of the Pequot war through Magawisca's voice should be examined by taking the whole text into account, rather than being viewed simply as an end in itself. Sedgwick's progressive position is indeed constrained, since Magawisca is deployed to give voice to the impossibility of mingling with the English. Toward the end of the novel, Magawisca shows up nine years after rescuing Everell from her father's persecution and is imprisoned and accused of conspiracy against the English settlers. At the trial, Magawisca powerfully retorts back, "Take my own word, I am your enemy; the sun-beam and the shadow cannot mingle. The white man cometh—the Indian vanisheth. Can we grasp in friendship the hand raised to strike us" (309)? The power of Magawisca's statement cannot be validated without establishing her authority first. In other words, Magawisca's recital of the Pequot war wins her authority first, and later, with this authority, Magawisca's statement that the English and the Indians cannot mingle becomes powerful and persuasive.

Another example of Magawisca as a character of authority uttering a stance against the commingling of the English and the Indians is the farewell scene when Magawisca turns down Hope and Everell's plea to stay and departs from the narrative for all. While Everell urges to Magawisca that "the present difference of the English with the Indians is but a vapour that has,

airiti

even now, nearly passed away" and Hope pleads that "we will walk in the same path, the same joys shall shine on us" (349), Magawisca's negative response tends to be taken, again, as a statement of truth, because of her established authority in the narrative:

> "It cannot be—it cannot be," replied Magawisca, the persuasions of those who she loved, not, for a moment, overcoming her deep invincible sense of the wrongs her injured race had sustained. "My people have been spoiled—we cannot take as a gift that which is our own—the law of vengeance is written on our hearts—you say you have a written rule of forgiveness—it may be better—if ye would be guided by it—it is not for us—the Indian and the white man can no more mingle, and become one, than day and night." (349)

Magawisca's reply to Hope and Everell's plea repeats what she has announced at the trial and reinforces it with a note of sentimentality. Magawisca's language here is remarkably emotionally-inflected, as a sense of sorrow permeates her utterance, regretting that their friendship is inevitably disrupted by their racial difference.

The above passage also shows that sentimentality, in addition to authority, underpins the characterization of Magawisca. Rather than a stoic Indian character stereotyped in fiction, Magawisca tends to show her emotions, and undoubtedly, sentimentality makes her appeal to the reader. Sentimentality here refers to the expression of emotions, the investment of affection into interpersonal relationships, and the susceptibility to others' feelings. Magawisca is constantly described in sentimental terms, being touched by Everell's tenderness, and her voice, "like a strain of sad music" (24), is registered by sentimentality. Later on, in her recital of the Pequot war, which I have discussed above, her sense of being wronged is not only supported by her witnessing of the bloody massacre, but her sentimentality. Without sentimentality, her recital might become a self-justified accusation instead of a representation of truth.

Whereas several critics have pointed out that *Hope Leslie*, with its anti-romantic tendency, subverts the conventions of sentimental fiction,[11] the

---

[11] Judith Fetterley points out that the romance between the main characters, Everell and Hope, is more like the affection between brother and sister and therefore, the critical focus is turned to identification, rather than romantic desire, between them (71, 74). Similarly, Carol J. Singley claims, instead of heterosexual romance, "the true bond—the true romance—in this novel is between Hope

airiti

relationship between Magawisca and Everell produces a romantic gloss. While the relationship between Hope and Everell is defined as identification, between Magawisca and Everell lie difference, separation, and border-crossing desire, all of which give rise to the sentimental climax required by sentimental fiction. That is to say, rescuing the white heroine, Hope, from the sentimental, romantic plot, Sedgwick in effect replaces Magawisca in the confinement of love and, more than that, has Magawisca sacrifice for love. An Indian woman's sacrifice for her love of an Englishman does contribute to lessening the hostility between the Indians and the white. The Indian woman has to be in love and be the object of desire, so that the ferocious character of the Indians can be softened and the reader can relate to her sympathetically. Magawisca's sacrifice for love makes her an eligible sentimental heroine. But it must be stressed that the characterization of Magawisca as a sentimental and romantic figure does not render her emotionally vulnerable, but, to a large extent, gains her textual authority. Magawisca's love and sacrifice make her feminine rather than Indian, and being feminine in turn makes Magawisca a figure that the reader would identify with. Instead of a revengeful Indian with bitterness, who might alienate the reader, Magawisca's sacrifice for love draws the reader to her side, wins over the reader, and thus makes her views on the interracial relation and her retelling of the Pequot war credible.

To make Magawisca a sentimental heroine, the scene of Magawisca interposing her arm under her father's strike and taking it for Everell is pivotal. The scene takes place after the exchange between Magawisca and Everell about what happens on the night of the Pequot massacre, after Magawisca's father launches a massacre of the Fletcher family at Bethel and kidnaps Everell as a captive. At this point, Magawisca has gained Everell's sympathy. Because of Everell's sympathy, "a tender chord" in Magawisca's heart has been touched, as the narrator says. Thus, Magawisca's interposition of her arm to rescue Everell is not simply out of gratitude to the Fletchers for their kindness, but it is also out of affection for Everell's tenderness. Even before the massacre, Mrs. Fletcher observes her, "in [Everell's] absence, starting at every sound, and her restless eye turning an asking glance at every opening of the door; every movement betokening a disquieted spirit, and then the sweet contentment that stealeth over her face when he appeareth" (33). Under Mrs. Fletcher's keen gaze, Magawisca's love for Everell is manifest. Then, the act

---

and Magawisca" (47). The conventional heterosexual romance between the hero and the heroine is displaced in *Hope Leslie*.

airiti

of rescuing Everell by interposing her arm is the turning point that their relation changes from romantic imaginings to violence.

