Despite his famous assertion in 1851 that he was the obscurest man of letters in America, Hawthorne seems never to have suffered a period of neglect such as that which befell Melville. In his own time there were, of course, those who preferred, as one of them put it, "to ascend to the sunny climes with Nathaniel Parker Willis than to descend to the charnel house with Nathaniel Hawthorne." But Hawthorne had his audience, though it was not quite so large as might be indicated by his remark in a letter to Horatio Bridge that "nobody's scribblings seem to be more acceptable to the public than mine."
His popularity during his life never reached the proportions of a Cooper or Irving or of that now all-but-faceless “d---d mob of scribbling women”; but his work was enough in demand for various influential editors, such as Griswold of Graham’s, O’Sullivan of the Democratic Review, Lewis Clark of the Knickerbocker, Epes Sargent of Sargent’s, all to approach him for contributions to their periodicals. Moreover, not only did he spark shocks of recognition in Poe and Melville, but as Bertha Faust’s Hawthorne’s Contemporaneous Reputation (1939) amply documents, his work stimulated a fair amount of what to us would be less significant critical interest as well.

In the second phase of Hawthorne’s reputation, the sixty-odd years following his death, interest in Hawthorne was given its most significant boost by the publication of Henry James’s excellent monograph in 1879. From the publication of what James called his “critical essay” until 1932, Hawthorne’s work (collected in 1883 and again in 1900) evoked enough critical comment to furnish materials adequate for a thesis by William Reid on “A History of Hawthorne Criticism, 1879-1932” (Colorado, 1932).

It is clear, then, that even in the first two phases of Hawthorne criticism and scholarship (taking 1932, the date of the publication of Randall Stewart’s edition of the American Notebooks, as the inception of the third) Hawthorne’s work managed to maintain a “dialogue” with our culture’s constant attempt to define its experience to itself; though, to be sure, it was sometimes used by critics such as Brownell (“deficient in passion” [1909]) or Parrington (“alienated from socio-political realities” [1927]) as an instance of the misconstruing of the essential American.

Nevertheless, despite this relatively uninterrupted skein of interest, Hawthorne has become the object of such an astonishing amount of attention in the past three decades that we may
justifiably speak of this phase of Hawthorne studies as a "revival." For example, of the 261 items listed under "Hawthorne" in Louis Leary's *Articles on American Literature, 1900-1950* (1954), almost two-thirds of them postdate Professor Stewart's edition of the *American Notebooks*; and in the annual bibliographies published in *PMLA* since the terminal date of Professor Leary's checklist, scarcely another American author has occupied so much total space as has Hawthorne. Since 1932, over seventy doctoral dissertations on Hawthorne have been completed (fourteen in 1961-1962!), and so many others are in progress that Hawthorne may well have become the most "dissertated" of American writers. From Herbert Gorman's *Hawthorne, A Study in Solitude* and Lloyd Morris' *The Rebellious Puritan* in 1927 until Hubert Hoeltje's *Inward Sky: The Mind and Heart of Nathaniel Hawthorne* in 1962, Hawthorne has been the subject of ten biographical studies. In the last two decades, over a dozen book-length studies have devoted themselves to exposing his ideas, sources, traditions; to exploring his methods and development; and to analyzing and evaluating his creative accomplishments. Moreover, more recently, Hawthorne has regularly been taking his place as a crucial, and even pivotal, figure in such special interpretations of American literary culture as R. W. B. Lewis's *The American Adam* (1955), Richard Chase's *The American Novel and Its Tradition* (1957), Harry Levin's *The Power of Blackness* (1958), and Marius Bewley's two studies, *The Complex Fate* (1952) and *The Eccentric Design* (1959), to mention some of the more influential progeny of F. O. Matthiessen's pioneering work, *American Renaissance* (1941).

From one point of view, the matter of biography would seem to be the simplest aspect of the Hawthorne revival, since
all literate cultures have traditionally been interested in the lives of their great writers. But the history of Hawthorne biography in the past three decades or so cannot be dismissed so easily, for the direction it has taken, especially when viewed against the general trend of Hawthorne criticism, is both interesting and curious. As Hawthorne criticism has increasingly tended toward a speculative enlargement of the issues his work raises in the moral, psychological, cultural, and mythic realms, and has increasingly discerned radical ambiguities, tensions, and paradoxes in his fictive geographies, Hawthorne biography, in what seems an almost conscious effort at counterbalancing, has worked toward creating an image of the man that is, comparatively speaking, solid and clear. Needless to say, a part of this movement toward what Wyndham Lewis calls "the substantiality, the person, the 'this-ness' of an author" is the result of our greater knowledge of Hawthorne. Yet do we know so much more about Hawthorne today than Professor Arvin knew in 1929 that we can account for the change that has taken place solely on the basis of our greater accumulation of data, though that is, of course, a great part of it?

The recent remark by Edward Davidson in his excellent introduction to the Hawthorne section of Major Writers of America (1962) that "Hawthorne's life was commonplace, even dull" would have struck Newton Arvin, who published his Hawthorne in 1929, as rather strange. Professor Davidson is referring solely to the "other Hawthorne," the one who "lived comfortably and unspectacularly in the world." But for Arvin, Hawthorne was a great American precisely because both his life and his works were two aspects of a single "tragic adventure" that will continue to have "high and durable significance" for the America in which he lived, struggled, and died.

Following the general direction of earlier Hawthorne biography in the twentieth century, though with greater sophisti-
cation and critical acumen, Arvin gave final form to the "dismal chamber" view of his subject; that is, he took as his controlling biographical image one which evokes Hawthorne's radical alienation from the "hum and buzz" of his culture. To be sure, in constructing his "myth" (in the good meaning of the word), he frequently psychologized portentously, preferred the darker interpretation of any event (such as the marriage to Sophia), and occasionally gothicized neutralities, as for example when the hotel room in which Hawthorne happened to die becomes "a grave and fitting [symbol] for a life spent in such incorrigible isolation." But in trying to locate the source of the most characteristic works in the life, Arvin was trying to face one of the most important challenges of literary biography: the exploration of that little lower layer where perhaps (only perhaps) some entry can be made into the creative imagination and thence into those works by which the creative imagination tries to make contact with history. The next surge of biographical interest in Hawthorne, however, was to expend tremendous talent and energy in an attempt to overturn this dark view of Hawthorne and present the world with a healthier, more normal, more worldly-wise man.

