

© 2022 by The New England Quarterly

Lindsay DiCuirci; Puritan Spirits in the Abolitionist Imagination. The New England Quarterly 2022; 95 (1): 97–100. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1162/tneq\\_r\\_00934](https://doi.org/10.1162/tneq_r_00934)

[https://doi.org/10.1162/tneq\\_r\\_00934](https://doi.org/10.1162/tneq_r_00934)

Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

**Please provide feedback**

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing [scholarworks-group@umbc.edu](mailto:scholarworks-group@umbc.edu) and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

Though every civil rights advance of previous decades was not reversed, many were. National recognition of a revived states' rights doctrine, manifest in "separate but equal," would assure policies of white supremacy for generations. By giving legitimacy to segregation in education, employment, housing, and public accommodations, supremacist policies nearly erased the bravery, idealism, and accomplishments of the first civil rights movement that Kate Masur so insightfully chronicles. Segregation masquerading as "separate but equal" rights supplied legitimacy for race discrimination. After *Plessy*, though new generations of activists opposed segregation in the United States Post Office and the United States armed forces, no congress and no president would challenge segregation until confronted by comparison with the Nazi regime.

Richard D. Brown is the Board of Trustees Distinguished Professor of History, Emeritus, University of Connecticut, and the author of *SELF-EVIDENT TRUTHS: CONTESTING EQUAL RIGHTS FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE CIVIL WAR* (2017).

*Puritan Spirits in the Abolitionist Imagination.* By Kenyon Gradert (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020. Pp. 246. \$50.00 cloth, \$49.99 ebook).

Nathaniel Hawthorne may have been haunted in the *Scarlet Letter* by "a throng of bearded men, in sad-colored garments of gray," but as Kenyon Gradert's lively book lays out, the puritans that populated the abolitionist rhetoric of Hawthorne's peers were warriors, revolutionaries, and zealots in the cause of righteousness. Indeed, Hawthorne's views remain "outliers" even if they have loomed large in the critical discourse surrounding the puritan legacy in the nineteenth century. This corrective, offered in the first endnote, lays the groundwork for the book's central achievement: to recover the version of puritan radicalism that antebellum thinkers instrumentalized in the cause of abolition. This recovery is necessary, Gradert argues, because critics today have wrongly "presumed [the puritans'] influence to be a conservative one" (10).

The critical question that Gradert's book poses is this: Given their constant invocations of the puritans, what did New England abolitionists find revelatory and imitable about them? Often conflating "Puritans," "Pilgrims," and "Roundheads" in their allusions, abolitionists

were less concerned with the finer theo-political points that separated these groups and more concerned with their “spirit,” their rebellious ethos in particular. Antebellum abolitionists found in this ethos an answer to the “sense that religion was now as spineless as it was civilized,” silent and subdued in the face of slavery (11). The puritan emigrants to New England are not as relevant to the Garrisonian abolitionists that populate this study as Oliver Cromwell and the revolutionary regicides. This book’s puritans are more John Milton than John Cotton. And while the nineteenth century comes alive in Gradert’s incisive analysis, its political and religious nuances sharply delineated, the seventeenth century is left comparatively indistinct, the titular Puritan Spirits, well, ethereal. Beyond the “usable past” that puritans might have provided, what did their specific theological convictions, exegetical principles, eschatology, social networks, worldview, pathos, or print culture lend to the righteous cause of abolition in the nineteenth century?

Chapters one and two focus on how abolitionist men and women adopted a puritan model of righteous militancy, exposing an unresolved tension between “progressivism and chauvinism” (14). Ralph Waldo Emerson, Wendell Phillips, and Theodore Parker, for instance, figured John Brown as “Cromwellian,” a comparison that embraced the “desire for spiritual heroism” through militant action (32). In the following chapter, Gradert traces how women writers like Maria Weston Chapman, Lydia Maria Child, and Julia Ward Howe co-opted this same masculinist model of activism to carve space for themselves in the abolitionist cause, a way to “reclaim [their] foremothers’ heroism for spiritual battle in a moral wilderness” (65). Gradert’s discussion of Child’s *The Kansas Emigrants* marks one of several important moments in this book of sustained attention to understudied texts. Here, though, I would have appreciated a closer look at the historiographical gymnastics that writers underwent to valorize Cromwell (ignoring, for instance, his treatment of Ireland) and create a kind of puritan soup of Roundhead rebellion and separatist spirituality, if only to help Gradert’s readers understand the importance of historical obfuscation in these invocations of the “Puritan spirit.”

