

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications -- Department of English

English, Department of

2016

The Transatlantic Village: The Rise and Fall of the Epistolary Friendship of Catharine Maria Sedgwick and Mary Russell Mitford

Melissa J. Homestead

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, mhomestead2@Unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Literature in English, North America Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), [Reading and Language Commons](#), and the [Women's History Commons](#)

Homestead, Melissa J, "The Transatlantic Village: The Rise and Fall of the Epistolary Friendship of Catharine Maria Sedgwick and Mary Russell Mitford" (2016). *Faculty Publications -- Department of English*. 191.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs/191>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications -- Department of English by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Published in *The Edinburgh Companion to Nineteenth-Century American Letters and Letter-Writing*, ed. Celeste-Marie Bernier, Judie Newman, and Matthew Pethers (Edinburgh University Press, 2016), pp 538-553.

Copyright © 2016 Melissa Homestead.

The Transatlantic Village: The Rise and Fall of the Epistolary Friendship of Catharine Maria Sedgwick and Mary Russell Mitford

Melissa J. Homestead

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

In June 1830, the American novelist and short-story writer Catharine Maria Sedgwick used the imminent London publication of her novel *Clarence* as a pretext for initiating a correspondence with the British author Mary Russell Mitford. In her first letter to Mitford, Sedgwick addressed her as “My dear Miss Mitford,” a violation of epistolary decorum in a letter to someone to whom she had not been introduced (*FOMRM*, 155).¹ As Sedgwick protested, however, “I cannot employ the formal address of a stranger towards one who has inspired the vivid feeling of intimate acquaintance, a deep and affectionate interest in her occupations and happiness” (*FOMRM*, 155). In this letter Sedgwick did not explicitly mention *Our Village* (1824-32), the title under which multiple volumes of Mitford’s sketches of country life had already appeared, but she referred by name to recurring characters in these sketches and proclaimed that Mitford’s “power over the imagination” in depicting them had “wrought on our affection like realities” (*FOMRM*, 156). In *Our Village*, Mitford – an unmarried woman from an “aristocratic but impecunious family, who lived in the village of Three Mile Cross in Berkshire, England, and supported her ne’er-do-well father with the proceeds from her writing – presented a thinly fictionalized version of life in an English country village as narrated

by a genteel woman who resides there. As Alison Booth has argued of this autobiographical strain in Mitford's work, she "took pains to create the intimacy of correspondence, to 'talk to the public as a friend,' but in an artful arrangement of the lifelike."²

Sedgwick was not the only female writer who read in *Our Village* an apparent invitation to write to its author in familiar terms, but she arguably had more reason to feel a strong kinship with Mitford than most, despite the Atlantic Ocean lying between them.³ Sedgwick was, like Mitford, unmarried and devoted to her family, and she was born and raised in the Berkshires, a mountainous region of Massachusetts named after the English county where Mitford lived. "[W]e all have dim impressions of the actual existence of those unknown and distant," Sedgwick told Mitford in her first letter, making it "difficult for you to realize that your name has penetrated beyond our maritime cities, and is familiar and honored, and loved through many a village circle" (*FOMRM*, 156). Thus, although Sedgwick initially wrote to Mitford from New York City, where she lived half of each year with her brother Robert, by adverting to the circulation of Mitford's works in the "village circle[s]" of the U.S. she aligned herself with rural life in the American Berkshires, where she lived the other half of each year with another brother. Moreover, because the narrator of *Our Village* frequently indulges a village girl, "dear, bright little 'Lizzie'; in her rambles, Sedgwick also allowed her niece and namesake, Katherine Sedgwick (Robert's daughter), to add a postscript asking whether various human characters and the dog May in Mitford's sketches were real (*FOMRM*, 156-7). In response to these subtle gestures of affiliation, Mitford wrote back to "My dear Miss Sedgwick" in September with enthusiasm and gratitude (*LOMRMTH*, 116). While she had not yet received the promised copy of *Clarence*, she had read Sedgwick's earlier novels *A New-England Tale* (1822) and *Redwood* (1824), and she admitted in both her letter to Catharine and her postscript to Kate that "[t]he indices of my private story" in the *Our Village* books "which have been so kindly received by the public, are for the most part strictly true" (*LOMRMTH*, 117). Adding details of her family life not included in *Our Village*, Mitford implored Catharine, "if you ever do come to our little England you must come and see us. We should never forgive you if you did not" (*LOMRMTH*, 118).

For a decade thereafter, the imagined co-residence of Sedgwick and Mitford in a transatlantic village flourished: they corresponded

regularly with sympathy and a sense of identification, promoted each other's works to their respective national reading audiences, and sent letters of introduction with friends and family crossing the Atlantic. It is thus ironic that the actual meeting of the two authors on Sedgwick's first and only trip to Europe in 1839 and Sedgwick's subsequent description of their encounter in *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home* (1841) led to the friendship's collapse. Their epistolary friendship was embedded in the broader Anglo-American circulation of texts, which often crossed and recrossed between manuscript and print as they circulated, and the rise and fall of their friendship illuminates the unstable boundaries between public and private that resulted when published authors corresponded transatlantically in the mid-nineteenth century.

When antebellum New Englanders "pictured the cultural geography of their region in their mind's eye; Lawrence Buell has observed, "the first thing they thought they saw was a patchwork of largely rural 'towns' ... small, self-contained, preindustrial districts ... dotted with hamlets and with a central village as the social or economic hub" (*NELC*, 304). As represented in the literature of this period, the village was "a self-contained unit, sheltered from the outside world and organically interdependent: a bird's nest shielded from wind and 'foreigners'" — its key qualities were "smallness, isolation, cohesiveness, innocence, and unchangingness" (*NELC*, 306). Across the ocean, meanwhile, Mitford's famous opening passage in the first volume of *Our Village* praised and described village life in England in very similar terms. "Of all the situations for a constant residence," she wrote, "that which appears to me the most delightful is a little village far in the country; a small neighbourhood, not of fine mansions finely peopled, but of cottages ... with inhabitants whose faces are as familiar to us as the flowers of our garden; a little world of our own, close-packed and insulated like ants in an ant-hill, or bees in a hive ... where we know everyone, are known to everyone, interested in everyone, and authorised to hope that everyone feels an interest in us."⁴ Sedgwick, unlike Mitford, seldom used a first-person participant-observer narrator, but some of her fiction of the 1820s is thematically akin to that of her English correspondent. Her representation of village life in her first novel, *A New-England Tale*, for example, may be less eulogistic than Mitford's (Buell calls it "more an expose than an exposition of provincial village culture"), but *Redwood* certainly idealizes

the intimacy of village life (*NELC*, 295). Thus, when describing the customs of a village funeral, the narrator of *Redwood* admits that despite its being “quite primitive,” its “simplicity is more touching than the most pompous ceremonial,” for “in the country where life is not so plentiful ... each knows his neighbour, the events of his life, and the hope he may have had in death.”⁵ Similarly, when a character loses his home to a fire, “the voluntary contributions of his townsmen” enable him to quickly rebuild it, thereby demonstrating “the prompt benevolence of our country people.”⁶ Moreover, the novel with which Sedgwick sought to initiate her correspondence with Mitford, *Clarence*, even more pointedly contrasts urban and rural lifeways, with an important interlude from the scenes set in New York City taking place in Clarenceville, a “thriving village” where the genteel heroine faces a series of challenges as she attempts to pull off an unexpected dinner party without ruffling the feathers of a series of village types from whom she must procure her provisions.⁷

