Title	『七破風の家』のなかの読む行為
Sub Title	The acts of reading in "The house of the seven gables"
Author	吉田, 恭子(Yoshida, Kyoko)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要刊行委員会
Publication year	2005
Jtitle	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要. 英語英米文学 No.46 (2005. 3) ,p.109- 141
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	In this essay, I will explore how multi-layered acts of reading helpdescribe the moral and aesthetic intricacy in The House of the Seven Gablesby Nathaniel Hawthorne. The modes of reading and interpretation presentedin the text instruct the reader how to read the text and reflect the author'swish how his romance and romances in general should be read by his idealreader. In short, The House of the Seven Gables is a romance about how weshould read romance.Due to its abrupt happy-ending plot, its conventional settings and itssentimental tone, Seven Gables invites the most simplistic reading and is themost morally didactic of the four romances; thus, Seven Gables serves as anexcellent case study to demonstrate how Hawthorne complicates our readingactivity in his fictions. In order to clarify what I mean by "the multi-layeredacts of reading," I will discuss how different layers of reading activities areinterwoven in the text. Here I will suggest that Hawthorne is trying to posita new mode of reading that best facilitates the new genre of "romance."Second, related to the new mode of reading that Hawthorne proposes, Iwill inquire into the roles that mirror imagery, daguerreotypy and portraitpainting serve in the romance. Not only do these add a touch of modernityto the romance, they are closely related to the acts of reading in the book.Finally, I will discuss the link between the acts of sympathetic reading andHawthorne's idea of romance and morality.
Notes	
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN10030060-20050331-0109

The Acts of Reading in *The House of the Seven Gables*[1]

Kyoko Yoshida

In this essay, I will explore how multi-layered acts of reading help describe the moral and aesthetic intricacy in T*he House of the Seven Gables* by Nathaniel Hawthorne. The modes of reading and interpretation presented in the text instruct the reader how to read the text and reflect the author's wish how his romance and romances in general should be read by his ideal reader. In short, *The House of the Seven Gables* is a romance about how we should read romance.

Due to its abrupt happy-ending plot, its conventional settings and its sentimental tone, *Seven Gables* invites the most simplistic reading and is the most morally didactic of the four romances; thus, *Seven Gables* serves as an excellent case study to demonstrate how Hawthorne complicates our reading activity in his fictions. In order to clarify what I mean by "the multi-layered acts of reading," I will discuss how different layers of reading activities are interwoven in the text. Here I will suggest that Hawthorne is trying to posit a new mode of reading that best facilitates the new genre of "romance." Second, related to the new mode of reading that Hawthorne proposes, I will inquire into the roles that mirror imagery, daguerreotypy and portrait painting serve in the romance. Not only do these add a touch of modernity to the romance, they are closely related to the acts of reading in the book. Finally, I will discuss the link between the acts of sympathetic reading and

Hawthorne's idea of romance and morality.

I. Two Self-Reflexivities in The Mutual Reading of the Characters

Ambiguity has often been the focus of interpretive studies on Hawthorne's fiction.[2] In these criticisms, however, the biographical author Hawthorne, the implied author Hawthorne, the narrator and the reader play major roles in the multivalent reading. In *Seven Gables*, however, the author, the narrator and the reader are not the only participants of the reading activity. Its characters are as much "readers" as we are, and as a consequence, an equal amount of attention must be paid to their modes of reading. Not only do they attempt to read the romance's central symbols, such as Colonel Pyncheon's portrait and the old Pyncheon house, they also read each other; the characters therefore become "texts" in a triple sense: they are simultaneously subjects of reading by other characters, subjects of reading by the narrator, and, finally, literary subtexts for the reader herself. The narrator holds two objectives in this romance: telling the narrative to the reader and showing the reader how to read a Hawthornian romance. And his characters are assigned two roles accordingly—as representative agents for the narrative (characters in the story) and as educating agents for the reader's romance reading.

Now let us examine some examples of the characters' acts of reading. We learn that a character is engaged in reading of others by two signals: (1) perceptive (especially optical) words which indicate a character's senses are stimulated; (2) indication that a character is attempting to apply a meaning to what he/she perceives. Clifford's reading of Phoebe, for example, is perhaps the most obvious case to start with:

He [Clifford] read Phoebe, as he would a sweet and simple story; he

> listened to her, as if she were a verse of household poetry.... She was not an actual fact for him, but the interpretation of all that he had lacked on earth, brought warmly home to his conception; so that this mere symbol or lifelike picture had almost the comfort of reality. (underlines mine; 142)

This often quoted passage in Chapter IX "Clifford and Phoebe" compares Phoebe to a text to be interpreted by Clifford.[3] If we are to assume the world where the characters inhabit is a macrocosm of the Hawthornian romance, which conveys the spiritual reality to be interpreted by the attentive reader, each character constitutes a microcosm that epitomizes the world of romance that they reside in. Individual characters hold their own spiritual reality to be unveiled by other characters' penetrative reading. Just as a romance is a medium for the reader to gain an insight into a higher reality, its characters are mystical pathways for other characters to reach a metaphysical understanding of the romantic world they reside in. According to Hawthorne's own distinction between romance and novel in his preface to *Seven Gables*, for Clifford, Phoebe is a romantic text, rather than a novelistic text, having "more to do with clouds overhead, than with any portion of the actual soil" (3).

Likewise, Phoebe is compared to a book again later, this time from Holgrave's point of view after he demolishes the mesmeric spell he casts upon her. Before Holgrave voluntarily gives up his vengeful mesmeric power, he has been perceived by Phoebe as too analytical, lacking human warmth in his observation of others, which is another instance of inter-character reading in the text. And her commentary was validated by the authorial information about Holgrave's background and personal tendency. Holgrave catches a glimpse of Phoebe's profound nature and modifies his

idea about her:

> With the insight on which he prided himself, he fancied that he could look through Phoebe, and all around her, and could read her off like a page of a child's story-book. But these transparent natures are often deceptive in their depth; those pebbles at the bottom of the fountain are farther from us than we think. Thus the artist, whatever he might judge of Phoebe's capacity, was beguiled by some silent charm of hers, to talk freely of what he dreamed of doing in the world. (underline mine; 182)

Holgrave used to read Phoebe as a monistic text. Now, however, aware of a deeper significance beyond her surface, Holgrave has rediscovered Phoebe as a romantic text, which, according to the preface, requires "a far more subtile process" of reading than "the ostensible one" to work out a "high truth" "fairly, finely and skillfully" (2–3).

