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1. In contrast to Hawthorne, Herman Melville has the mythic figure of Narcissus making an explicit appearance in the first chapter of *Moby-Dick, or The Whale*. The main source text for the Narcissus myth is Ovid’s *The Metamorphoses*, one of the key classical texts for the European-American literary tradition; Hawthorne was familiar with the 1717 translation of the Ovidian Narcissus myth by Joseph Addison. In addition to Ovid’s, the volume of mythology that Hawthorne specifically cited as a source for his two children’s books of classical Greek mythology, *Anthon’s Dictionary*, was published in 1841 and went through several editions. “Not once, however, in either his fiction or journals or letters did he ever mention Narcissus specifically, as did Herman Melville, or others of his era. Yet the presence of the deluded beautiful youth seems to haunt the subconscious world of the New England writer, providing much of his narrative structure and his characterizations,” an assessment with which I am in agreement. See Mary Helen Cleverly Harmon’s dissertation *The Mirror of Narcissus: Reflections and Refractions of the Classical Myth in the Short Fiction of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1981), 27–28; 34; 37–38.


4. To offer an absurdly simplified summary: the other orders are the Symbolic and the Real. The Symbolic is associated with language, law, rationality, and is therefore the order of the father, whose name and law language enacts; it is through the symbolic that we are produced as “subjects.” The Real is the unrepresentable, that outside or prior to the
symbolic, sometimes referred to as “the impossible”; it is the material of life that cannot be incorporated into the forms of signification, such as language.


8. See chapter 7 of Castiglia’s Interior States: Institutional Consciousness and the Inner Life of Democracy in the Antebellum United States (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008). This is a rich and provocative discussion of Hawthorne’s engagement with the disciplinary culture of interiority through which, in Castiglia’s view, the antebellum United States organized the emotional, somatic, legal, and criminal dimensions of its social order. Given that my work, rather than striving for a “post-interiority,” attempts to make sense of the lived experience of interiority that Castiglia critiques as a discursive phenomenon, I find his argument quite differently motivated from my own.


11. Ibid., 64.


14. In contrast to Freud in the pathologizing dimensions of his theory of narcissism and the trends of American psychiatry, Heinz Kohut, in The Analysis of the Self and other writings, offered a radically normalized view of narcissism, which he saw as linked to poor early attachment but also as a commonplace, nonpathological aspect of emotional and psychosexual life.


16. Wilhelm Stekel writes, “I consider auto-eroticism, the expression proposed by Havelock Ellis, preferable to the antiquated and abused term, onanism.” For Stekel, the psychic aspects of onanism are just as crucial an aspect as any other, hence his preference for “auto-erotic.” Ibid., 31.

17. Sylvester Graham’s writings are exemplary of these concerns. To his horror, as he wrote in A Lecture to Young Men, Graham discovered that public school boys who masturbated even engaged in “criminal,” “unnatural commerce with each other!” thus belaying any critical notion that homosexual relations are never explicitly specified in nineteenth-century texts before the 1860s. Sylvester Graham, A Lecture to Young Men (1834; repr., New York: Arno, 1974), 43.


24. Ibid, 159.

25. Hawthorne joined in public celebrations of Jackson, much to the surprise of his sister Elizabeth. As Edwin Haviland Miller describes of Hawthorne, “One of his heroes was the greatest Democrat of his era, Andrew Jackson, who was scarcely tolerated or even mentioned in elite circles in Salem. Jackson, however, was in the tradition of the Hathornes: virile, energetic, and more than a little ruthless. When Jackson visited Salem in 1833 after his reelection Hawthorne walked to the outskirts of the town, in the words of his sister Elizabeth, ‘to meet him, not to speak of him, only to look at him; and found only a few men and boys collected, not enough, without the assistance that he rendered, to welcome the General with good cheer.’ Forty years later Elizabeth was still surprised: ‘It is hard to fancy him doing such a thing as shouting.’” As Miller further observes: “Hawthorne’s opinion remained fixed. In 1858 he insisted that Jackson ‘was the greatest man we ever had; and his native strength, as well of intellect as of character, compelled every man to be his tool that came within his reach; and the cunninger the individual might be, it served only to make him the sharper tool.’ He wished in a strange matching that ‘it had been possible for Raphael to paint General Jackson.’” Miller, *Salem Is My Dwelling Place* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991), 89.


Graves’s summary useful, but I should note that classicists have very little use for Graves’s work, which has been discredited within the field.


5. Ibid., 107–8.


13. It is worth considering here the unsettled nature of the question of the difference between primary and secondary narcissism; from my perspective, the more we understand how frustratingly inconclusive Freud’s essay on narcissism remains for many, the better, for it is precisely this inconclusiveness that makes fresh readings of the work possible and resists any normalizing, pathologizing application. As Ruth Leys puts it in her important study of trauma, Freud’s concept of primary narcissism is “notoriously problematic.” Discussing the incoherencies inherent in this concept, Leys discusses the preliminary definition of it offered by Laplanche and Pontsalis. They “describe primary narcissism as an ‘early state in which the child [or ego] cathects its own self with the whole of its libido.’ But as they make clear,” Leys continues, “precisely the status of the ego is problematic in such a formulation. On the one hand, as a state in which the ego takes itself as its love-object, primary narcissism corresponds to the first emergence of a unified subject or ego. On the other hand, Freud also conceptualized primary narcissism as a primitive state of the infant that occurs prior to the formation of an ego, a state epitomized by life in the womb.” In this view, primary narcissism is an “objectless state, implying no split between the subject and the external world. As Laplanche and Pontsalis comment . . . it is difficult to know just what is supposed to be cathected in primary narcissism thus conceived.” Jean Laplanche and J. B. Pontalis, The Language of Psycho-Analysis, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (New York: Norton, 1974), quoted in Ruth Leys, Trauma: A Genealogy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 139.
14. Michael Warner offers a valuable critique of psychoanalytic denunciations of homosexuality as narcissistic, but to my mind his argument is deeply hampered by a reductionist view of Freud that does justice to his treatment neither of homosexuality nor of narcissism. The best overview I have found of the radicalism possible in psychoanalytic discussions of narcissism is Dean and Lane’s introductory essay to Homosexuality and Psychoanalysis. Andrew Morrison collects significant contributions from leading thinkers such as Freud, Heinz Kohut (whose efforts to depathologize narcissism are distinct from many of those of the twentieth century), Otto Kernberg (most notable for his theory of the grandiose self and narcissistic rage), and the overlooked but deeply insightful Annie Reich (wife of the more famous Wilhelm) in his Essential Papers on Narcissism. Notably absent from Morrison is Jacques Lacan, whose writing on narcissism is extensive. In his essay “Homosexuality and the Problem of Otherness,” Dean provides a helpful unpacking of Lacan’s views. While Lacan considers narcissism pathogenic, writes Dean, it is “as a consequence not of homosexuality but, more generally, of the ego’s delusional attachment to a mirage” (Tim Dean and Christopher Lane, eds., Homosexuality and Psychoanalysis [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001], 127). See Bruhm and Kochhar-Lindgren for particularly interesting reinterpretations of narcissism: Bruhm calls attention to the homoeroticism of the myth, whereas Kochhar-Lindgren focuses on narcissism as an inability to recognize otherness.