Based on the presumption that Mitford’s *Our Village* sketches, which began appearing in British gift books and magazines in 1822, were widely disseminated in the U.S. soon after their original publication, scholars have usually supposed that they influenced Sedgwick’s village fictions of the 1820s. However, even though U.S. copyright law permitted American periodicals to reprint individual sketches, and publishers to reprint entire volumes, without Mitford’s permission, her sketches did not catch the attention of American magazine editors until 1826, and *Our Village* did not appear in book form under an American imprint until New York’s Bliss & White — also the publisher of Sedgwick’s *A New-England Tale*, *Redwood*, and *The Travellers* (1825) — issued the first three volumes of collected sketches simultaneously in late 1828.⁸ Although Mitford had access to Sedgwick’s works of the 1820s in London editions published by John Miller not long after the American editions appeared, *Our Village* apparently entered the Sedgwick family circle in Bliss & White’s delayed edition.⁹ As one of Catharine’s nieces wrote to her father in March 1829, her brother had “brought up quite an importation of Novels” from New York to Stockbridge, amongst which, “[w]e were all delighted with Miss Mitford.”¹⁰ It is thus possible that Sedgwick influenced Mitford rather than *vice versa*. Regardless, their first exchange of letters in 1830 reveals a shock of recognition between the two women — a sense that throughout the 1820s they had embraced similar literary themes and

were thus neighbors in a village who had before failed to become acquainted but who could now proceed immediately to intimacy.

For Mitford, this sense of recognition was particularly strong, since before receiving Sedgwick's initial letter she had already selected three of the American's gift-book tales — "The Catholic Iroquois" (1825), "The Country Cousin" (1829) and "Cacoethes Scribendi" (1829) — for her not-yet-issued anthology *Stories of American Life* (1830). Indeed, in her introduction to the three-volume collection, Mitford singled out Sedgwick twice — praising "the moral tales of Miss Sedgwick" as among the book-length American works already well-known to British readers and acknowledging Sedgwick as one of the authors to whom she was "chiefly indebted" for shorter tales she had chosen "from a great mass of Annuals, Magazines, and other periodicals."¹¹ Mitford no doubt sensed a kindred spirit in a narrative like "Cacoethes Scribendi," which affectionately sends up the residents of a "little secluded and quiet village" named "H." that "lies at no great distance from our 'literary emporium'" (a thinly disguised version of Sedgwick's hometown of Stockbridge, Massachusetts).¹² Its protagonist, Mrs. Courland, an enthusiastic amateur author, writes gift-book tales deriving from events in H., within which the village's "church and school house [stand] there according to their actual dimensions."¹³ A delighted Mitford added this footnote, the only one in her anthology: "This story is a curious illustration of the universality of the fashion of the day. Many editors of our splendid English Annuals could ... bear testimony to a similar passion for literary fame on this side of the water."¹⁴ Serendipitously, meanwhile, Sedgwick introduced herself to Mitford during the gap between the printing of *Stories* and its publication, thus allowing Mitford to realize on a personal level her prefatory intention "to make American manners better known in England" by "promot[ing] kindly feelings between two nations, who, described from a common ancestry, possessing the same rich and noble language, and alike distinguished by a love of public freedom and domestic virtue, ought ... to be to each other, in a social and political sense, brethren and friends."¹⁵

Having arrived at this sense of personal recognition and affiliation, however, the difficulties of transatlantic correspondence very nearly ended the two writers' epistolary friendship before it began. Mail did not travel on regularly scheduled steamships between North America and Britain until 1840, and sending letters on both sides of the Atlantic

required the payment of high postage charges (potentially borne by the recipient) and following confusing regulations. Consequently, Sedgwick and Mitford, like other international correspondents, often sent letters with private individuals traversing the Atlantic instead. Nonetheless, whether sent by post or privately carried, transatlantic letters commonly suffered long delays or miscarriages.¹⁶ Indeed, the first editor of Mitford's published correspondence, Alfred L'Estrange, likely had possession of Mitford's September 1830 reply to Sedgwick's first letter because it never left England.¹⁷ In her second letter, written 10 October 1830, Mitford attempted to reconstruct her first, explaining that she had sent it to "an American Gentleman in London to be forwarded" to Sedgwick, but that "Mr. Jones" had changed lodgings and the letter's whereabouts were unknown (*CMSP*, 111.3.11). Mitford wrote this second letter "on the full gallop" because the gentleman himself, most likely the lawyer, editor, and poet James Athearn Jones, was standing by waiting to carry it to London, where he would entrust it to John Miller for its transatlantic crossing.¹⁸ On 7 January 1832, a chagrined Mitford reported that this "American Gentleman" had failed once more, having departed England without transmitting yet another letter addressed to both Catharine and her niece Kate — a miscarried letter that would partially fill a two-year gap in Sedgwick and Mitford's early correspondence (*CMSP*, III.3.13). Recognizing the threat to their budding friendship, Sedgwick proffered an elaborate Shakespearean metaphor in replying to this news on 14 May, calling Jones "my Petruchio" because he had denied her the food she craved — namely, letters from Mitford (*FOMRM*, 169). "His very name has a *knell* in it," Sedgwick protested, suggesting a bell tolling for a friendship that might die without correspondence to sustain it (*FOMRM*, 169). In response, Mitford wrote on 2 September confessing that, despite Jones being a "well intentioned person," his "carelessness" had made her "suspicious even of trustier people" — indeed she had delayed responding to Sedgwick because she wanted to convey the letter to London herself in order to ensure its safe passage (*CMSP*, III.3.13).

