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ABSTRACT

This study of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and George Sand is an analysis of selected works to 1) acquaint students of American culture with Rousseau's and Sand's works; 2) argue that Rousseau and Sand should be more seriously studied as influences on 19th century American writers; and 3) suggest that more work be done on Hawthorne's life-long interest in French literature, especially in Rousseau.

To many readers, Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand seem to have little in common. This is in part because they are so little studied in America by students of American literature and culture and because of our usual biographical orientation to their names and works. Usually, Rousseau is the advocate of the noble savage, primitive virtue in exotic natural retreats, and man's basic goodness; Hawthorne is the author of gloomy, sin-haunted stories of man's moral ambiguity and basic depravity; and Sand is the radical feminist, the ogress-lover of Chopin-Liszt-Musset, or the hack writer of sentimental novels.

However, when the texts of the works of these three authors are studied carefully and are viewed in the light of recent criticism such as Starobinsky's study of Rousseau, La Transparence et l'Obstacle, Stewart's Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Pierre Salomon's introductions to
the Classique Garnier editions of Sand's works, a different view emerges. These three authors tried to synthesize the diverse social, moral, and psychological changes of their times--both positive and negative--into a wholeness or system.

The philosophic system which is so similar in the writings of Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand consists of three states or conditions. All are moral-social states and all are realized in the lives of people who are closely related, especially men and women.

As these authors portray human relations in the state of nature or innocence, they either leave the individual single or place him or her in a primary love unit of two people together. Relations in this state are characterized by transparency, light, chastity or fidelity, open communication, natural simplicity, and health. Hawthorne's "The Great Stone Face," "The New Adam and Eve," and The House of the Seven Gables; Rousseau's Émile and the first and second Discourses and the first parts of La Nouvelle Héloïse and the Confessions; and Sand's Consuelo and La Mare au Diable are examples of works which portray transparent and healthy human relations in the State of Nature.

In the state of society or war, these authors establish unstable human environments with triangular sets of characters in which opacity and destructive communications are typical. This configuration is here called the ménage à trois and is broadly defined as any set of three characters tied closely together with or without sexual relations. Male-female and other human relations in this second state are characterized by opacity, masks, veils, darkness,
non-communication, social evil, sickness and death. Hawthorne's "Rappaccini's Daughter," The Scarlet Letter, and The Blithedale Romance; Rousseau's Confessions and La Nouvelle Héloïse; and Sand's Indiana and Jacques are examples of writings which portray human relations in the State of War.

Finally, in the higher moral or natural state, these writers resolve the triangles by reducing the characters to a single condition or to the primary love unit. They also allow the masks and veils to drop or they put light on the darkness. This state is characterized by a mature transparency and harmony, and, sometimes, happiness. Hawthorne's "Feathertop," "The Great Carbuncle," and The Marble Faun; Sand's François le Champi and Mauprat; and Rousseau's Contrat Social and Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire are examples of human relations in the Higher Moral State.
CHAPTER I

Introduction

The one-hundred years from 1760 to 1860 were years of tremendous change and upheaval in France and America and in the Western world. The Enlightenment with its celebration of reason, the scientific method, and scepticism; the eighteenth and nineteenth century political revolutions; the development of technology, industrialism, and materialism and the accumulation of capital; the decay of the aristocracies throughout Europe and the rise of the bourgeoisie and the common man; the emergence of a mass reading public and of efficient printing technology; the demands of women for rights and reform; and the volcanic expressions of individuality and feeling of the Romantic and Sentimental movements were some of these forces of change.

During these years, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and George Sand were three important thinkers and writers. Unlike most of their contemporaries who were either celebrants of the new world or Jeremiahs prophesying doom or whose interests were specifically social, intellectual, or religious, these three authors tried to synthesize the diverse changes of the times--both positive and negative--into a wholeness or system. They had a moral orientation to all of these issues and changes, and they shared an interest
in the drama of the human heart, a drama they could portray only when it was restricted to select individuals who were few in number and intimately associated. Synthesists, moralists, humanists, these three authors, more perhaps than any writers or thinkers in those one hundred years, with the exception of the Russian Dostoevsky, have embodied the whole "truth" of the human experience in those times of upheaval in their works.

The philosophic system or wholeness which is so surprisingly similar in the writings of Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand consists of three states or stages or conditions. All are moral-social states and all are demonstrated or realized in the lives of people who are closely related, especially men and women. As they portray human relations in the states of nature or innocence, they either leave the individual single or place him or her in a primary love unit of two people together alone. Relations in this state are characterized by transparency, light, chastity or fidelity, open communication, natural simplicity, and health. Hawthorne's "The Great Stone Face," "The New Adam and Eve," and The House of the Seven Gables; Rousseau's Émile and the first and second Discours as well as the first parts of La Nouvelle Héloïse and Les Confessions; and Sand's Consuelo and La Petite Fadette are examples of works which embody transparent and healthy human relations, especially between men and women, in the State of Nature.

As these three authors portray human relations in the state of society or war, they establish unstable human environments in which opacity and destructive communications are typical by making
triangular sets of characters. This configuration is here called the ménage à trois and is broadly defined to mean any set of three characters tied closely together with or without sexual relations. Male-female and other human relations in this second state are characterized by opacity, masks, veils, darkness, non-communication, social evil, sickness and death. Hawthorne's "Rappaccini's Daughter," The Scarlet Letter, and The Blithedale Romance; Rousseau's Confessions and La Nouvelle Héloïse; and Sand's Indiana and Jacques are examples of writings which portray human relations in the State of Society.

Finally, as they portray human relations, especially male-female relations, in the higher moral or natural state, these writers either resolve the triangles by reducing the number of characters, returning to either a single condition of solitude or to the primary love unit now distinguished by moral awareness and mature knowledge; or, they allow the masks and veils to drop or put light on the darkness, thereby resolving the triangles by separating the characters into a primary love unit plus a solitary friend with all living in transparency and harmony and, sometimes, happiness. Hawthorne's "The Great Carbuncle," "Feathertop," and The Marble Faun; Sand's La comtesse de Rudolstadt and Mauprat; and Rousseau's Contrat Social and Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire are examples of human relations in the Higher Moral State.

The method of this dissertation will be a combination of general literary-philosophical analysis and specific textual study. The central concern and scope is the meaning embodied in the
literary works themselves, with little reference either to the authors' lives or to historic influences not a part of the specific works. My intention, specifically, is to establish the fact of similarity between these three authors. Certainly the conclusions reached in this study have important larger implications for students of the Enlightenment, French and American Romanticism, and social-intellectual movements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but those larger implications are only suggested, not developed here.

I realize the need to make such a study legitimate since most readers will be surprised, some even perplexed, with the idea of associating Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand. Readers might wonder how Hawthorne's world of guilt, human frailty and sinfulness, and moral ambiguity relates to Rousseau's world of the noble savage, natural goodness, and sentimentality, or how either relates to Sand's domain of radical feminism, social and revolutionary zeal, and romantic-pastoral idealism. Certainly, in our usual conceptions of the life styles, philosophies, and literary talents of these three writers, they do seem incompatible.

Yet, information does exist which justifies such a study.

For instance, other scholars have suggested relations between the ideas and writings of these three authors. Both Edward Wagenknecht and Charles M. Lombard speak of similarities between Hawthorne's novels, especially *The Blithedale Romance* and *The Marble Faun*, and the works of George Sand.¹ Lombard even suggests that Sand may have been the model for Hawthorne's Zenobia in *The Blithedale*
As to possible relations between Hawthorne and Rousseau, two scholars have pointed specifically at similarities between *La Nouvelle Héloïse* and *The Scarlet Letter*. Leslie Fiedler calls attention to the basic plot and character "pattern" of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* which he sees repeated in *The Scarlet Letter*. Vernon Loggins is more explicit:

Hawthorne found in Heloise the plot for *The Scarlet Letter*. He shifted the drama to seventeenth-century Boston. M. de Wolmar became Roger Chillingworth, Julie d'Etanges became Hester Prynne, and Saint-Preux became Arthur Dimmesdale.

Two studies of the specific similarities between the ideas and works of Rousseau and Sand exist and, even though they seem to come to different conclusions as to how direct Rousseau's influence was on Sand or how literally she followed his philosophies, they show that the Sand-Rousseau question is certainly a legitimate one.

In addition to these scholarly suggestions, we can further appreciate the validity of associating Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand by knowing the similarities in Hawthorne's and Sand's early personal histories, by seeing the importance of Rousseau's works in both of their lives, and by understanding the influence of Rousseau and Sand in literary and intellectual circles in early and mid-nineteenth century America.

Both Nathaniel Hawthorne and Amantine-Lucille-Aurore Dupin (George Sand) were born in 1804. This was twenty-six years after Rousseau's death in 1778, but the social and human issues of the Revolutions of 1776 and 1789 which were so much a part of Rousseau's
world were still fermenting in these early years of the nineteenth century. Nathaniel and Aurore were born into a world of change which Rousseau had felt and experienced in its early stages.

When Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo, Belgium in 1815, Aurore and Nathaniel were eleven years old. In 1819 the fifteen-year-old Hawthorne was reading La Nouvelle Héloïse, one of the few "Best Sellers" of the day, which he described as "admirable." Two years later, Aurore Dupin, after returning to her ancestral home at Nohant in Berry from her education in an English convent in Paris, also read Émile and La Nouvelle Héloïse and was becoming a total and life-long disciple of a man she had heard about in family tradition since her early childhood.

Thus, in the early 1830's, fifty or so years after Rousseau's death, as Emerson published Nature and Victor Hugo produced "Hernandi," both Aurore, who is now married to Casimir Dudevant, has left him and her son to go to Paris, and who has now assumed the name of George Sand, and Hawthorne who has returned to Salem after his graduation from Bowdoin College in Maine and is living with his mother and sister--were both becoming established writers. Sand had written Indiana and Valentine in 1832, Lélia and Jacques in 1833, Lettres d'un Voyageur in 1834, André in 1835, and Simon and Mauprat in 1836. He had written Fanshawe in 1828, and of the twenty-seven or so short stories he wrote between 1830 and 1836 these are noteworthy: "The Gentle Boy," "My Kinsman, Major Molineux," and "Roger Malvin's Burial" in 1832; and "The May-pole of Merry Mount" and "The Minister's Black Veil" in 1836.
It is important to emphasize the extent and variety of these early writings because if we look closely at these titles we notice that among these works are some of the best both writers composed. For Sand these early writings were among her best both aesthetically and intellectually; for Hawthorne these early stories contained both some of his best writing and the germs of his later masterpieces. It is also enlightening to see how early in both of their careers these excellent works were written and how consistent with the ideas presented in them later pieces would be. I suggest, therefore, that their early reading of Rousseau and the early maturity of their works should be more carefully studied for specific similarities in social and moral philosophy and literary technique.

Rousseau and Sand had significant vogue in early and mid-nineteenth century social, intellectual, and literary circles in America. Despite the confusing fact that in the books of over forty major interpretors and historians of the American mind and of American intellectual and literary traditions there is no serious sustained mention of Rousseau's influence, it can be shown that he did have an important impact. Admittedly, as a political theoretician Rousseau's practical influence on the founding fathers, even on Jefferson, was slight. However, as McNeil and others suggest, there was a literary and social cult founded on Rousseau's more philosophic, sociological, and literary works like *Emile*, the *Confessions*, and *La Nouvelle Héloïse*. As opposed to the fading of
his political influence after his death, Rousseau's literary and social impact increased. At the core of his writing is a moral or religious fervor which combines with social prescriptions and a passionate quest for honesty and truth that continued to be very influential. McNeil says of this socio-literary cult, "The cult of Voltaire declined after his death, yet just the opposite was true of Rousseau. It was the religious aspect of the cult of Jean-Jacques Rousseau that now helped to raise it to new heights."  

In America, as Spurlin says, by the end of the century, "there are indications here and there that [Rousseau] had a certain prestige in the United States." Émile was even more popular than La Nouvelle Héloïse, which was "runner-up to the best sellers like Gulliver's Travels and the plays of Shakespeare and to the best sellers of American novelists such as Susanna Rowson's Charlotte Temple and Hannah Foster's The Coquette." After Voltaire, Rousseau was the most popular French writer. Thus, we see how popular his Émile and La Nouvelle Héloïse were in America. Hare, in his dissertation on Rousseau's influence on Charles B. Brown, notes:

Rousseau's novel the Nouvelle Héloïse was by all odds the most popular work of the eighteenth century. In the years from the time of its first appearance, in 1761, to the end of the century, there were at least six editions in French, many of them pirated; and there were nine translated English editions. There was at least one Philadelphia edition (1796). 

Because Spurlin and Jones conclude their studies of Rousseau and France and America around 1815, they contribute to the idea of a break in historical continuity at that time. We sense from these writers that Burke's and John Adams's conservative denunciations,
that the cooling of American-French relations during Washington's presidency, and that America's great desire at the close of the War of 1812 to get back to business effectively destroyed Rousseauism in America. This, however, is a misunderstanding of Rousseau's moral and social impact on the 19th century. A scholar who sees French influence bridging this "gap" is Charles Lombard, and his excellent book, French Romanticism on the Frontier, gives a sense of perspective much needed in this matter.

After 1800, Lombard says, "despite a general distrust of the French writers of the Enlightenment, who were held directly responsible for the excesses of the Revolution, the literature of France by no means lost its hold on the American mind." American Deism, he explains, was very compatible with the religious quality of Rousseau's works. "The general mood of the second Great Awakening (c. 1795-1835) with its emphasis on personal religious experience had in some respects much in common with Rousseauism." After quoting a statement of William E. Channing which shows his positive response to "Rousseau's Eloise," Lombard shows that magazines and preachers of the period "who would understandably reject Rousseau's theology" interpreted "the praise of religion in La Nouvelle Héloïse and Émile as an argument for personal religious experience."

We can also refer to major American thinkers and writers of this period to show that Rousseau was in vogue. Charles B. Brown, as he wrote his Henrietta fragment in 1801, "dreamed of himself as an American Rousseau" and it is this writer, so much "at home in
Rousseau's mind," that Hawthorne read early and whom he praised in his story "The Hall of Fantasy." William Ellery Channing said of La Nouvelle Héloïse in 1799: "I have been reading Rousseau's Eloise. What a writer! Rousseau is the only French author I have ever read who knew the way to the heart." As a witness of Rousseau's influence, Channing's Self-Culture (1838) is clearly in the tradition of Rousseau's Émile.