Although short studies of the "public" Hawthorne had appeared earlier in the century, for example, John Osborn's "Nathaniel Hawthorne as American Consul," in Bookman, XVI (1903), 461-64, and Winfield Nevins' "Nathaniel Hawthorne's Removal from the Salem Custom House," in EIHC, LIII (1917), 97-132, the counterreformation in the political aspects of Hawthorne's life and works did not gather any real momentum until the 1930's. Aided by the restoration of the notebooks and the discovery of letters and documents, scholars set out to correct the image of a Hawthorne so crucially aloof from the historical issues of his day that his indifference to them was hardened, not modified, by his periodic contacts with
such economic, political, and sociological realities as consulate, custom house, and utopian farm.

The titles of articles that began to appear in the 1930's and early 1940's indicate the kind of documentation and emphasis that was going on. Professor Stewart, one of the figures of the movement, using the materials of his research into primary sources, gave us "Hawthorne and Politics" (NEQ, V [1932], 237-63), "Hawthorne in England: The Patriotic Motive in the Notebooks" (NEQ, VIII [1935], 3-13), "Hawthorne's Speeches at Civic Banquets" (AL, VII [1936], 415-23), and "Hawthorne and the Civil War" (SP, XXXIV [1937], 91-106).

Neal Doubleday read The Scarlet Letter as being intimately concerned with the issue of feminism (PMLA, LIV [1939], 825-28), sketched out Hawthorne's involvement with the contemporary issue of a national literature (AL, XII [1941], 447-53), and, in his "Hawthorne's Criticism of New England Life" (CE, II [1941], 639-53) and "Hawthorne's Satirical Allegory" (CE, III [1942], 325-37), related Hawthorne's work to various contemporary events and concerns, as did Arlin Turner in "Hawthorne and Reform" (NEQ, XV [1942], 700-714), Manning Hawthorne in "Hawthorne and Utopian Socialism" (NEQ, XII [1939], 726-30), and William Randel in "Hawthorne, Channing, and Margaret Fuller" (AL, X [1939], 472-76).

These articles, and many more, came to a kind of culmination in Lawrence Hall's Hawthorne: Critic of Society (1944), a thoroughly scholarly work which sets out to place Hawthorne's work against the double background of American society in the nineteenth century and Hawthorne's developing attitude toward it. Whereas before it had "always been easy to regard Hawthorne as anything but the product and spokesman of democratic society," now that all the evidence was in, we could finally see, in Professor Hall's words, that "the portrayal of life in the tales and romances is as democratic as anything which
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nineteenth-century America produced.” How completely we have come to accept the culturally-implicated view of Hawthorne can be seen, for example, in the casualness with which Millicent Bell is able to assert in her recent book on Hawthorne (Hawthorne's View of the Artist [1962]) that “he was probably closer to the gritty substance of American history than most of the cause-jinters of Concord.” The aroused interest in The Blithedale Romance in the 1950’s, certainly the most “topical” of Hawthorne’s novels, can also be traced, at least partially, to this new image of Hawthorne. Not only has Blithedale been discussed in terms of Hawthorne’s attitudes toward various facts of social history—feminism, reform, utopianism—as, for example, in Darrel Abel’s “Hawthorne’s Skepticism about Social Reform” (UKCR, XIX [1953], 181-93), Lillian Beatty’s “Typee and Blithedale: Rejected Ideal Communities” (Personalist, XXXVII [1956], 367-78), or Alex Gottfried and Sue Davidson’s “Utopia’s Children” (Western Political Quarterly, XV [1962], 17-32), but it has also achieved the status of being viewed as a seminal novel of American politics. Irving Howe, in Politics and the Novel (1957), believes that “if ever a novel is written that dives beneath the surface of political life in 20th century America,” its author may find a hidden storehouse of fundamental insights in Hawthorne’s novel. Marius Bewley has discussed at great length (Scrutiny, XVI [1949], 178-95, reprinted in The Complex Fate) the influence of Blithedale on Henry James’s desire to write (in James’s words) “a very American tale, a tale characteristic of our social conditions,” a desire which became The Bostonians. And Richard Chase, in The American Novel and Its Tradition, considers Blithedale to have “launched,” in addition to James’s work, such political novels as Howells’s Vacation of the Kelwyns, Trilling’s The Middle of the Journey, and Mary McCarthy’s The Oasis.

As we look back on the commendable and hugely successful
effort of scholarship, especially in its earliest phases, to reverse the image of an historically insular Hawthorne, it is possible to see something besides splendid restorations and discoveries as contributing to the movement. It was not easy in the 1930's, and early 40's as well, to espouse the greatness and relevance of an American writer who did not squarely face up to the issues of the Republic. Had not the influential Parrington, "the father of American Studies," announced accusingly, in 1927, that Hawthorne was the "extreme and finest expression of the refined alienation from reality that palsied the creative mind of New England"? And wasn't reality for Parrington, as for many another literary professional of the time, the concrete issues raised by socio-political actualities? In this phase of Hawthorne studies, then, it is perhaps not too fanciful to see scholarship's first duty and responsibility—the discovery of truth—as being subtly supported and moved along by a pleasurable sense of bringing both itself and its subject into a viable relationship with one of the implicit assumptions about the function of literature of the era.

Finally, it should be said that much Hawthorne criticism owes a large debt to these early researchers. In making a place for Hawthorne in his own history, so to speak, this scholarship enlarged our critical field of vision by enabling us to incorporate into it various facets of social history to stand alongside the already established "Burden of Hawthorne's Puritan Heritage." In adding a socio-political dimension to the moral crises in Hawthorne's fiction, it contributed something to Matthiessen's American Renaissance, in which Hawthorne's view of tragedy is conceived primarily in terms of social attitudes involved in his tragic vision; it helped prepare the way for such critically complex discussions of the function of historical issues and tensions in Hawthorne's work as Roy Harvey Pearce's "Hawthorne and the Sense of the Past; or, The Immortality of Major
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Molineux" (ELH, XXI [1954], 327-49) or Marius Bewley's The Eccentric Design ("What Hawthorne leaves us with is . . . a set of exploratory symbols which vibrate with a peculiar intensity in a moral ambience that is objectively grounded in Hawthorne's society"); and it gave a factual base for such studies of Hawthorne's concept and treatment of the artist in a democratic society as Rudolphe Von Abele's The Death of the Artist (1955), Henry Fairbanks' "Hawthorne amid the Alien Corn" (CE, XVII [1956], 263-68), and, most definitively, Professor Bell's Hawthorne's View of the Artist.