For the next decade, in fact, Sedgwick and Mitford's correspondence would continue to bear out William Merrill Decker's observation that the carrying and miscarrying of letters is a common "thematic concern of the epistolary text."¹⁹ Commentary on persons carrying letters, queries about postage and escaping it through "franking" (by Mitford's friends in Parliament), as well as explanations of delays, occupy space

in nearly every letter the two women sent. Because of such issues, their initial round of personal disclosures took a great deal of time. Nevertheless, by January 1832 they had made clear to one another the similarities in their familial circumstances, with Mitford stressing her sense of responsibility toward her father (“one of the most beautiful of men ... , a perfect specimen of the English gentleman”) and Sedgwick writing of her brothers, her sister, her sisters-in-law (“as true, and devoted as if they were born flesh of my flesh”) and her “little community of nieces and nephews,” all of whom were said to share in her delight at Mitford’s letters (*CMSP*, III.3.11; *FOMRM*, 170).

This latter emphasis on the familial circulation of letters is, indeed, another common trope in the two women’s correspondence. Scholarship on transatlantic epistolarity has often focused on letter-writing as a means to maintain relationships, including family ones, over distance within expanding empires, but if, as Konstantin Dierks has argued, such relationships “were reduced almost completely to letters” for many “transatlantic immigrants and frontier migrants,” the relationship between Mitford and Sedgwick from 1830 until 1839 was not merely “reduced” to letters — it consisted entirely of them.²⁰ To compensate for this lack of physical familiarity they therefore resorted to what Elizabeth Hewitt has described as a “frequent conceit” in nineteenth-century letter-writing — the assertion “that there is no essential difference between the letter-writer’s *body* and her *letter*.”²¹ In this respect, as Eve Tavor Bannet adds, letters were understood as a “form of silent speech that both issued from conversation and returned to it,” especially through being read aloud in company.²² Thus, in May 1832, Sedgwick reported a dialogue between herself and her eleven-year-old niece after she read aloud a letter in which Mitford commended the stability of class hierarchies in England: “I said, I suspect our dear Miss Mitford is an anti-reformist. ‘Oh!’ she exclaimed, ‘I wish that everybody we *love* in England would not be against the reform!’” (*FOMRM*, 170). In the same letter, Sedgwick reported another response to Mitford that was both far less ambivalent and far more emphatic in its physicality: “My brother Robert ... is your devoted admirer. I wish I could describe to you the unaffected enthusiasm with which he kissed your signature” (*FOMRM*, 170). Several years later Sedgwick wrote to Mitford about another familial dialogue, this one concerning the imminent departure from New York of Mitford’s old and Sedgwick’s new friend, the Anglo-Irish writer Anna Jameson,

during which Sedgwick's sister-in-law similarly consoled her by observing that "Miss Mitford will be here in the next packet" (*FOMRM*, 251). While Mitford was less effusive she nevertheless praised Sedgwick's letters in March 1835 as the "most welcome & most delightful pieces of sweet talking which come to me across the Atlantic" (*CMSP*, IIIA.3).

Mitford herself never did cross the Atlantic, but in the first decade of her correspondence with Sedgwick travelers carrying letters of introduction sometimes did, becoming a means for them to establish physical intimacy by proxy. In December 1832, for example, Sedgwick began a long, intertwining series of introductions by putting a letter to Mitford in the hands of her nephew George Pomeroy. "He is in some sort entitled to the pleasure of seeing you," Sedgwick explained, "being among your most enthusiastic admirers" (*FOMRM*, 173). Pomeroy eventually ensured the safe passage of his aunt's letter to Mitford's home, but had to return to America before he could present himself in person, making Mitford rue, in a letter from January 1833, her lost opportunity to "have questioned him about you & yours!" (*CMSP*, III.3.14). Nonetheless, Sedgwick soon put a letter of introduction into the hands of another nephew, Theodore Sedgwick III, the relation responsible for bringing *Our Village* to the family's attention in 1829. This young man delighted Mitford — indeed, he even commenced his own correspondence with Mitford and in 1836 returned with his father to stay with her at Three Mile Cross for nearly a month. Meanwhile, during the gap between Theodore setting off to serve as secretary to the American legation in Paris in 1833 and his first meeting with Mitford, Mitford had in turn presented the sculptor Henry Westmacott to her American friend. Describing Westmacott's desire to seek opportunities in "your wide & flourishing nation" for his ten children in a note from September 1833, Mitford assured Sedgwick that she "would not trouble you with any introductions except to persons worthy of your confidence" (*CMSP*, III.4.2). That is certainly true of her most consequential letter of introduction, written on 9 July 1834, which acquainted Sedgwick with Harriet Martineau. Although Martineau was coming to make a study of American political economy "laden with letters of recommendation from the cleverest men of our country to the cleverest men of yours," Mitford claimed she placed more "value [on] an introduction from one quiet & respectable woman to another" (*CMSP*, III.4.3). "I am delighted to owe to you the

right to ask this distinguished lady to visit us in Berkshire,” Sedgwick tellingly replied. “This is a new bond between us, and though those that already exist are sufficient to bind me to you for life, and all beyond, yet I care not how much they are multiplied” (*FOMRM*, 184).

In response to Sedgwick’s celebration of their multiplying personal bonds, Mitford judged their friendship as emblematic of broader Anglo-American cultural relations. “Every day seems to me to encrease the union between [our] countries — I mean the union of taste & feeling,” she wrote in 1835, and the connections between American and British culture were in fact a recurrent theme in the two women’s correspondence (*CMSP*, I1IA.3). As in her very first letter, for example, Sedgwick continued to write about *Our Village* as a living reality bridging the gap between the nations. Thus in May 1832, she invited Mitford to tell her “anything of your noble father (long may he live!), whom I have loved ever since you took that ride with him in a one-horse chaise on a misty morning,” before adding “Do you remember?,” thereby implicitly turning an incident from Mitford’s fictional village sketch “The Bird Catcher” (1828) into a shared memory (*FOMRM*, 171). Sometimes, moreover, Sedgwick oddly transposed Mitford’s village sketches onto American soil, as in May 1833, when she described taking a drive in the country outside New York with a friend who instructed the driver to turn “into Miss Mitford’s lane,” a “deeply shaded, nooked” place (*FOMRM*, 179). This moment, Sedgwick informed Mitford, “made my heart beat quicker. Is it not something to have given a name and a heightened charm to nature three thousand miles away?” (*FOMRM*, 179). These sympathetic crossings of the Atlantic divide also sometimes stretched into the two writers’ published works, as with Sedgwick’s use of a quotation from Mitford’s historical play about the Roman republic, *Rienzi* (1828), as the epigraph to her 1835 novel on the American Revolution *The Linwoods* (“The Eternal Power / Lodged in the will of man the hallowed names / Of freedom and country”), or Mitford’s long footnote to her 1837 story “The Widow’s Dog,” in which she describes “the pleasure of exporting, this spring, to my friend Miss Sedgwick” the “roots and seeds” of an English primrose and other “indigenous plants which our Transatlantic brethren want.”²⁴ Extending this botanical metaphor for cultural exchange, Sedgwick then included some of Mitford’s advice on growing flowering vines from another footnote to “The Widow’s Dog” in her 1839 advice book for teenage girls, *Means and Ends, or Self Training*.