Chapters three through five reveal the roles that print and belles-lettres played in reviving a Miltonian spirit of the free press alongside a “prophetic authority” intent on moving readers to right feeling and decisive action (99). Gradert’s discussion of William Lloyd Garrison’s *Liberator* reveals the extent to which he positioned slavery as “a threat to [white Northerners’] own cherished Pilgrim and

Patriot tradition of a free press" (81). More than that, Gradert makes clear that channeling the puritan spirit gave the abolitionist press its teeth, even if critics of Garrison balked at his zealous gatekeeping of abolition's ways and means. Chapter four features the puritan poet-ics of James Russell Lowell and John Greenleaf Whittier, the latter a life-long Quaker who nevertheless found in Milton an aesthetic and authorial model for doing prophetic work that pricked the public's moral imagination. Turning to the Stowes in chapter five, Gradert introduces the useful and evocative phrase "bands of reverence" in reference to the ways that Harriet Beecher Stowe in particular imagined a "harmonious social order for racial differences" (148). Presenting a new model of Christian charity, as it were, the Stowes sought to heal the rifts wrought by slavery through integrated, albeit Protestant, community care. Chapter six introduces a crucial corrective to the assumption that only white Anglo-Saxon Protestants could find affinity (or utility) in a puritan story. Gradert examines how Black abolitionists like Henry Highland Garnet, James McCune Smith, and Martin Delany harnessed what they saw as the culturally white short hand—the *Mayflower*—to hold slavery's apologists to account. They invoked the "Puritans as ammo" in the fight to call out the apathetic North, but they also harnessed the rhetoric of rebellion and the example of Cromwell to recruit Black soldiers in the Civil War (164). Gradert shows a keen and necessary attention to the vexed relationship that Black abolitionists had to Anglocentric historiography and to the ways that Black abolitionist discourse thrived outside of that narrow view of liberation.

The conclusion covers Melville's *Battle-Pieces* and its (white) fantasy of fraternal repair following the war before moving, somewhat discordantly, to a reading of Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* as an exemplum of living with self-reliant conviction in a violent world. Gradert may have missed an opportunity here to revisit what he describes as the "long battle over our *memory* of the Puritans" as a way to reckon with what is *forgotten* (5). If we recognize New England's Anglo-American abolitionists as settlers, how does that change our reading of this referential, typological tradition, richly steeped in puritan war rhetoric? A puritan history of righteous holy war can only be trumpeted if a puritan history of actual war with, for example, the Pequots and Narragansetts is obscured. More broadly, how can scholarly work on the puritans and their legacies frankly reflect settler colonialism as *the* foundational phenomenon upon which origins myths are built? For even if puritanism's fiery convictions could be harnessed

for radical ends—no less than the destruction of slavery—they could not live so vividly in the abolitionist imagination if they were not also washed in the oblivious waters of colonial amnesia. These observations notwithstanding, scholars interested in the nineteenth-century construction of the colonial past will find in Gradert's engaging book an important revelation about how saturated abolitionist discourse (and the print market) was with the figure of the revolutionary Puritan and how that figure, crafted in the abolitionist imagination, animated the zealous fight to end slavery.

Lindsay DiCuirci is an associate professor of English at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. She is the author of *COLONIAL REVIVALS: THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY LIVES OF EARLY AMERICAN BOOKS* (2019).

*Eloquence Embodied: Nonverbal Communication Among French and Indigenous Peoples in the Americas.* By Céline Carayon. (Chapel Hill, NC: Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture. Pp. 472. \$49.95 cloth.)

In most narratives of contact between Native Americans and European newcomers, communication begins with gestures, pantomime, and rudimentary sign language before increased familiarity enabled speech. Céline Carayon's *Eloquence Embodied* shows how this familiar sequence of events oversimplifies—and often ignores—the rich variety of nonverbal communication that occurred in the early modern Americas, including signs, ceremonies, gestures, and performances. Instead, this study of the first two centuries of French colonization in the Americas from 1500 to 1700 argues that, rather than evolving from “basic” nonverbal to more “sophisticated” verbal communication, “colonial America was the site of rich intersections between effective traditions of embodied expressiveness” (6–7). Furthermore, far from fumbling from one misunderstanding to the next, French colonizers and the Native Americans they met generally managed to understand each other quite well.

Carayon's chronological framing means that French encounters with Indigenous people in Florida, Brazil, Guiana, and the Caribbean receive significant attention alongside the more frequently studied St. Lawrence Valley and Illinois Country. As a result, Carayon's account of Indigenous experiences with French colonizers includes Beothuc,