Running alongside the revision of Hawthorne as cultural disaffiliate—and bolstering it and interrelated with it at many points—was a concerted effort in the 1930's and 40's to normalize the contours of Hawthorne's personality; to replace, that is, the traditional conception of a haunted shadow suffering from some psychic wound with a portrait of the artist as ordinary man. A turning point seemed to come with Professor Stewart's edition in 1932 of the American Notebooks, based upon the original manuscripts in the Morgan Library. Mrs. Hawthorne, in her edition of 1868, had, though her intentions were good, so nicenellied and purified her husband's private journal as virtually to misrepresent him. The new Notebooks revealed a more earthy, a more manly, man. Here, clearly, was a start.

There is, perhaps, no need to cite each of the bricks that went into paving the road to the "new Hawthorne" who appeared in the three biographical studies which were published in the six months from the fall of 1948 to the spring of 1949. Suffice it to say that Manning Hawthorne, who had access to unexplored family holdings, presented in a spate of articles evidence of his great-grandfather's rather normal early life; and that various scholars, utilizing unpublished letters, showed us Hawthorne as a critic of poetry, a traveler in New England, a husband, and—God save the mark!—a gossip about Salem.
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Drawing upon all existing materials, published and unpublished, Randall Stewart accomplished in his *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography* (1948) what he had predicted in his edition of the *English Notebooks* (1941): "... Out of the restored journals and letters a new Hawthorne will emerge: a more virile and a more human Hawthorne; a more alert and (in a worldly sense) a more intelligent Hawthorne; a Hawthorne less dreamy, and less aloof, than his biographers have represented him as being." In marshaling and distilling the two decades of work upon the "upper layer" of Hawthorne biography, Professor Stewart quietly but firmly split Hawthorne in two. The mind which imaginatively conjured up the perilous moral crises in the fiction (which Stewart treated separately in an appended chapter) was cleanly severed from the husband-father-friend engaged in the everyday routine of practical life—a division which the earlier myth of Hawthorne explicitly repudiated.

Robert Cantwell, in his *Nathaniel Hawthorne: The American Years* (1948), also eschewed the secret space within and presented, instead, Hawthorne's intercourse with the world. In order to give Hawthorne even more substantiality, Cantwell massively documented—often to the point of irrelevancy—his environment, giving to his subject's world the kind of "beef and ale" solidity that Hawthorne wished (or at least said he wished) his fictive world had had. Every figure who entered Hawthorne's orbit, be it ever so fleetingly, was accorded a *DAB*-type sketch of his own; every place Hawthorne lived, be it ever so briefly, was accorded a guidebook description; every fact or occurrence that Hawthorne may have heard of, or thought of, was accorded an essay of its own. Yet, ironically enough in a biography which purported to be an objective account of a man of the world, Cantwell turned the fanciful materials of various sketches into "facts" of Hawthorne's life, and substituted
real adventure for the "romance" of the deeper psychology, as when he (on the slightest thread of evidence) implicated Hawthorne in a sensational murder trial in 1830 and turned him into a secret agent for the Treasury Department in 1838.

Mark Van Doren, whose *Hawthorne* (1949) appeared soon after the Stewart and Cantwell biographies, insofar as he incorporated the "normalizing" discoveries of the previous two decades, also depicted the new Hawthorne. But perhaps because he is himself a poet as well as critic-biographer, and surely because he devoted much space to a critical commentary of his subject's works, Van Doren's biography does not give precedence to the Hawthorne who lived the facts. Though he chronicles all the workaday aspects of Hawthorne's involvement with "the world's work," as Hawthorne had himself put it, these tend to be subsumed—not denied—in Van Doren's concentration on "the life within the life." Neither wounded solitary nor healthy citizen dominates the Van Doren portrait. Money was necessary and working to get it even had its rewards. "But the one place [Hawthorne] truly lived and labored in was his imagination." Hawthorne's life, finally, is informed neither by tragic alienation nor its opposite, but rather by the reconciliation that took place in his "utterly serious imagination," which saw both the "horror" and the "honor" in the human condition and "the dignity by which in some eternity our pain is measured."

Two studies which appeared in the early 1950's, Louise Tharp's *The Peabody Sisters of Salem* (1950) and Vernon Loggins' *The Hawthornes: The Story of Seven Generations of an American Family* (1951), as their titles suggest, added information about Hawthorne's family, but neither indicated any particular innovation in the presentation of the new Hawthorne. Edward Wagenknecht's *Nathaniel Hawthorne: Man and Writer* (1961), however, does, in that he explicitly sets out to counter the image of Hawthorne that has emerged from
recent critical discussions of his work—discussions which, in Professor Wagenknecht’s view, are often “as alien to [Hawthorne’s] spirit as they are to Cooper or Longfellow or Lowell or any of his other contemporaries whom they neglect.” Because we admire Hawthorne’s use of symbols and the fiction that can be read on multiple levels, and because Hawthorne “was given to literary ambivalences which suggest the kind of hidden depths into which a psychologically oriented age likes to probe,” Professor Wagenknecht feels that we are “making him over in our own image” and missing the “significant things about him.” Here, then, we have not only the “two” Hawthornes but a clear suggestion that the man-in-the-world one is the truer one, the one who, presumably, belongs with Longfellow and Lowell rather than, let us say, with Poe or Charles Brockden Brown. Professor Wagenknecht has read almost everything written by and about Hawthorne conscientiously and packs an immense amount of information on Hawthorne’s differing attitudes toward various aspects of life into a relatively small book. Yet they are presented not as dualities of some central ambiguity of spirit (which would involve recourse to the deeper psychology which Wagenknecht despises) so much as the normal, un-mysterious contradictions which any man who has lived a long time will fall into. As a result the “tone” of Wagenknecht’s life of Hawthorne is lighter, brighter, less portentous, and more self-certain than the mind which modern criticism (and the older biographical myth) induced from the most characteristic, or at least most notable, works. The dark places in Hawthorne are quite theoretical; the real Hawthorne “faced the light.”