Simultaneously this pattern of reciprocal exchange crossed into and through the less public realm of the epistolary. Thus in July 1839, Sedgwick sent the British edition of *Means and Ends* she had arranged for during her time in London to Mitford, calling the book “a piece of utility, which is entirely unadapted to you, but you may find some one among your humble friends to whom it may be acceptable” (*FOMRM*, 272). Mitford accordingly lent the book to a deserving recipient, whose situation and response to the text she described at length in an 1839 letter, where she also made clear that she herself had read it closely by proclaiming she was “proud of” Sedgwick’s “kind mention” of her own work (*CMSP*, II.1.4).

Notwithstanding Sedgwick and Mitford’s warm and enthusiastic embrace of one another in letters and print, their relationship was always inextricably intertwined in a broader public history of misunderstanding between Britain and the U.S, a friction fueled by travel writing and heightened by the sense that the two countries *should* understand one another. In *Clarence* Sedgwick herself launched her own sally in this ongoing battle by lampooning Captain Basil Hall — who had featured an encounter with “the accomplished author of ... ‘Hope Leslie’” in his infamous *Travels in North America* (1829) — as the character Edmund Stuart, a snobbish, clueless British travel writer.²⁵ Sedgwick and Mitford’s mutual negotiation of these frictions early coalesced around Hall’s successor Frances Trollope and her even more controversial travelogue *The Domestic Manners of the Americans* (1832). On 2 September 1832, shortly after the publication of Trollope’s book, Mitford wrote reassuringly to Sedgwick that each would genuinely like the other’s nation should they visit, before concluding “you must not confound me with Mrs. Trollope, who although she is my friend will never convince me to the opinions promulgated in her work not though she should write a thousand such” (*CMSP*, III.3.13). Sedgwick then responded by using a financial metaphor to assert that without Mitford’s endorsement, Trollope’s book was worthless — the references to her “friend Miss Mitford” in *Domestic Manners* were like reading the name “Baring” or “Rothschild” on “doubtful paper,” she declared (*FOMRM*, 173). After rejecting Trollope’s critique of the absence of social distinction in American culture, Sedgwick repeated Mitford’s earlier conviction that they would each be at home in the other’s country. “I am certain *you* would like America,” she stated, while also proclaiming that she herself more than “liked” England — “I love and

honor it as a dutiful child loves a parent” — and offering the mourning of both the American nation and the Sedgwick family over Sir Walter Scott’s death as evidence of this (*FOMRM*, 174).

Moved by Sedgwick’s tribute to Scott and her proclamation of filial love for England, Mitford wrote back on 28 January 1833 to describe in more detail the origins of her friendship with Trollope and the course of Trollope’s life as she and her barrister husband had ascended into higher social circles. These latter experiences made Frances Trollope, Mitford explained, the most “complete ... specimen of the Blue Stocking Fine Lady” in her “whole circle of acquaintance” and accounted for the views expressed in *Domestic Manners*: “Imagine such a personage as this landed on the banks of the Wolf River expecting to find a Paradise opening in the Wild ... & you will cease to wonder at her bitter disappointment & the complete convulsion of feeling ... [America] occasioned in her mind” (*CMSP*, III.3.14). Moreover, to Sedgwick’s delight, Mitford added that her father, though “an old Whig,” was “a hearty lover of your American institutions” who found *Domestic Manners* unforgivable, and observed that she herself wished “to go to America & write an answer” to Trollope’s book (*CMSP*, III.3.14). Trollope thus became a touchstone, both implicit and explicit, against which Sedgwick and Mitford each measured the potential for a form of Anglo-American understanding already realized in their friendship. Writing of Harriet Martineau’s reception in New York, for example, Sedgwick later noted with approval that she “has been received ... with a cordiality befitting her claims,” despite “our good people” being “a little shy” of “our English friends” having “been so roughly handled” by them (*FOMRM*, 184). And in return, in August 1836, Mitford assured Sedgwick that “Miss Martineau will do justice to America,” unlike “Mrs. Trollope [who] has another American book upon the stacks!” (*CMSP*, II.1.11).

Mitford and Sedgwick exchanged many such confidences in their letters and imaginatively connected their verbal exchanges in manuscript to distant bodies and voices, but they could not actually see one another. “I half envy Miss Martineau the pleasure of making your personal acquaintance,” Mitford remarked to Sedgwick on 9 July 1834, “whilst I have only this faint & feeble means of communication with one whom I love so much” (*CMSP*, III.4.2).²⁶ They thus eagerly examined visual representations of one another to supplement letters. Sedgwick, for example, enjoyed Henry Westmacott’s visit — describing him

to Mitford as “a most amusing and original person” – but valued even more his gift of a “charming bust” of their mutual friend, “looking just so intellectual, sweet-tempered, and kind-hearted as does the dear Miss Mitford of my imagination” (*FOMRM*, 181). Similarly in March 1836, Sedgwick expressed a desire to send Mitford a “picture” of her niece Kate – “a perfect Hebe” – while including in the same package the first volume of *The National Portrait Gallery of Distinguished Americans* (1834), which featured an engraving of Catharine derived from an earlier portrait by Charles Cromwell Ingham (*FOMRM*, 223). Sedgwick did not explicitly mention her inclusion in the book, telling Mitford that she sent it “for your father’s amusement” and that “as the characters [are] for the most part military or political, they cannot have much interest for you” (*FOMRM*, 224) ... However, in Mitford’s long, fulsome remarks on the “valuable set of American portraits” in August she coyly observed, “I need not tell you the portrait that interested us the most,” before concluding that the Ingham picture seemed to her to resemble “our great actress” Eliza O’Neill “before she grew fat,” more than the “notion” of Sedgwick she had formed in her mind (*CMSP*, II.1.11).