Margaret Fuller Ossoli while in Paris in 1847 got to touch the yellow and faded manuscripts of one of Rousseau's works and she wrote, "I seemed to feel the fire of youth, immortality flowing, more and more expansive, with which his soul has pervaded this century. He was the precursor of all we most prize." That is high praise and the statement "his soul has pervaded this century" very much to our point. Ralph Waldo Emerson read and made both positive and negative comments in his journals on Émile, the Confessions, and the Contrat Social. Herman Melville sought a copy of Rousseau's Confessions, in England in 1849, and although there is no indication Thoreau ever read Rousseau directly, several studies of the two suggest close correspondences. Finally, Walt Whitman, although he did read the Contrat Social and parts of the Confessions, was not directly influenced by Rousseau but nevertheless took Rousseau's doctrines whole as he directly absorbed and used in his poetry George Sand's Consuelo and La comtesse de Rudolstadt.

As to Hawthorne's reading in French and study of Rousseau, in his French and Italian Notebooks (volume X of the complete works, p.
12) under the heading "Hotel de Louvre, January 6, 1858," Hawthorne writes: "If they would speak slowly and distinctly I might understand them well enough, being perfectly familiar with the written language, and knowing the principles of its pronunciation." Whatever his speaking and aural ability, his reading capability seems well developed. At age fourteen or so (about 1818) he read well enough in French to be able to read Voltaire and Rousseau. His sister Elizabeth recalled:

When my brother was about fourteen he wrote me a list of the books he had been reading. There were a good many of them; but I only remember such of the Waverley Novels as he had not previously read, and as were then published, and Rousseau's Heloise and his Confessions. . . . 28

Lathrop also records that "He is known to have read before fourteen, more or less of Rousseau's works. . . ." 29 Jane Lundblad adds to our information when she refers to "a little scrap of paper" which Hawthorne wrote at about fifteen years of age on which it says, "Rousseau's Eloisa which is admirable." 30 Warren in his "Hawthorne's Reading" says, "Before fourteen, Hawthorne had also become acquainted with Froissart, with Clarendon's History, and with some Waverley novels, with much of Rousseau, . . ." 31

A few years later, as Kesselring records:

Throughout 1829, 1830 and 1831, Hawthorne apparently planned a course in French literature for himself. The names of Montaigne, Rousseau, Richelieu, Fenelon, Racine, Corneille and Maintenon recur in the Charge-Books. . . . 32

This is called the "Athenaeum Period" in Hawthorne's life because he and his sister Elizabeth were drawing heavily from the Athenaeum Library in Salem, Massachusetts. Elizabeth recalled of
her brother, "He read such French books as the library contained, there were not many except Voltaire's and Rousseau's." The most complete indication of exactly what he checked out is the list in Kesselring which shows that between 1829 and 1830 and again in 1848 Hawthorne checked out sixteen or so separate volumes of Rousseau's works, several of them two and three times. Warren, however, suggests that Hawthorne may have been reading more French literature than the lists would indicate:

The Athenaeum lists cannot, however, be taken as a complete index to Hawthorne's reading during the decade in which he was most free to explore. For example, when Miss Elizabeth Peabody made his acquaintance, in 1836, he had, though he had not drawn them from Salem's chief library, read all of Balzac's work which had then appeared. Later, in 1848, while he was living back in Salem after several years at the Old Manse in Concord, Massachusetts, he "borrowed four volumes of Rousseau." This is important because this was the post-Custom-House era and the time during which he wrote The Scarlet Letter. The final comment on Hawthorne's life-long interest in Rousseau is made in his French and Italian Notebooks wherein he records his feelings as he visits Clarens in 1859:

I read Rousseau's romance [La Nouvelle Héloïse] with great sympathy, when I was hardly a boy; ten years ago, or thereabouts, I tried to read it again without success; but I think, from my feeling of yesterday, that it still retains its hold on my imagination.

From Hawthorne's earliest reading experiences in 1818 to his mature reading and his experiences in Europe in 1859, Rousseau was one of the select authors who retained their "hold" on his imagination.
We can conclude, therefore, that Rousseau's ideas seem to have been more current in social, philosophical and literary circles in American than has hitherto been recognized. Also, there seem to be reasons enough for a specific investigation into Rousseau's influence on Nathaniel Hawthorne.

Now we turn to the question of George Sand's influence in nineteenth-century America. That she did have influence and that there are similarities between her writings and those of Hawthorne is suggested by the assumptions behind a comment in The Church Review which appeared upon the publication of The Scarlet Letter. The reviewer says, "We have had imitations enough of George Sand." That this is the comparison that would come into the reviewer's mind and that he would assume that others would understand his relating Hawthorne to Sand is very important to this study. Following this lead, when one pursues the whole question of Sand's influence in America and the influence of the French Romantic writers, a significant world opens up. Charles Lombard in his articles on Whitman and Hugo and on the treatment in American periodical literature of George Sand, along with the studies of others like Howard M. Jones and George Joyoux, gives us important details. These studies show that French Romantic writers such as Mme de Stael, Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Victor Cousin, Hugo, and George Sand were not only read extensively by Americans generally, but were also read and discussed specifically by writers and intellectuals closely associated with Hawthorne.
Scholars such as Lombard, Joyaux, and Albert Rabinovitz have shown how much discussion there was of George Sand during this period. Statements on her by Margaret Fuller Ossoli, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Orestes Brownson, Sam Ward, and Julia Ward Howe show that her specific social, moral, and literary impact was significant and is worthy of more careful study. 39

Emerson, Fuller, Hawthorne's sister-in-law Elizabeth Peabody, and Hawthorne's associates at Brook Farm who published The Harbinger were all directly involved with Hawthorne, who was intimately involved in American politics, especially with the "Young America" movement. 40 Thus, it is not hard to understand why he refers overtly and positively to Sand in The Blithedale Romance and why it might be possible to argue that Zenobia is patterned after Sand.

However, this is not an influence study directly. The point is that George Sand, like Rousseau, had a stature in the American social, literary, and philosophical world which surrounded Hawthorne that we usually do not recognize today. That Henry James would write four large and essentially positive reviews of her life and works--as many pages as he wrote on Hawthorne--suggests her literary stature. Julia Ward Howe in her Atlantic Monthly article on Sand also attests to the social significance of her works. To propose, therefore, that it might be fruitful to search Sand's words for ideas and techniques similar to those of an important American writer such as Hawthorne should not now seem strange. The moral, social, and literary ideas of Rousseau and Sand were available to Hawthorne in America, and he
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was closely related to the social, political, and literary circles where these French influences were most discussed and respected.

There are other ways, besides those of general influence, which suggest that it might be legitimate to associate Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand. One of these is to see how the critical interpretations of these writers, especially of Rousseau and Hawthorne, are changing. Another is to look closely at each of the three writers' views on basic human nature.

The traditional approach to Rousseau's works is extremely biography oriented. One of these interpreters, Frederick Green, says, "The force that has ensured the survival of La Nouvelle Héloïse is, therefore, extrinsic to the art of the novel since it derives mainly from the continuously felt presence of the author." These critics read Émile or La Nouvelle Héloïse or the Contrat Social with one eye, and they read Les Confessions and history books with the other. The result is a view of his writings which tends to make them events in Rousseau's life rather than literary works with an integrity of their own. This is what Green is saying when he concludes, "Unlike the genuine classics of fiction, La Nouvelle Héloïse is not a self-sufficing organism . . . because Rousseau neglected to sever the umbilical cord linking the artist with his creation." Although most other traditional biographers are more kind in their analysis than Green, the basic approach is the same.

Within the past twenty-five years, however, probably as a result of the textual concern of the New Critics, the recent
application of psychological knowledge to literary criticism, and the existential mood of modern criticism, a different approach to Rousseau has dominated the monographs and articles on him. These studies began with the publication of Jean Starobinski's *La Transparence et l'Obstacle* (1957) which studied images of transparency and opacity in Rousseau's works and then used these findings to generalize concerning Rousseau's perception of the world. This was a radical departure from the usual biography orientation of the past. These studies have increased in number and influence since. Perhaps Lester G. Crocker's two volume biography which proceeds from an analysis of the writing to the meaning of Rousseau's life is the textual approach taken to its extreme.

What has happened here is a shift from an interest in Rousseau's life to an interest in the moral, social, and literary truth of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* or *Émile*. Rousseau the artist has come front stage and Rousseau the man has moved behind the curtains. Studies of the *Confessions* such as the excellent article by J. Voisine, "Self-Ridicule in 'Les Confessions,'" show Rousseau's deliberate posing, balancing, distorting, and arranging of the facts for effect, and thus such articles demonstrate that these supposed confessions are as much a work of the creative imagination as they are autobiography.

I may be accused of equivocating when I say that I choose to borrow from both traditions, yet, because of their very nature, I think it important to distinguish Rousseau's literary from his
philosophical and theoretical works. I agree with Green, Morley, Ellis and others in their careful and close linking of Émile and the Contrat Social with Rousseau's life. Both of these works are philosophical in purpose and only make sense when kept within the bounds of Rousseau's declared intentions. I do not agree with Crocker and Marshall Berman and others who proceed to interpret Émile and the Contrat Social from meanings they have discovered in La Nouvelle Héloïse. They push Émile and the Contrat Social into contemporary totalitarian, or existential, or behaviorist meanings and Rousseau's intentions get lost in the transfer. Both Crocker and Berman, however, do an exciting critical job in their studies of La Nouvelle Héloïse and Les Confessions. With Starobinski, Ronald Grimsley, and many others of this newer trend, I find La Nouvelle Héloïse complex and ambiguous in its characterization and profound in its insight into moral and social meanings of human relations. To limit the study of this novel, of the Confessions, or of certain other works more imaginative than political or theoretical in nature such as the Dialogues and the Rêveries to events in Rousseau's life or to his own perceptions or descriptions of what these works mean is to deny Rousseau's creative abilities and to deny the ambiguity of the literary medium. Green does exactly that when he says, "Rousseau did not possess the talent that enables the born novelist to depart from the pattern traced by his own life and to create situations which, though imaginary, yet bear the stamp of reality." I consider that an inadequate perception of Rousseau's literary work.
I would argue that when Rousseau speaks philosophically and theoretically he should be taken at his word, but when he shifts into the literary form he should be allowed all of the license that the form makes possible. The social and moral meaning of the first kind of work is overt and its problems are those of definition and logic; the social and moral meanings of the second kind, however, are covert and the problems are worked out in images, characterization, tone and plot.

The issue with traditional Hawthorne scholarship is exactly the opposite from that I have described concerning Rousseau. Selecting, limiting, narrowing according to literary themes and characters and moods, traditional Hawthorne scholars have created a certain kind of author. This is not to deny the excellence of most of such studies. It is to say that as Frederick Crews dismisses many of Hawthorne's stories as "trivia" and passes them off in a footnote because they do not fit his thesis, so too do many of these writers dismiss as freaks or slips or mental shoddiness some of Hawthorne's important stories. Typical of the tone but unique in its forthrightness is this statement by Mr. John T. Frederick on several "sunny" passages in Hawthorne's American Notebooks: "It is not necessary to conclude, however, that such pietistic passages were consciously inserted in the interest of salability." Then with surprising innocence Frederick concludes, "... the notebooks of this period yield many comments similar in tone and content." Hawthorne must have wanted to sell desperately to write so many such "sunny" passages.
The traditional Hawthorne is painted as a writer of dark, pessimistic allegories which, in the Puritan or tragic traditions, demonstrate man's innate depravity, his guilt and evil, or his inherent tragic situation. One only need look at anthologies of his stories collected in short story anthologies or American literature surveys to see what is traditionally seen as "Hawthorne." Stories like "Young Goodman Brown," "The Minister's Black Veil," "My Kinsman, Major Molineux," "The Bosom-Serpent," etc. are standard, and The Scarlet Letter is his masterpiece. Dark Roger Chillingworth, guilt-ridden Arthur Dimmesdale, beautiful but morally ambiguous Hester Prynne, sin, guilt, prisons, cemeteries, scaffolds, hands on scarlet A's, ambiguity--these are the usual Hawthorne concerns. As Walter Blair says, this is "a Hawthorne withdrawn from society and from the world, aloof from their problems but driven to brood over them and to treat them fancifully."

Excellent studies such as those of Woodbury, Gorman, Warren, Waggoner, and Fogle stress this man of isolation and darkness. Other studies like that of Matthiessen and R. R. Male stress the tragic aspects of Hawthorne's vision. Frederick Crews and others of the Freudian bent paint just as dark a picture, but in terms of sex, blood, privations, and guilt.

Recently, however, there has been a change in Hawthorne scholarship with increased attention to his life, his family, and to his total writings. Walter Blair in his "Hawthorne" chapter in Eight American Authors recognizes and explains this: "To the very present two views--an earlier traditional one and a newer
interpretation--are distinguishable." He cites Randall Stewart's *Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1948) as the pioneer work because it "portrayed a more worldly, more sociable, more 'normal' figure, . . . a thinker with a positive message: 'essentially the recognition of man's fallability, the restoration of sympathy, the sharing of the common lot. Hawthorne's 'moral' comprehends the Christian doctrine of charity, the psychological doctrine of participation, the social doctrine of the democratic way.'"

Edward Wagenknecht and H. H. Hoeltje and others continue the theme of Hawthorne's essential balance and positive optimism. It should be noted that the "sunny" Hawthorne of Hoeltje's book, in particular, is perhaps positive to excess and can be seen as the far edge of the pendulum swing to the positive side.

To read and interpret Hawthorne as a writer with something besides sin and guilt on his mind is critically legitimate. This study is based on the work of those who suggest a larger, more positive Hawthorne. Newton Arvin states such a view in these words:

> His real faith . . . was in what we call the heart . . . , humanly speaking he believed in nothing else--in nothing that is, except in the capacities that equalize instead of dividing men, in the affections that draw them together, in imaginative sympathy and the sense of common brotherhood in error and suffering. His conviction is quite clear that what is wrong can be righted by nothing unless by love.51

This is the "Hawthorne" of this study. The Hawthorne whose "faith" in "affections that draw together," in love and heart, gives meaning to all of his works. Alfred H. Marks has stated the point explicitly:

Hawthorne had an absolute faith in love, between man and woman, between members of the same family, between human beings. He felt that as long as one person looks at another with love, the
idea that the other has sinned cannot enter. Where there is love there can be no sin. 52

"Where there is love there can be no sin"—that is an important statement to make concerning Hawthorne. When the emphasis is taken off from Hawthorne's darkness and pessimism and a more balanced picture drawn, the possibility of relating him to the optimistic Rousseau of the Les Charmettes and Mme de Warens period and to the pessimistic Rousseau of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* is more tenable. It is also possible in this light to compare him to a contemporary French novelist, George Sand.