15. All quotations from Freud will be taken from The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (SE) and will be noted parenthetically in the text.


18. Kaja Silverman, Male Subjectivity at the Margins (New York: Routledge, 1992), 130; 146; 152. Tim Dean also stresses the importance of distinguishing “vision” from the “gaze.” Dean critiques Lee Edelman’s conflation, in his Homographesis, of vision and gaze. Tim Dean, Beyond Sexuality (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 195n26. Henry Krips notes that the gaze is Lacan’s name for “the structural distortions of the visual field, those that are not only seen but are also the source of a look turned back upon the viewer.” Henry Krips, Fetish: Erotics of the Gaze (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 27.


CHAPTER 2

1. I want to thank Dr. David Diamond for kindly reading an early draft version of this chapter and generously sending me his responses, which I found to be valuable, challenging, and insightful. Dr. Diamond pointed out to me that Ilbrahim is keeping vigil at the scene of his father’s death at the start of the story, suggesting a strong oedipal-paternal identification. This is not a dynamic that I focus on here, but I believe it is one that is worthy of further consideration.

2. For his discussion of the historical emergence of homosexuality in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a theory that has sometimes had the effect of creating a view of homosexuality as an invention datable only from this period forward, see in particular Michel Foucault’s The History of Sexuality, vol. 1, trans. from the French by Robert Hurley (1988; New York: Vintage Books, 1990). A great deal of work done on both Foucault and the question of nineteenth-century sexual history over the past decade has significantly enlarged our understanding of the latter and usefully clarified the claims of the former.

4. Relevant for our study, Friedman and Downey do discuss the mother–child relationship to a certain degree.

5. It should be clearly stated that my project proceeds from the theoretical, rather than clinical, dimensions of psychoanalysis, and that any attempt to rethink narcissism has to take into account that pathological forms of it do indeed exist in severe mental illness, such as schizophrenia and other forms of psychosis. Less severely, but nevertheless painfully, the narcissism of intensely self-involved persons for whom an obsessive interest in the self damagingly limits their emotional lives and intersubjective relationships must be understood as problematic, as a barrier between satisfying relationships with self and other.


7. Ibid., 200.

8. Ibid., 202.

9. Ibid., 206.

10. Freud wrote *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* in 1905 but kept adding to it until 1924. This footnote was added by Freud in 1910.

11. Socarides was a pioneer in the movement to “cure” homosexuality through psychiatry. As Ronald Bayer discusses, Socarides was to become, “in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a leading and forceful proponent of the view that homosexuality represented a profound psychopathology.” In Socarides’ own words, “Homosexuality is based on fear of the mother, the aggressive attack against the father, and is filled with aggression, destruction and self-deceit. It is a masquerade of life in which certain psychic energies are neutralized and held in a somewhat quiescent state. However, the unconscious manifestations of hate, destructiveness, incest and fear are always threatening to break through.” See Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 34–38. Socarides quoted in Bayer, 34.


13. Ibid., 181.

14. Freud’s difficult treatment of the Oedipal complex for girls remains deeply controversial. Without discounting the problems of Freud’s sexism, I would argue that we can say that he exposes the effects of misogyny at the same time as he constructs them. I discuss the uses that can be made of Freud’s theories of women at greater length in chapter 1 of my book *Representations of Femininity in American Genre Cinema: The Woman’s Film, Film Noir, and Modern Horror* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).


17. Freud often discusses the ways in which the Oedipus complex goes awry for those who emerge as heterosexually oriented. The masochistic male who emerges as heterosexual doubles the homosexual male in his complex maneuvers to reimagine, innovate, and thwart the normative course of the Oedipus complex; though a sustained discussion of this point exceeds the scope of this chapter, the valences that exist between male heterosexual masochism and male homosexual narcissism—both of which processes privilege the maternal rather than paternal role in the Oedipus complex—demand a thorough investigation. Indeed, one could make the case that it is Freud’s theory of heterosexual male masochism, which involves identification with the mother, that is even more germane to Hawthorne. Certainly, there are masochistic elements in Hawthorne’s representation of masculinity, but to my mind the thematization of narcissism in Freud’s theory of male homosexuality, when linked to identification with the mother, sheds more light on Hawthorne’s work. As Leland S. Person persuasively argues in his review essay “Middlesex: What Men Like in Men,” *American Literary History* 17, no. 4 (2005): 753–64, the varieties of male desire for other males, however we define this desire, is wide-ranging. The male-identified homoeroticism in Hawthorne’s work, suggested by his idolization of the rough-hewn President Andrew Jackson, would be a compelling subject for future study.


25. Ibid., 130.


27. Freud’s Wolf-Man case study, *From the History of an Infantile Neurosis*, was written in the year 1914, but did not appear in print until 1918.


29. Frederick Crews, *The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne’s Psychological Themes* (1966; repr., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 67–72. Masochism in Hawthorne is far from an unimportant issue, but Crews’s argument is characteristic of his frequently highly conventional uses of Freud, which at times blunts the effectiveness of his often insightful treatments of Hawthorne. A more thorough and complex treatment of Freud’s theory of
masochism would need to be undertaken for real clarity about the issue's development in Hawthorne to be gained.

30. All quotes from Hawthorne are taken from the *Centenary Edition* of Hawthorne's works, and all volume and page numbers will be noted parenthetically in the text.


35. I discuss these issues at length in the introduction and in chapter 2, *Men Beyond Desire*, passim.


CHAPTER 3


8. Crews wrote disdainfully in 1966 of James K. Folsom’s book *Man’s Accidents and God’s Purposes: Multiplicity in Hawthorne’s Fiction* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963): “concluding regretfully that Hawthorne considers Oneness inscrutable,” Folsom “claims that the concept of ‘multiplicity’ governs the tales and romances.” But Crews seems to share Folsom’s view even as he dismisses it: Hawthorne “was aware that in exposing our common nature he was drawing largely on his own nature”, “uneasy with the self-revelatory aspect of his work,” Hawthorne with “one arm strikes a pose of cold dignity and holds us at bay, but with the other beckons us forward into the cavern of his deepest soul.” Crews, *Sins*, 9; 11–12.

9. “Roger Malvin’s Burial” was first published separately in 1832 and was later included in the collection *Mosses from an Old Manse* (1846).

10. One could make the case that the young man / old man split is also fundamental to Edgar Allan Poe’s work—one immediately thinks of tales such as “The Man of the Crowd,” in which the narrator insatiably follows around an old man with an insatiable desire for crowds, and of “The Tell-Tale Heart,” in which the narrator kills an old man whose titular heartbeat drives him mad. Homoerotic valences charge these as well as other Poe works with a disturbing intensity, disturbing because the homoeroticism is indistinguishable—indeed, constitutive of—a deep psychic dislocation. Herman Melville’s work is rife with split masculinities. His fictional worlds—especially in his sea fiction but not only there—are dominated by older men who prey on younger men, a form of dominance with often violent sexual implications, that is, implications of real sexual violence.