Such misconceptions were evidently part and parcel of the process of long-distance correspondence and could be brushed off with a joke. When refracted through a direct encounter, on the other hand, they could prove more damaging, as Sedgwick and Mitford found when the former arrived in England, accompanied by a large family group, in June 1839. On 10 June (after several days in the south of England, where Captain Basil Hall, to Sedgwick’s surprise, was a generous host) Sedgwick wrote to Mitford asking if she would believe herself “threatened with an incursion of Goths & Vandals” if “Kate & I and some of our people” made a visit to Three Mile Cross the very next day en route to London.²⁷ Although postponed until 13 June their long-awaited meeting finally took place and then, after several weeks in London during high season, the Sedgwicks departed for the Continent. The family’s intention to make a long return visit to England was later thwarted by a sudden turn for the worse in the health of Catharine’s brother Robert, which obliged them to merely transit through London on their way home. This curtailment notwithstanding, in July 1840, Sedgwick prevailed upon Basil Hall to write her a letter of introduction to his publisher, Edward Moxon, describing her “plan to give her observations to the world,” and by February 1841 she

was writing to Moxon herself, authorizing Hall to negotiate on her behalf for publication of “my journal.”²⁸ In April 1841, meanwhile, with its American production already underway, Sedgwick signed a contract with New York’s Harper & Brothers for the work by then titled *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*. A decade earlier the slow and unreliable nature of transatlantic transport links had helped to delay the British publication of *Clarence*, but by 1841 a steam packet service from New York to England sped Harper & Brothers’ proofs of Volume Two of *Letters* from Sedgwick’s hands in late June to Moxon’s by early July.²⁹

British reviewers of *Letters from Abroad* found Sedgwick’s brief description of her visit to Mitford therein to be an attractive target for excerpting. Sedgwick sets the scene by describing her family’s conversation with the coachman on their journey to Three Mile Cross. This man claimed “an acquaintance of some twenty years’ standing with Miss *M.*, and assured us that she was one of the ‘cleverest women in England,’ and ‘the doctor’ (her father) an ‘earty old boy,’” Sedgwick recalled:

And when he reined his horses up to her door, and she appeared to receive us, he said, “Now you would not take the little body there for the great author, would you?” and certainly we should have taken her for nothing but a kindly gentlewoman, who had never gone beyond the narrow sphere of the most refined social life. (*LFANY*, 1: 46)

Sedgwick then goes on to describe the “gentlewoman” herself (her “pale gray, soul-lit eye,” prematurely white hair, and natural, frank and affectionate manner), but provides little detail of a long social visit, including only a vignette of its beginning, where Mitford proclaims, “I must show you my geraniums while it is light, for I love them next to my father,” while leading them directly to her garden (*LFANY*, 1: 47). After briefly describing “this little paradise of flowers” so her own “countrywomen ... might learn how *taste* and *industry* ... and the art of garden-culture, might triumph over small space and means,” Sedgwick simply concludes by describing Mitford’s domestic establishment (including an enumeration of her servants) and praising the high literary reputation the Englishwoman has earned while laboring within its humble precincts (*LFANY*, 1: 47).

In contrast to British reviewers, who treated *Letters from Abroad* as a public document, many U.S. reviewers, as Lucinda Damon-Bach has noted, took a cue from Sedgwick's styling of each chapter as a letter to "Dear C" (her brother Charles) and "treated it as familial correspondence not [originally] intended for publication."³⁰ Yet as Damon-Bach also demonstrates, Sedgwick in fact crafted the book very carefully from multiple sources, including travel journals kept by herself and other members of her party. Specifically analyzing the "letter" featuring Sedgwick's visit to Mitford, for example, Damon-Bach observes the care with which the American revised her longer journal entry in order to create a "flattering" portrait of "the English writer [as] gentle and unpretentious, Sedgwick's *belle ideal* of female author-ity."³¹

While Sedgwick undoubtedly intended to flatter Mitford, the subject of this portrait, and some of her friends, perceived it differently. Sedgwick soon received a long letter of criticism from the poet John Kenyon, whom she had met in London (perhaps via Mitford) and who shared some of her family's travels on the Continent. Kenyon also numbered Edward Moxon, his publisher, and the poet Elizabeth Barrett, his cousin, among his correspondents. On 10 July 1841, Kenyon wrote to Sedgwick to explain that he had "happened to hear" that Sedgwick mentioned him in *Letters* (albeit not by name, like Mitford, but in a way that nonetheless made his identity clear) and that he had rushed to Moxon's print-shop wanting to "buy up the whole impression and burn it" (*CMSP*, 11.2.8). After reading Sedgwick's "eulogy" of him, he had then persuaded Moxon "to cancel the sheet" featuring it, and to allow him half an hour to make revisions to Sedgwick's description of her English travels, including "necessary (as I feel) alterations in what you have said about Miss Mitford and her father" (*CMSP*, 11.2.8). Sedgwick defended her intentions, but Kenyon replied on 17 October that the problem in the Mitford passages lay in the coachman's slangy epithets: "Now even in your Wigwam of Stockbridge ... you would not say 'little body' of a lady nor 'earty old boy' of a gentleman of 80 — whom you wished to please or not displease. — Now I happen to know and others happen to know — and he knows and his daughter knows that to be rather too much of a 'hearty old boy' is the sin of Dr. Mitford's character and the phrase would have wounded in proportion as it fitly applied" (*CMSP*, II.1.15). Thus, in Moxon's edition of *Letters from Abroad* as published, Mitford's father is a "fine 'old

gentleman” and Mitford a “lady” and “pleasing person” rather than a “little body” (*LFALON*, 1: 36, 37).³²

As Kenyon had observed on 10 July, however, proofs of the first volume (encompassing Sedgwick’s time in England) went to reviewers before Kenyon edited them, and it was early reviewers’ excerpts from the unedited proofs that initially led to Mitford’s own disapproval. Writing to a friend sometime around 15 July, for example, Mitford broadly characterized Sedgwick’s description of her visit as “a specimen of the very coarsest Americanism ever put forth” and remarked upon “how unexpected [her] coarse detail has been” (*LMRM*, 188). Seeming to forget that Catharine had introduced the two Theodore Sedgwicks to her, Mitford complained that the former “had been received as their kinswoman,” and that the “chief annoyance to me is the finding the aunt of a dear friend so grossly vulgar” (*LMRM*, 188). Indeed, Mitford seemed determined that her correspondent should read Sedgwick in the worst possible light, specifically advising her to “get the ‘Literary Gazette,’” which excerpted Sedgwick’s entire description of her visit to Mitford from the unedited proofs, rather than the *Athenaeum*, which excerpted only part of the description as edited by Kenyon (*LMRM*, 188).

Not all of Mitford’s friends were persuaded of Sedgwick’s sinfulness. Having seen only the *Athenaeum*, Elizabeth Barrett initially expressed puzzlement at Mitford’s outrage and observed that when “a man has either by great deeds or noble writings, passed into the heart of the world, he gives that world the *right to love* to sit at his fireside & hear him speak face to face & with a friend’s voice ... Well done Miss Sedgewick [*sic*]!”³³ Later, having read the longer, unedited excerpt in the *Literary Gazette*, Barrett wrote Mitford that she wondered how “you c[oul]d take these details any other way than as proofs of the high estimation & deep interest in which you are held, not simply by [Sedgwick] & her family, but by that great new world whose large listening ears stand erect to hear all about you, through Niagara!,”³⁴ Perhaps the longer, unedited description of Sedgwick’s visit to Mitford showed “some BAD TASTE,” Barrett conceded, but she objected more strongly to Kenyon’s unauthorized intervention, since “[p]roof sheets are private papers — are they not?”³⁵ Nonetheless, the damage was done, and Mitford and Sedgwick’s friendship imploded.