The new myth of Hawthorne’s life toward which the biographical studies of the past three decades have been tending is given final and extreme form in Hubert Hoeltje’s Inward Sky (1962). Though it is by far the longest twentieth-century biography of Hawthorne, it is notable not so much for the
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revelation of new facts as for the new concept which informs it. The focus, as in Arvin and Van Doren, is on "the inward life," as the title indicates; the method is "fullest sympathy" ("Here . . . is no book of criticism . . . no surgeon’s dissecting knife, nor even the anteroom of the psychoanalyst"); and the myth is "repose" ("In a review of Hawthorne’s life and writings nothing is more prominent than a quiet, deeply joyful affirmation"). The healthy sunshine of Hawthorne’s outer life, which was revealed by Stewart, elaborated by Cantwell, and emphasized as crucial by Wagenknecht, becomes in Hoeltje the warm coloration of Hawthorne’s inner idyllic landscape: "To recognize the hand of Providence in the affairs of man, to see the unity in the diversity of the world, to perceive in the forms of Nature a majestic and beautiful Idea . . . and to be assured that beyond is still a higher fruition in man’s immortality—these were the basic tenets of Hawthorne’s belief as a man, a belief, too, permeating all his writings. . . . " The two Hawthornes are once again one. How completely the "white" myth of Hawthorne has supplanted the "black" is wonderfully illustrated in the use made of Emerson’s view of the dead Hawthorne in the final paragraphs of the first and last biographies here treated. Arvin: "Emerson, who was among the pallbearers, had a . . . searching insight . . . into the drama just ended. ‘I thought,’ he wrote in his journal the next day, ‘there was a tragic element in the event that might be more fully rendered,—in the painful solitude of the man, which, I suppose, could not longer be endured, and he died of it.’" Hoeltje: “To Ralph Waldo Emerson, in the Concord village church, looking for the last time at the friend who lay in his blossom-covered coffin, it had seemed that Hawthorne’s was a powerful head—noble and serene in its aspect.” In the contrast between pallbearer and friend, solitude and serenity, are lodged the polar opposites of modern Hawthorne biography.
In reviewing a critical volume on Hawthorne some years ago, Marius Bewley had occasion to remark that if a literary sociologist undertook to investigate the phenomenon of "revivals," he suspected that the results would be "sinister." By this remark (forgetting for the moment the irony of Professor Bewley's own appreciable contribution to the Hawthorne revival), Professor Bewley seems to have meant that literary band-wagonism, and its beneficial effect on careers, rather than Hawthorne's enduring ability to speak significantly to our present condition, constitutes the essential motive in our renewed interest. Perhaps, perhaps not. No one, not even Professor Bewley's "literary sociologist," could accurately separate out the legitimate from the illegitimate strands in this or any other literary boom. (Nor, as a matter of fact, can it be done in scientific booms; the number of researchers in numerous branches of science who in the last decade or so suddenly altered the line of their investigations and began to zero in on cancer—which is now an iconic rather than a medical term—is suspicious enough to have given rise to the rueful remark that more people live off cancer than die from it.) But it is possible, nevertheless, to discern cultural factors which made the Hawthorne critical revival the result of somewhat less ominous impulses than Professor Bewley implies.

Roughly speaking—which is the only way one can speak of such matters—the critical revival in Hawthorne studies (that is, a new way of reading his works) begins about a decade or so after the biographical. Though, to be sure, Hawthorne's fiction was discussed in print in the 1930's, much of it was directed (as indicated in Part I of this essay) toward the creation of a new "biographical" image. Most of the essays used what might be called a horizontal method: Hawthorne's sketches, tales, and
romances were scrutinized for their paraphrasable content in much the same way and for much the same ends that letters and journals were used—so as to present in synoptic form an exposition of Hawthorne's ideas and attitudes. In such essays as Carlos Kiling's "Hawthorne's View of Sin" (Personalist, XIII [1932], 119-30) or Neal Doubleday's "Hawthorne's Inferno" (CE, I [1940], 658-70), the sketching out of Hawthorne's moral posture is implicitly based on the critical assumption that since literature is the result of putting abstract ideas into concrete form, it can be used as parallel evidence along with extrinsic sources of information in order to expose the author's beliefs.

Two comments can be made on such a literary critical method. First, it is essentially optimistic in that it believes that in a relatively short space imaginative complexity can be reduced to synoptic clarity; and second (which is a consequence of the first), it feels no need to read any particular work in depth. This is not to say, let us hasten to add, that such systematic studies of Hawthorne's "mind" are neither valuable nor are not to be found after the 1930's. On the matter of Hawthorne's "Puritanism," for example, or the relationship of that complex of religious-cultural-historical phenomena to his world-view, no serious student of Hawthorne can dispute the value of such horizontally comprehensive studies of the problem as are to be found, for example, in Austin Warren's introduction to Nathaniel Hawthorne: Representative Selections (1934), Barriss Mills's "Hawthorne and Puritanism" (NEQ, XXI [1948], 78-102), Henry Fairbanks' "Sin, Free Will, and 'Pessimism'" (PMLA, LXXI [1956], 975-89), or Joseph Schwartz's "Three Aspects of Hawthorne's Puritanism" (NEQ XXXVI [1963], 192-208). It is to say only that a new strategy in Hawthorne criticism did not emerge until the 1940's, until,
that is, the formalistic techniques of the so-called New Criticism caught up with Hawthorne and a cultural sense of broken promises in the post-World War II world raised the literary stock of those authors who could be read as having a "tragic vision" of life.

Hawthorne's reputation (along with Melville's and James's) rose immensely in the early 1940's as the reputations of the nineteenth-century optimistic prophets of America declined. In a world in which horror was domesticated in history, and kill or be killed had changed from a metaphor of business to a physical fact, it was difficult to believe, with Emerson, that there was no difference between the slayer and the slain because all men participate in the Oversoul. Cosmic hopefulness was as irrelevant to the world of Buchenwald and St. Lo as phlebotomy and the crossbow. The annihilative powers of blackness of "Young Goodman Brown," the ambiguity of sin or sorrow of "The Minister's Black Veil," the inscrutable moral paradoxes of "Rappaccini's Daughter," or the destructive power of scienticism of "The Birthmark"—these became, for a disillusioned culture, apt predictions of what Richard Chase called the "dark center of the twentieth century."

Moreover, the decay of social hopefulness also affected the Hawthorne critical revival. Whereas Hawthorne's fiction offered nothing positive to the Marxist and semi-Marxist critics of the 1930's—Granville Hicks in *The Great Tradition* (1933; rev. ed. 1935) rejected his work in much the same terms as had Parrington—in the war years and after, the New Liberals found in Hawthorne's awareness of the baffling contradictions of life a deeper insight into the nature of the American experience than that of the purveyors of a socialist-democratic dream. Lionel Trilling, for example, in his Preface to *The Liberal Imagination* (1950), asserted that the "job of criticism [is] to recall liberalism to its first essential imagination of variousness
and possibility, which implies the awareness of complexity and difficulty. . . . Because literature is the human activity that takes the fullest and most precise account of variousness, possibility, complexity, and difficulty.” And seven years before, Professor Trilling, in his book on E. M. Forster, singled out Hawthorne as having just such a complex vision of life “in his unremitting concern with moral realism,” which is not merely “the awareness of morality itself, but of the contradictions, paradoxes, and dangers of living the moral life.”