11. “She heard him not. With one wild shriek, that seemed to force its way from the sufferer’s inmost soul, she sank insensible by the side of her dead boy. At that moment, the withered topmost bough of the oak loosened itself, in the stillly air, and fell in soft, light fragments upon the rock, upon the leaves, upon Reuben, upon his wife and child, and upon Roger Malvin’s bones. Then Reuben’s heart was stricken, and the tears gushed out like water from a rock. The vow that wounded youth had made, the blighted man had come to redeem. His sin was expiated, the curse gone from him; and, in the hour, when he had shed blood dearer to him than his own, a prayer, the first for years, went up to Heaven from the lips of Reuben Bourne” (10: 360).


14. Fascinatingly, Cyrus’s own name-origins seem programmatic of his function in the story. As Herodotus tells Cyrus’s story, he is, like Oedipus, another one of those legendary royal children condemned to death who manage to survive (through the kindly intervention of a nonnoble person, such as a shepherd, who rescues and adopts them) and later reclaim their noble ancestry. See Herodotus, Book 1 of *The Histories* (New York: Penguin, 1972), 85–90.

15. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 64. Though space limitations preclude a discussion of them here, several innovative projects on the intersections of melancholia, race, and queer desire have been undertaken in the wake of Butler’s retooled Freudian paradigms, and the fullest treatment of these themes in Hawthorne would have to take them into account. See note 16 of the previous chapter.

16. Bruhm treats Coleridge’s 1802 poem “The Picture; or The Lover’s Resolution” as a
prime example of Romantic narcissism. The speaker of this poem, Bruhm argues, “holds a desiring male imago as the central phantasm of the poem.” “As the speaker falls into the image of youth at the end of the poem, and the youth is absorbed by the speaker (and then, both collapse into the image of the boy in the picture, whose desire for the mother they imitate), we see the act of identity and identification that this poem is really about.” See Steven Bruhm, Reflecting Narcissus: A Queer Aesthetic (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 30–38; Bruhm references Butler’s Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex” (New York: Routledge, 1993).

17. Kochhar-Lindgren, Narcissus Transformed, 121. I admire this theorist’s formulations greatly, but I should add that he sometimes too uncritically pathologizes Narcissus for his homoerotic desire to reproduce a blissful heterosexuality within his self-desire.


19. Ibid., 153.


21. As Thompson writes, “The stranger is, not Hawthorne, but a symbolic figuration of, a substitute agent for, a Hawthorne: that is, an author figure, symbolically present in the narrative.” The transformation of self into figure has decisive repercussions for the narcissistic gaze, in which the various possibilities for seeing and being seen are constantly explored and negotiated. Turning oneself into a figure—especially here, the authorial figure of the stranger who can watch Robin, another version of the authorial self, being seen as he sees—is a strategy of control of the visual field. G. R. Thompson, The Art of Authorial Presence: Hawthorne’s Provincial Tales (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), 156.


24. To be sure, vision is not the only sense thematized in the tale. The story’s concomitant obsession with the voice demands attention that I do not have the space to elaborate upon here. But to make a brief note of the point, the story is governed by images of the aural/oral, especially the riotous, sybaritic, barbaric laughter that frequently erupts, evoking the Bakhtinian theories of the carnivalesque and the grotesque. This raucous and derisive laughter anticipates the terrible, demonic laughter of the damned Ethan Brand. Slyly, smugly, and coyly, the stranger asks Robin if multiple voices can occur as well as faces (226). In this story, the voice shields the eye; or rather, the voice is the eye, coming at Robin from all sides and no less entrapping, enclosing, and imprisoning than the gaze.

Robin’s visual face-off with aggrieved Molineux perpetuates the pattern of seeing / being seen that structures the story: Molineux stares back at Robin staring at him, even as the “lantern-bearer” “drowsily” enjoys “the lad’s amazement” and that “saucy eye” again “meets his” (228). All the old gazers gather round, having never gone away—the innkeeper, the periwigged old citizen hemming and hawing, the derisive barbers, the guests of the inn, “and all who made sport of him that night,” all present, all watching Robin watch his kinsman writhe, all joining in with him, in a defensive denial of rapacious visual desire through raucous mass-laughter (228). I would argue that the shared laughter strategically distracts us from the profound desire to look that engulfs each figure in the story, and in which Robin engulfs his own desire to look.


CHAPTER 4


2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., 5–6.


6. The son’s rapt account of the father’s beauty alerts us to the narcissism inherent within oedipal relations. Julian becomes one of the men in Hawthorne’s fiction who contemplates the beauty of another man (Rappaccini and the younger Giovanni, Chillingworth and Dimmesdale)—albeit here, in life, it is the younger man who contemplates the older, indeed, the dead, man. But younger only in a relative sense—Julian, who was born in 1846, was thirty-eight years old when *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* was published.


12. In psychoanalytic terms, Hawthorne’s depiction of male beauty could be called a compromise formation. A compromise formation occurs when the psychic agencies at our disposal, such as the id, ego, superego, confront a split or conflict between what we desire and what has been prohibited from us and work within the confines of reality to produce something like a workable fantasy that a conscious mind can tolerate. Male beauty in Hawthorne points to a desire for an image of male beauty—a desire that we can understand as autoerotic, homoerotic, or both—and a painful apprehension of the terrible repercussions of having this beauty perceived. He allows himself to inhabit this beauty while also registering its dangers and the phobic responses it generates.


16. Ibid., 161.

17. Though it is not my focus here, the issue of class in Hawthorne has been underexplored and would make for a resonant complement, I think, to this analysis.

18. Whereas Plato argues that the mutual gaze of lovers leads to self-knowledge, his “trio of eros, self-speculation, and philosophical self-knowledge becomes diluted in Seneca in particular. In Seneca’s work the erotic force of gazing at self provides an impediment to self-knowledge.” Bartsch, *Mirror of the Self*, 72. A fascinating discrete study could be done of the correspondences between Hawthorne and the ancient writings on these matters.


25. “As Hawthorne drew on his readings in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century American history, he developed the strong pacifism that served as the foundation of his political thought. Although this pacifism wavered at times . . . it nevertheless served as the basic and consistent principle by which he implicitly judged the actions of individuals and nations.” See Larry Reynolds, *Devils and Rebels: The Making of Hawthorne’s Damned Politics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008), 19.


27. As Charles J. Rzepka continues, for Romantic authors, “the self that is engaged in direct confrontation is, on the one hand, individuated and affirmed as real thereby, but
on the other is nearly always felt to be taken away from itself by the eye of the person confronted, especially if that person is unsympathetic or a stranger.” Hawthorne’s entire body of work thematizes these conflicts. See Rzepka, *The Self as Mind: Vision and Identity in Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Keats* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 27.


29. Attesting to the proliferation of studies of shame in recent years, Morrison wrote another (much more populist) book and edited a collection of essays on the subject, while Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick presented a new edition of Silvan Tompkins’s important theories of the concept. The most interesting aspect of the growth of shame studies is its implicit reversal of the emphasis on phallic aggression in earlier Freud-focused discussions. It should be noted as well that David Halperin and Valerie Traub have edited a collection called *Gay Shame* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009). The volume collects papers from the controversy-filled conference by that name that the editors organized at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on March 27–29, 2003.