The relationship between Magawisca and Everell, however, is always traversed by difference. First of all, racial difference is the obstacle that makes their romantic love difficult. More than racial difference, their relationship is always predicated on the opposition between captor and captive. In other words, the tension inherent in their emerging love is the fight between two groups, the struggle of power, and even the antagonism between the conqueror and the conquered. Such opposition contributes to the impossibility of romance and simultaneously enhances the fantasy of romance.[12] Although both Magawisca and Everell experience captivity, captivity has different meanings for each of them. If romantic imaginings of their relationship are evoked in Magawisca's captivity, Everell's captivity results in the cancellation of the potential romance, though the impossibility of romance still functions in a way to feminize Magawisca. Everell's captivity gives Magawisca a chance to demonstrate her love and heroism. Obviously, Magawisca's love does not weaken her agency but augments her heroism by intercepting her father's strike on Everell and enduring the pain of losing her arm. Indeed, the power dynamic is changed in this scenario. In Magawisca's captivity, Everell has no difficulty showing his sympathy toward Magawisca, the conquered or the subordinate; however, once Everell is turned into a captive and becomes the object of Magawisca's heroic rescue and her sympathy, the emerging romantic desire is blocked. Once Everell is the object of sympathy and he seems to lose power, romantic imaginings becomes impossible. Moreover, from Everell's being captured to his captivity, violence is witnessed and experienced, which contributes to the blockage of love. Though the scene of the Pequot war is bloody, it is represented to Everell verbally in retrospect; nevertheless, Everell witnesses the massacre of his family and then watches Magawisca mutilated, which constitute the most violent scenes in the narrative. The experience of violence in his captivity shows Everell that violence is physical inscriptions. Violence is literally inscribed upon Magawisca's body, which makes Everell shudder, and suddenly the fantasy of romance and therefore the erotic desire vanish. Carolyn Karcher raises the question of why Sedgwick has Magawisca mutilated and argues that Magawisca's loss of her

---

[12] Ezra Tawil suggests that the impossibility of Magawisca and Everell's romance is attributed to natural law in *Hope Leslie* (123), but I would like to add that such impossibility arises not only from racial difference but also from the difference of their positions as captor and captive and, more importantly, the opposition as well as impossibility facilitates fantasy.

airiti

arm "functions to exclude intermarriage as a mode of reconciling the races. By disfiguring Magawisca, her sacrificial gesture defeminizes and removes her as a potential sexual partner"(xxiv). There is a connection between violence and desire that Karcher brings up but does not explore. Magawisca's mutilation is an inscription of violence, which dissipates Everell's desire. Sedgwick could choose to avoid Magawisca's mutilation, but Sedgwick refuses to elude the fact that the interracial relation is registered by violence and makes violence physical and thus irreducible. In other words, the relationship between Magawisca and Everell is characterized not only by sympathy and romantic imaginings, but also by violence. While the spectacle of taking the strike to rescue Everell is the climax of what Magawisca can do to show her love, this climax is also the point where the fantasy and the desire are turned into physical violence and consumed. Immediately after the climax, Magawisca abruptly disappears and the narrative focus shifts to the white heroine, Hope Leslie, writing a letter to Everell.

It must be noted that Magawisca's sacrifice for love of Everell results in the reader's sympathy. Without Magawisca's sacrifice for love, the reader might not feel too much for Magawisca. But more than arousing the reader's sympathy, the suggestion of romance and its impossibility paradoxically keep working to maintain the reader's interest. The interracial romance of Magawisca and Everell has been suggested and dispersed within the first seven chapters in Volume One of *Hope Leslie*, but in the remainder of the novel, the impossibility of romance lingers and becomes the subject either to lament or to disavow. After several years of separation from the New England settlement, Everell comes back and meets with Digby. In their recollection of the happy years spent with Hope Leslie before Everell embarks on the journey to England, Digby strangely recalls the burgeoning love between Everell and Magawisca. As he laments, "[i]t is odd what vagaries come and go in a body's mind; time was, when I viewed you as good as mated with Magawisca; forgive me for speaking so, Mr. Everell, seeing she was but a tawny Indian after all" (223-24). Digby's remarks sound abrupt, for he seems to touch on a taboo subject, the possibility of romance. Everell's response sounds even more striking; as he replies to Digby, "Forgive you, Digby! You do me honour, by implying that I rightly estimated that noble creature; and before she had done the heroic deed, to which I owe my life—Yes, Digby, I might have loved her—might have forgotten that nature had put barriers between us" (224). This exchange between Digby and Everell shows how the interracial romance of Magawisca and Everell is viewed and eventually turns out impossible.

airiti

Digby's remarks show that in his view Magawisca cannot be Everell's partner because she is an Indian, but he also implies that he underestimates Magawisca's nobility, given her heroic deed. However, from Everell's response, it can be inferred that Magawisca's heroic deed makes the interracial romance even more impossible. If Magawisca's heroic deed wins Digby's respect, it also changes Everell's attitude toward Magawisca from being sympathetic to being indebted. As Michelle Burnham points out, for Everell, his relationship with Magawisca is overwhelmed by the idea of "debt" because Magawisca saves his life at the cost of her arm, and by extension, the English colonizer is in debt because the Indians are driven out of their land (116). Indeed, the idea of "debt" reinforces the impossibility of interracial romance. Long after the tragedy, the interracial romance, being mentioned again, is to be disavowed and dismissed on the part of Everell, as he claims that he has forgotten the romance is impossible due to nature. As it seems, the violent strike, from which Everell is redeemed by Magawisca, and the entailed "debt" awaken Everell from the fantasy of the interracial romance.

Whereas the interracial romance is rendered impossible, its impossibility does continue to characterize Magawisca as a sentimental, romantic figure. After Magawisca reappears in the narrative, she cannot but evince her emotional commotion at hearing Everell's name. In particular, as she is imprisoned, Everell's attempt to rescue her brings her happiness and soothes her sorrow. According to the narrator, "[Magawisca's] affection for Everell Fletcher had the tenderness, the confidence, the sensitiveness of woman's love; but it had nothing of the selfishness, the expectation, or the earthliness of that passion. She had done and suffered much for him, and she felt that his worth must be the sole requital for her sufferings" (276). Magawisca's sacrificial and selfless love reverberates through the narrative, and the inscription of Magawisca's love, paradoxically, makes the unfulfilled, impossible love even more resonant. In fact, in this way, the narrative nourishes what Renato Rosaldo terms "imperialist nostalgia," a form of yearning for what is destroyed in colonization (108-9). That is to say, as the interracial romance is prohibited in colonization, lamenting for the unfulfilled and unspeakable love is a form of imperialist nostalgia.[13] When the narrative paints a sentimental picture of Ma-

---

[13] As Ezra Tawil argues, "The figure of the sympathetic Anglo-American subject who nonetheless acknowledges the necessity of natural law is thus profoundly indebted to the structure of feeling that Renato Rosaldo has termed "imperialist nostalgia" (118). On the one hand, the narrative has Everell lament that nature is the obstacle between him and Magawisca; on the other hand, the narrative continues to invest in Magawisca's love.

airiti

gawisca in love, and at the same time interracial love is made impossible, the narrator turns the impossibility of the interracial romance into remembrance and celebration of Magawisca's selfless love. Again, Magawisca is constructed as a feminine figure who voluntarily sacrifices for love, and the racial other is deployed for the sentimental purpose. Given that the romance is aborted with the loss of Magawisca's arm and later Magawisca disappears from the text, making Magawisca a sentimental character is tantamount to killing the racial other softly and tenderly. In the following, I would like to turn to the inherent violence in the characterization of Magawisca, which is indeed a form of domestication.