Of the three writers considered in this dissertation, George Sand is, so to speak, the "unknown quantity." A reader might say, yes, Rousseau and Hawthorne I see; but, George Sand?

Again we are dealing with the question of the critical approach to be taken toward the writer. Ask people what they know of George Sand and if they know who she is they will probably rehearse for you her list of lovers such as Musset, Liszt, and Chopin, or her role in the women's movement in the early part of the nineteenth century, or perhaps her use of cigars and men's clothes and the masculine pronoun or her castigations of marriage, or maybe her associations with Lammanais, Pierre Leroux, and other French politicians and revolutionists. Then, ask them what she wrote!

As with the usual treatment of Rousseau, biography is George Sand. The critical works begin with her parentage and end with her death with all of the same names of works and dates and scattered
critical observations unsupported. Even the excellent _Lelia_ of Andre Maurois is disappointingly usual in its general disregard for careful analysis of the works themselves. This kind of emphasis leads to such disappointing statements as this by one of Sand's most recent interpreters. Of her novel _Jacques_ George Edwards says, "It was one of the least consequential of her books. . . ." Janis Glasgow, whose study of _Jacques_ forms a major part of her dissertation on "Psychological Realism in George Sand's Early Novels," makes the quality of that novel clear and also shows why this woman had such an impact on all the western world from America to England to Russia during her time.

When studies do leave the biographical mode, they focus on some aspect of her life or on some influence on her writing. Some stress her political or social involvement, others her interest in music and art, others her use of dialect, and others her relation to lovers and other writers. One looks almost in vain for serious critical analysis of the works themselves.

Aside from the dissertation by Glasgow in 1966 and the excellent introductions by Pierre Soloman and others to the works of Sand in the Garnier Classiques series, there is very little--even in French--careful textual study of her writings.

Why? The most obvious, easiest, and, some would say, most accurate answer is that her life is more interesting than her books. As a colleague of mine exclaimed, "With a life like that, who cares about the books!"
We forget that something in this woman's prose message itself had a deep and lasting effect on writers as diverse as Dostoevsky, Matthew Arnold, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Henry James. Yes, that is true, one might answer, but that was because she was a spokeswoman for feelings of a certain moment in time and that even by 1860, as her correspondence with Flaubert makes clear, she was passe; her moment came and passed. Therefore, she only has interest in relation to those times. As she herself acknowledged in 1875 or so, "Even now I practically do not exist for the younger generation of readers. I am too virtuous, too optimistic. I am out of fashion." There is certainly something in her works which is valuable only if we look at her life and times.

There is more, however. When I first read her Jacques and then Mauprat and then Indiana in French and English, I was struck with the complexity of her character relations and with the "modern" quality of her psychological insights into male-female emotional tensions and struggles. I had read in her Histoire de ma Vie of her early reading of Rousseau and these "tough" and strange character relations reminded me of those in La Nouvelle Héloïse and of recent criticism of that book. Since I was also reading in Hawthorne at the time, I began to look for correspondences and similarities there also. The realization that all three writers were using a similar philosophic system with similar patterns of human relations for the same social and moral reasons helped to set this dissertation into motion.
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Now that we can see how critics and scholarship have paved the way for a different look at all three of these writers, one essential place to look anew is at their views of man's basic nature. Our traditional idea that Rousseau thinks man naturally good, that Hawthorne sees him by nature depraved, and that Sand sees human nature as pure and ideal is a major stumbling block to the point of this study.

Many view Hawthorne as does Freisen: "Hawthorne's fictional world is created on the presupposition that man is innately evil." Eisinger agrees and says, "Hawthorne believed in innate depravity. Man was conceived in sin and could not, through his own efforts, achieve a state of grace or reach perfectibility." Kariel says that Hawthorne, like Jonathan Edwards, "found only one formula that could make life significant: the hypothesis of the original fall, of innate human depravity, of the ubiquity of sin." Frederich in The Darkened Sky says Hawthorne "vigorously rejected . . . the doctrines of the natural goodness of man and the perfectibility of man through his own efforts." These treatments of Hawthorne whether from a Christian, a tragic, or a Freudian point of view finally argue that Hawthorne saw man innately depraved, divided, or repressed.

When we turn, however, to descriptions of Hawthorne himself by his wife and son, to accounts of his life and personality by contemporaries, and to his American Notebooks, we get a definition of man's basic nature that is difficult to square with these critical conclusions.
For example, his wife Sophia, writing at Lenox in 1850 during the **Scarlet Letter** period, says of him:

Beauty and the love of it, in him, are the true culmination of the good and true, and there is no beauty to him without these bases. He has perfect dominion over himself in every respect, so that to do the highest, wisest, loveliest thing is not the least effort to him, any more than it is to a baby to be innocent... I never knew such loftiness, so simply borne... If the hours make out to reach him in his high sphere, their wings are very strong... Happy, happiest is the wife, who can bear such and so sincere testimony to her husband after eight years' intimate union... If I can only be so great, so high, so noble, so sweet, as he in any phase of my being, I shall be glad.61

We can suppose that a man could be perceived by his wife in this way and still believe man innately depraved, but at least his life is not lived as if he believed himself and his wife depraved. She says of him at an earlier time in their relationship:

What a beautiful smile he has! You know, in 'Annie's Ramble,' he says that if there is anything he prides himself upon, it is on having a smile that children love. I should think they would, indeed. There is the innocence and purity and frankness of a child's soul in it.

Then she concludes, "He has a celestial expression. It is a manifestation of the divine in human..."62

George Lathorp, Hawthorne's brother-in-law, refers to the "disagreeable gloom," "indefinable horror," "too hopeless a downfall," and "morbidness" of some of Hawthorne's stories, but, he says, "these extremes are not frequent."

It is not quite a natural twilight in which we behold these things; rather the awesome shadowiness of partial eclipse; but gleams of the healthiest sunshine withal mingle in the prevailing tint, bringing reassurance, and receiving again a rarer value from the contrast.63

Lathrop's perception of Hawthorne is such that he sees these dark
spots we find accentuated so strongly and so often in the criticism
as unnatural expressions of a man more given to the "healthiest
sunshine."

Julian Hawthorne, his son, and Elizabeth Peabody, his sister-in-law, make similar observations. She sees Hawthorne as "profoundly
social" and speaks of his excellent insights into nature and the
interest he causes when he converses. Julian, when he read his
father's books twenty or thirty years after his father's death, says
they "struck him as being but a somewhat imperfect reflection of
certain regions of his father's mind with which he had become
otherwise familiar." The books did not strike him as typically his
father's ideas but as signs, and "imperfect reflections" at that, of
one aspect of his father he had come to know otherwise.

When we turn to Hawthorne's American Notebooks, which were
written during the same period as his tales and The Scarlet Letter,
we are again surprised at the "sunny" quality of his thought. We are
almost startled if our perception of him is of depravity and gloom.
On September 18, 1842, as he floats along in the blue-green boat he
bought from Henry Thoreau, Hawthorne records:

The sky, and the clustering foliage on either hand, and the
effect of sunlight as it found its way through the shade, giving
lightsome hues in contrast with the quiet depth of the prevailing
tints—all these seemed unsurpassably beautiful, when beheld in
upper air. But, on gazing downward, there they were, the same
even to the minutest particular, yet arrayed in ideal beauty,
which satisfied the spirit incomparably more than the actual
scene. I am half convinced that the reflection is indeed the
reality—the real thing which Nature imperfectly images to our
grosser sense. At all events, the disembodied shadow is nearest
to the soul.
Is that Hawthorne writing or Thoreau? On a Sunday, September 23, 1843, Hawthorne writes these words:

There is a pervading blessing diffused all over the world. I look out of the window, and think—'Oh perfect day! Oh beautiful world!' Oh good God!' And such a day is the promise of a blissful eternity; our Creator would never have made such weather, and have given us the deep hearts to enjoy it above and beyond all thought, if He had not meant us to be immortal. It opens the gates of Heaven, and gives us glimpses far inward.66

Was he just writing for Sophia? Was he imitating and mocking? The tone of the entire passage is consistent with the above quotation and there are so many passages of a similar nature that we must conclude that he is stating his beliefs, or at least a significant portion of them, in such passages.

If he is going to speak of human evil and depravity, we would think he would do so in moments of despair and emotional-spiritual suffering. However, as he sits by his mother's bed on July 29, 1849 as she dies, he says he sees playing outside "Una of the golden locks, looking very beautiful, and so full of spirit and life that she was life itself . . . ."

And then I looked at my poor dying mother, and seemed to see that whole of human existence at once, standing in the dusty midst of it. Oh, what a mockery, if what I saw were all,—let the interval between extreme youth and dying age be filled up with what happiness it might! But God would not have made the close so dark and wretched, if there were nothing beyond; for then it would have been a fiend that created us and measured out our existence, and not God. It would be something beyond wrong, it would be insult, to be thrust out of life and annihilated in this miserable way. So, out of the very bitterness of death, I gather that sweet assurance of a better state of being.67

Whence this "sweet assurance" even in the face of miserable death if men are innately evil, and whence the beauty and innocence of the "golden" child if men are depraved? And finally, and most explicitly,
he says in an entry dated August 30, 1842—without irony or
mockery:

... it seemed as if the world was newly created, yesterday
morning; and I behold its birth; for I had risen before the sun
was over the hill, and had gone forth to fish. How instantane­
ously did all dreariness and heaviness of the earth's spirit
flit away, before one smile of the beneficent sun. This proves
that all gloom is but a dream and a shadow, and that cheerfulness
is the real truth. It required many clouds, long brooding over
us, to make us sad; but one gleam of sunshine always suffices
to cheer up the landscape.68

There is certainly more to this man's view of human nature than
depravity and sin.

In addition to such statements of his wife and family, there
are scholars who have seen his work as essentially positive. R. W. B.
Lewis in The American Adam summarizes Hawthorne's beliefs in these
words:

Beneath the sunshine that illuminates the soul's surface, he once
wrote, there is a region of horror that seems, to the inward
traveler, 'like hell itself,' and through which the self wanders
without hope; but deeper still there is a place of perfect beauty.
He was not often so certain, but that was the substance of his
guess about experience. And this is why there is always more to
the world in which Hawthorne's characters move than any one of
them can see at a glance. There is more than the surface sunshine
covering the whole horizon of the hopeful of his day or his
faction. . . . But there is more too, much more, than the
darkness, the monsters, and the divers shapes which tormented
the souls of the lost and the guilty. . . . There was still some
fulfillment of the spirit, some realization of the entire self
which it was worth losing one's self to find. . . .69

That is a wise and accurate appraisal. Roy R. Male, within his
der'inition of tragedy, also shows Hawthorne as a writer of balance.

Male concludes by saying:

In Hawthorne's view no automatic formula suffices for meeting
problems of the spirit. In this imperfect world some rise by
sin and some fall by virtue. . . . Dimmesdale ascends as a
consequence of his sin; Young Goodman Brown's dying hour is
gloom. Like Dimmesdale, Donatello rises spiritually and intel­
lectually, although his flesh is incarcerated; Ethan Brand
plunges into the pit. In order to develop his full human
potential, man must become fully involved with time yet retain
his unique ability to stand aside from its fleeting onrush and
contemplate the eternal.70

Some rise, some fall, and there does not seem to be the neat logic
of innate depravity to explain it. H. H. Hoeltje's very affirmative
view of Hawthorne is summarized in these lines, "Hawthorne's view,
in short, was one of firm faith in man's spiritual destiny."71 To
this we can add another statement of balance like this of Wagenknecht's,
"There was a dark side to him, but he faced the light. If there was
a potential Ethan Brand in him or a young Goodman Brown, he watched
him and guarded against him and strangled him."72 It appears, then,
that "inextricably interwoven with his faith in Providence was
Hawthorne's faith in the immortality of man."73

On a more technical level, as Henry Fairbanks demonstrates
in "Sin, Free Will, and 'Pessimism' in Hawthorne," we can say that
Hawthorne "located sin in man's will, not in man's nature."74 Man
does not sin by nature but by will, by choice, and however much
"original sin" may make the human condition gloomy, man is not by
nature depraved. On the contrary, Fairbanks says of Hawthorne, "he
was anything but an unmitigated pessimist. There is more sympathy
than cynicism in his works. And there is no misanthropy."75
Hawthorne saw the "unnatural fragmentation of the personality" as "the
great fact of the modern world."76 This is the imbalance of head and
heart that is spoken of so often in Hawthorne scholarship. As
Fairbanks says in "Hawthorne and the Nature of Man," Hawthorne identified "human perversity with aberrations from a naturally established order between heart and head, and "he locates human excellence where the balanced relationship prevails." 

Balance or wholeness, then, of the human personality is Hawthorne's answer to the question of human sin and evil:

The wholeness which had been lost in man's isolation from God, from Nature, and from his fellow man, had been lost in man's nature, too. The inner world of mind and heart, no less than the outer world of society, showed signs of breaking up under the divisive pressures of the nineteenth century.

Wholeness is the original nature of man, not sin and depravity, in Hawthorne's view.

Hawthorne's protest and portrayal of this "breaking up" which "turned men . . . into monsters" and which is the result not of innate depravity but of moral conditions and of choice and will, lead directly to Rousseau and to Sand.

Yet this is not to the Rousseau and Sand of the popular stereotypes. It is not to the Rousseau described here by Emery:

Rousseau, [commentators] maintain, looked on natural man as a naive and glorious Adam dwelling in an earthly paradise--they almost include the rivers flowing with milk and hills exuding honey. Jean-Jacques, allegedly, constructed a system based on these puerile imaginings, unless perhaps he was satisfied to plagiarize and rationalize the Bible story or the legend of a golden age.

Likewise, I am not linking Hawthorne to the Rousseau described by Lewis Mumford:

... but in the eighteenth century Jean-Jacques Rousseau, preaching the wisdom of the peasant and the sanity of the simple rural occupations, led a whole succession of generations outside
the gates of their cities: they botanized, they climbed mountains, they sang peasant songs, they swam in the moonlight, they helped in the harvest field; and those who could afford to built themselves rural retreats. . . . The important thing is to realize that at the very moment life was becoming more constricted and routinized, a great safety valve for the aboriginal human impulses had been found—the raw, unexplored, and relatively uncultivated regions of America and Africa, and even the less formidable islands of the South Seas.