31. Ibid., 66.


33. Ibid., 161.


35. Ibid.

36. As Bridge notes, “Soon after graduation [from Bowdoin] we agreed to correspond regularly at stated periods, and we selected new signatures for our letters. Hawthorne chose that of ‘Oberon,’” while Bridge (not being a Romantic artist, evidently) chose the more prosaic name “Edward” (55–56). Bridge debunks the idea that Oberon was Hawthorne’s college nickname or that “his beauty” had anything to do with the name: “In a letter of Miss Peabody, quoted by Mr. Conway, it is stated that ‘his classmates called Hawthorne ‘Oberon the Fairy’ on account of his beauty, and because he improvised tales.’ It seems a pity to spoil so poetic a fancy; but, if truthful narrative is required, the cold facts are these,” i.e., that Oberon was a post-college signature (55). Bridge does not, however, dispute the idea that the real-life Hawthorne was beautiful.


38. Ibid., 124.

39. “The narrator of “The Minister’s Black Veil,”” writes Richard Millington, “notes that Hooper’s sartorial orientalism makes him a peculiarly effective clergyman: ‘Strangers came long distances to attend service at his church, with the mere idle purpose of gazing at his figure, because it was forbidden them to behold his face’ (9: 49). Hooper’s strategy has been to make himself a piece of art, a ‘figure’ instead of a ‘face.’” Millington notes that this strategy’s one obvious benefit is that it does wonders for Hooper’s career. Another obvious benefit is that it allows Hooper (and Hawthorne) to maintain some degree of control over the visual field in which Hooper is an object. Richard H. Millington, *Practicing Romance: Narrative Form and Cultural Engagement in Hawthorne’s Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 30.
40. For Michael T. Gilmore, the title of whose book *Surface and Depth: The Quest for Legibility in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) bespeaks its relevance to a study of narcissism, *The Scarlet Letter* is a key text in the American quest for legibility, which Hawthorne treats with appositely contradictory impulses because he “at once shares and recoils from the [American] demand for openness” (80). Hawthorne can barely hide his revulsion against the stocks, “a penal technology that immobilizes the culprit before ‘the public gaze’ and forbids him ‘to hide his face for shame.’” (81). Hawthorne “craves truthfulness without” this “pitiless exposure”; he wants “the balm of self-disclosure in a context secure from the ‘public gaze.’” (83). Gilmore reads Dimmesdale’s ultimate “self-erasure” as an attempt to convert “abasement into narcissistic falsehood” (85). I would place a somewhat different emphasis on what Hawthorne creates here—not narcissism as flight from shame but, instead, an atmosphere of shame in a state of shockingly public exposure that is itself a mediation of essentially narcissistic desire to see the self and control the ways in which the self is seen by others—the shame is the symptom of a fatally conflicted narcissism.

41. As Colacurcio writes, “On this point Jonathan Edwards and Edgar Poe would be in perfect agreement: the appropriate result of a truthful look might be fairly described as ‘horror’; the blackness within the self would correspond much more nearly to the darkness outside the wedding into which Hooper rushes (‘For the Earth, too, had on her Black Veil’) rather than the cheery light inside the [wedding] hall.” Michael J. Colacurcio, *The Province of Piety: Moral History in Hawthorne’s Early Tales* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 340.

42. Noting that Hooper spills his wine at the wedding, Colacurcio reads this moment as an allegorical evocation of the dread ante-bellum figure of the onanist. Frederick Crews reads “sexual ambivalence” in figures such as Hooper and Young Goodman Brown: “It is possible that Hooper, who like Goodman Brown is obliged to confront the sexual aspects of womanhood, shares Brown’s fears and has hit upon a means of forestalling their realization in marriage. His literal wearing of a veil, like Brown’s figurative removal of it to leer at the horrid sexuality underneath, acts as a defense against normal adult love.” Immediately upon making these suggestive though heterosexist observations, Crews retreats from their implications (“I do not care to lay very much stress on indications of sexual squeamishness in Hooper”) yet also rightly observes that the rumors of a sexual scandal involving Hooper and the young dead woman who is said to shudder when he peers at her corpse are just that, rumors, started by the townspeople and, in a review of *Twice-Told Tales*, Edgar Allan Poe, wearing his critic’s hardhat. Crews, *The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne’s Psychological Themes* (1966; repr., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 109–10.


44. See Greven, *Men Beyond Desire*, chapter 2, for a discussion of male blight in *Fan-shawe*.

CHAPTER 5


4. “Although the gaze might be said to be ‘the presence of others as such,’ it is by no means coterminous with any individual viewer, or group of viewers. It issues ‘from all sides,’ whereas the eye ‘[sees] only from one point.’” In her delineation of Lacan’s theory of the gaze, Kaja Silverman differentiates the eye or the “look” from the gaze, making the analogy that the eye and the gaze are, in psychoanalytic theory, as distinct as penis and phallus. Drawing from Lacan, Silverman elaborates that, far from lending an air of mastery to the subject, voyeurism renders the looking subject “subordinated to the gaze,” disturbed and overwhelmed, and overcome by shame. In Lacanian gaze theory, “the possibility of separating vision from the image” is called “radically into question,” and along with it the presumed “position of detached mastery” of the voyeuristic subject. This clarification of Lacanian gaze theory has bold implications for feminist film theory, whose proper interrogation of the male look has not, at times, “always been pushed far enough. We have at times assumed that dominant cinema’s scopic regime could be overturned by ‘giving’ women the gaze, rather than by exposing the impossibility of anyone ever owning that visual agency, or of him or herself escaping specularity.” See Kaja Silverman, *Male Subjectivity at the Margins* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 130; 146; 152. This view of the voyeuristic subject not as victim but as vulnerable and fragile insofar as he can never achieve the sense of mastery that fantastically impels his very voyeuristic project informs my reading of *The Blithedale Romance.*

5. See Suzanne R. Stewart, *Sublime Surrender: Male Masochism at the Fin-de-Siècle* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 10. In this study, Stewart discusses the discourse of the masochistic male in the German-speaking world between 1870 and 1940. Male masochism, she suggests, was a rhetorical strategy through which men asserted their cultural and political authority paradoxically by embracing the notion that they were (and always had been) wounded and suffering.

6. Baym specifically refers to the work of critics such as Robert K. Martin, Scott Derrick, David Leverenz, and Karen L. Kilcup. See her chapter “Revisiting Hawthorne’s Femi-
nism,” in *Hawthorne and the Real: Bicentennial Essays*, ed. Millicent Bell (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2005), 111.


8. The bachelor has been established as a highly interesting figure in contemporary critical work. In her excellent study *Bachelors, Manhood, and the Novel, 1850–1925*, Katherine V. Snyder writes, “I like to think of the bachelor as the figure who stands in the doorway, looking in from the outside and also looking out from within” (17). Examining first-person bachelor narrators, Snyder argues that “bachelor trouble was gender trouble. While they were often seen as violating gender norms, bachelors were sometimes contradictorily thought to incarnate the desires and identifications of hegemonic bourgeois manhood” (3–4). Bachelors have a “wide variety and sheer intensity” of “erotic and identificatory energies” (5). As Snyder writes in her discussion of the “third man” who observes male–male–female triangles, this “bachelor onlooker is a figure of surplus value, one who is apparently in excess of the requirements of a homosocial market in Oedipalized desire.” It is remarkable that Pearl describes Dimmesdale, interrupting her forest fun with her mother Hester, as “the third man” (10). See Katherine V. Snyder, *Bachelors, Manhood, and the Novel, 1850–1925* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).