Such a view of the nature of literature implied a shift from a cursory view of a literary work for its abstractable content to a closer scrutiny of the actual concrete embodiments of the text to see what attitudes and insights they bring into being. The critical method for exploring “variousness and complexity” in individual works, however, was to be the contribution of what has come to be called the New Criticism.

Although the formalistic techniques of the New Criticism have their origins in the 1920’s, when the first stirrings of discontent with the non-technical modes of moralism and didacticism manifested themselves, as a movement and force New Criticism did not, as Walter Sutton has recently pointed out (Modern American Criticism [1963]), rise to prominence until the 1940’s. The revolution in the teaching and study of literature which it then effected in English departments all over the country particularly influenced the study of Hawthorne’s work because the non-naturalistic fictive mode of much of his writing easily accommodated the New Critical tendency to read fiction as poetry. Such a tendency, according to the notable Hawthorne critic Roy Male, can distort certain kinds of novels, but “Hawthorne’s fiction lights up when examined under this kind of intensive scrutiny.”

In brief, then, the initial upsurge in the Hawthorne critical revival is the result of a cultural tendency to respond to the
more darkly complex visions of life intersecting with the dominance of a critical method which was drawn to fiction that rendered experience as much by means of image and symbol as by character and action. The results of this convergence of forces can be discerned in (1) the kind of Hawthorne story which has been most frequently singled out for separate analysis; (2) the emergence of studies of Hawthorne's symbolic patterns; and (3) the new emphasis given to what George Woodberry in 1902 called "the dark side of the truth" in Hawthorne.

Perhaps nothing else so clearly demonstrates the nature of Hawthorne's viability for us as that handful of his stories which have continued to exercise our critical minds. Of the over one hundred short pieces he wrote—at least several dozen of which can be classed as short stories—only a very few have repeatedly been analyzed individually (not simply discussed in more broadly focused studies): "Young Goodman Brown" (seventeen times since 1945); "Ethan Brand" (sixteen times since 1947); "Rappaccini's Daughter" (fifteen times since 1947); "My Kinsman, Major Molineux" (thirteen times since 1951); "The Minister's Black Veil" (eight times since 1948); and "The Birthmark," "The Artist of the Beautiful," and "The May-Pole of Merry Mount," several times each. In contrast to such prefabricated tales as "The Lily's Quest" or "The Three-Fold Destiny," these are all stories in which meanings seem to be felt for rather than imposed, in which implications emerge complexly and tentatively from densely symbolized textures. It is to these stories, therefore, rather than to what Hawthorne called his "tales of evident design" (which far outnumber the others) that the modern critic has turned to find that variousness and tragic complexity which constitute for him the essential Hawthorne.

A critical awareness that Hawthorne's fiction was organized
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around principles “more analogous to those of lyric poetry than those of the novel” both radically altered the way in which his fiction was read and gave rise to a number of studies which concerned themselves with tracing recurrent patterns of imagery and symbolism in his works. Of the latter, for example, Walter Blair’s “Color, Light, and Shadow in Hawthorne’s Fiction” (NEQ, XV [1942], 74-94) is one of the first. Malcolm Cowley’s “Hawthorne in the Looking Glass” (SR, LVI [1948], 545-63) analyzes the wealth of mirror images in Hawthorne (also discussed by Matthiessen) as the key to Hawthorne’s methods of finding correspondences between the outer world of things and the inner world of images. John Shroeder explores Hawthorne’s heart symbolism and “inward” versus “outward” imagery for their revelations about Hawthorne’s attitudes toward sin, fatality, and the kinship of human guilt (“‘That Inward Sphere’: Notes on Hawthorne’s Heart Imagery and Symbolism,” PMLA, LXV [1950], 106-19). In “Ritual and Reality: Mask and Dance Motifs in Hawthorne’s Fiction” (PQ, XXXIV [1955], 56-70), Norris Yates reveals how Hawthorne uses masking and the dance as a symbolic method of dramatizing the fact that “irresponsible illusion [is ultimately] shattered by the solid realities of duty.” And James Ragan points out how Hawthorne in his first three novels uses the human body to symbolize “the progressivism of American democracy” in “Hawthorne’s Bulky Puritans” (PMLA, LXXV [1960], 420-23).

It would be difficult to find an analysis of a Hawthorne work written in the last two decades that does not base at least a part of its reading on the assumption that Hawthorne’s meanings are crucially imbedded in the texture of his highly symbolic language. Although earlier articles, such as Robert Heilman’s “Hawthorne’s ‘The Birthmark’: Science as Religion” (SAQ, XLVIII [1949], 575-83) and Richard Fogle’s essays on “The Minister’s Black Veil,” “Young Goodman Brown,” and “Ethan
Brand" in the 1940's (collected in his *Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark* [1952]), showed how a close attention to Hawthorne's images and symbols invested the works with a new vitality, suggestiveness, and a whole range of hitherto hidden implications, it was Mrs. Q. D. Leavis who first put the matter unequivocally in a two-part article significantly entitled "Hawthorne as Poet" (SR, LIX [1951], 179-205, 426-58). Hawthorne, Mrs. Leavis announced, was a dramatic poet who "can have gone to school with no one but Shakespeare for his inspiration and model"; his language is "poetic," "symbolic," "directly evocative," each story almost "an expanded metaphor," his corpus a poetic saga of American cultural history. Two years later, William Bysshe Stein, in *Hawthorne's Faust* (1953), argued that imagery and action in Hawthorne were mythic, symbolic ritualizations of the archetypal Faustian contract. Hyatt Waggoner's contention that Hawthorne characteristically thought in symbols led him, in *Hawthorne: A Critical Study* (1955), to focus his analyses of the tales and romances on Hawthorne's use of color, symmetry, "intricate tissues of symbolism," and patterns of imagery so as to demonstrate how complexly Hawthorne renders his moral, historical, and psychological ideas. In *Hawthorne's Tragic Vision* (1957), Roy Male asserts that Hawthorne's "accomplished work is a rare combination of poetry and fiction: poetry, in that each image functions as part of a larger design; fiction, in that the narrative . . . preserves some degree of versimilitude." But it is the symbolic "larger design" upon which Male focuses—the "tragic rhythm" which oscillates between the spatial, optimistic, or at least amelioristic, male principle and the timeless, half-dark, half-redemptive female principle. Subsequent articles—such as Sister Hilda Bonham's study of the needlework symbolism in *The Scarlet Letter* ("Hawthorne's Symbols Sotto Voce," CE, XX [1959], 184-86), Peter Murray's discussion of the season sym-
bolism in The Blithedale Romance ("Mythopoesis in The Blithedale Romance," PMLA, LXXV [1960], 591-6), or Daniel Hoffman's splendid readings of "Young Goodman Brown" and "My Kinsman, Major Molineux" (Form and Fable in American Fiction [1961]) as examples of Hawthorne's "most successful fictions," those in which meaning is not separable from the symbol in which it manifests itself—demonstrate the continuing pull in this direction of Hawthorne studies.