All of which leaves us, like Barrett, to ask why. How did three printed paragraphs — styled as part of a letter but not actually derived

from one — undo an intimacy established through a decade of correspondence? As Barrett’s reference to “private papers” suggests, for nineteenth-century authors categories of public and private did not map clearly or unproblematically onto print and manuscript respectively. Mitford and Sedgwick, in line with nineteenth-century norms, knew their letters to one another were not, in any simple sense, solely private. Letters not only circulated among family members, as we have already seen; they also often circulated — either in print or manuscript form — well beyond their original addressees.³⁶ Knowing this, Mitford occasionally warned Sedgwick when subject matter required discretion. Having explained how the inherited class status of “Country Families” produced “refinement & elegance” in a 7 January 1832 letter, for example, Mitford cautioned Sedgwick: “Do not let this National trait get into your newspapers with my name dearest Miss Sedgwick because the London papers copy copiously from the American & one should not like to be known to speak even truth too freely of one’s native land” (*CMSP*, III.3.13). Similarly, Mitford’s 28 January 1833 biographical sketch of Frances Trollope came with the parenthetical caution that it was “(in confidence to you & your own family circle)”; a long letter from June 1837 recounting a dispute with the American actor Edwin Forrest, who had failed to pay her for a London-staged play he had commissioned, included three warnings about confidentiality; and her last extant letter to Sedgwick, from 1839, contains a caustic portrait of an elderly Wordsworth seeking “flattery at great tables” in London rather than staying home with his family in the country, before concluding with the assertion that “this is between ourselves” (*CMSP*, III.3.14; II.1.12; II.1.4).

Beyond the question of epistolary privacy, moreover, Mitford and Sedgwick’s friendship always balanced on the unsteady edge between their private lives as women devoted to family and their public lives as authors. They first acquired knowledge of one another and developed the desire for greater intimacy by reading each other’s works in print, but once they had struck up a correspondence they repeatedly assured one another that their identities as authors were secondary to their identities as private women. Thus Mitford wrote to “grumble” at her “enforced authorship” in 1836, proclaiming that she published “purely for bread & would never send a line to the press” except for financial exigency, while in 1838, *when* Sedgwick first announced her intention to travel to England, she told Mitford that she lacked

“the common curiosity to see authors as authors” during her visit but wished instead “to see ... *friends*” (*CMSP*, II.1.11; *FOMRM*, 251). Indeed, after eventually meeting Mitford, Sedgwick specifically broke off from her reflections on the pleasure of “hav[ing] your image realized” to insist that being introduced to people “with an initiatory sentence about my books” made her “feel as if cold water were thrown in my face. I have not yet got familiar with my name in print; it always seems to me as if that Miss Sedgwick was quite an individual independent of myself” (*FOMRM*, 271).

That Sedgwick had nonetheless planned a travel book and would turn her visit with Mitford into fodder for it seemingly surprised Mitford, even though the American’s visit already came thoroughly embedded in their own extended dialogue over transatlantic travel writing. The two women, as we have already seen, corresponded repeatedly about Basil Hall and Frances Trollope, while the American travels and eventual emigration of the British actress Frances Kemble, who published her journals of her first years in America, became a more positive epistolary node for them. Nor was the other direction in transatlantic travel writing ignored in their letters. Indeed, in 1836 Mitford urged Theodore Sedgwick III to turn the journal of his English travels into a book in order to “cement the bonds of union” between the two countries (*CMSP*, II.1.13). Theodore did not take up Mitford’s suggestion, but the American writer Nathaniel Parker Willis had earlier provoked an uproar when he published accounts of his visits to British celebrities’ private homes, eventually collected as *Pencilings by the Way* (1835). Nevertheless Mitford — who did not feature in Willis’s travel book — continued to praise his poetry and his personal distinction in letters to Sedgwick, and even lent her one of Willis’s books when she visited Three Mile Cross.³⁷ Appropriately, British reviewers linked Sedgwick’s *Letters from Abroad* to all of these published antecedents, whether they objected to her portrayal of private scenes or not. In fact, nothing Sedgwick wrote about Mitford — neither her humble cottage, her devotion to her father and her flowers, nor her physical appearance — was news to the reading public, who had access to numerous physical and verbal portraits of the author of *Our Village*, many of them unflattering.³⁸ As *Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine* pointed out in its September 1841 issue, Mitford had “spoken so often and freely of her home, her pleasures, and her *pets*” in her published works that “a similar sketch” from Sedgwick’s “very friendly

hand” should offend no one.³⁹ Ironically, in *Letters from Abroad*, Sedgwick had tried to defend her friend against some of the public images of her that were circulating in the press. Mitford in person, she stressed, was “as unlike as possible to the faces we have seen of her in our magazines, which all have a broad humour bordering on coarseness” (*LFANY*, 1: 46-7). Yet on seeing herself portrayed in the book, Mitford allowed what Lawrence Buell has called “the presumption of New World primitiveness” to trump a decade of sympathetic identification — Sedgwick was no longer a friend, but, as she herself had predicted, part of the invading mob of “Goths & Vandals.”⁴⁰

During Mitford’s lifetime, her rage at Sedgwick’s betrayal circulated only in manuscript form. She last mentions Sedgwick in print in her *Recollections of a Literary Life* (1852), off-handedly referring to her as “my friend.”⁴¹ However, the epistolary trail ends in 1843. In April of that year, Sedgwick wrote to John Kenyon about receiving a “note” from Mitford together “with several of her Manifestos,” printed circulars seeking funds to pay debts incurred during her father’s final illness.⁴² Notwithstanding the rather self-serving nature of this mis-sive, Sedgwick was driven to reply. In her last extant letter to Mitford, from June 1843, an apparently futile effort to reclaim Mitford as her friend and neighbor in their transatlantic Berkshire village, she apologized for a long silence, caught Mitford up on Sedgwick family news, both happy and sad, and expressed her satisfaction at hearing that the circulars had now raised enough funds to pay Mitford’s debts. Moreover, Sedgwick devoted an entire paragraph to an “account of the product of the geranium seeds” that Mitford had sent her many years before. Sedgwick had shared them, she explained, with her friend Andrew Jackson Downing, “a gentleman who has written some charming books on landscape-gardening and rural architecture,” who showed her “with pride, his Mitfords, as he calls them” (*FOMRM*, 288). Projecting many future generations of plants derived from these seeds, which she had also planted in her own garden, Sedgwick concluded by positioning them as evidence of “a visible relationship between the Berkshire of the old and the new world” (*FOMRM*, 288). But, it seems, this transatlantic epistolary friendship was not destined to bloom again.