Gordon Hutner neatly summarizes the structure of *Seven Gables*, stating that Hawthorne's narrative functions in two levels: ostensible and subtile. He argues that the romance revolves around the idea of a "secret." On the ostensible level, the secrets are Holgrave's true identity as the last Maule, Judge Pyncheon's actual corpse in the Pyncheon House, and the location of the Eastern territory map for which the successive Pyncheons committed terrible crimes. In the subtile level, the secrets are symbolically represented by, for instance, the moonlight under which Holgrave and Phoebe mystically reach a mutual understanding, or by the metaphor of a corpse half-decaying in an old house.[4] Based on Hawthorne's definition of romance in his preface, we may justifiably call the ostensible narrative the novelistic one and the subtile narrative the romantic one. The two narratives have respective morals and are aimed at different kinds of readers, for the preface suggests

that reading of a romance demands a mental activity different fro the one for a novel. Many critics have rightly attributed this double nature of the book to Hawthorne's intention of appealing to a wider audience and to dismantle his reputation as a morbid writer after the publication of *The Scarlet Letter*, which shocked his contemporaries.[5] Hawthorne clearly felt competitive toward the writers of his time, both commercially and aesthetically; while he hoped his works would be widely accepted by the public, which included an audience for the books by a "damned mob of scribbling women," he would not compromise the representation of a high truth that could only manifest itself in the attentive minds of "Gentle, Kind, Benevolent, Indulgent and most Beloved and Honoured Readers" in his imaginary "Paradise of Gentle Readers" (*The Marble Faun* 2). In Hutner's words, "Hawthorne's lonely pleasure is that he would fail his own ideas of excellence and of moral complexity if he were ever as popularly successful as Susan Warner" (89). I will later discuss the further requisite for successful romance reading, but I hope that I have now made it clear how the characters' acts of reading epitomize our romance reading. The reader acquires a sense of how to approach the text through its characters' interpretive activities. In this sense, we may regard *The House of the Seven Gable*s a self-reflexive text.

Upon the understanding that the characters' acts of mutual reading reflect the desirable mode of romance reading, let us pay closer attention to individual characters' modes of reading, from which another type of self-reflexivity emerges: the respective modes that the individual characters employ to read others reflect their own spiritual reality. In short, how they see others comes back upon themselves, revealing to the reader who and what they are. Hepzibah's case is most illustrative: her myopia, which is stressed throughout the book, prevents her from achieving clear vision of others and consequently makes her reading of others dim and rather self-

indulgent. But she is also one of the few who are capable of sensing Judge Pyncheon's evil nature despite his agreeable smile. She reaches this insight precisely because the judge's deceitful self-display does not influence her judgment of him due to her myopia. It is important to note here that acquiring an accurate physical view of others constitutes a ground work of reading others in the book. It is always through superficial appearance—faces, figures and what lights and shades reveal and conceal—that the characters and the reader access the world of metaphysics: Hepzibah's "forbidding scowl" which is "the innocent result of her near-sightedness, and an effort so to concentrate her powers of vision, as to substitute a firm outline of the object, instead of a vague one" (34) hides her sentiment and ability to love, making a deft contrast with Judge Pyncheon's pasted grin that covers his corrupt soul. On the other hand, Phoebe's face and figure straightforwardly indicate her good nature, purity, strong poise, nimbleness and domestic productivity. Hawthorne's physiognomical approach to the giving of clues that lead to a higher truth generates a dilemma, however, which draws our attention to the paradoxes central to Hawthorne's view of how complex morality is. The narrative tells us that our judgment on characters should depend on how they see others; in Hepzibah's case, we should not interpret her nature according to her frown (outer appearance) because she cannot see well and thus does not base her judgment on exteriors.

Phoebe's mode of reading reflects how she should be interpreted as well. Her understanding of others is always intuitive and assertive. When she is given an opportunity to read judge Pyncheon for the first time in person (after she saw his daguerreotype portrait produced by Holgrave), she instinctively escapes his "cousinly" kiss and blushes (118), instantaneously detecting his aggressive sexuality. The reader likewise reaches a similar

conclusion about the judge's nature through the authorial references to his gold mahogany cane—the recurring sign of a Hawthornian seducing villain—and through the information of his having "worn out" his wife just like Colonel Pyncheon did (116).

Clifford is another interesting case, and his mode of "reading" intertwines with a central symbolism of the book: mirror imagery. In fact, he rarely "reads" others but "reflects" others. His hypersensitive temperament reacts to what he perceives, and skipping the interpretive procedure of the intellectual faculty, his emotional faculty directly and dramatically mirrors the impressions he receives. As stimuli in the outer world change, one mood after another rapidly takes over Clifford's mind. He is depicted as a gray, ghostly existence throughout the book. He is a man in the neutral zone: the border between black and white, between femininity and masculinity—"almost too soft and gentle for a man" (92)—between reason and emotion (note his excited speech in his train ride with Hepzibah), between light and shadow, etc. In Chapter VII, Hawthorne almost officiously controls the shadow and the light in the breakfast room through Hepzibah's manipulation of the curtain. Clifford prefers to stay in the shadow, but the light must be present in his sight to maintain his merry mood. This characteristic strikingly resembles the mechanism of the silver-plated mirror. The manipulation of the light and the dark takes place again later in the mystical moonlight scene when Phoebe and Holgrave experience their strange euphoria (213). Clifford is also associated with Maule's Well, another central mirror symbol of the romance:

> He had a singular propensity, for example, to hang over Maule's Well, and look at the constantly shifting phantasmagoria of figures, produced by the agitation of the water over the mosaicwork of colored pebbles, at

> the bottom.... The truth was, however, that his fancy—receiving faster than his will and judgement, and always stronger than they—created shapes of loveliness that were symbolic of his native character, and now and then a stern and dreadful shape, that typified his fate. (underlines mine; 153–4)

Here, Clifford is captured by the fascinating effect of two mirrors (the well and himself) held against each other, reflecting one another and creating an image of kaleidoscopic infinity. It is the narrator who provides interpretation. In another instance, Phoebe describes "[t]he pale, gray, childish, aged, melancholy, yet often simply cheerful, and sometimes delicately intelligent, aspect of Clifford" (159) to Holgrave as follows: "He has had such a great sorrow, that his heart is made all solemn and sacred by it. When he is cheerful—when the sun shines into his mind—then I venture to peep in, just as far as the light reaches, but no farther. It is holy ground where the shadow falls!" (178). Although she does not refer to Maule's Well directly, the allusion is clear here. In "The Flight of Two Owls," when responding to "a gimlet-eyed" old gentleman's remark ("I can't see through you!"), Clifford says, "And yet, my dear Sir, I am as transparent as the water of Maule's Well!" (265).