This whole picture of Rousseau as the primitivist and advocate of the Noble Savage is false. As Emery explains:

To allege that Rousseau wanted us to return to a state of nature or, as Voltaire sarcastically put it, to go on all fours, is a travesty of his views and not an examination of them. Not only did he realize clearly that human nature does not take a step backward, he did not even experience any genuine nostalgia for the hedged-in condition he depicted. Could he seriously envy a creature with no spiritual awareness, no moral or religious life?

What, then, was Rousseau's idea of man's natural goodness and man's condition in the State of Nature? If he did not believe in such a state, why did he use the idea and why has it become almost synonymous with his name?

As Crocker says, Rousseau used this primitive condition as a "starting point" for his general philosophic discussion. It was essential for Rousseau to "distinguish properly between what is original and what is artificial in the actual nature of man, or to form a true idea of a state which no longer exists, perhaps never did exist, and probably never will exist." Whether it existed or not is not the point: it could have and it thereby provides a beginning for man which explains his present miserable state within society.

Crocker summarizes this point well:

The state of nature he postulates, however, is based not on any empirical methods, but on pure speculation dictated by the
conclusion he wishes to reach. 'Let us begin by putting aside all facts, for they have nothing to do with the matter.' In order to know human nature before it was corrupted by society, it is necessary to go back to a stage prior to history, before man as we know him in even the most primitive societies. We see at once that to Rousseau the word 'natural' means 'original,' or 'pre-cultural'--and of this we must never lose sight. It does not signify an end or a capacity, and above all, it is not what (in Rousseau's words) is 'natural to man in society'; it is, rather the starting point.85

In order for Rousseau to speak of the false direction and corruption of his contemporary civilization, it was necessary to show that there existed something to be corrupted; therefore, an essential task was to explain "man's basic conduct, whether it is innate or acquired through society."86 Thus his hypothetical "state of nature."

Arthur O. Lovejoy and others have shown that in his first draft of the Contrat Social "Rousseau himself declared . . . that there had never existed an ideal state of nature: 'l'heureuse vie de l'âge d'or fut toujours un état étranger à la race humaine!'87 The state of nature was a construct which Rousseau used to show his perceptions of human morality and the effects of civilized society upon that morality. As he says in the second Discourse, "Let us begin then by laying facts aside, as they do not affect the question. The investigations we may enter into, in treating this subject, must not be considered as historical truths, but only as mere conditional and hypothetical reasonings, rather calculated to explain the nature of things, than to ascertain their actual origin."

Therefore, as Havens demonstrates, Rousseau is not preaching "primitive goodness" or "instinctive goodness" when he speaks of "la bonté naturelle," he is speaking of that "goodness that is
natural to the best in man." This Havens continues, "portrays man's higher nature warring for the victory against the evil in his lower nature. . . ." 89 These words are very important because the idea that "la bonté naturelle" means "higher" faculties and not lower ones, that our "social natures" are our lower potentialities, is essential to a correct understanding of Rousseau's philosophic system and it is this distinction that has been ignored by those who see only the stereotyped "Rousseau." The critic Noone is correct when he says that Rousseau's belief in the higher natural moral law "was essential to his entire moral theory." 90

It is this Rousseau of the higher morality that is the profound prophet of modern society. In Rousseau's mind, when man left the hypothetical state of nature and entered into the social state, a "very remarkable change" occurred for the worst and for the best. "The man who wrote that--when he wrote it--was no believer in the Noble Savage; nor was he the high priest of the cult of the subrational who has been painted so luridly by Professor Babbitt." 91 So says Hoxie Fairchild in her study of The Noble Savage. We are dealing with a "pessimistic evolutionist," 92 as one critic calls him, on the one hand and with a religious and moral philosopher on the other.

By employing this historical construct, then, in his two Discourses and in Émile, Rousseau is using a familiar line of speculation to probe backwards to establish a foundation for man. To prove his contention that "there is no original sin in the human heart, the how and why of the entrance of every vice" had to be
traced. 93 And that in the face of Hobbes: In the second Discourse Rousseau says:

Above all, let us not conclude, with Hobbes, that because man has no idea of goodness, he must be naturally wicked; that he is vicious because he does not know virtue; that he always refuses to do his fellow-creatures services which he does not think they have a right to demand; or that by virtue of the right he truly claims everything he needs, he foolishly imagines himself the sole proprietor of the whole universe. 94

Rousseau felt that Hobbes saw man's nature accurately enough, but he did not understand it except in a false sense. 95

What is the "correct sense?" It is that man's nature as we see it in society is not the only possibility. Rousseau's insight into man's social morality or man's nature in the social state is as pessimistic or brooding as anything Hawthorne ever wrote. In Émile Rousseau says, "Men are depraved and perverted by society." 96

God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil... He destroys and defaces all things; he loves all that is deformed and monstrous; he will have nothing as nature made it, not even man himself. 97

Thus Rousseau's hypothetical construct traces man's development into the state of his present miserable condition.

Rousseau's treatment of this present world is one of the paradoxes of his writing that needs brief explication. In the second Discourse he speaks of man's "perfectibility" and he says, "It is man's attribute for perfectibility which, in time, draws man out of his original state..." 98 Paradoxically, "the faculty of self-improvement, which... gradually develops all the rest of our faculties and is inherent in the species as in the individual" is precisely that which enables him to fall "lower than the brutes..."
Progress or perfectibility leads man out of his state of innocence of necessity. Thus, man moves into the state of society with two forces potential within him (self-love and pity), which in the natural state were in a condition of balance because the law of nature presided over all things with an impartiality and severity which allowed for no undue egotism or meekness. In Émile Rousseau says:

While I meditated upon man's nature, I seemed to discover two distinct principles in it; one of them raised him to the study of the eternal truths, to the love of justice, and of true morality, to the regions of the world of thought, which the wise delight to contemplate; the other led him downwards to himself, made him the slave of his senses, of the passions which are their instruments, and thus opposed everything suggested to him by the former principle.

The movement out of the state of nature into the state of society is when these two warring tendencies come into conflict. Yet, despite the evil that must come of necessity when this transformation from one state to the other takes place, Rousseau sees this change from innocence to experience as necessary because if conscience can balance pride and establish a harmonious balance again between the head and the heart, man can, as he said, be raised to the "study of the eternal truth, to the love of justice, and of true morality. . . . " Consider these three statements from Émile which summarize his views:

But remember, in the first place, that when I want to train a natural man, I do not want to make him a savage and to send him back to the woods, but that living in the whirl of social life it is enough that he should not let himself be carried away by the passions and prejudices of men; let him see with his eyes and feel with his heart, let him own no sway but that of reason . . . . The same man who would remain stupid in the forests
should become wise and reasonable in towns, if he were merely a spectator in them.\textsuperscript{101}

There is all the difference in the world between a natural man living in a state of nature, and a natural man living in society. Emile is no savage to be banished to the desert, he is a savage who has to live in the town.\textsuperscript{102}

Emile is not made to live alone, he is a member of society, and must fulfill his duties as such. He is made to live among his fellowmen and he must get to know them. . . .\textsuperscript{103}

To be social is necessary; to be evil is not. Rousseau believed that through education and institutions based on natural law and not on men's laws, that it is possible for man to be brought up to live in harmony. Man must live in the common world, but not be a part of it. That is the meaning of \textit{Emile} and the \textit{Contrat Social}.

In summary, Rousseau paints a very pessimistic picture of man in society. His judgment of his present society was harsh and unrelenting; but that pessimism and judgment must be seen in context. Plamenatz gives the context:

Rousseau was often given to pessimism. Yet his doctrine is not in itself pessimistic. It does not in the least follow that men, because society has 'corrupted' them, cannot find a remedy for their condition; they can, by taking thought, improve society. They can, despite their vices, set about creating the environment suitable to their nature. . . . No matter what society has done to them, men can come to know their condition and to imagine a way out of it; they can discover what suits their nature and are by nature inclined to it. This is Rousseau's doctrine.\textsuperscript{104}

In the second \textit{Discourse} Rousseau gives one of his most important images which embodies exactly what Plamenatz has just summarized:

How can he distinguish what is fundamental in his nature from the changes and additions which his circumstances and the advances he has made have introduced to modify his primitive condition? Like the statue of Glaucus, which was so disfigured by time, seas, and tempests, that it looked more like a wild beast than a god,
the human soul, altered in society by a thousand causes perpetually recurring, by the acquisition of a multitude of truths and errors, by the changes happening to the constitution of the body, and by the continual jarring of the passions, has, so to speak, changed in appearance, so as to be hardly recognizable. Instead of a being, acting constantly from fixed principles, instead of that celestial and majestic simplicity, impressed on it by its divine Author, we find it only the frightful contrast of passion mistaking itself for reason, and of understanding grown delirious. 105

When man does uncover or "dénovilée" and does recover "that celestial and majestic simplicity, impressed on it by its divine Author," then we have a higher state of harmony and wholeness and unity very much like that of Hawthorne's higher visions which is also shown in stories of sculptors and sculpture like "Drowne's Wooden Image" and the Marble Faun.

Here Rousseau and Hawthorne meet. Dickstein says this of Rousseau but it applies to Hawthorne equally as well: he attempted "to reconstruct man's psychological unity." 106 Out of the "human alienation," the "lost unity," the "perversion of the true human nature," out of this "growth of discord," as Dickstein says, Rousseau tried to "re-establish a lost unity." 107 So did Hawthorne. As Hawthorne preached the "inviolability" of the human heart, so also did Rousseau "search for a true system of the human heart." 108

The human heart and the unity of the soul were also the subject of George Sand. Her views of human nature can be easily stated. Our inquiry, however, leads to other questions which are not so easily answered.

She believed, as one critic says, "in the immutable goodness of man and in his moral perfectibility." 109 In her Letters d'un
Voyageur, she says of man:

Thou wast of pure and solid marble and thou camest from the hand of God, proud and flawless, as a statue comes, snow-white from the studio, and proudly mounts its pedestal. But behold thee now, weather-beaten like one of those dilapidated allegorical figures, that still stand in abandoned gardens.--So many storms have dimmed thy glory, that those who chance to pass beneath thee no longer know if thou art of alabaster or of clay, under this funeral crape.--Thou adornest well the desert; why seemest thou to weary of solitude?110

We are immediately struck by the resemblance between Sand's image here of the statue and the same images of Rousseau's and Hawthorne's; we should also note that the image is being used for exactly the same purpose: to show a change in man as he lives in society. Man is pure, glorious, and snow-white originally; life defaces and obscures that innocence.

There is a twist in Sand's thought that is a little different but clearer than the way this question of man's changing nature is treated by Rousseau. Here are the words of Bernard Mauprat at the end of Mauprat where he summarizes the point of the book:

What I am saying now is not very orthodox, but, take my word for it, it is Christian, because it is true. Man is not born wicked; neither is he born good, as is maintained by Jean Jacques Rousseau, my beloved Edmee's old master. Man is born with more or less of passions, with more or less power to satisfy them, with more or less capacity for turning them to a good or bad account in society. But education can and must find a remedy for everything; that is the great problem to be solved, to discover the education best suited to each individual. . . . Every man needs to be loved before he can be worth anything; but each in a different way. . . . Do you ask me how? My answer will be brief; by loving one another truly.

The issue in her mind isn't man's innate goodness or evil, that is a moot point: man is pure, glorious, snow-white, but potentially only. For her, like for Rousseau in Émile, the issue is more social; how
can the good rather than the evil be developed in the social world. Like Rousseau and Hawthorne, she says evil comes from the environment and that this is the source of evil and human destructiveness. Some, like Ernest in Hawthorne's "The Great Stone Face," grow to a sublime maturity with no experience with wickedness or evil. We do not sense that Phoebe of The House of the Seven Gables must experience evil in life. Rousseau's Emile and Sophie are concrete demonstrations of the idea that if the environment can be one of proper training and principle and love, there need not be sin in the world at all.

For all three authors, transforming, unveiling or re-discovering the solid pure marble after it has become defaced by the grossness of human meanness in the state of society is the central energy and direction of their writing. That is the central "moral," if you will, of Mauprat. Sand's earliest and most prodigious biographer, Mme. Karénine, says of this novel, "... in Mauprat, the moral transformation and the rebirth of the man under the effect of love and under the influence of a superior being, are painted with an extraordinary talent."112 Certainly one's mind goes to Miriam's effect on Donatello in The Marble Faun and to one after another of Hawthorne's stories; to Emile and Sophie as guided to morality by the tutor in Émile; and to other works of Sand where the transformation of man is accomplished by the love of woman, a man, or a friend.

Our minds, however, also go to Sand's Jacques and Indiana where the characters refuse or are too petty for this transforming
love. Our minds also go to Hawthorne's Hester and Arthur and Roger, to Zenobia and Hollingsworth, and to the Man of Adamant where the refusal of the gift of woman or of love and friendship is so terribly confused and destructive. Finally, our minds go as well to Rousseau's Confessions and to Julie, Claire, Saint-Preux, and Wolmar where denials and refusals of love and friendship so damages them all.

We can conclude that all three believed in man's basic, deep down immortality, perfectibility, and innate innocence. However, in their genius and in their sensitivity to the tensions and destructive selfishness of the people of their times, they saw life as it was lived, with its divisions, disharmony, and contention, its ancient institutions, rigid beliefs, and increasing scientific and intellectual fracturing of man's basic balance, and they saw that man was being destroyed within. For all three, art is both a mirror and a sermon: the sermons are the least satisfying of their works; the mirrors deeply troubling.

Finally, I wish to speak of all three of these authors as synthesists who saw this entire question of man's innocence and corruption, both morally and socially, in a three-fold system of wholeness and balance which explains man's several conditions.

Rousseau believed in a three-fold system of human moral development. The state of nature, with several stages of growth within it from savage to fisherman and huntsman, was Rousseau's world of innocence, openness, and simplicity. As has been said, it is
inaccurate to call Rousseau either a primitivist or an advocate of the noble savage because he says this state is hypothetical in man's history and that there is no morality in this condition. As Green says, men and women in this state were innocent, were without conscience, and thus were incapable of moral growth. The only and therefore the primary passions were self-love and pity.

Not saying how exactly or why, Rousseau has the fisherman-huntsman stage develop into the agriculture-metalurgy stage where humans first begin to say, "This is mine!" With private property comes inequality and the dependence of some on others and the rule of men's rather than of nature's laws. The passions of vanity, pride, and greed develop and humans become separated from each other by the masks and veils of pride they insert between them. Lying, cheating and deception become obstacles to human communication and humans find themselves in a state of society or the state of war which is the condition of the contemporary world as Rousseau saw it.