10. As the online journal *Encyclopedia Mythica* reports: “Endymion was a handsome shepherd boy of Asia Minor, the mortal lover of the moon goddess Selene. Each night he was kissed to sleep by her. She begged Zeus to grant him eternal life so she might be able to embrace him forever. Zeus complied, putting Endymion into eternal sleep and each night Selene visits him on Mt. Latmus, near Milete, in Asia Minor. The ancient Greeks believed that his grave was situated on this mountain. Selene and Endymion have fifty daughters” [1]. Micha F. Lindemans, “Endymion,” *Encyclopedia Mythica*, http://www.pantheon.org/articles/e/endymion.html.

11. In classically Hellenizing fashion, the walls of the Hawthorncs’ West Newton home, which Nathaniel rechristened “The Wayside,” “were adorned by a bust of Apollo” and “Mrs. Hawthorne’s drawing of Endymion.” No more perfect emblems of Hawthorne’s own enigmatic beauty and personality could have existed, and it is little surprise that they adorned their home, or that Sophia drew the figure so often present—in my view—in her husband’s fiction. See Randall Stewart, *Nathaniel Hawthorne* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1948), 124.


14. In calling Coverdale the self-as-panopticon, I attempt to evoke Jeremy Bentham’s original design for supervision of prison inmates and the now conventional Foucauldian ominousness of social surveillance, but I do not mean to offer a Foucauldian argument in this chapter. Coverdale’s panoptical selfhood explores the idea of a functioning means of surveillance that can in any way control or shape or manipulate what it sees. Along these
lines, see E. Shaskan Bumas's essay “Fictions of the Panopticon: Utopia and the Out-Penitent in the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne,” *American Literature* 73, no. 1 (March 2001): 121–45, which provides insights into early prison reform. Bumas contends that “in *Blithedale*,” Hawthorne “shows the virtually historiographic power of a narrator over narrated events and people, and he judges this power as barren but not much different from other forms of power. In Coverdale, the spy, the voyeur, and the observer overlap” (133). I would add that Hawthorne actively critiques and destabilizes Coverdale's narrative subject position of power and mastery.


17. For a sustained discussion of inviolate manhood and the antebellum threat of onanism as represented in Hawthorne's first novel, the 1828 *Fanshawe,* see my book *Men Beyond Desire,* chapter 2.


19. Many discussions of the "tourist gaze" exist, most notably in recent examinations of Jewett's 1893 novel *The Country of the Pointed Firs.* For our discussion, I find Katherine Frank's examination of it in *G-Strings and Sympathy,* a theoretical deconstruction of her own experiences as a stripper, particularly interesting (though far too brief). Drawing on the work of sociologist John Urry, Frank discusses the “collective gaze”—in which multiple tourists lend glamour to their surroundings—and the “romantic gaze”—which emphasizes solitude and privacy; obviously, Coverdale embodies the latter, but one could argue that Blithedale as a whole constitutes a collective gaze. See Katherine Frank, *G-Strings and Sympathy: Strip-Club Regulars and Male Desire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 28–29.


23. Ibid, 113. Samuels reads this desire to see not the presence of the object but its absence as a desire on the part of the [male] subject to dominate the object by pushing it to "the limits of the visible and the sayable," an especially relevant goal for the misogynistic subject.


25. Like the uncanny apparitional Green Knight of the great medieval poem *Sir Gawain*
and the Green Knight, the pigs have “red eyes,” an odd parallel, to be sure, but, for me, one that corroborates the uncanny quality of these highly odd pigs. Like the Green Knight—who carries a bunch of holly in one hand, an axe in another—the pigs signify gendered anxiety and threat, and much less merrily than the Green Knight.


27. For Freud, the head of the Medusa suggests part of the terror of accidentally viewing the primal scene that Freud located in the iconography of the Medusa, which he saw as a representation of the male child’s attendant revulsion—the writhing snakes being representations of pubic hair and also compensatory substitutions for the castrated penis. The 1922 essay “Medusa’s Head” (SE 18: 273–74) was unpublished in Freud’s lifetime.

28. As Marjorie Garber writes in her marvelous chapter on the gender indeterminacy of Macbeth, the Male Medusa, “the foliate head or leaf mask which gained enormous popularity in England and throughout western Europe during the Romanesque and medieval periods . . . with leaves sprouting from [its face] . . . [is] often sinister and frightening. . . . [This] Green Man . . . embodies a warning against the dark side of man’s nature, the devil within” (101–3). It is interesting that this sinister figure represents the union between brutal masculinist power and generative female nature. See Marjorie Garber, Shakespeare’s Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality (New York: Methuen, 1987).


31. For an excellent discussion of the implications of the veil for female sexuality, see the discussion of The Blithedale Romance in chapter 4 of Roberta Weldon’s Hawthorne, Gender, and Death: Christianity and Its Discontents (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).


33. Jacksonian America was growing increasingly aware of, and hostile to, the image of the European dandy, as historian David G. Pugh points out: “[Jackson could] speak from experience . . . [since he] brought earthy wisdom to Washington rather than esoteric knowledge. . . . Their independence from Europe secure, Americans turned upon themselves and found on their own eastern doorstep the cultivated, effeminate enemy of the true democrat.” David G. Pugh, Sons of Liberty (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1983), 18.

34. “Hawthorne’s great friend Horatio Bridge wrote that [the author] was invariably cheerful with his chosen friends.” But then Hawthorne could relax with companions such as Bridge; with literary celebrities and rival authors he seldom opened up. See James R. Mellow, Nathaniel Hawthorne in His Times (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 28.

35. Ibid., 195.

interesting contributions; especially useful are her sympathetic insights into the often misunderstood Sophia Peabody Hawthorne, her own writing, and how the pain she suffered from a miscarriage affected it.


38. See Herbert, *Dearest Beloved*, 140, for a discussion of the Peabodys’ opinion of Hawthorne’s “suspiciously feminine” manhood. Sophia chided her family for failing to recognize that her husband possessed a “divine poetic manhood, into which feminine qualities are incorporated,” as Herbert puts it. They needed, felt Sophia, to better comprehend Hawthorne’s androgynous Apollonian qualities as such.


40. It is of course impossible to discuss the issue of homoeroticism in Hawthorne without mentioning the issue of Hawthorne’s relationship with his uncle, Robert Manning. Hawthorne shared an adolescent bed with his uncle after an accident that left the young Hawthorne unable to use one of his legs for several months. See Mellow, *Hawthorne*, 610, n66, for a very interesting discussion of Hawthorne’s “animus” toward his uncle. Mellow makes the interesting point that this animus appears to translate itself into the association with horticulture on the part of Hawthorne villains such as Rappaccini, Chillingworth, and Judge Pyncheon: Uncle Robert Manning was also a horticulturist. Whatever their relationship, a wounded quality seems to permeate Hawthorne’s depiction of young men, who often flinch against the threat of an older and more powerful male (“Young Goodman Brown,” “The Gentle Boy,” “The Artist of the Beautiful,” “Rappaccini’s Daughter,” *The Scarlet Letter*). Mellow suggests that this theme may be attributable to a childhood sexual trauma that Hawthorne, who once noted that “an uncle is a very dangerous thing,” may have experienced at the hands of his uncle. Though there is, undeniably, a considerable amount of suggestive evidence in Hawthorne’s work for Mellow’s theory, there is also nothing in the way of concrete evidence for it. I would point out that by placing this information in a footnote, Mellow both makes sure to include it—give it voice—and keep it discrete, if not discreet. I would add that works such as the tale “The Gentle Boy” could be justifiably read as an allegory of childhood sexual trauma.

see a problematic, unsettling homoerotic desire as a factor in the anxiety of Coverdale and other Hawthorne males, I think a revulsion against male intimacy—exemplified by Hawthorne's experience at the Shaker community (see n46)—needs to be considered not only as a panicked cover for an actual desire for other men but also as a chafing against compulsory American homosociality.