The arched window in Clifford's room is the only view to the outer world for him who is "doomed to haunt" (169) the old Pyncheon House. What he sees through the window is congruent to society itself for him. Since Clifford is "constantly assimilating nutriment for his spirit and intellect from sights, sounds, and events, which passed as a perfect void to persons more practiced with the world" (173), the frame of the arched window also frames Clifford's mind; his emotional reaction to every detail he sees outside the window reflects the moral condition of society. In the

chapter "The Arched Window," for example, Clifford sees an Italian street musician with a monkey from the window. When he witnesses the monkey avariciously collecting every copper cent scattered on the ground and begging the bystanders for even more, his fragile sensibility gets deeply disturbed:

> [D]oubtless, more than one New-Englander ... passed by, and threw a look at the monkey, and went on, without imagining how nearly his own moral condition was here exemplified. Clifford, however, was a being of another order.... he was so shocked by his [the imp's] ugliness, spiritual as well as physical, that he actually began to shed tears; a weakness which men of merely delicate endowments can hardly avoid, when the worst and meanest aspect of life happens to be presented to them. (underlines mine; 164)

Clearly, Clifford's mirror quality is utilized by the narrator to express his sarcastic social criticism on the uprising Yankee commercialist mentality. But equally important in this passage is that Clifford's response is based on both his moral and aesthetic discernment. The narrator stresses time and again how Clifford keenly reacts to aesthetic stimuli, both ugly and beautiful, and how he unconsciously incorporates moral values into his aesthetic admiration. Various mirror imageries represented in *Seven Gables* do not merely reflect the optical double of the original, but they also reflect what is underneath the surface. Clifford does not add much integrity to the romance as a personality, but his role as a mirror-like reader plays an important part in the systematic symbolism of the mirror imagery, which also includes moonlight, Maule's Well, miniature, windows, etc. as we have already observed.

Although not directly involved with Clifford, the daguerreotype is another component of the mirror symbolism; it not only produces the exact outline of its original, it is also made from a silver plate like a mirror and a combination of chemicals, including mercury. Cathy N. Davidson points out the uncanny aspect of daguerreotype: "the mirrored image contained simultaneously, a positive and negative image; each one was double, unique, and unreproducible. The image is uncanny: tilt it one way, and you see the lateral reverse of the positive image; tilt it another and the images, the light and the dark, are reversed" (681). The daguerreotype resembles a road mirage, "dodging away from the eye, and trying to escape altogether" as Phoebe describes it (91). Closely related to the daguerreotype in the romance, of course, are the portrait paintings.[6] Colonel Pyncheon's grave portrait, for instance, literally beholds the event from the beginning to the end.

II. Daguerreotypy, Portraiture, Mirror Imagery

It is no coincidence that Henry James repeatedly uses metaphors of portraiture and painting in his discussion of the characters in S*even Gables*,[7] especially in the case of Judge Pycheon (128–9), who is represented as a double, a reification of Colonel Pyncheon, whose posthumous presence as a portrait pervades the narrative, controlling the symbolic discourse of the house and the romance. Besides the parallel between Judge Pyncheon and Colonel Pyncheon, there is another instance of parallelism related to the representation of the two Pyncheons: daguerreotypy and portraiture. The former delineates Judge Pyncheon; the latter depicts Colonel Pyncheon.

Numerous discussions have occurred about the interplay of portraiture, daguerreotypy, Colonel Pyncheon and Judge Pyncheon, and what they signify in *Seven Gables*, especially with regard to their relation to

Hawthorne's concept of romance. Before getting into a detailed discussion of my view on the matter, I would like to summarize briefly some of these arguments.

According to Gordon Hutner, Hawthorne's intensive interest in the human face as sign emanates from his experience of sitting for a portrait by Cephas G. Thompson in 1850. Hawthorne came to realize that portraiture shared affinities of "'subtile' schema of representation with romance," and that "representation itself can realize the secrets belonging to a subject" (78). In *Seven Gables*, the narrator observes:

> [Old portraits] acquire a look which an artist ... would never dream of presenting to a patron as his own characteristic expression, but which, nevertheless, we at once recognize as reflecting the unlovely truth of a human soul. In such cases, the painter's deep conception of his subject's inward traits has wrought itself into the essence of the picture, and is seen, after the superficial coloring has been rubbed off by time. (59)

Such a view suggests that a romance executes its art through the mutual efforts between the writer and the reader to excavate the essence beneath the "superficial coloring." Thus it is important to stress the active role of the attentive reader in the Hawthornian romance. The characters demonstrate the significance in their acts of reading others.

Similar to Hutner's point of view, Michael Davitt Bell defines the narrative's overall design as a movement from "darkness into sunshine, from morbid isolation into healthy sociability and normalcy, from the past into the present, from the world of romance into the world of the novel" (xx). [8] By the "world of novel," Bell means what Hawthorne calls the "minute fidelity" of realism. Bell's hypothesis is based on two observations: the narrator's praise of

Phoebe upon her triumphal return in the end with her "gift of making things look real, rather than fantastic, within her sphere" (297) and Hawthorne's letter which says that many passages in *Seven Gables* "ought to be finished with the minuteness of a Dutch picture" (xiii). Bell also quotes another letter of Hawthorne's wherein he compares an impression of writing in minute details to a daguerreotype fixed in the reader's mind (xiii). So in Bell's view, Hawthorne's novelistic realism is equivalent to daguerreotypy in terms of mimesis.

Alan Trachtenberg and Cathy Davidson present, on the other hand, a different daguerreotypy analogous to Hawthorne's concept of romance. Hawthorne describes the role of romancer as follows: "he may so manage his atmospherical medium as to bring out or mellow the lights and deepen and enrich the shadows of the picture" (1). Both Trachtenberg and Davidson interpret the passage akin to a photographic procedure (Trachtenberg 461, Davidson 686–7). Trachtenberg skillfully explores the paradoxical position that the daguerreotype occupies in the romance and in the socio-economic context of the time.[9] Politically egalitarian, daguerreotype portraits were a republican medium made equally accessible to the public; economically, it was a commodity for the public who were so eager to discern the "character" of the subjects (469). In *Seven Gables*, reading the portraits and the daguerreotypes is key to comprehending "the image of the world, the world deflected into image" (472). Trachtenberg points out "[t]he preponderance of looking, seeing, gazing, scrutinizing ... declares the reading of images ... as a core issue in the narrative.... There are texts within texts, not only figurative storybooks and the 'legend' of Alice Pyncheon composed by Holgrave but a host of pictures ... and the gingerbread figures of animals and 'the renowned Jim Crow' " (471). He positions the painting and the daguerreotype alike as romantic texts to be read by the characters and the reader.