While the power of Magawisca's narrative of the Pequot war depends on the listener's sympathy, while truth cannot be validated without sympathy, sympathy itself does not engender equality, but reinforces the power dynamics, and in turn undermines what sympathy gestures to support, i.e. affinity and a correspondence of feelings. I would like to return to the very beginning when Magawisca crosses the threshold of the Fletchers' home at Bethel. Magawisca shows up in the Fletcher household as a servant in the domestic sphere and a stranger in the English culture. Magawisca's racial otherness entails domestication, assimilation, and estrangement. What is revealed in domestication, assimilation, and estrangement is the anxiety over racial difference. Magawisca is introduced into the narrative by Mr. Fletcher at the point when he receives a letter informing him that Alice, his beloved in England, leaves two children in his custody and when he plans to bring them home. Indeed, both the Indian children (Magawisca and her brother) and Alice's daughters are foreign to the Fletchers, but it is the Indians that are viewed by Mrs. Fletcher as outsiders and even intruders. As Mr. Fletcher tells his wife that the Indian children can help with the domestic labor, Mrs. Fletcher suppresses her conflicting feelings about Indian servants, alluding to the difficulty of domesticating them. In Mrs. Fletcher's view, Magawisca cannot be domesticated as a servant and even she is an intruder, a threat to the domestic order. By implication, even though the white can feel sympathetic toward the Indian girl, the Indian girl still needs to be domesticated. It is revealed that sympathy cannot adequately build a relation between the Indians and the English settlers, but domestication is required.

As a domestic servant, Magawisca's racial difference is highlighted and reiterated. Because she is an Indian, Magawisca is viewed by Mrs. Fletcher as unsuitable for domestic labor but as an intruder, disrupting the domestic order. In a word, Magawisca's difference cannot be eradicated. Indeed, at some

airiti

point, the narrative vacillates between assimilation and estrangement as the narrative gaze is fixed upon Magawisca, a stranger to the English culture. The moment she shows up, Magawisca comes under scrutiny for her "peculiarities:"

> The Indian stranger was tall for her years, which did not exceed fifteen. [...] Her face, although marked by the peculiarities of her race, was beautiful even to an [sic] European eye. Her features were regular, and her teeth white as pearls; but there must be something beyond symmetry of feature to fix the attention, and it was an expression of dignity, thoughtfulness, and deep dejection that made the eye linger on Magawisca's face, as if it were perusing there the legible record of her birth and wrongs. (22-23)

And what follows is a comprehensive description of Magawisca's hairdressing, which is "contrary to the fashion of the Massachusetts Indians," and her attire, part of which is ornamented with mystic hieroglyphics, and part of which is of English material and style, not unfamiliar to the English audience.

Indeed, Magawisca's appearance is marked by essential difference, that is, the peculiarities of her race, which suggest more their oddities and difference than anything else. Obviously, it is difficult to put the peculiarities of her race into words, but, though beyond description, her strangeness is lessened and even neutralized by the qualification, "beautiful even to an [sic] European eye," which makes it possible to imagine and appreciate. The European eye becomes the measurement of whether one's difference is acceptable. Also, to make Magawisca's appearance appealing to the reader, Magawisca is described as not following the Indian fashion, but having some tastes similar to the English. Still, while Magawisca's style is made familiar to the English, she cannot lose her mystic exoticism. The mixture of Indianness and English style, exoticism and familiarity, forms a wild grace, a harmony of oppositions, fitting well with the "noble savage."

In fact, Magawisca is best described with the epithet, "noble savage," which also appropriately illustrates the narrator's effort to assimilate Magawisca into familiar terms and simultaneously estrange her into an other. However, in large measure, both the rhetoric of assimilation and estrangement are underpinned by "epistemic violence."[14] Reading the character Magawisca,

[14] I use G. C. Spivak's critique of "epistemic violence" in her essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?"

airiti

we must ask whose gaze it is, in what light the gaze presents Magawisca, and what are the presumptions behind the gaze. As the object of the European gaze, Magawisca's body is the site upon which the gaze projects its knowing self. Faced with the unknown other, the knowing self endeavors to impose what is known unto the unknown other, to make it familiarized, and to assimilate the unknown into the categories of knowledge. Indeed, the narrative resonates with ambivalence about Magawisca's otherness. On the one hand, Magawisca's otherness is reduced by the rhetoric of sympathy; that is, the narrator tries to induce the reader to imagine him/herself in Magawisca's situation, and thus Magawisca's otherness is foreclosed. On the other hand, Magawisca's otherness is reiterated when the gaze fails to understand.