42. “Fourier's plan for a social system was embedded in a broad philosophical program. Rejecting contemporary individualistic and competitive society, which he called Civilization, Fourier projected a future ideal state of Harmony based on cooperation. He imagined a system of communities, what he termed phalanxes or phalansteries, in which all adults would engage in productive work determined by their interests and be rewarded by a complex scheme of remuneration for both labor and capital.” The American Albert Brisbane, who studied in Europe and worked with Fourier before his death in 1837, transmogrified the French philosopher’s ideas into an American version that de-emphasized Fourierian irreligiousness and sexual openness, heightening instead Fourierian elements that appealed to “economic and social value.” See Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, Rereading Sex: Battles Over Sexual Knowledge and Suppression in Nineteenth-Century America (New York: Knopf, 2002), 261.

43. Engaged in a passionate discussion with her mother about Fourier, Sophia reported finding Fourier’s views “abominable”; she noted that while she read a small part, “My husband read the whole volume and was thoroughly disgusted.” Sophia slightly excused Fourier by noting to her mother that his having written after the French Revolution accounts somewhat for the monstrous system Fourier proposes. Mother Peabody responded by saying that the French “have been and are still corrupt.” See Mellow, Hawthorne, 248–49.

44. “It was not a translation of Fourier that I read,” wrote Sophia. “It was the original text.” She then passed it onto her husband, who read the whole volume. Ibid., 249.

45. See Horowitz, Rereading Sex, 262–63.

46. See Mellow, Hawthorne, 378–79. Touring a Shaker village with Melville, interestingly enough, Hawthorne, observing quarters in which men slept in the same beds with other men, called the Shakers “filthy.” His hostility toward the Shakers seems only to have deepened over time.

47. See Anthony Rotundo, American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 223. By the end of the nineteenth century, American men, obsessed with men’s bodies, even more obsessed with their own, “treated physical strength and strength of character” as one and the same.


49. Ibid., 14.

50. Ibid., 17.

51. Drawing on Kristeva’s theory of the “chora,” a womb/receptacle, Dixon argues that the camera is the dark womb, the chora, of film, the birthplace of imagery. Ibid., 81–82.

52. Drawing on the work of sex researcher Theodor Reik, Silverman argues that “the male masochist,” unlike the female, “leaves his social identity completely behind—actually abandons his self—and passes over into the ‘enemy terrain’ of femininity.” Male masochism can be “disruptive,” “shattering.” See Silverman, Male Subjectivity, 190. Though highly unpleasant for him, Coverdale’s masochism does allow him to be critical of the masculine subject position as a whole and to empathize with women and female desire, as his empathy for Zenobia in the face of misogynistic Hollingsworth’s freezing idealism evinces. It does
not, however, enlarge his capacity to see dandified Westervelt in anything but phobic terms, though it must be insisted upon that this phobia is indistinguishable from the critique of masculine power and capacity for cruelty that makes Coverdale such an unflinching critic of manhood in the first place. The pig-passage, as I elaborate upon, functions as Hawthorne's authorial critique of the illusion of mastery that Coverdale fantasmatically believes he gains from his phobic calumniation of Westervelt, who is, after all, not essentially read inaccurately by Coverdale, given Westervelt's showman's knack for domination and cruelty. We can further interpret Coverdale's apprehensiveness around Old Moody, revealed to be the father who abandoned Zenobia, as further evidence of his skill for discerning questionable manhood.


57. “Pig” is a common epithet for police officers; pigs are also the animals who betray their beastly brethren in Orwell's Animal Farm, finally indistinguishable from the “men” to whom they sell out their ideals.

58. Barbara Creed—drawing, like Dixon, on the work of Julia Kristeva—theorizes that traditional narrative film thematizes the figure of what Creed calls “The Monstrous-Feminine.” As discussed by Creed, this figure evokes “the dread of the generative mother seen only in the abyss, the monstrous vagina, the origin of all life threatening to reabsorb what it once birthed” (54). See Barbara Creed’s book The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis (New York: Routledge, 1993), particularly the chapter on Alien, 16–31, in which Creed unpacks Kristeva's theory of abjection for feminist readings of the horror film, focusing on the figure of the archaic mother; or her chapter “Horror and the Monstrous-Feminine: An Imaginary Abjection,” in The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film, ed. Barry Keith Grant (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 35–65. If the monstrous-feminine represents the primal, archaic mother who threatens to devour, to re-engulf, the subject, the pigs in Hawthorne represent a primal, archaic father, animal and barbaric masculinity unvarnished by language, rationality, culture, the embodiment of a bestial irrational gendered knowledge a return to which is too terrifying to contemplate. One thinks of Cronos, madly and with an unappeasable appetite, devouring his children in Goya's famous painting. Perversely, the pigs can suggest such a bestial gendered state of origins while being themselves fattened up for the slaughter.

fascination with the malformed Richard III to his ambivalent feelings about his maternal Manning family and Uncle Richard in particular.

   60. Monika Mueller sums up the Hollingsworth–Coverdale relationship this way: “In *The Blithedale Romance*, homoeroticism is finally abandoned in favor of ‘frosty bachelorhood’ on the part of one character involved in the relationship and a heterosexual marriage, clouded by the outcome of the homosocial exchange of women, on the part of the other” (71–72). See Monika Mueller, *This Infinite Fraternity of Feeling: Gender, Genre, and Homosexual Crisis in Hawthorne’s “The Blithedale Romance” and Melville’s “Pierre”* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1996). Overall, Mueller’s approach is too simplistic. Some critics, such as biographers James R. Mellow and Edwin Haviland Miller, Robert K. Martin, and Mueller, argue that Hawthorne and Melville both worked out in literature—*The Blithedale Romance* and *Pierre*, specifically—the tortured feelings each eventually developed within the course of their famous friendship. If, as these critics contend, Hawthorne transmuted his fraught friendship with Melville into art with *The Blithedale Romance*, we can look upon Hollingsworth as the Melville figure, brimming with blustery brio, offering his hand to Hawthorne in deep longing promise of friendship, and Coverdale as the Hawthorne figure, cryptic and unresponsive, but secretly filled with unresolved longings.