Davidson takes Trachtenberg's idea a step further, shedding light on "the nonrealistic aspects of photography (spooky, hidden, surrealistic)" (677), intimating how photography (daguerreotypy in this case), opens up a path to the fantastic, allegorical world of romance. She also maintains that the invention of the daguerreotype spurred on the nineteenth century's "fascination with physiognomy, the decoding of the face's moral and intellectual sign system" (682). Here, unlike Hutner's case, the daguerreotype is linked to physiognomy, the influence of which over the mutual readings between the characters in *Seven Gables* I have already discussed in the previous section.

Rather than determining the daguerreotype either as a romantic or a novelistic medium for Hawthorne, I would like to introduce here yet another view on *Seven Gables* represented by James and Hyatt H. Waggoner. Unlike Bell's idea of the movement from romance to the novel, or other critics' insistence upon romance as a distinctive genre from the novel, Waggoner suggests *Seven Gables* is paradoxically both realistic and allegorical at the same time. While it has a "palpable recreation of a definite time and place and way of life," Waggoner states, it is "directly and completely controlled by a conscious conceptual framework... involving the most abstract levels of thought" (176). In James's words, while "[Hawthorne's] pages were full of its [the romance's] spirit, and of a certain reflected light that springs from it," it has "more literal actuality than [Hawthorne's other romances]" (124). Rahter than considering the two as mutually exclusive, distinctive forms of fiction, we should regard that romance and the novel overlap, sharing certain conventions and prerequisites of fiction writing.

Here, I would like to survey the relationship between painting and daguerreotypy in the mid-nineteenth century. My conclusion is that the daguerreotypy was viewed as an evolutionary form of painting, both mimetically and spiritually. It should be noted that this view of

daguerreotypy resembles James's and Waggoner's "more realistic" *and* "more fabulous" impression of *Seven Gables*.

Today, in our photocentric culture, we tend to regard painting as a creative, subjectively expressive mode of visual representation as opposed to the "objective" representation of the photograph. But such a notion of painting has been developed by painters after Impressionism as a result of the invention of the daguerreotype, which undermined the throne of painting as the mimetic visual art. Painters therefore promoted their originality by foregrounding the non-realistic aspects of painting, so painting had to wait until the 1870s to reestablish its aesthetic identity.

In Hawthorne's time, during the early expansion of daguerreotypy, painting still remained a mimetic art, and the daguerreotype, which was remodeled from the camera obscura—a device originally designed for realistic painting and drawing—was considered as an evolutionary form of painting; it was an extension of painting as a mimetic art.

And mimesis was not the only reason the American public found the daguerreotype evolutionary—it was more democratic and more spiritual than painting. For the Americans, daguerreotypy was a republican technology to capture Providence manifesting upon every American's countenance.

The American public viewed the daguerreotype as a super-mimetic art, which transcended the representative capacity of human artistry. In his *Mirror Image*, Richard Rudisill clarifies how daguerreotypy served American society's nationalistic demand, which culminated in the 1840s and '50s. In short, the mechanical eye of the camera became the divine eye. Rudisill writes:

> In general, the feeling prevailed that the mechanical nature of the process guaranteed its freedom from human fallibility. A common

> ground of trust was soon established which equated a picture made by the camera with the truth of a direct perception. Once this sort of reliability was attributed to the medium and it was placed into wide use, it was inevitable that national imagery should henceforth have to base itself on the evidence of the machine.... [P]opular portraiture of statesmen, entertainers, or criminals in the press had to credit origin in the daguerreotype when laying claim to accuracy. (231)

The American public's blind trust in the direct perception of the camera's eye operated on the spiritual level as well, and it is this spirituality that flattered American nationalism most. The daguerreotype "was certainly a technological process which served nationalistic ends and which sharpened direct experience with symbolic influences throughout American life. But its use was basically a further manifestation of existing national faith in spiritual insight derived from nature," for this was "the time when Emerson could speak of becoming a 'transparent eyeball' as the means to achieving unity in creation with God. This thought of seeing beyond the surface of nature by keenly observing the surface was ideally the same concern for perception as the wish of the portrait maker to reveal the inner character of his sitter by making a searching likeness of his features" (233). Both the painting and the daguerreotype portraits shared the same motivation of decoding the ideographic "character" of the subject. Therefore, the painting of Colonel Pyncheon and the daguerreotype of Judge Pyncheon are equally "ocular phenomena" upon which Hawthorne relies to stage "the moral climaxes" of his narrative (20).

Likewise, Hyatt H. Waggoner and Henry James express their impression of *Seven Gables* being "more realistic" and yet "more fabulous" just as daguerreotype was to the Americans. I would argue that their idea of

the compatibility of romance and the novel is very sound, and also important to get the picture of how the visual symbolism operates on both mimetic and spiritual levels in the book.

In *Seven Gables*, through both painting and the daguerreotype "the secret character with a truth" (Holgrave on the daguerreotype; 91) oozes out and appeals to "a perception of the truth" (Hepzibah on painting; 59) of the beholder—or the "reader." Painting is depicted as more plastic in the book. Hawthorne figuratively provides Colonel Pyncheon's portrait with a liberty of different facial expressions in the crucial scenes that take place in the parlor. Daguerreotype, on the other hand, is more fixed, but radiates more mystic, alchemic aura which is interwoven with the imagery of the silvery surface of the mirror, mesmerism and a "wonderful insight in heaven's broad and simple sunshine" (91). Observing the dead judge, the subject of the only shown daguerreotype in the book, for example, the narrator comments: "We were betrayed into this brief extravagance by the quiver of the moonbeams; they dance hand-in-hand with shadows, and are reflected in the looking-glass, which, you are aware, is always a kind of window or door-way into the spiritual world" (underlines mine; 281).

Because daguerreotypy made portraiture popularly affordable, the daguerreotype is also a symbol of democracy,[10] whose scaled-down mirror analogy, the silver coin, suggests the redistribution of wealth when it is handed down from aristocratic Hepzibah to little Ned Higgins in the end of *Seven Gables*. The American nationalist discourse integrates the "silvery beams" which transfigure "the common-place characteristics" by "a charm of romance" (23) and reinforces the daguerreotype's power as a democratic silvery currency into the cult of portraiture in the nineteenth century. Rudisill states that "it is at this level of spirit that we must seek for the most essential operation of the daguerreotype in American life. It both reflected

and activated national faith in spiritual insight and truth obtained from perceiving the works of God in nature" (5). In order to demonstrate that such a view of daguerreotypy is uniquely American, Rudisill cites comparative definitions of the American and French photographic styles, observing that the American daguerreotype consists almost entirely of portraits and has a distinguishing depth and harmony of tone, while the French one is very bright, and sunny and shows violent contrasts (208). The American daguerreotype is shady and grayish; the French one is black and white. On the popularity of portraits, Rudisill writes: "Giving portraits first emphasis in a world competition of nationalisms implies the belief that American character could best stand contest in the form of national personalities revealed to a viewer as directly as possible" (209).