If Magawisca is constructed as a racial other, paradoxically assimilated and estranged, Mary Leslie is the other who is totally ostracized and beyond the epistemology of the English, the site upon which the ethnocentric assumptions are projected. Mary Leslie, christianized as Faith Leslie when arriving in New England, is Hope Leslie's long lost sister. At the Bethel massacre, Mary is taken as a captive by Magawisca's father; afterwards, she is married to Oneco, Magawisca's brother. While the traditional plot of the captivity narrative features the return of the white heroine, whose faith in God helped her to survive the hardship in captivity, and whose experience is used more to demonize the Indians than to put cultural and racial conflicts in perspective, Mary's marriage to Oneco and her rejection of the idea of returning to the English community reverse the convention of the captivity theme. To Mary, captivity might not entail hardships, the Indians are perhaps not demons, and there is no way, with desire or not, to return. But in fact, it is impossible for those captives who have never returned, and who choose not to return, to tell their story. In this sort of captivity, we can hear only silence. In *Hope Leslie*, however, Mary is made to appear, so the narrative offers Hope as well as the reader an opportunity to "survey" what changes have been brought about. Again, what we get in the encounter between the sisters is through Hope Leslie's gaze, which defines what is English and what is savage. In the meeting scene, the narrator tells us,

---

Spivak argues that historians of Subaltern Studies might commit what Foucault terms "epistemic violence" in imposing the homogeneous insurgent consciousness on the silenced subaltern, which amounts to assimilating the Other into the Same or the Self, and which is problematic in terms of ethics.

airiti

> Hope uttered a scream of joy; but when, at a second glance, she saw her in her savage attire, fondly leaning on Oneco's shoulder, her heart died within her; a sickening feeling came over her, an unthought of revolting of nature; and instead of obeying the first impulse, and springing forward to clasp her in her arms, she retreated to the cliff, leaned her head against it, averted her eyes, and pressed her hands on her heart, as if she would have bound down her rebel feelings. (237)

Instead of a sentimental, tearful family reunion, Hope is paralyzed by the shocking vision, her sister in savage attire and leaning on an Indian's shoulder. As the negative words, "sickening" and "revolting," are used to describe Hope's feeling, it must be further examined what is so sickening and revolting. Tellingly, to Hope, the picture of Mary's being physically intimate with Oneco is beyond Hope's imagination and even against nature. While Magawisca has told Hope beforehand that her sister is married to Oneco, Hope does not fully accept the fact. Indeed, the idea of interracial marriage remains an abstract notion, till it is embodied in the intimate physical contact between Mary and an Indian, which sickens Hope. Such physical contact with an Indian is viewed as corrupting. In Hope's secret meeting with Magawisca before they can arrange Hope's meeting with Mary, Magawisca retorts, in response to Hope's expression of shudder at the news of Mary's being married to Oneco, "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. Think ye that your blood will be corrupted by mingling with this stream?" (196-97). In responding to Hope's disgust at Mary's physical intimacy with Oneco, Magawisca celebrates the Indian blood, which determines their superior soul and spirit. Interestingly, Hope's despise and Magawisca's celebration target the corporeality. Hope might not disagree with Magawisca about the Indian soul and spirit, but for Hope the Indian soul and spirit has to be disembodied. To the contrary, Magawisca is against such tendency to disembodiment. While for Magawisca, to be proud of the soul and spirit is also to be proud of the body, for Hope, the Indian soul and spirit can be admired, but not their body. Accordingly, what sickens Hope is the mingling of Mary's and Oneco's bodies and their blood, not the affection, expressed in Mary's gesture; what frustrates her is not the loss of her sister, but the addition of the Indian blood to the pedigree and genealogy of the Leslies.

airiti

In Hope's survey of Mary's appearance, Mary's otherness is summarized in her clothing, revolting to Hope's concept of what is beautiful and natural. After a while, Hope composes herself and diagnoses what is so sickening in Mary's attire, and the narrative continues,

> Hope knew not what to address one so near to her by nature, so far removed by habit and education. She thought if Mary's dress, which was singularly and gaudily decorated, had a less savage aspect, she might look more natural to her; and she signed to her to remove the mantle she wore, made of birds' feathers, woven together with threads of the wild nettle. Mary threw it aside, and disclosed her person, light and agile as a fawn's, clothed with skins, neatly fitted to her waist and arms, and ambitiously embellished with bead work. The removal of the mantle, instead of the effect designed, only served to make more striking the aboriginal peculiarities; and Hope, shuddering and heart-sick, made one more effort to disguise them by taking off her silk cloak and wrapping it close around her sister. Mary seemed instantly to comprehend the language of the action, she shook her head, gently disengaged herself from the cloak, and resumed her mantle. (239)

Hope's distaste for the Indian, savage style of dressing is revealing. Though it cannot be assumed that Hope's opinions represent the narrator's or the author's attitude, what is demonstrated, however, is the politics of dressing and undressing the Indianized Mary. Here, dressing is considered as a cultural habit, which paradoxically can reflect and be imposed on one's nature. At first, Hope removes Mary's mantle in the hope of removing the savage aspect, but once the mantle is removed, the sign of animal nature in Mary is disclosed. Hope can only cover Mary's savagery with her own cloak, that is, the culture she inhabits.

Indeed, what is implied in the act of dressing and undressing is the concept of racial difference. Wittingly or inadvertently, Sedgwick intervenes in the debate over whether racial difference is the result of intrinsic nature or imposed culture, and whether one's racial identity would be lost once his/her cultural identity is changed (Tawil 114-15). In Mary's case, as it appears, her English, cultural identity is irrevocably lost, whether she wears her Englishness in her dress or not. Also, as the "aboriginal peculiarities" are inscribed upon her body, it is implied that Mary loses her English racial identity as well. Indeed, Mary is not merely assimilated into the Indian culture, but racially

airiti

becomes an Indian. Mary is the one that captivity narratives fail to represent, the one that never returns to tell the version of their captivity story. Mary is the captive that refuses to be one, but chooses to live in the Indian culture and even to become a racial other. Mostly, Mary is silenced, given that she can't speak English. To the extent that Mary cannot tell her own story, dressing in this scenario is used to represent Mary's experience of "conversion" to Indian otherness, culturally and racially. In other words, as Hope tries dressing and undressing Mary, the unspoken story of Mary's captivity becomes clear.[15] That is, after years of living in captivity, or living with the Indians, Mary is Indianized, infantilized, and, in a word, uncivilized. To some extent, the narrative anxiety is revealed by Hope's act of dressing and undressing Mary, the anxiety about whether racial identity can be changed or not. Sedgwick seems to argue that racial identity can be changed, as Mary is converted to the Indian identity; if so, Mary can again be changed back. However, it is implied that once Mary is Indianized, there is no way to return.