   Yet I would argue that Hollingsworth is also an Emersonian figure, in that he represents a social-program-obsessed visionary with huge philanthropic ideals but a lack of interest in the individual human soul. Hawthorne “took aim at his public-spirited neighbors,” such as Emerson, when he lived in Concord, surrounded by “poets, reformers, and wooly transcendentalists of the sanguine persuasion.” Hawthorne saw Emerson as “pretentious and spoiled,” and had little use for his lofty transcendentalist ideals and programs. See Wineapple, *Hawthorne*, 171–72. But I also think Wineapple’s wonderfully compelling biography is too dismissive of Hawthorne’s own feelings toward Melville. She discusses the famous first meeting between Hawthorne and Melville as “a good story” (222) and focuses primarily on Melville’s over heated passion for Hawthorne, never fully exploring Hawthorne’s own potential desires for the younger, initially idolatrous author. Wineapple offers a much more considered account in her essay “Hawthorne and Melville: Or, the Ambiguities,” *Hawthorne and Melville: Writing a Relationship*, ed. Jana L. Argersinger and Leland S. Person, 51–70 (University of Georgia Press, 2008). See also Robert Milder, “The Ugly Socrates: Melville, Hawthorne, and the Varieties of Homoerotic Experience,” *Hawthorne and Melville: Writing a Relationship*, ed. Jana L. Argersinger and Leland S. Person (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 71–97.

   61. At the start of Marlowe’s *Edward II*, the King’s lover Gaveston, who has just been recalled from exile, describes the erotic entertainments he wants to stage for Edward:

   I must haue wanton Poets, pleasant wits,
   Musitians, that with touching of a string
   May draw the pliant king which way I please:
   Musicke and poetrie is his delight,
   herefore ile haue Italian maskes by night,
   Sweete speeches, comedies, and pleasing showes,
   And in the day when he shall walke abroad,
   Like *Silvian* Nimphes my pages shall be clad,
   My men like Satyres grazing on the lawnes,
   Shall with their Goate feete daunce an antick hay,
   Sometime a louelie boye in Dians shape,
With haires that gild the water as it glides,
Crownets of pearle about his naked armes,
And in his sportfull hands an Oliue tree,
To hide those parts which men delight to see,
Shall bathe him in a spring, and there hard by,
One like Actæon peeping through the groue,
Shall by the angrie goddesse be transformde,
And running in the likenes of an Hart,
By yelping hounds puld downe, and seeme to die,
Such things as these best please his maiestie. (1.1. 51 forward)

Not only does this homoerotic revision of the Diana-Actaeon myth correspond to Hawthorne’s masculinization of the Odysseus-Circe-male pigs episode from *The Odyssey*, but it also influences our reading of Hawthorne’s own version of the Diana-Actaeon myth in *The Blithedale Romance*. In this manner, Coverdale reproduces or is forced to relive his confrontation with the peeping pigs when he spies on the Comus-like masque of revelers in the forest. I thank Alan T. Bradford for reminding me of the Marlowe passage.

62. In his revolutionary 1972 study *Homosexual Desire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), Guy Hocquenghem discusses homosexual desire as “an arbitrarily frozen frame in an unbroken and polyvocal flux” (50). Hocquenghem’s refusal to distinguish homosexual from any other form of desire—which is to say that desire has multiple forms, and cannot be subdivided into homosexuality or heterosexuality, that is, imitative and prior forms—matches, in my view, the polyamorous appreciation of male and female beauty in Hawthorne’s work. Significantly for the pig-passage and its breakdown of normative forms of identity, as well as for Coverdale’s inability to distinguish Westervelt from man or machine, Hocquenghem writes, “Homosexuality exists and does not exist, at one and the same time: indeed, its very mode of existence questions again and again the certainty of existence” (53). The animal–male references—their interspecies blurriness—contribute to the overall sense of splintering, shaken order, dissolving reality.

63. Surprisingly, Thorwald’s returned gaze is not discussed in Dixon’s *It Looks at You*, not only because it’s a great moment for his thesis but because surely Thorwald stares just as harrowingly at us as he does at Jeff.

64. Precisely because Hawthorne’s greatest political accomplishment is his consistent and consistently unflinching critique of conventional, compulsory forms of manhood and masculinity, which has implications not only for heteromanhood but for queer manhood as well, I find the strain of masculinism in treatments of Hawthorne’s politics vaguely humorous and largely unsettling. Since the 1980s, in a critical movement spearheaded by Jonathan Arac and Sacvan Bercovitch, a broad critique of Hawthorne’s ambiguity—seen as, among other dubious things, an aesthetic maneuver for expressing by camouflaging ambivalence over the slavery issue or for providing a seeming array of possibilities to us as desiring subjects while actually depriving us of all choice, making us complicit with our own deadening socialization—has denatured Hawthorne’s aesthetics by seeing it in strictly political terms. The issues in this critique, which extends into the present, as many chapters in the Millicent Bell–edited collection *Hawthorne and the Real* evince, are painfully, pressingly important, but, as I argue at length in chapter 1, the critique in its Arac–Bercovitch cast suffers from an inability to see aesthetics in anything other than ideological terms.

I am left largely mystified by Michael J. Colacurcio’s provocative, at times revealingly well-observed, but ultimately quite confused reading of the novel in “Nobody’s Pro-
test Novel,” *The Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* 34 (2008): 1–39. While this essay deserves a much more elaborate response than I can provide here, I find his thesis—that Coverdale actually murders Zenobia—wildly improbable, especially given the passivity and fragility that defines Hawthorne's sympathetically drawn males even at their most scornful. In other words, I find it vexing that Colacurcio ignores Hollingsworth's declaration of his willingness to beat women into submission—literally, through physical violence—and focuses on Coverdale as a would-be lover so jealous that he's driven to kill the woman his love for whom he cannot explicitly express. Not only does Colacurcio fairly thoroughly heterosexualize Coverdale—in that he is read as a character motivated by sexual passion for a woman he cannot possess—but he also blunts Hawthorne's tragic feminist point: Zenobia's suicide is her only means of real resistance in the novel, at least in her own view.

CHAPTER 6


5. The Italian poet Dante, whose works define the early Renaissance, evoked the character of Beatrice in his *La Vita Nuova* and *Paradiso*, the third book of *The Divine Comedy*, in which the figure of Beatrice, embodying the divine grace of womanhood, leads Dante to Heaven. (Figured as one of Heaven's great women, Beatrice takes over the role of Dante's guide from Virgil, author of *The Aeneid*. The Latin poet, because pagan and therefore fallen, cannot lead Dante into paradise.) A significant intertextual overlap for Hawthorne's work generally is the figure of “The Lady of the Screen” in *La Vita Nuova*. Dante anticipates modern theories of the gendered gaze in his thematization of The Lady of the Screen, the woman that Dante used as a substitute object of veneration so that he would not embarrass the real-life object of his desires, Beatrice Portinari, with his unceasing gaze. One also inevitably thinks of the historical Beatrice Cenci, executed for having murdered her powerful, cruel father but venerated as a victim who fought back (her father forced her to have sexual relations with him), a tender soul plunged into a miasmic world of sin who yet managed to retain her poignant, delicate humanity. She became a prominent figure of sympathy in the Romantic era, as evinced by Percy Bysshe Shelley's drama *The Cenci*; Hawthorne centrally evokes her in *The Marble Faun*.

7. For a discussion of the diabolical horticulturist, which she ties to the avuncular figures in Hawthorne’s life and fiction, see chapter 4 in Gloria Erlich’s *Family Themes and Hawthorne’s Fiction: The Tenacious Web* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1984).