It is no wonder then that the daguerreotypist—whose perceptive power was in fact attributable to photographic technology—was rendered as a sort of mystical alchemist. Such is the case of Holgrave in *Seven Gables*. His occupation is a result of genealogical evolution—or degeneration for that matter: from Maule (the wizard) and young Matthew (the mesmerist) to Holgrave (the daguerreotypist).

III. A Romance within a Romance

The chapter "Alice Pyncheon" illustrates the ocular nature of the Maules' mystical power. This chapter contains all the mirror imagery we have discussed so far except the daguerreotype. They are so carefully manipulated and intensely incorporated into each other that they almost overwhelm the reader with its symbolic effect. The chapter is a romance within a romance, the signification of which both the characters (Phoebe and Holgrave in this case) and the reader must read. Not only does it reveals the past, which itself sets the groundwork for subsequent chapters, but it also

brings all the central symbols together as a condensed form of romance. Let us examine one scene when Alice Pyncheon meets young Matthew Maule only to be fatally mesmerized in the presence of her father Gervayse Pyncheon.

First Matthew and Gervayse discuss the business of the old document. When Gervayse accepts the deal of giving up the Pyncheon House in exchange for the whereabouts of the document, the narrator reports that Colonel Pyncheon's portrait "seems to have persisted in its shadowy gesture of disapproval," then from Gervayse's point of view, the narrator adds, "as Mr. Pyncheon set down the emptied glass, he thought he beheld his father frown" (199). Right before Alice's appearance, the narrator refers to her portrait having been sold out for its artistic value, and gives the reader account of what is represented in the portrait, such as beauty, pride and tenderness. Why does the narrator bother to introduce an absent portrait when the original is about to appear in person in the scene? First, the portrait's fate foreshadows Alice's fate of being bartered; second, it is taken as a purer representation of the personality than the original. The moment Alice enters the room, she and Matthew behold each other. Matthew's extraordinary sexuality has been explicitly indicated by his ruler "the end of which protruded" from a long pocket (201) and the preliminary remark about "the marvelous power of his eye" rumored among "the petticoated ones" (189). The two characters *read* each other within the sphere of Matthew's animal magnetism:

> A glow of artistic approval brightened over Alice Pyncheon's face; she was struck with admiration—which she made no attempt to conceal—of the remarkable comeliness, strength, and energy of Maule's figure. But that admiring glance ... the carpenter never forgave. It must have

> been the devil himself that made Maule so subtile in his perception.
>
> "Does the girl look at me as if I were a brute beast!" thought he, setting his teeth. "She shall know whether I have a human spirit; and the worse for her, if it prove stronger than her own!" (underlines mine; 201)

Overt sexual tension and the conflict of the two proud characters are now staged. Here, the irony is that Matthew misreads Alice, and that misreading triggers him to respond to her as a beast, not as a human. Meanwhile, Gervayse refers to Alice's favorite landscape painting of Claude Lorraine in the parlor and explains that he must discover the location of the Pyncheon estate document "through her means." Clearly, the Claude painting corresponds to the treasure of the estate. Matthew tells her to fix her eyes on his. "Alice put woman's might against man's might" (203).

As their psychological battle starts, the narrative curiously shifts to Gervayse's point of view, leaving the center of the scene behind. Facing the wall, he *turns away* from the two. The narrator observes that he "seemed absorbed in the contemplation of a landscape by Claude" (underline mine; 203). The verb "seem" draws the reader's attention to his awkward behavior, his affected absorption and contemplation. Indeed, the narrator adds, "the picture was no more to him, at that moment, than the blank wall" (203). The father, meanwhile, is becoming more and more uncomfortable with the situation as he recalls all the morbid legends about the Maules, so he turns *half* around, not to get a direct view of Alice and Matthew, but to catch *a reflected view of Matthew in the looking-glass* on the wall. Noting Matthew's mesmeric gesture, Gervayse tells him to stop, but Alice forbids her father's interruption, so Gervayse *turns his eyes to the Claude landscape again*, telling himself that it is her will, not his. His fancy of "imaginary

magnificence" goes on as he watches the Claude landscape: once he restores the wealth, he muses, Alice can wed better "an English duke, or a German reigning-prince, instead of some New England clergyman or lawyer" (204). Therefore, the father concludes, it is for her sake far more than his own, and her purity will protect her against Matthew's devilish power. The Claude's imagery—the symbol of the lost, rich estate and the socio-cultural superiority of the Old World for the aristocratic Pyncheons—has worked on Gervayse's conscience. He mesmerizes himself contemplating the picture. When Alice gives a faint, low cry, the father does not turn any more. After a while, Mathew calls the completion of the procedure. Gervayse finds Matthew standing erect, smiling—his frequently described "dark smile" and ruler remind of us of Judge Pyncheon's grin and cane—and Alice sitting in "profound repose" with her eyes half open. The desecration has been completed.

This one scene in the parlor dramatizes the nature of the "generations of wrongdoing" on the both sides of Maule and Pyncheon. The Pyncheons barter their daughters and conscience away for accumulation of further wealth; the Maules exercise their sexually aggressive, mesmeric power for revenge. Gervayse Pyncheon's minute movement of his eyes between the portrait, the Claude, the mirror and his daughter speaks of the nature of their losing inner conflict as much as the psychological match between Alice and Matthew does.

The story exercises a meta-narrative power over Phoebe and Holgrave. Reading the story aloud, Holgrave achieves a moral awakening; listening to the story, Phoebe becomes mildly mesmerized and comes to maturity. The Alice Pynchon tale is a condensed, embedded romance, which both the characters and the reader must construe. Having authored the story himself, Holgrave is already familiar with the story, which is actually his family

history, but in order to fully appreciate the essence of his secret, just writing a story is not suffice; Holgrave must *read it aloud*, opening up his body and heart. Any author is the first reader of his own story, but Holgrave here *acts out* his reader's role.