If we recall how Magawisca's attire is described and appreciated in the beginning of the narrative, then the juxtaposition of Magawisca's and Mary's clothing will illuminate how Magawisca is made appealing to the reader and how Indianized Mary is totally turned into otherness. It is puzzling to find Sedgwick's characterization of Magawisca subverting, in large measure, the stereotypes of the Indians in the nineteenth century while the representation of Mary is totally negative. Though Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* is one of the few antebellum novels that directly portray interracial marriage, however, Mary and Oneco's marriage is by no means positive to the reader and it is impossible for the white community to tolerate this couple. Portraying Mary as Indianized, infantilized, and uncivilized undermines Sedgwick's claim that Hope transcends the prejudices of her era, and her authorial claim of justice in depicting Magawisca's heroism is also undercut.[16]

Furthermore, the scene of Hope's reunion with Mary is pivotal, for the significance of Magawisca's role as a translator[17] fully comes to the surface.

---

[15] On the subject of dresses and racial essence, see Douglas Ford.

[16] Similarly, Douglas Ford argues that, since *Hope Leslie* tends to be viewed as exposing injustice and subverting a single, monolithic ideology of a repressive mechanism, this expectation obstructs "our view of the plurality of discourses which produce power" (83) and, indeed, the representation of Mary's otherness bears witness to the "unavailability of a truly liberating discourse" (86).

[17] Here, I use "translator" broadly to include those who do either written or spoken translation, i.e. interpreter, and metaphorically "translation" also refers to cultural translation, a form of contact between different languages or different cultures, which entails the (im)possibility of alterity being represented, contained, or assimilated. For further discussions of translation, see Walter Benjamin,

airiti

As Mary can speak little English, Magawisca translates Hope's and Mary's messages for the sisters to understand each other. In Hope's desperation to win back her sister, Hope once casts doubt on the fidelity of Magawisca's translation. Two aspects need to be explored; first, what is involved in qualifying Magawisca as a translator, and second, what is the power dynamic in the process of translation. In fact, throughout the narrative, Magawisca has been playing the role of translator. In Mr. Fletcher's introduction to Magawisca, he particularly points out that Magawisca "understands and speaks English perfectly well, having been taught it by an English captive, who for a long time dwelt with her tribe. On that account she was much noticed by the English who traded with the Pequods; and young as she was, she acted as their interpreter" (21). It is noteworthy that Magawisca's English is acquired and learned from an English captive. While this English captive is confined physically and politically by the Indians, culturally this English captive is the one who dominates, since it can be inferred that the language taught and learned would be the vehicle for communication, cultural transmission, and trades, as Magawisca is said to interpret for English traders. More importantly, what qualifies Magawisca as a translator is not merely her command of English, but her reliability as a translator. In the narrative, Sedgwick's endeavor to characterize Magawisca as dignified, loyal, and truthful, those qualities underpinning "faithfulness," is to make Magawisca reliable and qualified as a translator. Everell also plays the role of translator for Magawisca and translates what he reads in Greek and Latin about heroism into English. What Everell translates for Magawisca is the qualities which are desired by the translator, which Magawisca could assimilate, and which can qualify Magawisca as a translator. In this regard, translation has its positive, constructive effect. Clearly, translation is part of the process of cultural assimilation, that is, to make Magawisca assimilated into English culture.

Focusing on translation as the mechanism for cultural assimilation, however, we should not ignore its effect of violence. Violence is engendered in the sense that translation is to substitute the allegedly superior knowledge for the existent learning. Magawisca's mother, Monoca, is said to reject conversion to Christianity and, as Mr. Fletcher tells his wife, "[Monoca] 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 ob-

---

"The Task of the Translator"; Naoki Sakai, Introduction, *Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism*, 1-17; G. C. Spivak, "The Politics of Translation."

airiti

jects of His favour; and that He had not deemed the book he had withheld, needful to them" (21). To the missionaries, translating the Bible into the Indian tongue is to disseminate God's messages, to enlighten the Indians. To Monoca, translation of the Bible is to replace her faith in the Great Spirit and implies that Indians should be enlightened by the holy word, and that the Indian belief in the Great Spirit is not qualified as religion, but myth or even superstition. Monoca's rejection of translation is to insist on the equality of different religions and faiths and to question the function of translation, which is more disruption than communication.[18] In Magawisca's case, though she does not resist Everell's translation of European Classics, she does counter it by translating Indian legends into English and her act of translation can be viewed as a means of reconstituting her subjectivity and cultural identity; that is, Indian culture has already nourishes a system of values not inferior to those in the European culture. However, while the narrative implicitly takes the translation of European Classics as a way to assimilate and improve Magawisca, Magawisca's translation of Indian legends and beliefs into English does not have the same implication, for as the subaltern, Magawisca lacks the power which can make her translation of Indian legends a vehicle of assimilation. At best, Magawisca's translation of Indian legends for Everell puts emphasis on the idea that Indian culture is not far away from European culture, but such translation might fail to represent the nuances of Indian culture. It is not to blame Magawisca for this failure; rather, this failure reveals the fact that translation is underpinned by the power structure.

In the encounter of the Indians and the English colonizers, translation is required. Mostly, translation contributes to imperialist conquest and the colonial expansion, and the fact that Sacajawea plays the role of translator in the Lewis and Clark expedition in the early nineteenth century is an example. In the history of English colonization of North America, warfare is launched to seize the land and inevitably violence is engendered, but it is often ignored that besides warfare, translation can also entail violence, since translation itself is underpinned by power dynamics. In the colonial encounter, who has the power to demand translation, who is qualified as a translator, and who decides what to translate all involve a certain degree of violence, which might not be physical power but political power to regulate translation.