There has, of course, always been critical attention paid to Hawthorne's depictions of evil and sin; after all, Melville heavily underscored in religious terms that "great power of blackness" in his friend's work as early as 1850. But the emphasis, before the 1940's, tended to be solely on Hawthorne's "sense of sin" as seen from a theological or religious point of view. That is, the appropriate fictions were scrutinized for revelations of Hawthorne's doctrinal beliefs about the soul's relationship to some supernatural order of reality. (In an author such as Hawthorne, in whose works religious matters often reverberate in the moral-psychological ambiences of his characters, a critical interest in his theological stance will inevitably be aroused. See, for example, such recent studies of the problem as Leonard Fick's The Light Beyond: A Study of Hawthorne's Theology [1955]—the most extreme attempt at schematization in terms of such constants as Augustinianism, Thomism, Arminianism, etc.; Joseph Schwartz's "God and Man in New England" in American Classics Reconsidered [1958]—which tries, though not too dogmatically, to fit Hawthorne into a Catholic theology of love and hope; or Randall Stewart's discussion of original sin in Hawthorne in American Literature and Christian Doctrine [1958].)

In the post-World War II period, however, it is possible to discern a critical dissatisfaction with the interpretation of Hawthorne's dramatizations of sin and evil as being primarily or exclusively concerned with salvational matters. There begins
to emerge, about this time, what might be termed a "politicalization" of Hawthorne's depictions of moral failure to stand alongside and interact with the more traditional religious evaluation. The portrayal of sin in Hawthorne is seen, that is, not only as denoting a spiritual lesion in the soul, but also as a kind of metaphor of the limited possibilities of human accomplishment in history. In articles such as Richard Chase's "The Progressive Hawthorne" (PR, XVI [1949], 96-100), Russel Kirk's "The Moral Conservatism of Hawthorne" (Contemporary Review, No. 1044 [1952], pp. 361-66), Henry Kariel's "Man Limited: Nathaniel Hawthorne's Classicism" (SAQ, LII [1953], 528-42), Marvin Fisher's "The Pattern of Conservatism in Johnson's Rasselas and Hawthorne's Tales" (JHI, XIX [1958], 173-96), C. N. Stavrou's "Hawthorne's Quarrel with Man" (Personalist, XLII [1961], 352-60), or Melvin Askew's "Hawthorne, The Fall, and the Psychology of Maturity" (AL, XXXIV. [1962], 335-43), the critical view of the origin, nature, and response to sin and evil in Hawthorne's fiction is broadened to include its purely human, existential implications as well. In other words, such a theological concept as original sin, for example, is interpreted not only in terms of man's tendency to defy the precepts of God, but also as a symbol of all those ambiguities, paradoxes, and impenetrable mysteries of experience which circumscribe man's understandable but doomed desire for infinite achievement in the world in which he lives.

Such an emphasis on the "moral realism" in Hawthorne enabled Philip Rahv, for example, to discuss the "dark ladies" in Hawthorne's fiction, not as "good" or "bad," but as "one heroine" who symbolizes "the contrary values that [Hawthorne] attached to experience" ("The Dark Lady of Salem," PR, VIII [1941], 362-81); Gordon Roper to read The Scarlet Letter as Hawthorne's "examination and acceptance of the darker am-
b.biguieties of life” (“The Originality of Hawthorne’s The Scarlet Letter,” Dalhousie Review, XXIX [1950], 62-79); Louise Dauner to view “The Gentle Boy” not as an attempt to define a “true” Christian creed but as a grimly tragic reflection of life’s moral ambiguities (“The ‘Case’ of Tobias Pearson: Hawthorne and the Ambiguities,” AL, XXI [1950], 464-72); and Professors Fogle, Stein, Waggoner, and Male to analyze the Hawthorne canon in terms of its “moral dilemmas,” “experiential dualities,” “tragic complexities,” and “trope[s] representing the dialectic between present and past, rebellion and acceptance, space and time.” For good or ill, Hawthorne criticism had moved a long way from the straightforward exposition of beliefs and ideas.

The advent of Freudian psychoanalytic criticism of Hawthorne’s fiction is, from one point of view, the result of a general movement that got started in the late 1930’s and which would find the fact that Hawthorne grew up in a fatherless household full of females irresistible. But it is also possible to see it as another, more extreme, reaction to moralistic criticism. Simon O. Lesser in his Fiction and the Unconscious (1957), which includes his previously published psychological interpretation of “My Kinsman, Major Molineux” (PR, XXII [1955], 372-80), explicitly indicates this reaction in his assumption that literature is not “centrally concerned with moral problems.” That is, whereas the critics we have been citing expressed their dissatisfaction with moralism by enlarging and complicating their responses to Hawthorne’s depictions of “the midnight of the moral world,” the psychoanalytic critics (that is, those who read Hawthorne’s fiction as the projection of the author’s subconscious stresses) simply denied the “public” implications of the symbolizations of sin, guilt, and isolation entirely. By locating their sole reality in the interior of Hawthorne’s psyche, these critics removed the fictive crises in Hawthorne’s fiction from both history and supra-history.
The first to be persuaded of the relevance of such a view were the psychiatrists, of course. Clarence Oberndorf ("Psychoanalytic Insight of Hawthorne," Psychoanalytic Review, XXIX [1942], 373-85) and O. L. Zangwill ("A Case of Paramnesia in Nathaniel Hawthorne," Character and Personality, XIII [1945], 246-60) read The Scarlet Letter as a projection of the author's Oedipal situation, one of his unconscious attempts "to cure himself through repetitive confessional writing." Joseph Levi ("The Scarlet Letter: A Psychoanalytical Interpretation," AI, X [1953], 291-306) and Lois Adkins ("Psychological Symbolism of Guilt and Isolation in Hawthorne," AI, XI [1954], 417-25) also (boringly) follow the formal Freudian theory of the Oedipus complex, though they do not agree about which characters represent Hawthorne's id, ego, and superego. Although Eugene Arden accepts the Oedipal premise of The Scarlet Letter, he tentatively suggests (only tentatively since, after all, he is writing in The American Imago, "A Psychoanalytic Journal for the Arts and Sciences") that a novel is not solely a case history of its author—Hawthorne could have learned of psychological phenomena from his physician-friend, Oliver Wendell Holmes, amongst other sources of such information. But his amazed "discovery" that Chillingworth follows modern psychoanalytic procedure in 1850 (Hawthorne is a "Freudian before Freud"), because it ignores both Chillingworth's motive and the symbolic meaning of his actions in the total design of the novel, comes to no more than a pointing out of an historical curiosity ("Hawthorne's 'Case of Arthur D.,'" AI, XVIII [1961], 45-55).