Before Holgrave *reads* the story for Phoebe, in the chapter "The Daguerreotypist," he is the one *to be read* from various angles by different characters and the narrator. The strongest trait of Holgrave is, according to the narrator, how he never loses his "identity" in spite of his frequent changes in his profession: "It was impossible to know Holgrave without recognizing this to be the fact. Hepzibah had seen it. Phoebe soon saw it" (177). The following pages are spent on his defects, which are, we must note, related to his way of comprehending (i.e. reading) others. From Phoebe's point of view, his lack of affection is pointed out as follows:

> He made her uneasy, and seemed to unsettle everything around her, by his lack of reverence for what was fixed....
>
> Then moreover, she scarcely thought him affectionate in his nature. He was too calm and cool an observer. Phoebe felt his eye, often; his heart, seldom or never. He took a certain kind of interest in Hepzibah and her brother, and Phoebe herself; he studied them attentively, and allowed no slightest circumstance of their individualities to escape him .... (underlines mine; 177)

Here, his lack of affection is pointed out from Phoebe's point of view. Holgrave relies only on his intellectual faculty when he reads others, which gives Phoebe a chill. This remark foreshadows his conversion in the end because in order to unite with Phoebe, Holgrave must become settled and learn a sincere, affectionate way to read others. According to the narrator,

Holgrave's intellectual faculty is not as high as Holgrave thinks: "Holgrave had read very little.... He considered himself a thinker, and was certainly of a thoughtful turn, but with his own path to discover, had perhaps hardly yet reached the point where an educated man begins to think" (180). Holgrave is in process of maturity, and his progressive view is nothing but an illusion caused by his youth:

> Man's own youth is the world's youth; at least, he feels as if it were, and imagines that the earth's granite substance is something not yet hardened, and which he can mold into whatever shape he likes. So it was with Holgrave. ...[H]e was a young man still, and therefore looked upon the world ... as a tender stripling, capable of being improved into all that it ought to be, but scarcely yet had shown the remotest promise of becoming. (underlines mine; 179)

Holgrave's will to "mold the world" provides us with another look at mesmerism as a mode of reading. It has a power to penetrate the subject as an insightful act of reading. Yet, mesmerism, the book warns, is a dangerous mode of reading since it distorts the heart of its subject; it deforms the text itself. After reading the Alice Pyncheon story, Holgrave successfully defeats the temptation to mesmerize and ruin Phoebe.

This moral victory transforms Holgrave, and yet his victory suggests his mediocrity as a man of irresistible attraction in contrast to young Matthew Maule's sexual appeal. Now it is even possible to reread the entire situation: Phoebe simply becomes drowsy listening to Holgrave's "long and dull" story as she was warned before he started reading. The reader might assume the absence of actual mesmerism as a sign of his impotence rather than his abstinence. All that Holgrave can put into a mesmeric trance is

Chanticleer, the Pyncheon fowl (176–7), which makes a rare comic moment in the Hawthornian romance. Nevertheless, it is Holgrave who tells Phoebe (and by this time it is clear to the reader as well) that the characteristic of the Pyncheon fowl is "a symbol of the life of the old house; embodying its interpretation, likewise, although an unintelligible one, as such clues generally are" (152), and while he confesses that the subject of his studies is not in books but the house itself (184), the ridiculous sight of Holgrave putting the degenerated chicken into a trance debases our estimate of his power, and makes the reader wonder how much of a Maule he is in comparison to how much Hepziba and Clifford are Pyncheons.

Considering these hints that the narrator prepares for us before Holgrave's moral climax in "Phoebe's Good Bye," we may conclude that his abrupt conversion to conservatism in the end is not, after all, a surprising change.[11] Indeed some signs of change already show in this chapter. Since his defect is related to his mode of reading, the reform must be related to it as well. What kind of desirable change does he make? Does the change illustrate the reader an ideal mode of romance reading?

IV. Circle of Sympathetic Readers

Holgrave's mode of reading is well summarized in his reply to Phoebe's question about whether he wishes well or ill for Hepzibah and Clifford:

> It is not my impulse—as regards these two individuals—either to help or hinder; but to look on, to analyze, to explain matters to myself, and to comprehend the drama .... But, through Providence sent you hither to help, and sent me only as a privileged and meet spectator, I pledge myself to lend these unfortunate beings whatever aid I can! (underlines mine; 216–7)

Phoebe compares such an attitude with that of a cold-hearted audience of a tragedy. Her answer indicates the flaw of his observatory attitude: "You talk as if this old house were a theatre; and you seem to look at Hepzibah's and Clifford's misfortunes, and those of generations before them, as a tragedy ...; I do not like this. The play costs the performers too much—and the audience is too cold-hearted!" (underlines mine; 217). Analyzing the Pyncheons has been his life-long project, and it seems that Holgrave is aware that he lacks something to reach a complete understanding of the secret of his subject. Holgrave's remark on Phoebe's figurative explanation of Clifford's state of mind reveals his problem: "How prettily you express this sentiment! ... I can understand the feeling, without possessing it" (178). He understands Clifford cognitively but never sentimentally. He continues: "Judge Pyncheon! Clifford! What a complex riddle—a complexity of complexities—do they present! It requires intuitive sympathy, like a young girl's, to solve it. A mere observer, like myself, (who never have any intuitions, and am, at best, only subtile and acute,) is pretty certain to go astray" (underline mine; 179). "Intuitive sympathy" is a characteristic of Phoebe's mode of reading, as demonstrated throughout the narrative, and Clifford's hypersensitive mind is also described to possess "naturally poignant sympathies" (257). Phoebe and Clifford are also the spectators whom the Italian street musician cherishes most. Missing Phoebe and Clifford, he cannot leave the spot immediately. "He persisted ... trusting that his dark, alien countenance would soon be brightened by Phoebe's sunny aspect. Neither could he be willing to depart without again beholding Clifford, whose sensibility, like Phoebe's smile, had talked a kind of heart's language to the foreigner" (underline mine; 294). This passage suggests that one need not to be fluent in foreign language to achieve a mutual understanding. What Phoebe and Clifford possess and Holgrave does not in their reading and understanding of others is sympathy,

warmth in heart.

Holgrave's transformation into a sympathetic reader takes place in three steps: (1) his act of reading the Alice Pyncheon story; (2) his triumph over the temptation to mesmerize Phoebe; (3) the euphoria he experiences under the moonlight. Moreover, the narrator suggests that Holgrave has started to acquire some sort of human warmth right before he starts reading the story: "it was a pleasant sight to behold this young man, with so much faith in himself, and so fair an appearance of admirable powers ... it was pleasant to see him in his kindly intercourse with Phoebe. Her thought had scarcely done him justice, when it pronounced him cold; or if so, he had grown warmer, now" (underline mine; 181–2). As the underlined part implies, Holgrave is now psychologically ready to undergo the transformation process.