[18] Douglas Ford points out that Monoca's rejection of the interpretation of the holy word highlights a concern that translation and language can be "a source of disruption" (89). Ford's point draws attention to the inherent violence in translation.

airiti

In *Hope Leslie*, the encounter between the Indians and the English settlers demonstrates that when the translator is a racial other, suspicion easily arises and power dynamics become manifest. Before the Bethel massacre, when the fear of vengeance from Magawisca's father is aroused, the Indian woman, Nelema, who frequently appears in the vicinity of the Fletchers' place, is suspected of communicating to Magawisca about her father's intended action. In this episode, Magawisca is forced to translate for Mrs. Fletcher the meaning of the roll—"an arrow" and "the rattle of a rattle-snake enveloped in a skin of the same reptile" (38)—that Nelema has dropped at her feet. Politically, Mrs. Fletcher has the power to demand translation. This time, Magawisca is asked to translate not simply the Indian tongue, but a system of signs and symbols. Magawisca's translation of Nelema's message is further complicated by the conflict between the Indians and the English. If Magawisca faithfully translates Nelema's message about her father's vengeance, her translation is tantamount to an insider's betrayal. On the other hand, the English colonists' awareness of Magawisca's racial identity might also lead them to be alert to another possibility, i.e. Magawisca betraying the ethics of translation and deliberately conveying false meanings of the symbols. Magawisca is faced with the dilemma of whether to fulfill one's loyalty to one's racial identification or to practice the ethics requested of the translator. Also, such dilemma signifies Magawisca's precarious, subordinate position as a translator. In other words, it is because Magawisca is a racial, colonized other who presents her culture in the colonizer's language that her racial loyalty and the faithfulness of her translation are brought into question. In the example of translating Nelema's message, none of the Fletchers can judge the correctness of Magawisca's translation, nor can they assess the extent that her racial loyalty would affect her translation. Still, the Fletchers have the political power to question Magawisca's translation. Suspicion lingers, even though Magawisca has correctly translated the meanings of the arrow and the snake's skin.

Bringing into consideration Mrs. Fletcher's suspicion of Magawisca in translating Nelema's message, we are not surprised by Hope's lack of trust at the beginning of her meeting with Mary. In fact, paradoxically, the narrative of *Hope Leslie* depends on but calls into question Magawisca's faithfulness in translating. In translating for Hope and Mary, offended by Hope's request "promise me you will interpret truly for me" (238), Magawisca can only counter Hope's implied suspicion with her guarantee that "we hold truth to be the health of the soul" (238). Magawisca has to constantly pledge herself to

airiti

the ethics of translation, which is underwritten by her racial pride—her Indian character of being truthful and loyal to friends. Put differently, while Magawisca's racial identity is the cause of Hope's as well as Mrs. Fletcher's suspicion, her insistence on her racial identity is also the guarantee of her faithful translation. The paradox of trusting and doubting Magawisca's translation reveals the complicated relation between the Indians and the English, the entailed friendship as well as violence. By implication, ambivalence about the Indian racial other is embedded in the narrative.

Further, the paradoxical attitudes toward Magawisca's translation, involved with the ambivalence about the racial other, undermine what sympathy is originally intended to build, identification between the sympathizer and the sympathized. The paradox, as well as the ambivalence, should be juxtaposed with the sympathy aroused by Magawisca's narrative of the Pequot war. As discussed above, Everell is touched by Magawisca's recital of the Pequot war and absorbed by Magawisca's melancholy, conveying a large amount of sympathy toward Magawisca. Magawisca's ability to kindle Everell's sympathy not only validates her version of the Pequot war but also constructs certain identification between her and Everell. In one sense, Everell's experience of the Bethel massacre is to mirror Magawisca's experience and, thus, as Everell is transported to the circumstances that Magawisca has gone through, Everell could claim to understand how Magawisca feels in a similar situation. In other words, identification is the desired result of sympathy. By the same token, identification is also the outcome of translation. In translation, one language can be transferred to another language, and one symbol can be rendered identical to another. Nevertheless, the suspicion of Magawisca's translation is completely the opposite of sympathy and identification. The suspicion of Magawisca's translation is to reject the intended aim of translation, i.e. mutual understanding, and it follows that identification becomes impossible, whether it is identification between the translator and the translated, or between the one requesting translation and the translated. In a word, Magawisca's translation, both for Mrs. Fletcher and for Hope, is a failure. If Magawisca's translation cannot be trusted by Mrs. Fletcher and Hope, how can sympathy between Magawisca and the English be obtained?

Indeed, Magawisca's failure in translation exposes the narrative anxiety over translation, which is fundamentally apprehension about the other, unknown and unknowable. Also, the lack of trust in Magawisca's translation

airiti

underlines the possibility that there is always something untranslatable.[19] For example, Nelema uses an arrow and the snake's skin to symbolize the approach of the enemy and death, but what cannot be translated is the motivation behind Nelema's warning and the cultural context of the used symbols. What's more, the witchcraft that Nelema practices to cure people is untranslatable. In Hope's letter to Everell, Hope has portrayed how Nelema saves Master Cradock's life when he is on the verge of death because of a rattle-snake's bite, but Nelema's performance cannot be fully transcribed into words and translated into knowledge. Viewed as a "heathen witch" (107), an other that has to be ostracized from the Puritan community, Nelema is described as "making quick and mysterious motions, as if she were writing hieroglyphics on the invisible air," and Hope continues her description,

> "She writhed her body into the most horrible contortions, and tossed her withered arms wildly about her, and, Everell, shall I confess to you, that I trembled lest she should assume the living form of the reptile whose image she bore? So violent was her exercise, that the sweat poured down from her face like a rain, and, ever and anon, she sank down in momentary exhaustion, and stupor; and then would spring to her feet, as a race horse starts on the course, fling back her long black locks that had fallen over her bony face, and repeat the strange process." (108-9)

In this passage, Hope plays the role of translator for Everell and the reader; but even though Hope can transcribe Nelema's mysterious motions, a kind of language, into the animal metaphors, their meanings cannot be fully translated. Because of her untranslatable body language, Nelema is viewed as an "emissary of Satan" and has to be imprisoned.