As one reads *Emile*, the second Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité (1755), and the *Contrat Social* especially, one realizes that Rousseau's rhetorical energy is directed towards finding a way out of this "civilized" condition. Must man live this way? Rousseau's belief in man's basic capacity for good which is now so obviously depraved leads him to his central images of "dévoilement," discovery, and creation; the task is to find the natural man again, to uncover his basic self. It has already been pointed out how Rousseau saw the statue of Glaucus with its covering of time and
weather as but a block of pure marble waiting to be cleaned off and its goodness realized.

It should be stressed again, however, that Rousseau's rejection of civilized society is not a rejection of the social concept. Only in a society do the higher faculties of reason and conscience develop fully. The task is to maintain natural goodness through childhood and courtship and then to perpetuate it as reason and conscience develop by providing a proper, a "natural" political state. This is the higher moral state. In Rousseau's system this state, like the primary or natural state, is not definite and immediately realizable. It is for Rousseau more of a dream or a wish or a speculation.

Thus in his state of nature, state of society, and state of higher morality, Rousseau gives us a tripartite moral construct upon which man's moral development can be understood. Humans in the state of nature are portrayed in Émile, the two Discourses and the beginnings of the Confessions and La Nouvelle Héloïse. The state of society or war is demonstrated in the body of the Confessions and La Nouvelle Héloïse, and the higher natural state is shown in Émile, the Contrat Social, and the Réveries.

Several students of Hawthorne have built convincing analyses of his works upon a three-part division of his stories and novels. Although each scholar has his or her unique name for the pattern and personal interpretation of what the pattern means, all agree that Hawthorne's works seem to be best understood as they divide into
three related groups or stages.

Roy R. Male calls this tripartite relationship of Hawthorne's works "the original tragic action," which, he says,

... may thus be described as a three-fold movement: first the parental bond is established; it is broken as the individual proudly asserts his independence from the father and accepts a new bondage to his mate; and finally, after the terrible human cost of sin, agony, and death, some degree of spiritual purification and re-establishment of the original bond is achieved.\(^{16}\)

The tragic action or situation is Male's idea of Hawthorne's basic system or dramatic action. R. W. B. Lewis calls this pattern "the re-creation of the story of Adam" and says that Hawthorne "more than any other contemporary, exploited the active metaphor of the American as Adam--before and during and after the fall. These are the three aspects of Hawthorne that I shall consider,"\(^{117}\) Lewis tells us. He sees a mythic pattern in Hawthorne's works which follows the pattern of the Adam-Eve-Garden story.

Claudia Johnson calls this tripartite meaning in Hawthorne's works "the mythic development of nineteenth-century Perfectionist doctrine."\(^{118}\) This doctrine, she says, is that man's journey in life first involves a leaving of the present innocent condition to descend into "the dark, forbidden mystery of the soul below, which had to be experienced and transcended in love, and the active, growing world of human relationships above, in which salvation had to be achieved."\(^{119}\) Her concern is with a religious humanism or pattern of moral growth in Hawthorne's works. Melvin Askew calls this three-fold construct "the psychology of maturity," which, freed from theology, becomes a "figure of speech, a trope, a myth . . . for a universal human
circumstance." It involves 1) a growing "beyond the confines of Eden" or of "inexperience and ignorance" and narcissicism; 2) a fall which "shatters the organization and circumstance of Eden" or the demolition of innocence "by love, which breaks the Narcissistic shell;" and 3) "a new psychological organization in the real world through which man ascends in "care and anxiety" to the full exercise of "those virtues which constitute his humanness and which constitute him man."

Leslie Fiedler and David Howard in their discussions of The Marble Faun name this tripartite system in Hawthorne's works the fortunate fall. Fiedler calls the initial state the fall, and he speaks of the rise as "the Faustian theory of the meaning of Faustian action." Howard speaks of Hawthorne's "using the metamorphosis of character as part of a complex vision of human diversity...." Thus, Howard says, Hawthorne poses his characters at "moments of transition" or of "human choice" where, and Howard says this is the version of the fortunate fall idea he will stress, there are those who sin (Adam) and those who observe (the reader), there are those who provide the instruction in sin (Miriam and Donatello) and those who "retreat to their native and domestic Eden (Kenyon and Hilda)."

Thus to suggest that Hawthorne's works lend themselves to a tripartite interpretation is not unreasonable. Further, to suggest that the stages in that interpretation see man as first prior to experience some way, then involved in experience, and then some way transcending it is possible and is a part of each of the interpretations that has been summarized. This dissertation suggests another
set of terms and another shade of meaning for this three-fold drama.

Hawthorne, like Rousseau, believed in a state of innocence, simplicity, and openness. His characters in this state are usually portrayed in settings of nature with garden-peasant cottages and the rural country. Usually his natural characters are either children or child-like, pre-sexual or a-sexual and a-moral. These characters are not just minor stage props in his fiction but are usually either the central female figure or a strong secondary character in his stories and novels. Ellen in Fanshawe, Ilbrahim in "The Gentle Boy," Phoebe in The House of the Seven Gables and Hilda in The Marble Faun are obvious examples. Most of the women Randall Stewart lists as the "wholesome New England" and the "frail, Sylph-like creatures" are of the state of nature. 124

Like Rousseau, Hawthorne also portrayed humans in the state of society. We should note that Rousseau's pessimism and sense of gloom and sin is as deep as Hawthorne's concerning humans in this condition. Sin, guilt, deception, obstacles, frustration are the central themes. This kind of pessimism as seen in "The Minister's Black Veil," "Young Goodman Brown," and The Scarlet Letter is our usual perception of Hawthorne.

But there are stories and novels like "The Great Carbuncle" and The Marble Faun that suggest that Hawthorne, again like Rousseau, could philosophically believe in a "transformation" of man. The Marble Faun was entitled the Transformation in its English edition and was renamed for the American edition.
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Thus, from beginning to end, in his stories, novels, and other writings, Hawthorne demonstrated a belief in certain stages in man's changeable moral and social condition and these stages can be seen to be like those set up and demonstrated by Rousseau.

Sand, also, like Rousseau and Hawthorne, presented man in several moral stages or conditions and repeatedly showed his moral development moving from one stage to another. She, too, has the innocent, virtuous characters, usually, but not always, young girls. Her portrayal of this character and her placing of this person in her plots is so similar to Hawthorne's use as to be startling. Consuelo's similarity to Phoebe is a good example. Sand, also, can present a stark and pessimistic view of humans in society. The society of Paris, Venice, or Roche-Mauprat in Jacques, Consuelo, or Mauprat is an illustration. Because she was a different kind of craftsman than Hawthorne and the Rousseau of La Nouvelle Héloïse, her contrast between natural innocence and social depravity is more obvious and therefore more within the sentimental tradition. And she too, like both of them, yet with more real belief and conviction in its tangible reality, portrayed the possible transformation of humans and society into a higher moral state in such novels as La comtesse de Rudolstadt, La Petite Fadette, and Mauprat.

These three writers, then, basing their philosophic systems on their belief concerning man's basic nature as it contrasts with his life as lived in society, set their individual works within larger philosophic contexts which are strikingly similar. These
contexts, importantly, are different from those found in the writings of their contemporaries. Rousseau's pessimism with its moral and modern quality in La Nouvelle Héloïse had virtually no peer. There were historical models, as Leslie Fiedler and others point out, but Rousseau did not write another Clarissa in the sentimental tradition.

Melville and Flaubert also used the triangular pattern in Pierre and Madame Bovary to show destructive character relations, but their inability or unwillingness to portray also aesthetically and philosophically convincing "good" and innocent characters demonstrates that their overall philosophical systems are very different.

Now that the legitimacy of this study has been discussed and the tripartite philosophic system explained and defined, I will now demonstrate the similarities of this system in the specific works of each author.
CHAPTER II

Human Relations and Moral Conditions in the State of Nature or Innocence

Before the fall and the intrusion of civilized society, before the masks and veils which obscure man's goodness and separate his appearance from his reality which makes humans opaque to each other, before the breakdown in social and moral communication which separates people and thereby destroys them, there is a condition of moral innocence where the human soul is as transparent as crystal with a harmony between appearance and reality and pure communication between human beings. In the writings of Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand are essential portrayals of this moral and social condition of innocence. Specifically, children, some single people, and most old people are of this state as are some unique "natural couples."

Children, Single Adults, and Old People in the State of Innocence

Of surprising similarity is the portrayal of children in the works of these three writers.

Rousseau's portrayal of Émile is his finest portrait of man's natural goodness and potential, but he also shows this kind of goodness in the beginning of the Confessions. Rousseau begins the Émile with this statement: "God makes all things good; man meddles
with them and they become evil . . . , he will have nothing as
nature made it, not even man himself."¹ Then he gives one of his
most important metaphors: If the child is left by the mother to the
"existing conditions" of the world, he will "be like a sapling
chance sown in the midst of the highway, bent hither and thither and
soon crushed by the passerby."² This is the whole point of Rousseau's
Émile and the basis for his educational theory. We must "remove this
young tree from the highway and shield it from the crushing force of
social conventions." Émile is born innocent with a capacity for
moral growth and if he is cared for and educated by "nature's law,"
if parents will fix their "eyes on nature, follow the path traced by
her," and if they will "follow the natural growth of the human
heart," all will be well with the child.

However, if they do not, the child will be lost to the world
and will only recover his lost innocence through an extremely
difficult process of self-recovery and "dévoilement."³ In the
Confessions one of the most important moments in the life of the man
Jean-Jacques occurs when he was a "young tree." He and his cousin are
accused of stealing a comb from Mlle. Lambercier. She and her father
accuse the two boys and, despite their denials, the father punishes
them severely. Fifty years later, as Rousseau writes of the expe-
rience, he becomes angry once more as he denies he took the comb and
speaks of the effect of that experience upon him. Just from the
energy of the passages in this part of the Confessions and the
importance the adult Rousseau attaches to them it is clear that he
intends this story to be a symbolic "fall" in his story of his life.

Imagine a person timid and docile in ordinary life, but proud, fiery, and inflexible when roused, a child who has always been controlled by the voice of reason, always treated with kindness, fairness, and indulgence, a creature without a thought of injustice, now for the first time suffering a most grave one at the hands of the people he loves best and most deeply respects. Imagine the revolution in his ideas, the violent change of his feelings, the confusion in his heart and brain, in his small intellectual and moral being!4

There ended the serenity of my childish life. From that moment I never again enjoyed pure happiness, and even to-day I am conscious that memory of childhood's delights stops short at that point.5

Only at scattered moments such as the times of bliss with Mme. de Warens at Les Charmettes when he is her son and she is his "Maman" does he recover some glimpses of this lost transparency and innocence of childhood. Jean Starobinski speaks of this moment in Rousseau's life as the moment when "le paradis est perdu: car le paradis, c'était la transparence réciproque des consciences, la communication totale et confiante. Le monde lui-même change d'aspect et s'obscurcit."6 Émile is the boy Jean-Jacques protected from this destructive highway of society that had done such damage to the real Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

Hawthorne also portrayed children as innocent and as morally pure and socially transparent. Three stories which embody his ideas on the child and innocence are "Little Annie's Ramble," "The Snow-Image," and "The Gentle-Boy."

"Little Annie's Ramble" is dismissed as "trivia" by Frederick Crews in his study of Hawthorne. This kind of unfortunate disregard for a central embodiment of an important tenet of Hawthorne's
philosophy is a serious flaw in much Hawthorne criticism. "Little Annie's Ramble" is the story of an older man who sees a child leaving her home and venturing alone away from her own street. Whether he physically goes with her on her ramble or whether his participation is just mental is insignificant. The wistful quality of the piece is clear. He is in black attire, has a heavy brow and thoughtful eyes. She trips lightly along with her "unwearied heart" as a "happy child." As they pass the people in the town and stop to look at a caged bird in a window, Hawthorne's narrator reflects:

It is curious, in the most crowded part of a town, to meet with living creatures that had their birthplace in some far solitude, but have acquired a second nature in the wilderness of men. Look up, Annie, at that canary bird, hanging out of the window in his cage. Poor little fellow! His golden feathers are all tarnished in this smoky sunshine; he would have glistened twice as brightly among the summer islands; but still he has become a citizen in all his tastes and habits, and would not sing half so well without the uproar that drowns his music. What a pity that he does not know how miserable he is.7

The words, "acquired a second nature in the wilderness of men," apply sadly enough to Little Annie as well, and this idea that our nature changes in society could be directly out of Rousseau or Sand.

After looking at a doll in a store window which in turn stands looking out on the people passing by, the narrator says:

Meantime, good-by Dame Doll! A toy yourself, you look forth from your window upon many ladies that are also toys, though they walk and speak and upon a crowd in pursuit of toys, though they wear grave visages. Oh, with your never closing eyes, had you but an intellect to moralize on all that flits before them, what a wise doll would you be! Come, little Annie, we shall find toys enough, go where we may.8

Like Rousseau's picture of Emile, Hawthorne's use of the child is to contrast the condition of the old man and of the social world. The
child is not depraved; but the man is and society is.

"The Snow-Image" is the story of a mother and a father whose two children build a snow girl which comes to life for the children, almost comes to life for the mother, and does not come to life at all for the father. In images of dazzling sunlight and pure white snow, Hawthorne describes the children and the snow girl. "Look here, Peony! Come quickly! A light has been shining on her cheek out of that rose-colored cloud! and the color does not go away." When the snow girl comes to life, the mother looks out and thinks she sees something through the veil of the light, but the "setting sun came obliquely into the lady's eyes. So she was dazzled, you must understand, and could not very distinctly observe what was in the garden. Still, however, through all that bright, blinding dazzle of the sun and the new snow, she beheld a small white figure in the garden. . . ." 

When the father comes home, she tells him what she thinks she saw to make clear to him what the children's excited words to him mean. He says she is silly and is as much a child as the two children. Hawthorne then says:

And in one sense she was, for all through life she had kept her heart full of childlike simplicity and faith, which was as pure and clear as crystal; and, looking at all matters through this transparent medium, she sometimes saw truths so profound that other people laughed at them as nonsense and absurdity. 

In precisely Rousseau's terms of "crystal" and "transparency," Hawthorne equates the mother with her children and shows their moral and social innocence. The mother, like an Émile, has retained her childhood innocence through her adult experiences. The contrast of
the children and the wife with the husband makes the difference between the state of innocence and the state of society obvious. He sees the snow child which is playing in the snow "like a dancing snow-wreath" as just another little girl. Because of his "stubborn materialism," his "matter-of-fact" "common sense" and his hard and impenetrable head as empty "as one of his iron pots," he demands that his children bring the child in the house and, when she is forced in and has melted away, he denies she ever existed. His efforts to do even a little good are so confused by his materialism that he is a horror of destruction. His children and his child-like wife, like the youthful Rousseau, suffer because of his insensitivity and opacity.