In each of these "cases," the action of the work is related to the mind of Hawthorne, so that if they have no critical relevance, they may yet be acknowledged as having, at least theoretically, biographical relevance. William Bysshe Stein's "'The Artist of the Beautiful': Narcissus and the Thimble" (AI,
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XVIII [1961], 35-44) is something else again. His reading of the story as an "almost clinical explanation of the paranoic symptoms which characterize an individual's struggle to sublimate homosexual predispositions," in which the main action (Warland's attempt to spiritualize machinery) is interpreted as the "determination of the superego to desexualize the meaning of copulation," since it is not related to either the mind of the author or the mind of the audience (which, according to many theorists of literary psychoanalytic criticism, are the only valid alternatives, since a fictional character cannot properly be said to possess a "mind"), is finally nothing more than a summary of the action by means of a technical vocabulary. Moreover, given his position, Professor Stein logically concludes that Hawthorne unequivocally damns his main character, and thus he reduces Hawthorne's complex vision of the artist in America to a simplicity. Professor Bell's chapter on the story in her Hawthorne's Vision of the Artist can well serve as an indication of how beside the point Professor Stein's essay is.

Much more sophisticated and far-ranging psychological analyses, because they are not shackled by the restrictive terminology of psychiatry and are aware of the nature of literary form, are John E. Hart's "The Scarlet Letter: One Hundred Years After" (NEQ, XXIII [1950], 381-95) and Rudolphe Von Abele's The Death of the Artist (1955). Professor Hart, eschewing the simplistic triune of id, ego, and superego, interprets the attitudes and actions of the characters in The Scarlet Letter as symbolic representations of "different sides of [Hawthorne's] own personality," especially as these explore Hawthorne's complex feelings about the relationship of his art to his guilt feelings about his implication with the past. Professor Von Abele reads the romances and two of the tales primarily as projective fables of Hawthorne's problems with art, sex, and society, and in doing so tries to account for his artistic disintegration.
Finally, we may look at Professor Lesser's psychonalystic interpretation of "My Kinsman, Major Molineux," in which the action of the story is not interpreted as a revelatory projection of the "mind" of the author but rather as a disguised appeal to the unconscious emotional needs and desires of the audience. In Professor Lesser's view, the career of Robin on its unconscious level is motivated by his desire to be free of adult domination, which he accomplishes in the climax of the story when, in his laugh, he vents his latent hostility for his kinsman and abandons his search. The "meaning" of the story is in its psychological appositeness to the unconscious life of the reader: "What [Robin] is doing, unwittingly but flamboyantly, is something which every young man does and must do, however gradually, prudently, and inconspicuously: he is destroying an image of paternal authority so that, freed from its restraining influence, he can begin life as an adult."

Interestingly enough, Professor Lesser's reading of the tale has been objected to by both a psychiatrist and a literary critic. Louis Paul in "A Psychoanalytic Reading of Hawthorne's 'Major Molincuy' [sic]: The Father Manqué and the Protégé Manqué" (AI, XVIII [1961], 279-88), arguing from a different view of what constitutes normalcy in young men's responses to fathers, asserts that only "neurotic" young men attempt to destroy the paternal image. "The healthy son integrates selective standards or restraints proposed by the father, as inner constraints, and becomes his own man." As such, Dr. Paul rejects Professor Lesser's reading of the tale as a successful initiation into adulthood, for in his view (shared by no other critic) Robin, at the end of the story, "is about to retreat homeward to resume attachment to mother and the bondage to father." The psychiatrist stands alone; in the dozen or so other interpretations of the story, no matter what emphasis or slant is given to the action by the critics, all agree that some rite de passage has been effected. And thereby hangs a tale.
Using Professor Lesser’s reading of “Molineux,” Roy Harvey Pearce attempts in his “Robin Molineux on the Analyst’s Couch: A Note on the Limits of Psychoanalytic Criticism” (Criticism, I [1959], 83-90) to demonstrate the “inadequacy and partiality” that results from abstracting a character from his fictive context so as to psychoanalyze him in private. Generously granting Professor Lesser’s contribution to our understanding of the character, Robin, he shows that the created world of the whole tale, of which Robin is but one part, opens up dynamic implications which the exclusive concern with Robin short circuits. Robin’s “freedom” is achieved at the expense of his and his society’s guilt—its cost is the torment and destruction of “a noble, tragic figure, a loyalist caught up in Revolutionary anti-loyalist violence.” As such, in the language of “moral realism,” Professor Pearce concludes that Robin’s attainment of freedom (and his society’s) “is dreadful”—for “Molineux” is “a tragic assertion of the inextricable relation of freedom and unfreedom in the world.”

The critical interest in the relationships between Hawthorne and Melville and Hawthorne and James, the other two American fiction writers whose work was accorded a revival at about the same time, is a logical by-product of the forces we have been sketching here. These three authors having been singled out as being particularly viable in the culture’s attraction to the “complex vision,” it was natural that inter-relationships (though not between Melville and James) would emerge.

The Hawthorne-Melville relationship has a longer history. Earlier studies tended to be superficial, such as Hildegard Hawthorne’s “Hawthorne and Melville” (Lit. Rev., II [1922], 406), or deflective, such as Lewis Mumford’s attempt to make Ethan Brand into a portrait of Melville (Herman Melville [1929]), which was refuted by Randall Stewart in “Ethan Brand” (SRL, V [1929], 967). Henry Seidel Canby’s chapter on “Hawthorne and Melville” in his Classic Americans (1931) is,
however, an extremely valuable comparative study, and F. I. Carpenter's "Puritans Preferred Blondes: The Heroines of Melville and Hawthorne" (NEQ, IX [1936], 253-72) is a brilliant exposition of the way the conservative aspect of the Puritan tradition—"the old morality of purity"—inhibited the imaginative creativity of both authors.