Hutner explains how reading of the story operates on Holgrave's mind: "the secret that Holgrave discloses to himself is conveyed through his act of reading. Yet that reading is really a rereading of his story and his biography that leads him to reconcieve the very meaning of his secret and the very basis of sympathy" (82). In order to fully understand the story that conveys the essence of his secret, Holgrave must read it with sympathy because, as stated before, the Alice Pyncheon tale is a mise-en-abyme romance, and according to Hutner, sympathy is "the requisite condition" of reception for Hawthornian romances (88). If sympathy is a prerequisite for the harmonious mutual readings between the characters, the reader must read the romance sympathetically in order to reach "a high truth" through a "subtile process," because, as discussed in the first section, the way the characters read each other is the model of how we too achieve a penetrative romance reading.

After overcoming the temptation, the completion of Holgrave's transformation is figuratively indicated by "sprinkling dews and liquid

moonlight." "Here and there, a few drops of this freshness were scattered on a human heart, and gave it youth again, and sympathy with the eternal youth of nature. The artist [Holgrave] chanced to be one, on whom the reviving influence fell" (underlines mine; 213). Holgrave expresses the change in his mood, saying, "After all what a good world we live in! How good, and beautiful! How young it is, too, with nothing really rotten or age-worn in it!" (214). Phoebe, who has already been a sympathetic reader, gains even more wisdom by "a charm of romance" (213):

> "I have been happier than I am now—at least, much gayer," said Phoebe thoughtfully. "Yet I am sensible of a great charm in this brightening moonlight .... I never cared so much about moonlight before. What is there, I wonder, so beautiful in it, to-night? ....
>
> "..... It seems as if I had looked at everything, hitherto, in broad daylight, or else in the ruddy light of a cheerful fire, glimmering and dancing through a room. Ah, poor me! .... I have grown a great deal older, in this little time. Older, and, I hope, wiser, and—not exactly sadder—but, certainly, with not half so much lightness in my spirits!" (underlines mine; 214)

Hawthorne here consciously connects the sudden shift of her mood with his notion of romance as defined in his preface. Having gone through Alice's story together with Holgrave, it is the "atmospherical medium" that "mellow[s] the lights and deepen and enrich the shadows" (1) of Phoebe's psyche. She becomes deeper, fuller, and more romantic. Critics tend to focus on Holgrave's conversion only, but the text clearly presents that the couple's transformation is mutual and complementary. Hawthorne demands his reader to make more efforts than the novel reader does. And the desirable modes of

reading are represented in his characters' attempt to gain better knowledge of their spiritual reality.

In *The House of the Seven Gables*, the characters who successfully demonstrate their ability of sympathetic reading win the narrator's favor. They are rewarded with maturity, companionship and harmonious happiness. In the book, the sympathetic readers—Phoebe, Holgrave, Hepzibah, and Clifford—form a sort of harmonious community. When such characters win the reader's favor likewise, the reader hopes to join the circle of sympathetic readers, which now becomes expanded to the meta-narrative level embracing Hawthorne and his attentive readers.

The only main character who does not read others is Judge Pyncheon. This exception is significant to understand the idea of the harmonious community formed in the romance. He is, in fact, ostracized from the community of mutual reading. This narrative strategy of not allowing Judge Pyncheon to read others confirms his position as a definitive villain in the romance while others are depicted more roundly with virtues and flaws.[12] What convinces the reader that Judge Pyncheon is evil is not simply the characters' dislike for him, nor even the narrator's lengthy description of his appearance for the purpose of revealing his true inner being, but ultimately, I argue, the narrator's strategic exclusion of Judge Pyncheon from the circle of readers. While all other characters, including the disembodied narrator, are engaged in the same activity as us the reader, Judge Pyncheon never joins the activity. On the contrary, he is the textual violator; he fabricates and distorts legal documents to trap Clifford. He becomes a moral failure due to his failure to read others. In other words, morality and spiritual reality, which Hawthorne invites his reader to pursue, belong within the network of mutual readings and understandings.

Interpretation, or "reading of others," is essentially a moral activity because a moral depends on causality, and therefore, must have a meaning.[13] Interpretation is, however, a kind of translation, which bears a risk of oversimplification. A series of didactic interpretations would cause to demean the romance leaving only an "ostensible" moral behind. The subtile morality, a high truth, a complex entity of morality, or what emerges above the network of mutual sympathetic readings, lies extremely close to the pure representation or the text of romance per se. On the other hand, Hawthorne cannot accept the opposite end of the spectrum against the "ostensible" didacticism—that is, the aesthetic autonomy of the romance—because if a romance does not have any relation to social reality, its representation has no meaning and therefore the romance is amoral. No matter how much Hawthorne stresses that departure from reality is requisite for romance, a romance must correspond to the reality to bear any meaning. Between the ostensible didacticism and aesthetic autonomy, Hawthorne would locate himself, I assume, somewhere very close, infinitely close to aesthetic autonomy. James K. Folsom articulates a similar yet distinctive view as follows: "The moral dimension of Hawthorne's art ... becomes an aesthetic means to suggest the multiplicity of motives and explanations inherent in any human action, yet this moral dimension is purposely divorced from any final interpretation in terms of an ultimate Reality" (19). Folsom suggests that the moral dimension of Hawthorne's art manifests only through his aesthetic representation:

> Hawthorne uses moral and ethical concepts not with the end in view of weighing their various merits and shortcomings in order to choose the best one, but rather with the intention of showing that each, like his "ambiguous" symbols, is only an aspect of his underlying artistic

> preoccupation, which is the presentation in symbolic terms of that diversity underlying the apparent unity which observers always find in their own, personal, subjective interpretation of experience. (22)

But considering his Faith and his strong desire for meanings and consequently, morals—no matter how ambiguous they are—it is impossible to imagine Hawthorne giving himself completely to aesthetic autonomy. For him, such autonomy would be a nihilistic abyss of skepticism with no human sympathy.[14] In his tales and romances, we recognize glimpses of dark signs to indicate the temptation to fall into the abyss. Hawthorne might peek into the darkness, but he maintains his poise "fairly, finely, skillfully" at the verge of pure representation.

* * *

In this essay, I have explored various acts of reading in *The House of the Seven Gables,* assuming that the romance instructs the reader how to read Hawthornian romances in general. In conclusion, this essay tries to demonstrate that the preferable mode of reading indicated in the text is "sympathetic" reading, and that the likable characters create a harmonious community of "sympathetic readers." But what exactly makes a reader "sympathetic"? In the historic context of sentimental novels in the nineteenth century, what defines the Hawthornian sympathy? Reading the book, one might describe it "warmth in heart" to put it quite simply. Gordon Hutner, for instance, does not venture much further, based on the versatility of the word in Hawthorne's fiction. The notion of sympathy in Hawthorne's works calls for further analyses.