Finally, the story "The Gentle Boy" has as central character the Christ-like child Ilbrahim. Notice the terms in which he is described:

His airy gayety, coming to him from a thousand sources, communicated itself to the family, and Ilbrahim was like a domesticated sunbeam, brightening moody countenances, and chasing away the gloom from the dark corners of the cottage.12

He was a sweet infant of the skies that had strayed away from home, and all the inhabitants of this miserable world closed up their impure hearts against him, drew back their earth-soiled garments from his touch, and said, 'we are holier than thou.'13

That the miserable world rejects him is a comment on men in the state of society not an affirmation of man's innate depravity. The child is clearly good and the adults--Tobias, Dorothy and Catherine--are shown to be innately good as well. When the child dies at the end of the story, our painful sense of moral loss and of the social depravity of Puritans, Quakers, mothers and fathers--all who deny
innocence and purity—is acute. With the old man of Annie's Ramble, "when life settles darkly down upon us," we lament the loss of innocence in our lives. "Sweet has been the charm of childhood on my spirit," the narrator friend of Annie's says, "the pure breath of children revives the life of aged men, [and] so is our mortal nature revived by their free and simple thoughts." So, after associating with "those fountains of still fresh existence," Annie's friend returns to his life "with a kinder and purer heart, and a spirit more lightly wise." So, too, do we return to life after reading the story of the pure boy Ilbrahim.

The Hawthorne who wrote these stories is quite a different Hawthorne from the one of the popular stereotype. In "The Old Manse", while looking down into the Concord river, Hawthorne says:

All the sky glows downward at our feet; the rich clouds float through the unruffled bosom of the stream like heavenly thoughts through a peaceful heart. We will not, then, malign our river as gross and impure while it can glorify itself with so adequate a picture of the heaven that broods above it; or, if we remember its tawny hue and the muddiness of its bed, let it be a symbol that the earthliest human soul has an infinite spiritual capacity and may contain the better world within its depths.

Childhood and children embodied for him the "infinite spiritual capacity" of the human soul.

This "infinite spiritual capacity" embodied particularly in children is also the interest of George Sand. Of the children she portrays in La Petite Fadette, La Mare au Diable, François le Champi (her pastoral romances) and elsewhere, it is obvious that Rousseau's and Hawthorne's veneration of the child and the childhood state of the soul is hers as well.
In the fifth chapter of *La Mare au Diable*, as the peasant farmer Germain sets out to travel to another village to meet a woman who might be his second wife, the young sixteen year old Marie, daughter of a neighbor, joins him to be escorted to a town near his own destination. He is very indulgent and soft hearted and he wants to be off without his children; so he leaves without saying goodbye to his small son, Petit-Pierre, who has not been seen since morning. The boy, however, knowing that his father would be taking a certain road, goes some distance and falls asleep by the side of the road as he waits. When Germain and Marie find him, the father's inclination despite his joy at seeing the boy is to be angry and to send him back home. Marie sides with the child and assures Germain of the special nature of his son and tells him that the boy will be no problem if he comes along. She says to Germain, "They are lovely as little angels, and so well brought up that you can't find better children . . . . He is so very little, he can't help being naughty. But he is very bright." Germain answers, "He is bright, it is true, and very brave." In the same tone of naive simplicity, Sand embodies in the characterization of this simple man and maid and this angelic child the honesty of communication that should exist among people whose souls are transparent and pure. Petit-Pierre is in need of training to overcome his naughtiness which is natural to all children—even Rousseau's Émile and Hawthorne's daughter Una--, but we have no doubt that with the love of Marie and Germain, the love of a family, the boy will grow up, retaining his purity and openness.
The characterization of Francois in François le Champi is even more obviously like that of Emile and Hawthorne's Ilbrahim. François is an orphan or waif and he is being reared by a foster mother named Zabelle. This old woman goes to the mill of M. Cadet Blanchet to find housing and work. Madeleine Blanchet, Cadet's young and beautiful wife is one of Sand's most interesting creations. Like Edmée in Mauprat and like Sand herself, Madeleine is a maternal type—lovely, compassionate and appealing but maternal not passionate in her love.

When Madeleine sees Francois the child, she happens to look into his eyes and she notes "something she had never observed in the eyes even of the most honest persons she knew; something so kind, and yet so decided, that she was quite bewildered." Because of his keen and honest intelligence, Madeleine reads to him from The Lives of the Saints: "He wanted to read, too, and learned so quickly and well that she was amazed, and in his turn he was able to teach little Jeannie." When he is old enough for his first communion, Madeleine helps him "and the parish priest was delighted with the intelligence and excellent memory of this child."

This drama is very similar to that of Jean-Jacques' own experience with Mme. de Warens at Les Charmettes where the son (Jean-Jacques) and the mother ("Maman") share a deep maternal and filial love but embrace in innocence not as lovers. Thus does Madeleine love her son/lover Francois, "the most innocent boy in the world. . . ."
Sand's imagery of light and darkness which she uses to describe her innocents has little allegorical or symbolic significance so common to Hawthorne's works, and her strong sense of innocence and transparence and open communication in children is someway less philosophical and more literal than it is in his works. Perhaps this is because it was much easier for her to believe in this social and moral state as a reality and not as a speculation than it was either for Hawthorne or Rousseau.

As an artist she saw her problem as exactly that of the mother in "The Snow-Image" and the tutor in Emile: how does one retain the ability to know the truth of life as one grows to be an adult in civilization. How can the channels of pure, child-like, communication be kept open. In her introduction to *Françoise le Champi* she says, "I am trying to discover by what means art, without ceasing to be universal, can penetrate the mystery of primitive simplicity, and interpret the charm of nature to the mind."21 That need to "penetrate" and "interpret" the world of innocence and make it available to adults who have forgotten the child-like state was shared by Sand, Rousseau, and Hawthorne.

Some adults and most old people are also portrayed as innocent and as inhabitants of the state of nature. By so describing these people as naturally transparent and open, Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand again affirm the social and moral fact that human relations can be morally good and socially harmonious. This discussion will begin with a summary of George Sand's theory of the artistic peasant, will
then show that kind of person in her stories, and then will show that Rousseau and Hawthorne portrayed this kind of character as well.

In the introduction to François le Champi Sand records an imaginary conversation between two artists who are lamenting their difficulty in trying to feel "the mystery of this natural rustic life" because of their "civilized" conditioning, and who are decrying their inability to record their feelings in the degraded language of the civilized arts. There is clearly a difference, they agree, "between the language spoken by nature, primitive life, and instinct, and that spoken by art, science—in a word, by knowledge." As they continue to specify the demerits of the "artificial life" and the merits of the "primitive life," they make distinctions and give definitions that are crucial to this discussion of Sand, Hawthorne, and Rousseau. As one reads this, one should think of the Tutor's discussion of developing Émile's natural language and thoughts and Hawthorne's discussions by the man and woman in "The New Adam and Eve." Sand writes:

'That is just what I am complaining of. I should like to rid myself of this eternal irritating demonstration; to erase from my memory the teachings and the forms of art; never to think of painting when I look at a landscape, of music when I listen to the wind, or of poetry when I admire and take delight in both together. I should like to enjoy everything instinctively, because I think that the cricket which is singing just now is more joyous and ecstatic than I.'

'You complain, then, of being a man?'

'No; I complain of being no longer a primitive man.'

'It remains to be known whether he was capable of enjoying what he could not understand.'

'I do not suppose that he was similar to the brutes, for as soon as he became a man he thought and felt differently from them. But I cannot form an exact idea of his emotions, and that
is what bothers me. I should like to be what the existing state of society allows a great number of men to be from the cradle to the grave—I should like to be a peasant; a peasant who does not know how to read, whom God has endowed with good instincts, a serene organization, and an upright conscience; and I fancy that in the sluggishness of my useless faculties, and in the ignorance of depraved tastes, I should be as happy as the primitive man of Jean-Jacques's dreams."

'I, too, have had this same idea; who has not? But, even so, your reasoning is not conclusive, for the most simple and ingenuous peasant may still be an artist; and I believe even that his art is superior to ours. The form is different, but it appeals more strongly to me than all the forms which belong to civilization. Songs, ballads, and rustic tales say in a few words what our literature can only amplify and disguise.'

Central here is the contrast between man under the conditioning of civilization, even (maybe most of all) the artist, and man in the uneducated, uncivilized peasant state. The overt reference here to Rousseau's *Discours sur les arts et sciences* and *Discours sur l'origin d'inégalité* as to the effect of society on the arts and sciences and the state of primitive happiness locates that area of human experience where both writers saw moral and social happiness to be found. Note the distinction made as these two artists in the conversation go from "man" to "brute" to "peasant" to "artist."

Happiness is not "in the sluggishness of my useless faculties, and in the ignorance of depraved tastes"; it is in the peasant life lived artistically.

No where in her novels does Sand sing the praises of the cloddish peasant who has no perception of his world. In *Le Marquis de Villemer*, for example, she speaks of the murderousness, drinking, and idle instincts, the barbarous treatment of women, the arguing, killing, stinking odor, "dirty linen and old stockings [hanging] with
meat and bread" from their rafters, and of the "vilest filth" of the peasants and peasant language. She suffers no Romantic illusions about the general run of peasants, but on the other hand, there are peasants who perceive the beauty and truth of their natural lives. Here, Sand says, is her ideal peasant: the artist who lives in the country and who also happens to be a peasant, who comprehends the drudgery and monotony of his environment but who can live above it. Sand knew first hand of the virtues and the limitations of her neighbors of Berry, the peasants around her home at Nohant.

These are humans of the middle rung, those above the usual peasant dullness but still not civilized, those who are innocent and uncorrupted as children yet are wise. These are her most celebrated and praised characters.

There are many such peasant-artists in Sand's words and those who will be mentioned here are the ones whose fulfillment is in human wisdom and love without marriage or coupling. Of importance are Justine Peyraque in Le Marquis de Villemer (1860), Gottlieb and Zdenko in La Comtesse de Rudolstadt (1843), and old Gaffer Patience in Mauprat (1837).

The heroine of Le Marquis de Villemer is a young working girl named Caroline, who with her sister Camille is nursed by a French peasant woman named Justine Peyraque. Justine is mentioned in the beginning as Caroline's wet nurse and then again near the last third of the book when Caroline goes to live with Justine in the mountains of Le Pays to avoid the true and natural but socially unacceptable
love of Gaetan, the Marquis of Villemer. We meet Justine, then, as a wet nurse and as an older matron of a peasant home in the mountains.

As Caroline thinks back on Justine and considers the influence of the nurse on the two little girls, "It seemed to her that the milk from the peasant woman's breast has entered into the very marrow of her bones, and that her companions [Justine and her husband] were of a type with which she had been familiar in some previous existence." 24 Caroline's ability to find joy in hard work, to speak clearly and honestly with total transparency and to sense the virtue and truth of experience are all "from the peasant woman's breast" and part of "the very marrow" of Caroline's bones. Caroline's moral strength and social confidence in the high and corrupt society of a Marchionness who has employed her as a scribe and companion come from this peasant woman.

When Caroline's own moral strength seems unable to sustain her virtue against Gaetan's love any longer, she leaves Paris and goes to Justine's home in the mountains. As she enters the peasant cottage, she is struck with Justine's cleanliness and industry. Her home is very different from those of her peasant neighbors. Her food hangs from one area of the rafters and her clothes from another, whereas in other homes food and clothes hang disagreeably together. Justine's thoughts are lofty and her language pure and without defilement. Old Peyraque is "an old saint" and although his gifts are clearly less than those of his wife, his nobility and total transparency are remarked upon. Thus, in a novel written late in her career, Sand
again endows her peasant-artists with strong moral character and child-like innocence.

Two other such characters are found in two books which were written near the middle of her career, Consuelo and its sequel La Comtesse de Rudolstadt.

One character is the peasant Gottlieb who is the adult son of the jailer Schwartz of the Spandaw prison. Frederick the Great sends Consuelo to this prison when she becomes too honest concerning his faults for him to tolerate her in his court in Berlin. Because of a mysterious illness, Gottlieb had been "declared an idiot by the physicians" and his "wandering eyes" and "stupid smile" as well as his "ugliness" and almost totally inert life by the fireplace support such a decision.

However, at the time Consuelo enters the prison, Gottlieb undergoes a sudden "awakening." In this "new era" of his life he spends all of his time fabricating an imaginary pair of shoes. For three and four hours a day he works on his shoes which "took all forms except that of a shoe" and "was never finished." He is one of Sand's most realistic peasant-artist creations because she does not impose at this point and tell us outright what Gottlieb means. He is perhaps the closest she comes to an allegorical or symbolic character.

He begins to send Consuelo notes which she describes in her journal as "mysterious billets" of "beautiful devotedness." He speaks in a strange jargon which is a combination of Christian
parables and mesmerism, but we sense with Consuelo that there "is poetry in the diseased mind of this child." With Consuelo, when she admits "I verily believe I am becoming crazy, and that before long I shall perfectly understand Gottlieb's wandering," we are coming to understand that his sense of reality is of a higher order, and, as Consuelo declares, he is "a spirit of light." With him Sand uses the light imagery to denote purity and innocence that we have seen is so important to Rousseau and Hawthorne.

At the end of the novel, as Consuelo is adopted into the secret society of The Invisibles, Gottlieb is there as one of the inspired commoners of this society of the new world order. A man of simple transparency, Gottlieb is a candidate for the coming social equality and enlightenment so much a part of Sand's philosophy.

Another character of like nature is Albert of Rudolstadt's friend, the peasant Zdenko. He is an important character in both Consuelo and La Comtesse de Rudolstadt, but the moral and social significance of his peasant nobility and transparency is not seen until the last pages of the second novel.

These pages are a sequel to the main narrative, written by the prophet-wanderer Philon, a disciple of Albert of Rudolstadt. Philon's writing is a description of a meeting he and another man have with Albert, Consuelo who is his wife, and their three children. This family is living a vagabond-gypsy life in the country and are clearly prophets of the new society. The little son is named Zdenko after the father's dear peasant friend. Zdenko the Elder is now very old and he sits on the ground with the two girls on his knees and
his eyes on the boy. Albert looks at the old man and says,
"Zdenko is a wise man, the wisest man I have ever known." Then, 
he turns to Zdenko the boy and speaks to him of his parentage:

'Come, Zdenko! You, my son, you the descendant of the 
Podiebrads, and who bear the name of a slave, prepare yourself to 
sustain us. You are the new man: which side will you take? 
Will you be with your father and mother, or with the tyrants 
of the world? In you is the strength, new generation: will you 
confirm slavery or liberty? Son of Consuelo, son of the gypsy 
woman, godson of the slave, I hope that you will be with the 
gypsy woman and with the slave. Otherwise, I, born of kings, I 
renounce you. . . . He who should dare to say that the divine 
essence, which is beauty, goodness, power, will not be realized 
upon the earth, that man is Satan. . . . He who should dare to 
say that the human essence, created in the image of God, as says 
the Bible, and which is sensation, sentiment, and knowledge, will 
not be realized upon the earth, that man is Cain.'