Another example of the untranslatable can be found in the episode of Hope's secret meeting with Magawisca in the graveyard to arrange Hope's meeting with her sister, Mary. As Hope approaches Magawisca, awe is inspired in her by Magawisca's performance of some sacred but strange ritual:

---

[19] Gustavus Stadler points out that Magawisca's liminal position, simultaneously included in the Fletcher family and excluded from the English community, contributes to her unreadability, which marks the limit, or the border, of the new white nation (42-43). My idea of untranslatability is connected to but departs from Stadler's idea of unreadability. While, as Stadler suggests, Magawisca's unreadability functions to make the body of the white, male citizen transparent, self-evident, and thus disembodied, I emphasize the untranslatability to highlight the investment of the narrative in translation, or in reading "otherness," but only to find the surplus, something beyond translation, which cannot be fully represented in words.

airiti

> there saw Magawisca, and Magawisca alone, kneeling before an upright stake, planted at one end of a grave. She appeared occupied in delineating a figure on the stake, with a small implement she held in her hand, which she dipped in a shell placed on the ground beside her. […] She accompanied the movement of her hand with a low chant in her native tongue. (193)

Again, Magawisca is put under the narrative gaze, or Hope's. As the object of the English gaze, Magawisca has no right to explain her performance, to articulate the cultural language of the ritual. It is the English, who have access to the vehicle of writing to describe the object of the English gaze. Such description is a form of translation, transcribing body language into verbal language and putting racial otherness in English terms. The description can by no means be politically neutral or objective. In fact, such description has the power to determine what can be understood and what is mystic. Magawisca's performance, viewed by Hope and described by the narrator, is fraught with puzzling and unknowable elements. What is the figure she is delineating? What on earth is the implement? What is in the shell in which she dips the implement? And what is she singing? Obviously, this short passage does not so much intend to explain Magawisca's ritual, which is probably performed in front of her mother's grave, in terms transparent to the reader, as to reiterate its untranslatability. While the beginning of the narrative still has a tendency to highlight the familiar aspect of Magawisca's appearance, the passage in question is registered by opaque coloring, such that the untranslatable as the core of Magawisca's otherness is underlined and made horrifying. Again, with the representation of Magawisca's otherness preceding her translation for Hope and Mary, it is not surprising that Hope would cast doubt on Magawisca's translation.

Magawisca's failure in translation and the reiteration of the untranslatable otherness undermine the sisterhood which is projected between Magawisca and Hope. Critics have pointed out that the sisterhood is suggested and constructed throughout the narrative.[20] They are both orphaned, their

[20] For instance, Christopher Castiglia emphasizes female community and sisterhood as the focus of the narrative (10). Judith Fetterley does not have a positive view on sisterhood, though, and even brings the sisterhood into question, since the other female characters, with the exception of Magawisca, are more often than not cast as a foil for Hope Leslie ("'My Sister! My Sister!'" 78). Fetterley further suggests that in fact the idea of women being equal to men is much more crucial to

airiti

mothers are coincidently buried side by side, they are in love with the same man, and they are literally sisters-in-law, since Hope's sister, Mary, is married to Magawisca's brother, Oneco. More importantly, both Magawisca and Hope are depicted as spontaneously acting by the heart and are celebrated for their ethical conduct. Magawisca rescues Everell out of friendship and justice, in addition to affection; by the same token, Hope releases Nelema and later Magawisca for the same reason of friendship and justice. The intention to construct the identification between Magawisca and Hope is resonant. Such identification between the Indian girl and the white heroine works not only to reinforce what is stated in the preface, that "the difference of character among the various races of the earth arises mainly from difference of condition" (4), but also to underwrite the characterization of Hope as transcending the prejudices of her era, as the subject of ethics. Therefore, this identification is not so much between sisters, as between women differentiated by their racial identities. While the attempt to transcend racial differences by aligning Magawisca with Hope is telling, it is vulnerable, for the failure of translation and the inability to accept the untranslatable disrupt the intended sisterhood, the sense of sharing between Magawisca and Hope. As Judith Fetterley has argued, the sisterhood is frustrated in *Hope Leslie*, as Mary cannot understand Hope, Hope cannot identify herself with Mary, and the only hope for sisterhood through identification with Magawisca is doomed, since Hope cannot approach Magawisca's untranslatable otherness (79-81).

Not only does the untranslatability surrounding Magawisca's racial identity disrupt the sisterly bonding between Magawisca and Hope, but it also foreshadows Magawisca's decision to depart. Judith Fetterley has noted that Magawisca's image has constantly been associated with the "evening of life—something fading, disappearing" and that nothing in the text suggests Sedgwick can imagine a future for Magawisca (84). Put differently, Magawisca's destiny of vanishing is predetermined by the white society's inability to incorporate the Indians into their social imaginings. However, the white society's inability to imagine the existence of otherness is naturalized by the metaphor of day and night, which crystallizes the difference between the English and the Indians and, more significantly, it is justified by the reiteration of the untranslatability in portraying the Indian "peculiarities." After all,

---

Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*, while the attempt to identify with her sister merely brings Hope into despair, as Hope sees only vacancy in Mary's face, nothing of herself mirrored in Mary's eye/I ("'My Sister! My Sister!'" 73, 85).

airiti

if there is no language that can adequately transcribe the Indians' rituals, habits, and signifying system, they can only be left out of the text. In this sense, the act of translation does entail violence, insomuch as translation is more an act of demarcating the domestic from the foreign than a means of communication. Eric Cheyfitz highlights the connection between "conquest abroad and translation at home" in the process of national formation in English history and suggests that translation is the tool of colonization (101). As Cheyfitz stresses, translation is closely connected with transportation, both connoting the sense of transference from one place to another, and therefore translation is inseparable from an idea of place. More specifically, according to Cheyfitz, translation marks out frontiers between the domestic and the foreign (88). In the process of translation, the foreign is placed in opposition to the proper, defined as the *national*, the *domestic*, the *familiar*, the *authoritative*, the *legitimate* (Cheyfitz 90). The power dynamics inherent in the act of translation between the foreign and the domestic cannot be ignored. That is to say, when translation functions to differentiate what is domestic, familiar, and recognizable in our language and thus our imagination from what is foreign, which fails to be transported into our language, the foreign is destined to be left out.

Ivy Schweitzer argues that Hope has gone through the process of "epistemic repositioning" in approaching difference and otherness, either embodied as Magawisca or as Mary (198-201), and further suggests that ethical friendship, that is the ethics of dealing with the other, is finally achieved, when Hope recognizes and accepts Magawisca's and Mary's differences and releases them from her comprehensibility (205). Indeed, Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* draws our attention to the interracial relation and attempts to work out a way of dealing with otherness. However, whether ethical friendship is obtained between Hope and Magawisca, between Hope and Mary, remains contestable. The dilemma facing Sedgwick and her contemporaries was that whereas reiterating cultural difference and racial "peculiarities" of the Indians results in essentialization and estrangement, recognizing the Indians as one branch of the human family, that is, they are not different from the English, is to negate their difference. In fact, as my reading of *Hope Leslie* has shown, Sedgwick's narrative vacillates between these two attitudes. The fundamental questions are who is to claim or negate difference, what essentialization would lead to, and what effect the negation of difference would bring about. In the novel, Hope's recognition of Magawisca's and Mary's difference does not make the coexistence of the Indians and the English desirable and feasible.

airiti

Instead, Hope's recognition occurs at the moment of Magawisca's and Mary's disappearing. If Hope's recognition is ethical, it must be asked why ethics can begin only when the distance is drawing.