Notes

1 This essay is based on the paper read on October 16th at the 43rd annual conference of the American Literature Society of Japan at Konan University.

2 Susan Van Zanten Gallagher clearly demonstrates that the reading of *Seven Gables* shifts depending on the reader's preoccupation and socio-historical background (1–13). Hyatt W. Waggoner's discussion revolves around the possibility of multiple interpretations (160–187).

3 Note that several chapters in the book have contrastive structures: "May and November" (Phoebe and Hepzibah), "The Pyncheon of Today" (Colonel Pyncheon and Judge Pyncheon), "The Scowl and Smile" (Hepzibah and Judge Pyncheon), and so forth. A conventional reading of these chapters invites us to contrast two distinct characters compared within the chapters. But if we pay attention to the narrator's shift in points of view and words of perception applied to the characters, it becomes clear that these chapters are the mutual reading sessions of selected characters.

4 James K. Folsom states that the critics have generally had two opposing views about the ethical dimensions of Hawthorne's fictions: didactic fiction of ethical parables and fiction of intentional and artful ambiguity (18).

5 See Bell ix–xvi and Waggoner 160.

6 Michael Jay Bunker Noble discusses the relation between Hawthorne's idea of the "romantic imagination" and the mirror imagery, especially the daguerreotype (72–74).

7 e.g.:"[The characters] are all figures rather than characters—they are all pictures rather than persons" (125). "Hepzibah Pyncheon is a masterly picture. I repeat that she is a picture, as her companions are pictures; she is a charming piece of descriptive writing rather than a dramatic exhibition" (126). "Judge Pyncheon is an ironical portrait ... the portrait of a superb-full-blown hypocrite, a large-based, full-nurtured Pharisee..." (128).

8 I would also add "from memory to oblivion" to the list, that is to look ahead instead of looking behind. From Clifford's enthusiastic speech on the train to the ending, the positive aspect of "leaving the past behind" is underlined.

Among those who discuss the shift in the narrative but in different context from Bell's are Lewis B. Horne and Clark Griffith. They both focus on the temporal and spacial shifts, which support my addition mentioned above.

9 Charles Swann also explores the possibilities of the photograph as "the recorder and interpreter of appearances" in *Seven Gables* (7–9).

10 Swann, among others, notes the democratic virtue of the daguerreotype (8–9).

11 Francis Joseph Battaglia attempts to explain that Holgrave's conversion is a natural consequence (79–90). Von Abele defends Holgrave, arguing he is an aesthetic symbol rather than an economic one.

12 "[Judge Pyncheon] is also the most unambiguous figure in this romance. There is doubt as to who its hero and its heroine are, but there is no doubt that Judge Pyncheon is the villain" (Marks 355).

13 Adam Zachary Newton maintains that ethical discourse often depends on narrative structures (8).

14 William Scheick's interesting essay lets us see what sort of skeptic darkness Hawthorne was facing. He discusses the influence of David Hume's skeptical empiricism on personal identity in *Seven Gables*. "Hawthorne was an artist divided between a conscious philosophical agreement with eighteenth-century empirical thought (in which meanings are fixed) and an unconscious instinctual agreement with nineteenth-century Romantic thought (in which meanings are open-ended)" (131). Humean empiricism refutes "the possibility that the perceiving mind can ever 'really' know" the external world. Applying the idea to the romance, Scheick argues that the book tells us the characters, the narrator, the author and the reader of *Seven Gables* are hollow beings who fail to perceive their identity, and death is the central threat or the reason for our impossibility to define our identity (131–154).

Works Cited

Battaglia, Francis Joseph. "*The House of the Seven Gables*: New Light on Old Problems," *PMLS* 82 1967: 579–90.

Bell, Michael Davitt. Introduction. *The House of the Seven Gables*.

Boudreau, Kristin. *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from*

Jefferson to the Jameses. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2002.

Davidson, Cathy N. "Photographs of the Dead: Sherman, Daguerre, Hawthorne." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 89.4 Fall, 1990: 667–701.

Dunne, Michael. *Hawthorne's Narrative Strategies*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1995.

Fichtelberg, Joseph. *Critical Fictions: Sentiment and the American Market, 1780–1870*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2003.

Folsom, James K. *Man's Accidents and God's Purposes: Multiplicity in Hawthorne's Fiction*. New Haven: College and University P, 1964.

Griffith, Clark. "Substance and Shadow: Language and Meaning in *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Modern Philology* 51 1954: 187–95.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Blithedale Romance*. 1852. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

——. *The House of the Seven Gables*. 1851. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

——. *The Marble Faun*. 1860. New York: Penguin Books, 1990.

——. *The Scarlet Letter*. 1850. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.

Hendler, Glenn. *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2001.

Horne, Lewis B. "Of Place and Time: A Note on The House of the Seven Gables." *Studies in the Novel* 2.4 1970: 459–467.

Hutner, Gordon. *Secrets and Sympathy: Forms of Disclosure in Hawthorne's Novels*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1988.

James, Henry. *Hawthorne*. 1887. New York: AMS P, 1968.

Marks, Alfred H. "Who Killed Judge Pyncheon? The Role of the Imagination in *The House of the Seven Gables*." *PMLA* 71 1956: 355–69.

Newton, Adam Zachary. *Narrative Ethics*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.

Noble, Michael Jay Bunker. "Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Explicator* 56.2 Winter, 1998: 72–4.

Rosenthal, Bernard. Ed. *Critical Essays on Hawthorne's* The House of the Seven Gables. New York: G. K. Hall, 1995.

Rudisill, Richard. *Mirror Image: The Influence of the Daguerreotype on American Society*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1971.

Scheick, William. "The Author's Corpse and the Human Problem of Personal Identity in Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Studies in the Novel* 24.2 Summer, 1992: 131–54.

Swann, Charles. "*The House of the Seven Gables:* Hawthorne's Modern Novel of 1848." *The Modern Language Review* 86:1 Jan, 1991: 1–18.

Trachtenberg, Alan. "Seeing and Believing: Hawthorne's Reflections on the Daguerreotype in *The House of the Seven Gables*." *American Literary History*. 9.3 Fall, 1997: 460–481.

Van Zanten Gallagher, Susan. "A Domestic Reading of *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Studies in the Novel*. 21. 1 Spring 1989: 1–13.

Von Abele, Rudolph. *The Death of the Artist: A Study in Hawthorne's Disintegration*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1955.

Waggoner, Hyatt H. *Hawthorne: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1963.