That is straight socialist and humanitarian doctrine. Consuelo makes 
another comment which also shows the virtue and goodness of this 
Zdenko and of Gottlieb as peasant-artists or spiritual peasants when she makes this observation:

But were Gottlieb and Zdenko the last disciples of the mysterious 
religion which Aibert preserved as a precious talisman, I feel 
none the less that this religion is my own, since it proclaims 
future equality among men, and the future manifestation of the 
justice and goodness of God upon the earth.

This belief in a divine equality among men and in a society and moral 
order composed of such people is the Perfectionist doctrine of 
nineteenth-century French socialism as preached particularly by 
Pierre Leroux, but beneath its historical context Sand's own basic 
faith in the reality of goodness in all men and especially in the 
peasant-artists like Gottlieb and Zdenko and in women like Justine is 
very important. The type is prevalent in her work from beginning to 
end and is not, therefore, merely a mirror of Leroux's doctrines as
many of her biographers contend. As we have seen, it comes as much from Emile and Sand's own humanism as it does from the socialists Saint-Simon and Pierre Leroux.

A final example from one of her earliest novels will show her belief in adult man's ability to live a moral and social life of innocence and transparency. This is the old peasant Gaffer Patience in *Mauprat*.

Gaffer is a peasant who inhabits or haunts the woods between the two homes of the two branches of the Mauprat family. The crude and violent Mauprats hate and persecute him and the honorable branch of the family treats him as an equal. He occupies, therefore, a sort of middle moral territory between man's evil and his civilized possibilities, although he himself is by nature of neither location. In the spirit of Sand's peasant-artist, Gaffer speaks a "mixed idiom" of peasant vocabulary and the metaphors of the poets. Sand says he is "material for the most important studies in the development of the human mind, and an inventive to the most tender admiration for primitive moral beauty." Those are important words if one would understand the philosophic basis of Sand's moral and social theory and see how that philosophy relates to Rousseau.

Edmée Mauprat, another of Sand's complicated but "natural" women, develops Patience's mind by introducing him to epic poetry. Like a Galatea, Edmée adds artistic beauty to Patience's own "primitive moral beauty" and "This initiation into the wonders of poetry and of similar thoughts and feelings he has had prior to this
introduction, "It may be that I am the first untutored man who has
divined truths of which no glimpse was given him from without." He
enjoys the beauty of the poetry, but he has thought the thoughts
before.

A Curé of the region introduces Patience to "the works of
Jean-Jacques Rousseau" which "carried him away into new regions. . . ."
When one day the Curé repeats to old Patience Rousseau's "Profession
of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar," the man "became enamored of Jean­
Jacques" and asked to have Rousseau's other works read to him. Sand's "natural man" is the actual embodiment of Rousseau's specu-
lation.

Hence we can say that for George Sand this old man was the
embodiment of a certain philosophic and human truth: natural man
is morally good and the natural state is the best society. On Gaffer
Patience Sand delivers one of her strongest panegyrics: he walks
through the dew with bare feet, his garments are free and natural
with no constraint about them; his skin is "hardened by exposure"; he
goes bareheaded in the sun and weather; "His beard was shining like
silver. His bald skull was so polished that the moon was reflected
in it as in water. He walked slowly, with his hands behind his back
and his head raised, like a man who is surveying his empire." This god-like peasant-artist is the natural man.

This peasant was the foundation of Sand's humanitarian actions
and beliefs. Old Gaffer Patience tells Bernard Mauprat, "love the
people; hate those who hate them; be ready to sacrifice yourself
for them. . . . Yes, one word more--listen. I know what I am saying--
become the people's friend."  

The common people! For many students
of her works this is the key to her literature. Matthew Arnold in his
essay written at the time of Sand's death tries to summarize her
power in these words:

What is the central figure in the fresh and calm rural world of
George Sand? It is the peasant. And what is the peasant? He
is France, life, the future. And this is the strength of George
Sand.

Later in his essay he returns to this theme and says:

I have somewhere called France the 'country of Europe where the
people is most alive.' The People is what interested George
Sand. And in France the people is, above all, the peasant. . . .
But the real people in France, the foundation of things there,
both in George Sand's eyes and in reality, is the peasant. The
peasant was the object of Madame Sand's fondest predilections
in the present, and happiest hopes in the future. The
Revolution and its doctrine of equality had made the French
peasant. What wonder, then, if she saluted the doctrine as a
holy and paramount one?

This celebration of the peasant moral strength and open transparence
comes from Sand's own moral character. Sand's pure ability to
communicate, so appealing to Henry James, the strength of her own
moral character, her total honesty in social and personal relations,
and her peculiar philosophic and human ties to these peasant people
is best summarized by Pearl Craigie in her introduction to Mauprat:

She did what she wished to do: she said what she had to say, not
because she wanted to provoke excitement or astonish the multitude,
but because she had succeeded eminently in leading her own life
according to her own lights. The terror of appearing inconsistent
excited her scorn. Appearances never troubled that unashamed
soul. This is the magic, the peculiar fascination of her books.
We find ourselves in the presence of a freshness, a primeval
vigour which produces actually the effect of seeing new scenes,
of facing a fresh climate. Her love of the soil, of flowers, and the sky, for whatever was young and unspoilt, seems to animate every page—even in her passages of rhetorical sentiment we never suspect the burning pastille, the gauzy tea-gown or the depressed pink light. Rhetoric it may be, but it is the rhetoric of the sea and the wheat field. It can be spoken in the open air and read by the light of day.41

Many, including Dostoevsky, Henry James, Matthew Arnold, and Walt Whitman would and did agree. Lest this be mistaken as the final word on her works, however, I remind the reader that Sand produced works of darkness, opacity, separation, and destruction among humans. This dark "Sand" will be considered subsequently, and we must realize that it is her overall philosophy which is our concern here and not just one segment of it. Unfortunately, this pastoral and happy George Sand (except when the criticism is biography oriented and focused on her loves and lovers) is the common view of her works. These peasant-artists whose lives are of the state of nature come from the deep faith of her own soul; similar characters come also from similar faith in the writings of Rousseau and Hawthorne.

Because Rousseau's Émile is his best example of an adult who has retained his natural innocence and because Émile will be treated in detail when I go next to couples and male-female relations in the state of nature, I will now go to Hawthorne's treatment of adults and old people in this state of innocence.

Such characters are many in Hawthorne's works, but of central interest to this dissertation are several lesser-known persons and Ernest in "The Great Stone Face."
I will begin with the town pump who tells his story in "the Rill from the Town Pump." The pump is a personification who stands in the middle of the highway of life's affairs and makes observations on what goes on around him.

In the moral warfare which you are to wage--and, indeed, in the whole conduct of your lives--you cannot choose a better example than myself, who have never permitted the dust and sultry atmosphere, the turbulence and manifold disquietudes of the world around me, to reach that deep, calm well of purity, which may be called my soul. And whenever I pour out that soul, it is to cool earth's fever or cleanse its stains.\footnote{42}

Unsullied, deeply pure, this pump, like Sand's Gaffer Patience, has retained his transparence and quietness of soul into adulthood. There is a balance, a good health about this pump. That "deep, calm well of purity" or soul with its healing and cleansing properties below, beyond the "turbulence and manifold disquietudes of life" is man's natural self. The pump gives its pure water to a young school boy and tells him, "Take it, pure as the current of your young life."\footnote{43} To all he offers this same living water which comes from a life lived in virtue and peace in a world where "moral warfare" dominates.

At first glance the Old Apple Dealer in the story of that name seems to suffer "a moral frost" in the "chilliness and torpid melancholy of his old age."\footnote{44} Of his inner soul, Hawthorne comments:

Yet, could I read but a tithe of what is written there, [in his mind and heart] it would be a volume of deeper and more comprehensive import than all that the wisest mortals have given to the world; for the soundless depths of the human soul and of eternity have an opening through your breast. . . . There is a spiritual esse\textsuperscript{45} in this gray and lean old shape that shall flit upward too.
Outside, the old man has not been able to avoid the destructiveness of age and society, but inside is a "spiritual essence" which no mortal chilliness can destroy. This old man is a study in man's natural and original goodness contrasted with the veneer of coldness society creates and observes. Like Sand's Gottlieb whose beauty is hidden by society's definitions, pressures, and ignorance of moral truth, so this old man's truth is hidden but not lost: Hawthorne sees the "deeper and more comprehensive import" and the "soundless depths" which shine in this man's breast.

In a similar story entitled "The Village Uncle," the narrator of the story says of his wife Susan, "Obeying nature, you did free things without indelicacy, displayed a maiden's thoughts to every eye, and proved yourself as innocent as naked Eve." Open, transparent, and pure, she is the outward realization of the Old Apple Dealer's inner reality. Of most importance, the narrator in this second story says, "Be this the moral then, in chaste and warm affections, humble wishes, and honest toil for some useful end, there is health for the mind, and quiet for the heart, the prospect of a happy life, and the fairest hope of heaven." That is the "moral," if you will, of many of Sand's novels as well and of Rousseau's Emile. This kind of simple, honest, peasant-like warmth and humility is moral and social happiness for adults as well as children.

We move now to "Drowne's Wooden Image" a story of greater literary significance but of equal moral insight. The opening lines set the moral stage of the story: "One sunshiney morning in the good
old times of the town of Boston..." In this environment of light Drowne is a wood carver who is one day commissioned to carve a figurehead for the ship "Cynosure." Like the "sunshiney morning" quality of the story, a cynosure is something that strongly attracts attention by its brilliance or something that serves for guidance or direction. Drowne, then, is to create the foremost and most brilliant tip of the lighting or guiding ship or leader.

As Drowne works, "'A well-spring of inward wisdom gushed within me as I wrought upon the oak with my whole strength, and soul, and faith.'" After Drowne finishes his statue and removes "the strange shapelessness that has encrusted her, and revealed the grace and loveliness of a divinity" with "The strange, rich flowers of Eden on her head," Hawthorne comments on this Galatea or devoiler of the statue (like Rousseau's and Sand's similar uses of this statue-revealing imagery): "Yet who can doubt that the very highest state to which a human spirit can attain in its loftiest aspirations, is its truest and most natural state..." Drowne is a natural man who lives his adult life according to the moral and social precepts of the state of nature.

When the artist Copley looks into Drowne's face, "and again saw that expression of human love which, in a spiritual sense... was the secret of the life that had been breathed into this block of wood," we see that the true artist is one whose outward expression of "human love" equals his inner "natural state." That was the point in the discussion of George Sand's own moral character. It is also
the point of one of Hawthorne's most affirmative stories, "The Great Stone Face."

"The Great Stone Face" is built on a contrast which makes the story at once one of Hawthorne's most positive and most negative stories. The contrast is between life lived as Ernest lives it and life lived as his neighbors, the townspeople, live it. Ernest's life is positive and of the state of nature, the townspeople's lives are negative and of the state of war or society.

Briefly, the story is of a little boy named Ernest who is attracted to the beneficent radiations of a stone face carved on the mountain above his home. Ernest's mother tells him of a legend which says, "at some future day, a child should be born hereabouts, who was destined to become the greatest and noblest personage of his time, and whose countenance, in manhood, should bear an exact resemblance to the Great Stone Face." During Ernest's lifetime several boys of the village who have done well in the world return and are hailed as the fulfillment of the prophecy. Mr. Gathergold with his magnificent palace and "skin as yellow as if his own Midas-hand had transmuted it" comes back home, is hailed by the people, loses his money and dies in poverty and alone. Old Blood-and-Thunder the "war-worn veteran" returns and he, too, is hailed by all as the image of the Great Stone Face, but he is not the personage foretold. Then comes a statesman who has been nicknamed "Old Stony Phiz" who is running for the office of President. Despite his acceptance by the crowd, it is clear he is not the one. Finally, the poet comes in the time of
Ernest's old age. He is not the one foretold either, but as he meets Ernest and hears him lecture he sees in him the features of the Great Stone Face: the prophecy is fulfilled in Ernest.

Embarrassingly obvious in its allegorical meaning, the story is not so obvious in its moral tensions. Gathergold, Old Blood-and-Thunder, Old Stony Phiz, and the Poet are clearly alternative ways to live life and all are just as clearly rejected as the best way. This rejection, significantly, in each case is Ernest's in the face of the total acceptance of each by the townspeople. There are not just four alternative ways to live life; there are six. The first four as listed above are allegorical as the names of their principal representatives make clear. These are the least important alternatives. The other alternatives are those of the townspeople and that of Ernest and the Great Stone Face.

Symbolically, then, there are two locations for the moral and social action of the story. One is the Great Stone Face or natural goodness and the other is the world of money, war, politics, and art of civilization. Ernest and his townspeople are in the middle. The important action of the story is not the return of the four pretenders but is played out between Ernest and his fellows.

When Gathergold's carriage comes into town, the people shout, "'The very image of the Great Stone Face!' 'Sure enough, the old prophecy is true; and here we have the great man come, at last!'' Then we get Ernest's reaction and there is no doubt but what he is correct. "And, what greatly perplexed Ernest, they seemed actually
to believe that here was the likeness which they spoke of."
Others "bellowed," "He is the very image of the Great Stone Face."
"But Ernest turned sadly from the wrinkled shrewdness of that sordid visage" and looked up the valley at the face on the mountain and the "benign lips" which assured him "the man will come!"

When Old Blood-and-Thunder comes to town, the people say:

'Tis the same face; to a hair!' cried one man, cutting a caper for joy.'
'Wonderfully like, that's a fact!' responded another.
'Like! Why, I call it Old Blood-and-Thunder himself, in a monstrous look-in-glass!' cried a third. 'And why not? He's the greatest man of this or any other age, beyond a doubt.'

But when Ernest gets to see him at last, he "could not recognize" the resemblance. "He beheld a war-worn and weather-beaten countenance, full of energy, and expressive of an iron will; but the gentle wisdom, the deep, broad, tender sympathies, were altogether wanting in Old Blood-and-Thunder's visage. . . ." Ernest sadly concludes, "This is not the man of prophecy. . . ."