The fullest discussion of the relationship between the two writers is to be found in Harrison Hayford's unpublished dissertation (Yale, 1945), two parts of which have appeared as "The Significance of Melville's 'Agatha' Letters" (ELH, XIII [1946], 299-310) and "Hawthorne, Melville, and the Sea" (NEQ, XIX [1946], 435-52). Most of the relationship studies are concerned with the two authors as dual reflections of certain cultural, moral, or literary situations rather than with examples of specific influences. For example, Randall Stewart discusses their general similarity of moral vision in "Melville and Hawthorne" (SAQ, LI [1952], 436-46); James E. Miller compares their conceptions of the unpardonable sin in "Hawthorne and Melville: The Unpardonable Sin" (PMLA, LXX [1955], 91-114); Charles Feidelson, in reaction to what he considered Matthiessen's too emphatic social and political bent, examines the two (along with several other nineteenth-century writers) in terms of their "devotion to the possibilities of symbolism" (Symbolism and American Literature [1953]); and Harry Levin chose the two authors (along with Poe) to represent "the symbolic character of our greatest literature and the dark wisdom of our deeper minds" (The Power of Blackness [1958]). Of the influence studies, the most convincing are Leon Howard's (Herman Melville [1951]) and Nathalia Wright's discussions of the influence of Hawthorne's tales on the conception and execution of Melville's masterwork ("Mosses from an Old Manse and Moby-Dick," MLN, LXVII [1952], 387-92). Edward G.
Luciders' "The Melville-Hawthorne Relationship in Pierre and The Blithedale Romance" (WHR, IV [1950], 323-34) is an extremely suggestive essay on the effect of the friendship of the two men on their 1852 novels, both of which are more autobiographical than either had written before, both of which criticize transcendentalism, and both of which utilize a contrasting pair of light and dark ladies.

A critical awareness of the influence of Hawthorne on James is almost wholly a product of the 1940's. Before Matthiessen had pointed it out in American Renaissance (1941) and in Henry James: The Major Phase (1946), only T. S. Eliot seems to have written on the relationship in his "The Hawthorne Aspect" (Lit. Rev. V [1918], 44-53). The main work in this area, however, has been done by Marius Bewley, whose 1949 and 1950 articles in Scrutiny on "James's Debt to Hawthorne" are reprinted in The Complex Fate (1952). The common bond which Bewley discerns between Hawthorne and James is their mutual concern with the relationship of America to Europe, a dichotomy which subsumes the relationship of past to present and solitude to society. Hawthorne's main contribution to James, generally speaking, is, according to Professor Bewley, his pioneering attempt to fashion native materials into art, thereby making them accessible for James's later perfections, and a persistent concern with the reality of moral evil, which may have helped to save James from sharing the hermetically sealed, amoral aestheticism of the expatriates found in some of his fiction. But since Professor Bewley feels that it is better to consider Hawthorne's influence on James as "specifically as possible, for it is extremely elusive of generalizations," he discusses James's use of, and improvement upon, the Zenobia-Priscilla relationship in his depiction of the relationship between Olive and Verena in The Bostonians; ascribes the weakness in the portrait of Milly
Theale in *The Wings of the Dove* to James's absorption of the unwarrantedly reverential ideal of New England womanhood as envisioned in Hawthorne's Hilda; and analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of James's handling of the Hawthornian theme of the discrepancy between appearance and reality in *The Golden Bowl, The Turn of the Screw,* and *What Maisie Knew.*

Following Professor Bewley's lead, Edwin Fussell in "Hawthorne, James, and 'The Common Doom'" (*AQ*, X [1958], 438-53) documents his contention that "the very richest aspect of their literary relationship" lies in James's working out in various novels the "Hawthorne theme" of the sin of isolating oneself "from the common life"; Peter Buitenhuis discusses James's various views of Hawthorne to cast light both on "how James was able to learn different things from his predecessor at various stages in his development"—all through the 1880's and 1890's Hawthorne's influence is apparent to some degree—and on how James's responses to Hawthorne indicate his evolving view of America ("Henry James on Hawthorne," *NEQ*, XXXII [1959], 207-25); and Annette Baxter explores a special relationship in "Independence vs. Isolation: Hawthorne and James on the Problem of the Artist" (*NCF*, X [1955], 225-31). A number of articles have a narrower focus. For example, J. R. Lucke's suggestion that a passage in *The Blithedale Romance* is "The Inception of ‘The Beast in the Jungle’" (*NEQ*, XXVI [1953], 529-32) is expanded to a discussion of those figures in Hawthorne who can serve as prototypes for James's hero in George Monteiro's "Hawthorne, James, and the Destructive Self" (*TSLL*, IV [1962], 58-71). R. J. Kane's briefly stated surmise in "Hawthorne's 'The Prophetic Pictures' and James's 'The Liar'" (*MLN*, LXV [1950], 257-8) that Hawthorne's tale is the basic source of James's story is convincingly established by Edward Rosenberry in "James's Use of Hawthorne in 'The Liar'" (*MLN*, LXXVI [1961], 234-38). And Robert Gleckner
in "James's Madame de Mauves and Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter" (MLN, LXXIII [1958], 580-86), not only points out parallels in the two novels, but asserts that James's criticism of Hawthorne's method in the forest scene (in his Hawthorne) is subtly supported by his own different method of handling a comparable scene in Madame de Mauves.

IV

These, then, are the general contours of the Hawthorne revival, though not, of course, all of the facts. The structure of this essay has unfortunately caused much significant scholarship to be passed over without even a nod. No mention has been made of Edward Davidson's definitive study of the unfinished romances, nor of the many valuable source studies by such Hawthornians as G. H. Orians, Jane Lundblad, Frank Davidson, B. Bernard Cohen, and Robert Stanton. Similarly unacknowledged are studies of Hawthorne's revisions by Arlin Turner and Scymour Gross, of his esthetic theories by such scholars as C. H. Foster, Roy Male, Robert Kimbrough, and Harry Clark. Nelson Adkins' brilliant reconstruction of the early unpublished projects and Norman Holmes Pearson's various substantial contributions have also been left out, and others besides.

But one may ask, finally, when confronting this mountain of Hawthorne criticism and scholarship, Is Hawthorne really that good? Does he really mean that much to us, or is our accelerated interest in him primarily the result of various external factors which have relatively little to do with his intrinsic significance? It is true, of course, that he has profited from the dearth of important novelists in American literature before James, from the spill-over of the Melville and James revivals, from a fictive mode that caught the prevailing fashions in
criticism. But if he were not, basically, "good" and "important," if he could not speak significantly to our present condition, nor we to him, then the fortuitous aspects of his revival would hardly have had the opportunity to help things along. Where, we may ask, is the William Gilmore Simms revival?