Acknowledgments — For research travel funding, thanks to: the Eccles Center at the British Library (Fellowship in North American Studies) and University of

Nebraska-Lincoln (English Department and Research Council Maude Hammond Fling Faculty Travel Fellowship). For research assistance: Carmen Smith. For advice, feedback on drafts, and sharing of resources, thanks to: Thomas Baker, Eve Bannet, Elise Boshero-Bondar, Lucinda Damon-Bach, Ellen Foster, Kevin Morrison, and members of the Midwest Nineteenth-Century Americanists (John Barton, Stephanie Fitzgerald, Laura Mielke, Patrickia Okker, and Paul Outka).

Notes

1. See Patterson, "The 'Anna Jameson and Her Friends Database,'" n.pag.
2. Booth, "Revisiting the Homes," 46.
3. See Halsey, "'Tell me of Some *Booklings*,'" 125.
4. Mitford, *Our Village*, 1: 1-2.
5. Sedgwick, *Redwood*, 1: 111.
6. *Ibid.* 1: 150.
7. Sedgwick, *Clarence*, 142.
8. Those asserting Mitford's immediate influence on Sedgwick (such as Killick in "Mary Russell Mitford," 26) don't account for the anonymous publication of her earliest village sketches in scattered venues, meaning that *Our Village* did not become a coherent phenomenon until 1824 (see Morrison, "Foregrounding Nationalism"). A search of periodicals databases, such as ProQuest's American Periodicals Series, Gale's Nineteenth-Century U.S. Newspapers, and the American Antiquarian Society Historical Periodicals Collections, finds scattered references to imported copies of *Our Village* volumes before 1826 but no evidence of reprinting from them. Those claiming earlier U.S. circulation of Mitford's village sketches (such as Sullivan, "Mary Russell Mitford," 195) cite not a single concrete instance.
9. See Homestead, "American Novelist."
10. Maria Banyer Sedgwick, Letter to Theodore Sedgwick III, 7 March 1829, in Theodore Sedgwick II Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Box 7, Folder 11.
11. Mitford, "Preface," iv-v.
12. Sedgwick, "Cacoethes Scribendi," 162.
13. *Ibid.* 176.
14. *Ibid.* 162.
15. Mitford, "Preface," vi-vii.
16. See Gerber, *Authors of Their Lives*, 143-53.
17. Nineteenth-century collections of letters in print are notoriously unreliable, and the work of L'Estrange as Mitford's primary nineteenth-century editor is no exception. His transcriptions of Sedgwick's letters are riddled with apparent errors and almost certainly omit portions (see Boshero-Bondar, "Mitford's Letters"). Unfortunately, most of Sedgwick's side of this correspondence is accessible only in L'Estrange's 1882 *The Friendships of Mary Russell Mitford*

- as *Recorded in Letters*. Two brief manuscript letters from Sedgwick to Mitford not in this volume survive, but the whereabouts of most of the letters to Mitford that L'Estrange presents, including eleven from Sedgwick, remains a mystery. L'Estrange included only the one waylaid letter from Mitford to Sedgwick in his 1870 *Life of Mary Russell Mitford*, and eleven additional manuscript Mitford letters survive in Sedgwick's papers.
18. Jones spent several years in London working for Colburn & Bentley, publishers of both *Clarence* and *Stories of American Life* — indeed he provided the American gift books and magazines from which Mitford selected the contents of the latter (see Pease, “James Athearn Jones”).
 19. Decker, *Epistolary Practices*, 58.
 20. Dierks, *In My Power*, 101. See also Round, “Neither Here Nor There,” 428, and Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 5.
 21. Hewitt, *Correspondence and American Literature*, 1.
 22. Bannet, *Empire of Letters*, 46.
 23. For this sketch see Mitford, *Our Village*, 3: 254-65.
 24. Sedgwick, *The Linwoods*, 1: vii; Mitford, “The Widow’s Dog,” 206.
 25. Hall, *Travels in North America*, 2: 74. See Homestead, “Introduction,” 12-19.
 26. Similarly, in her next letter, after Sedgwick reported Martineau’s imminent arrival in Stockbridge, Mitford protested that she “env[ied] her the delight of seeing you” and “our Kate” (Sedgwick’s niece). See Letter to Catharine Mara Sedgwick, 29 March 1835, in Sedgwick, Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, III.4.3.
 27. Sedgwick, Letter to Mary Russell Mitford, 10 June 1839, Clifton Waller Barrett Library, MSS 6970-d.
 28. Hall, Letter to Edward Moxon, 14 July 1840, Houghton Library, Autograph File H, 1584-1988; Sedgwick, Letter to Edward Moxon, 28 February 1841, Beinecke Library, YCAL MSS 446, Box 26. As Lucinda Damon-Bach has demonstrated, writing a book was, from the first, one object of Sedgwick’s European travels (see “Catharine Maria Sedgwick Tours England,” 22).
 29. See Sedgwick, Letter to Edward Moxon, 25 June 1841, Pennsylvania State University, RBM 3586.
 30. Damon-Bach, “Catharine Maria Sedgwick Tours England,” 22.
 31. *Ibid.* 36.
 32. One can only imagine Kenyon’s horror had Sedgwick published the coachman’s actual words as recorded in both her and her niece Kate’s journals, where Mitford is dubbed a “rum old file” rather than a “little body.” See Katharine Sedgwick, *Travel Diary*, 56, and Sedgwick, *Travel Journal*, Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, 1.12.1, 99.
 33. Barrett, Letter to Mary Russell Mitford, 15 July 1841, in *The Brownings’ Correspondence*, <http://www.browningscorrespondence.com/correspondence/938/> (last accessed 22 September 2015).
 34. *Ibid.* and Barrett, Letter to Mary Russell Mitford, 26 July 1841, in *The Brownings’ Correspondence*, <http://www.browningscorrespondence.com/correspondence/946/> (last accessed 22 September 2015).

35. Ibid.
36. See Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 36-7, and Bannet, *Empire of Letters*, xvii-xviii. As Bannet observes, the conventions of the travel letter “turned every traveler into a spy” (282).
37. See Baker, *Sentiment and Celebrity*, 62, 70-1.
38. See Booth, “Revisiting the Homes.”
39. “Miss Sedgwick’s Letters,” 592.
40. Buell, “Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic (Mis)Understandings,” 8.
41. Mitford, *Recollections*, 515.
42. Sedgwick, Letter to John Kenyon, 25 April 1843, John Kenyon Autograph Album, Huntington Library, HM69273-69383.