The failure to recognize and embrace racial difference is even pronounced, if we take into consideration that at the end of *Hope Leslie*, an alternative of family, not based on kinship, is proposed and imagined. Hope and Everell construct a quasi-familial community, which includes Aunt Grafton, Master Cradock, Digby, and the jailer, Barnaby Tuttle, with their differences in culture and class. While difference characterizes the individuals in the community, sympathy creates a bond among all the differences. Nevertheless, in this community, the racial difference is almost virtually obliterated; obviously, racial difference is considered as disrupting the sympathetic bond that maintain the community of heterogeneity and thus must be expelled.

As far as Magawisca is concerned, the trajectory of the narrative, a move from Magawisca's sympathy-eliciting recital of the Pequot war, her translation of the Indian native language or cultural symbols, to her pronouncement that the Indian and the English communities as well as cultures are incommensurable, is traversed by both identification and difference. Drawing on the rhetoric of sympathy, Sedgwick's narrative has intended to transcend the differences between the Indians and the English, whether they are culturally imposed or intrinsically racial traits, to embrace the racial other and to achieve identification. Nevertheless, the rhetoric of sympathy turns out to be a means of buttressing the white woman writer's authority, a way of sentimentalizing the subordinated and the oppressed. In translation, the narrative exposes its own contradictions and anxiety over the untranslatable racial otherness, failing to accept the untranslatability of the foreignness. Translation, in parallel with sympathy, is an encounter with difference; both involve crossing the boundary between the self and the other. As sympathy is orientated toward sameness, so translation tends to make the foreign familiar, familial, or even identical. In this sense, sympathy and translation fail to deal with difference without assimilating the Other into the Same or the Self, but tend to eradicate and expel otherness.

airiti

Works Cited

Bauermeister, Erica R. "*The Lamplighter*, *The Wide, Wide World*, and *Hope Leslie*: Reconsidering the Recipes for Nineteenth-century American Women's Novels." *Legacy* 8.1 (1991): 17-28.

Baym, Nina. *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America, 1820-1870.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978.

---. *American Women Writers and the Work of History, 1790-1860.* New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers UP, 1995.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of Translator." *Illuminations.* Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1969. 69-82.

Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861.* Hanover and London: UP of New England, 1997.

Castiglia, Christopher. "In Praise of Extra-Vagant Women: *Hope Leslie* and the Captivity Romance." *Legacy* 6.2 (1989): 3-16.

Cheyfitz, Eric. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from* The Tempest *to* Tarzan. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.

Fetterley, Judith. "'My Sister! My Sister!': The Rhetoric of Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *Separate Spheres!* Ed. Cathy N. Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002. 67-91.

Ford, Douglas. "Inscribing the 'Impartial Observer' in Sedgwick's Hope Leslie." *Legacy* 14.2 (1997): 81-92.

Garvey, T. Gregory. "Risking Reprisal: Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* and the Legitimation of Public Action by Women." *American Transcendental Quarterly* 8.4 (1994): 287-99.

Gossett, Suzanne, Barbara Ann Bardes. "Women and Political Power in the Republic: Two Early American Novels." *Legacy* 2.2 (1985): 13-30.

Gould, Philip. "Catharine Sedgwick's 'Recital' of the Pequot War." *American Literature* 66.4 (1994): 641-62.

Harris, Susan K. "The Limits of Authority: Catharine Maria Sedgwick and the Politics of Resistance." *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives.* Ed. Lucinda Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2003. 272-85.

Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity." *American Literature* 70.3 (1998): 581-606.

Karafilis, Maria. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: The Crisis Be-

airiti

tween Ethical Political Action and US Literary Nationalism in the New Republic." *American Transcendental Quarterly* 12.4 (1998): 327-44.

Karcher, Carolyn. Introduction. *Hope Leslie, or, Early Times in the Massachusetts*. Catharine Maria Sedgwick. New York: Penguin, 1998. ix-xxxvi.

Luciano, Dana. "Voicing Removal: Mourning (as) History in *Hope Leslie*." *Western Humanities Review* 58.2 (2004): 48-67.

Nelson, Dana. "Sympathy as Strategy in Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender and Sentimentality in Nineteenth-Century America.* Ed. Shirley Samuels. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. 191-202.

Rosaldo, Renato. "Imperialist Nostalgia." *Represenations* 26 (1989): 107-22.

Sakai, Naoki. *Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2008.

Schweitzer, Ivy. *Perfecting Friendship: Politics and Affiliation in Early American Literature.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006.

Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. *Hope Leslie, or, Early Times in the Massachusetts.* Ed. Carolyn L. Karcher. New York: Penguin, 1998.

Singley, Carol J. "Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*: Radical Frontier Romance." *The (Other) American Tradition: Nineteenth-Century Women Writers.* Ed. Joyce W. Warren. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1993. 39-53.

Spivak, G. C. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 66-111.

---. "The Politics of Translation." *Outside in the Teaching Machine.* New York and London: Routledge, 1993. 179-200.

---. "Translating into English." *Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation*. Eds.

Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2005. 93-110.

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

Tawil, Ezra. *The Making of Racial Sentiment: Slavery and the Birth of the Frontier Romance.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860.* New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Tuthill, Maureen. "Land and the Narrative Site in Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*."

airiti

American Transcendental Quarterly 19.2 (2005): 95-113.

Wexler, Laura. "Tender Violence: Literary Eavesdropping, Domestic Fiction, and Educational Reform." *The Culture of Sentiment.* Ed. Shirley Samuels. New York: Oxford UP, 1992. 9-38.

Zagarell, Sandra A. "Expanding 'America': Lydia Sigourney's *Sketch of Connecticut*, Catharine Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 6.2 (1987): 225-45.

[Received 16 February, 2009;
accepted 12 October, 2009]