9. This is a structuring theme that is not unique to Hawthorne, and nor are its homoerotic as well as homophobic implications. Poe’s stories ranging from “The Man of the Crowd” to “The Tell-Tale Heart” also contrast a young man against a frightening older man, although the sources of this fear appear to lie in the younger man’s own conflictual feelings. Similarly, Melville frequently contrasts endangered younger men against alternately predatory and brutal older men, while consistently thematizing that the younger man is sexually endangered, if not actively violated, within this intergenerational conflict.

10. As Carol Marie Bensick explains, Hawthorne draws on the poison damsel tradition. This tradition was widely circulated in the sixteenth century. The tradition of the poison damsel had entered Europe from the East via the two pseudo-Aristotelian miscellanies, the *Gesta Romana-rum*, from which Baglioni’s version comes, and the *Secreta Secretorum*. In the legends, the poison damsel tended to be associated with India, as in Baglioni’s rendering. Variants included the presence of a characteristic “flowering creeper”; subtraditions dealt specifically with “Poisonous Breath” and “Poison by Intercourse.” An especially famous version form the Neapolitan chronicler Costanzo told the story of King Ladislaus of Naples, a retelling of which by Montaigne Hawthorne transcribed in his notebook. In Costanzo’s original version the father of the poisonous bride is “a certain unscrupulous doctor of Perugia”—the citadel, we may recall, of the historic Balioni. One version of the Alexander legend was circulated in the sixteenth century under the title of “La Pucelle venimeuse”; this title seems close to Aubépine’s supposed original title for “Rappaccini’s Daughter,” “La belle empoisonneuse.” Even earlier, a variant of the legend was circulated by Dante Alighieri’s teacher and later fictional inhabitant of the circle of Inferno reserved for sins related to sex, Brunetto Latini.


11. See chapter 1 of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), in which she influentially describes, building on the theories of René Girard, the theory of triangulated desire, the ways that males exchange and circulate their own desires through the traffic in women.


16. Ibid., 112.


18. Robert Daly mentions Vertumnus in his review of various intertextual valences in the story; his conclusion, that Hawthorne’s tale is primarily about a broad battle, one going beyond Christian philosophy, between fideism (faith as the ultimate knowledge) and empiricism seems to me to miss out entirely on the provocatively sexually charged nature of Hawthorne’s themes. See Daly, “Fideism and the Allusive Mode in ‘Rappaccini’s Daughter,’” Nineteenth-Century Fiction 28, no. 1 (June 1973): 25–37.

19. Vertumnus is a related, complementary figure to Narcissus, not his opposite. If we consider the reference to Vertumnus as Hawthorne’s means of exploring his unacknowledgeable interests in the figure of Narcissus, the Freudian concept of reaction-formation illuminates this device. In Freud’s theorization, a reaction-formation is the psychic defense whereby a desire or image one cannot acknowledge and or wishes to repudiate is replaced by its opposite quality. While Hawthorne’s use of Vertumnus is not precisely representative of this Freudian concept, the concept sheds light on Hawthorne’s usage of one classical figure to evoke another, at least insofar as I interpret Hawthorne’s work. The explicit reference to Vertumnus exposes the absence of a textually named Narcissus as it nods to Ovid.


21. Though I have not found a discussion of it in print, in a conference paper, T. Walter Herbert made the allusion to the Dimmesdale-exposed-chest scene as a scene reminiscent of the nineteenth-century bodice-ripper.

22. For a discussion of the “debility” caused by onanism, the finest study of sexual reform in the antebellum United States remains Stephen Nissenbaum’s Sex, Diet, and Debility in Jacksonian America: Sylvester Graham and Health Reform (1980; repr., Chicago: Dorsey, 1988). His primary focus is Sylvester Graham, and there is also a notable chapter on Thomas and Mary Gove Nichols. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz’s Rereading Sex is an important new interpretation of sexual morality and its mavens in nineteenth-century America.


24. Oscar Wilde called his beloved “Bosie,” Lord Alfred Douglas, “Narcissus” among other classical names. “[T]he notion of the male lover as ethical mirror,” writes Dowling of the Platonic discourse of same-sex desire in the nineteenth century, “would come to be represented by the figure of Narcissus, a symbol that, emptied of its classical ethical context, would in turn come to represent male love—Wilde and [W. H.] Mallock . . . both deploy it this way.” Ibid., 145, 147.

25. Of “Medusa’s Head,” Freud’s standard translator James Strachey writes that “it appears to be a sketch for a more extensive work” (SE 18: 273n1).

26. Freud cited Sándor Ferenczi’s discussion of the myth as a goad to his own theorization of the Medusa. Ruth Leys offers an excellent discussion of Ferenczi’s views of Medusa (in his Clinical Diary) in her book Trauma: A Genealogy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 134–38. As Leys observes, Ferenczi gets the details of the myth wrong but comes up, nevertheless, with a fascinating reading of Medusa’s hideousness as a mirror for that of her raging, animalistic killer, whom Ferenczi fails to identify as Perseus.

27. Diane Jonte-Pace, Speaking the Unspeakable: Religion, Misogyny, and the Uncanny Mother in Freud’s Cultural Texts (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 53.
28. Ibid., 54.
29. Jonte-Pace notes that Freud remarked on this theme in print, in a footnote to the published paper “Infantile Genital Organization.” As Freud put it, “Athene, who carried Medusa’s head on her armor, becomes, in consequence, the unapproachable woman, the sight of whom extinguishes all thought of sexual approach” (SE 19: 144n3).
30. The relationship between Athena and Medusa was certainly well known in the antebellum context. As S. G. Goodrich, who was the editor from 1828 to 1842 of the illustrated annual *The Token*, which published the younger Hawthorne, wrote in his book of mythological stories retold for children, “The countenance of Minerva was generally more expressive of masculine firmness than of grace or softness. She was clothed in complete armour, with a golden helmet, a glittering crest, and nodding plume. She has a golden breast-plate. In her right hand she holds a lance, and in her left, a shield, on which was the painted the dying head of Medusa, with serpents writhing around it.” See Goodrich, *A Book of Mythology for Youth: containing descriptions of the deities, temples sacrifices and superstitions of the ancient Greeks and Romans: adapted to the use of schools* (Boston: Richardson, Lord and Holbrook, 1832), 37.
33. Ibid., 44.
34. Ibid., 57.
35. Ibid., 65.
36. Ibid., 85–86.
38. Ibid., 185.
40. For a fine discussion—and one of the first—to make the point—that the overlaps between Hawthorne’s tale and *Paradise Lost*, see Liebman, who argues interestingly, especially given that the essay dates from 1968, that Hawthorne figures Beatrice as the New Adam, and Giovanni as the New Eve. Hawthorne inverts the *Paradise Lost* myth, since it portrays “the second fall, the fall from the promised paradise rather than from paradise itself.” Liebman reads Baglioni as Satan to Rappaccini’s God, and therefore argues that Giovanni is the Eve figure seduced by Satan-Baglioni, whereas the “New Adam”—Beatrice is “fallen but pure.” See Sheldon W. Liebman, “Hawthorne and Milton: The Second Fall in ‘Rappaccini’s Daughter,’” *The New England Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1968): 521–35; quote from p. 534.
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