Works Cited

- Baker, T. (1999), *Sentiment and Celebrity: Nathaniel Parker Willis and the Trials of Literary Fame*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bannet, E. T. (2005), *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688-1820*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrett, E. (1806-61), *The Brownings’ Correspondence*, Wedgestone Press, <http://www.browningscorrespondence.com/> (last accessed 22 September 2015).
- Booth, A. (2008), “Revisiting the Homes and Haunts of Mary Russell Mitford,” *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 30: 39-65.
- Boshero-Bondar, E. (2013-present), “Mitford’s Letters,” Digital Mitford: The Mary Russell Mitford Archive, University of Pittsburgh, <http://mitford.pitt.edu/letters.html> (last accessed 22 September 2015).
- Buell, L. (1986), *New England Literary Culture: From Revolution through Renaissance*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Cited parenthetically as *NELC*.
- Buell, L. (2013), “Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic (Mis)Understandings from Washington Irving and Frances Trollope to Mark Twain and Lord Bryce,” in R. Peel and D. Maudlin (eds.), *Transatlantic Traffic and (Mis)Translations*, Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire Press, 1-19.
- Damon-Bach, L. L. (2012), “Catharine Maria Sedgwick Tours England: Private Letters, Public Account,” in B. L. Lueck, B. Bailey, and L. L. Damon-Bach (eds.), *Transatlantic Women: Nineteenth-Century American Women Writers and Great Britain*, Durham, NH: University Press of New England, 21-48.
- Decker, W. M. (1998), *Epistolary Practices: Letter Writing in America before Telecommunications*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Dierks, K. (2009), *In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gerber, D. A. (2006), *Authors of Their Lives: The Personal Correspondence of British Immigrants to North America in the Nineteenth Century*, New York: New York University Press.

- Hall, B. (1829), *Travels in North America, in the Years 1827 and 1828*, 3 vols., Edinburgh: Cadell & Co.
- Hall, B. (1840), Letter to E. Moxon, 14 July 1840, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Autograph File H, 1584-1988.
- Halsey, K. (2011), “‘Tell me of Some *Booklings*’: Mary Russell Mitford’s Female Literary Networks,” *Women’s Writing*, 18: 121-36.
- Hewitt, E. (2004), *Correspondence and American Literature, 1770–1865*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Homestead, M. J. (2012), “Introduction,” in C. M. Sedgwick, *Clarence*, ed. M. J. Homestead, Peterborough: Broadview, 9–40.
- Homestead, M. J. (2015), “American Novelist Catharine Sedgwick Negotiates British Copyright, 1822-1857,” *Yearbook of English Studies*, 45: 196-215.
- Killick, T. (2004), “Mary Russell Mitford and the Topography of Short Fiction,” *Journal of the Short Story in English*, 43: 11-28.
- L’Estrange, A. G. (1870), *The Life of Mary Russell Mitford, Told by Herself in Letters to her Friends*, New York: Harper. Cited parenthetically as *LOMRMTH*.
- “Miss Sedgwick’s Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home” (1841), *Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine*, 8: 590-600.
- Mitford, M. R. (1824-8), *Our Village*, 3 vols., London: G. B. Whittaker.
- Mitford, M. R. (1830), “Preface,” in M. R. Mitford (ed.), *Stories of American Life*, 3 vols., London: Colburn and Bentley, 1: iii-vii.
- Mitford, M. R. (1837), “The Widow’s Dog,” in *Country Stories*, London: Saunders and Otley, 203-28.
- Mitford, M. R. (1852), *Recollections of a Literary Life*, New York: Harper.
- Mitford, M. R. (1872), *Letters of Mary Russell Mitford*, 2 vols., ed. H. Chorley, London: Bentley. Cited parenthetically as *LMMR*.
- Mitford, M. R., et al. (1882), *The Friendships of Mary Russell Mitford as Recorded in Letters from her Literary Correspondents*, ed. A. G. L’Estrange, New York: Harper. Cited parenthetically as *FOMRM*.
- Morrison, K. A. (2008), “Foregrounding Nationalism: Mary Russell Mitford’s *Our Village* and the Effects of Publication Context,” *European Romantic Review*, 19: 275-87.
- Patterson, K. (2000), “The ‘Anna Jameson and her Friends Database’: Mapping Anna Jameson’s Associative Links with the Victorian Intellectual Community,” *Digital Studies*, 7: n.pag, <http://www.digitalstudies.org/ojs/index.php/digitalstudies/article/view/71/104> (last accessed 22 September 2015).
- Pearsall, S. M. S. (2008), *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pease, R. L. (1881), “James Athearn Jones,” *Memorial Biographies of the New England Historic Genealogical Society*, 2: 204-22.
- Round, P. H. (2005), “Neither Here Nor There: Transatlantic Epistolarity in Early America,” in S. Castillo and I. Schweitzer (eds.), *A Companion to the Literatures of Colonial America*, Oxford: Blackwell, 426--45.

- Sedgwick, C. M. (1798-1908), Catharine Maria Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Ms. N-852.1-3. Cited parenthetically as *CMSP*.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1824), *Redwood*, 2 vols., New York: Bliss & White.
- Sedgwick, C. M. [1829] (1830), "Cacoethes Scribendi," in M. R. Mitford (ed.), *Stories of American Life*, 3 vols., London: Colburn and Bentley, 3: 162-86.
- Sedgwick, C. M. [1830] (2012), *Clarence, or A Tale of Our Own Times*, ed. M. J. Homestead, Peterborough: Broadview.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1835), *The Linwoods; or "Sixty Years Since" in America*, 2 vols., New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1839), Letter to M. R. Mitford, 10 June, Special Collections Library, Clifton Waller Barrett Library, University of Virginia, MSS 6970-d.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1841), Letter to E. Moxon, 28 February, Beinecke Library, Yale University, YCAL MSS 446, Box 26.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1841), Letter to E. Moxon, 25 June, Catharine Maria Sedgwick Letters and Portraits, Special Collections Library, Pennsylvania State University, RBM 3586. Sedgwick, C. M. (1841), *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*, 2 vols., New York: Harper. Cited parenthetically as *LFANY*.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1841), *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*, 2 vols., London: Edward Moxon. Cited parenthetically as *LFALON*.
- Sedgwick, C. M. (1843), Letter to J. Kenyon, 25 April, John Kenyon Autograph Album, Huntington Library, San Marino, California, HM69273-69383.
- Sedgwick, K. (1839), Travel Diary, Charles Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, IX.B.VIII, Ms. N-853.
- Sedgwick, T., II (1780-1839J), Theodore Sedgwick II Papers, Sedgwick Family Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Ms. N-851.
- Sullivan, M. R. (1992), "Mary Russell Mitford," in B. K. Mudge (ed.), *British Romantic Novelists, 1789-1832*, Detroit: Gale, 192-200.