In a like pattern, the statesman, ironically but appropriately dubbed "Old Stony Phiz" as a mockery of the disparity between the real qualities of the Great Stone Face and this man's life, is hailed as the man by the people. Even Ernest, since "as yet he had not seen him," threw up his hat and cried, 'Huzza for the great man! Huzza for Old Stony Phiz!' When the great man appears, the people continue to cry, 'There! there! Look at Old Stony Phiz and then at the Old Man of the Mountain, and see if they are not as like as two twin brothers!' 'Confess it,' said one of Ernest's neighbors to him, 'the Great Stone Face has met its match at last.'"
When the neighbor repeats the question after the fellow stands before them, Ernest replies, "'No!'" "'I see little or no likeness.'" The neighbor then replies, "'Then so much the worst for the Great Stone Face.'"

Ernest turns away in sadness because Old Stony Phiz was very much like the face on the mountain; he "might have fulfilled the prophecy, and had not willed to do so."

The pattern is repeated in the case of the poet and, with Ernest's rejection of this man's bid for the title of the one who fulfills the prophecy, the story nears its end.

The townsman who says, "'Then so much the worst for the Great Stone Face'" is a horror to us. It is obvious that the people do not know what the face on the mountain looks like since they accept anyone as being in its image. Wealth, power, prestige, talent--these are the gods of the people and the gods of nature and religion are molded in the likeness of these worldly commodities. The theme of man's growing into the image of a divine being or principle or form is reversed by these townspeople. They pervert the divine by making it become the image of the momentary. Rather than move toward the face, they go toward the world. Thus the essential sadness of the story.

However, seen from Ernest's moral perspective, the story is positive and affirming because he is capable of a life lived under the guidance of the smiling face on the mountain and of therefore maintaining the divinity of his innocence.
As a little boy, Ernest gazes at the face and it smiles on him in love and kindness. Ernest is not unique in this, however, because Hawthorne says "It was the happy lot for children to grow up to manhood or womanhood with the Great Stone Face before their eyes." The face smiles on the whole valley, but Ernest is the only one who looks at it. "... the secret was that the boy's tender and confiding simplicity discerned what other people could not see; and thus the love, which was meant for all, became his peculiar portion." Like Drowne, Ernest sees the truth within the stone. Consider these descriptions of Ernest and his moral growth:

Ernest had had no teacher, save only that the Great Stone Face had become one to him.

They knew not that the Great Stone Face had become a teacher to him, and that the sentiment which was expressed in it would enlarge the young man's heart, and fill it with wider and deeper sympathies than other hearts. They knew not that thence would come a better wisdom than could be learned from books and a better life than could be molded on the defaced example of other human lives. Neither did Ernest know that the thoughts and affections which came to him so naturally, in the fields and at the fireside, and wherever he communed with himself, were of a higher tone than those which all man shared with him. A simple soul--simple as when his mother first taught him the old prophecy,--he beheld the marvelous features beaming adown the valley, and still wondered that their human counterpart was so long in making his appearance.

Unsought for, desired, had come the fame which so many seek, and made him known in the great world, beyond the limits of the valley in which he had dwelt so quietly. College professors, and even the active men of cities, came from far to see and converse with Ernest; for the report had gone abroad that this simple husbandman had ideas unlike those of other men, not gained from books, but of a higher tone.

Often had the poet held intercourse with the wittiest and the wisest, but never before with a man like Ernest, whose thoughts and feelings gushed up with such a natural freedom, and who made great truths so familiar by his simple utterance of them. Angels, as had been so often said, seemed to have wrought with him at his
labor in the fields; angels seemed to have sat with him by the fireside; and, dwelling with angels as with friends, he had imbibed the sublimity of their ideas, and imbued it with the sweet and lowly charm of household words.

And finally,

Into this natural pulpit Ernest ascended, and threw a look of familiar kindness around upon his audience. They stood, or sat, or reclined upon the grass, as seemed good to each, with the departing sunshine falling obliquely over them, and mingling its subdued cheerfulness with the solemnity of a grove of ancient trees, beneath and amid the boughs of which the golden rays were constrained to pass. In another direction was seen the Great Stone Face, with the same cheer, combined with the same solemnity, in its benignant aspect.

Ernest began to speak, giving to the people of what was in his heart and mind. His words had power, because they accorded with his thoughts; and his thoughts had reality and depth, because they harmonized with the life which he had always lived. It was not mere breath that this preacher uttered; they were the words of life, because a life of good deeds and holy love was melted into them. Pearls, pure and rich, had been dissolved into this precious draught.

Ernest is an adult who has retained his crystal innocent and has added to it moral and spiritual wisdom born of that goodness. As Ernest thus stands before the people as the image of the Great Stone Face and the fulfillment of the prophecy, the obvious Christ-Father-Mother Mary-Holy Ghost symbolism is overt and we realize that perhaps Hawthorne intended the final speech to be a kind of Sermon on the Mount. The story does not have to be taken in this way, however. In the beginning of the story we learned that the face on the mountain appeared "like a human face, with all its original divinity intact..." Ernest is a representative of the potential divinity in all men.

Ernest, then, in becoming like the face on the mountain is actually maintaining the innocence he had in the beginning. He, like
Émile and many of Sand's peasants such as Gaffer Patience, has retained his innocence into his adulthood and that purity has become the source of a higher and more profound wisdom than the world knows. This is man in the state of nature. This peasant-artist-prophet condition is the state of nature. It is in this condition of moral purity and transparence where words have "power, because they accorded with his thoughts; and his thoughts had reality and depth, because they harmonized with the life which he had always lived."

Of Émile and Sophy, Germain and Marie, and Holgrave and Phoebe: Marriage In the State of Innocence

As they could see children, single adults, and old people in the condition of innocence and nature, so, too, could Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand portray couples living in such a condition.

Because of the power of Hawthorne's stories of male-female relations in the state of war such as those between Hester Prynne and Arthur Dimmesdale, these relations in the state of innocence which contrast with those others so starkly are either embarrassingly relegated to the sentimental tradition and to lapses in his creative powers or are ignored by many of his critics. Rousseau's La Nouvelle Héloïse is often read as a study of virtue and purity triumphant which, as we will see in chapter three, is questionable. His depiction of the marriage of Émile and Sophy is more accurately a study in the innocent condition. Many, even those who have only heard of Sand's novels, know enough about her life to suppose that her country novels
and those of a highly romantic nature are of this world of innocence, and generally this supposition is true.

The story of Émile and Sophy is told in Book V of Émile. Émile is Rousseau's natural man whose "negative education" has protected him from the errors of the "civilized" world and has allowed him to grow to manhood in obedience to the laws of things not people as administered in a "natural" way by his tutor. He is, therefore, innocent as he reaches the age of maturity and is still an infant as to his passions. As if anticipating the scoffer who smiles at the idea of such a person as Émile and such an education, and like Hawthorne's comment on the general availability of the blessing of the Great Stone Face, Rousseau declares, "The story of human nature is a fair romance. Am I to blame if it is not found elsewhere? I am trying to write the history of mankind. If my book is a romance, the fault lies with those who deprave mankind." However much a "fiction" Émile may seem, for Rousseau he is real because he is true to "human nature," to man's true potential. Like Ernest in "The Great Stone Face," Émile is "not found elsewhere" among men because of the ignorance and depravity of all of the other people, not because he is unreal.

When Émile reaches the age of manhood, the tutor sees the passions beginning to arise in the boy as by nature's command and as he knows, the "murmur of rising passion announces this tumultuous change" in Émile's life. "We are born, so to speak, twice over; born into existence and born into life; born a human being, and born
a man. Thus, "at the time ordained by nature," Émile becomes ungovernable, excitable, deaf to his tutor's voice, as a lion in a fever, and distrustful. "The time is come; we must now seek [Sophy] in earnest. . . ." It is time, as Burgelin says, for Émile's "Second Education" into worldliness, love, and the city. Most of all, however, it is time for him to attach his heart to a pure woman and to marry.

Thus the search for Sophy, who, like Émile, is an abstraction so true as to be possible everywhere but found rarely because of the world's preparation of women. "Sophy should be as truly a woman as Émile is a man, i.e., she must possess all those characteristics of her sex which are required to enable her to play her part in the physical and moral order." Importantly this natural mate for this natural man is not to be found in the city, in Paris: "Then farewell Paris, far-famed Paris, with all your noise and smoke and dirt, where the women have ceased to believe in honour and the men in virtue. We are in search of love, happiness, innocence; the further we go from Paris the better."

Before pursuing the mating of Émile and Sophy, we need to see the role of sex and passion in Rousseau's overall philosophy. Rousseau says, "Thus, in making him a lover, I will make him a man." Émile cannot be a man except through sex, passion, and female love. Berman says this of Rousseau's attitudes toward sex:

He saw sexual desire, like all natural feelings, as basically good; 'it must not be destroyed, it must be controlled.' The only authentic form of control, for Rousseau, was self-control. But the self-control that he had in mind here did not entail a
reduction of sexuality. Rather, the mutual intimacy and trust and knowledge and tenderness of romantic love was a medium in which sexuality could flow more freely--and more deeply--than ever before. . . . Sexuality would be intensified and deepened by the romantic relationship. . . .

Rousseau sees the central importance of the sexual passions in man's maturity, and so he plans Émile's introduction to these passions carefully.

Rousseau begins Émile's search for Sophy by saying, "It is not good for man to be alone. Émile is now a man, and we must give him his promised helpmeet. That helpmeet is Sophy." The biblical tone here and the assumption of the benevolent "God" role by the tutor makes false the idea that some critics argue that Rousseau intended the tutor to be seen as a totalitarian dictator or a behavioral scientist, controlling or manipulating Émile like a moron. As nature's timetable initiated Émile's transition into his second state, the "unity and wholeness of being which [this] simple Natural Man had enjoyed as a matter of course in his primitive forest"--state of innocence--breaks up and, as is clear from Émile's feverishness and lack of control, he is now no longer a unified and whole creature. Thus, as the tutor knows, "The time has come. . . ."

What is now being formed is the basic love unit which is the primary male-female relation in Rousseau's, Hawthorne's, and Sand's works. Two together, alone. Berman calls this couple "The Romantic Dyad." "No solitary individual, no dues-paying member of society, but only a man and a woman bound together by mutual love, could hope to become 'a complete moral person.'" Rousseau says:
the social relation of the sexes is a wonderful thing. This relation produces a moral person of which woman is the eye and man the hand, but the two are so dependent on one another that the man teaches the woman what to see, while she teaches him what to do. ... But in their mutual harmony each contributes to a common purpose; each follows the other's lead, each commands and each obeys. 71

The words "mutual harmony," "common purpose," and "each commands and each obeys" are important to this study because it is this sense of openness, transparency, and pure communication that distinguishes male-female relations in the state of nature. "... together they provide the clearest light and the profoundest knowledge which is possible to the unaided human mind; in a word, the surest knowledge of self and of others of which the human race is possible." 72

"Together they provide the purest light. ..." Male-female relations characterized by light and purity are important in Rousseau's moral and social philosophy. We must learn of them here and keep them in mind for an adequate understanding of male-female destructiveness in the state of society and of Rousseau's purposes for showing these relations in these ways.

This love which brings an awareness of self by merging together with another is not only a restoration of unity and wholeness to the growing person, it is also an anchor for the "personality in a world that threatened to sweep it away." 73 It will be recalled that at the beginning of Émile the child as an infant is likened to "a sapling chance sown in the midst of the highway":

Under existing conditions a man left to himself from birth would be more of a monster than the rest. Prejudice, authority, necessity, example, all the social conditions into which we are plunged, would stifle nature in him and put nothing in her
place. He would be like a sapling chance sown in the midst of the highway, bent hither and thither and soon crushed by the passers-by.

Tender, anxious mother, I appeal to you. You can remove this young tree from the highway and shield it from the crushing force of social conventions. Tend and water it ere it dies. One day its fruit will reward your care. From the outset raise a wall round your child's soul; another may sketch the plan, you alone should carry it into execution.74

What can the "anxious mother" anchor the youth's soul to as his passions begin to demand participation in the world? How can the natural education be continued? Rousseau seems to say that it is best to set Émile's heart on fire for one woman and hers for one man in a proper (natural-passionate) way so as to "anchor" them, "shield" them against the new plunging into the world, cities, and society. Modernity will not destroy them if romantic passion ties them together as a "Dyad." Berman calls this romantic love "The Primary Community" and, recalling the tree image, says, "The tree could live fruitfully on the highway only if it intertwined itself with another tree."75

After announcing their search for Sophy, the tutor describes what "Sophy, Woman" will be like. Sand's negative reaction to Rousseau's ideas of women remind us as we read of Sophy that Rousseau's notion of "ideal woman" is fraught with the genius and the cliches of his age. Women are weak and passive; they should offer little resistance; their minds are not capable of abstract thinking; they should be taught the domestic skills, etc. But Sophy is also endowed by Rousseau with powers which seem more compatible with life: "Self-possession, penetration, delicate observation, this
is a woman's science; the skill to make use of it is her chief accomplishment."  

Of male and female relations, the tutor says, "When the wife is like Sophy, it is, however, good for the man to be led by her; that is another of nature's laws. . . ."

Summing up all of "the considerations which decided my choice of Sophy," the tutor gives this list which shows us Rousseau's ideal woman:

Brought up, like Émile, by Nature, she is better suited to him than any others; she will be his true mate. She is his equal in birth and character, his inferior in fortune. She makes no great impression at first sight, but day by day reveals fresh charms. Her chief influence only takes effect gradually, it is only discovered in friendly intercourse; and her husband will feel it more than any one. Her education is neither showy nor neglected; she has taste without deep study, talent without art, judgment without learning. Her mind knows little, but it is trained to learn; it is well-tilled soil ready for the sower. She has read no book but Bareme and Telemachus which happened to fall into her hands; but no girl who can feel so passionately towards Telemachus can have a heart without feeling or a mind without discernment. What charming ignorance! Happy is he who is destined to be her tutor. She will not be her husband's teacher but his scholar; far from seeking to control his tastes, she will share them. She will suit him far better than a blue- stocking and he will have the pleasure of teaching her everything. It is time they made acquaintance; let us try to plan a meeting.

So, this, the "most delightful couple whom love and virtue have ever led to happiness" passes "from one stage of life to another." After Émile's heart is firmly anchored in deep romantic love for Sophy, the tutor says, "Émile, you must leave Sophy" and the travel now begins. Safely anchored from the deceptions and deceits of the world by her love, Émile goes into cities and learns of governments, learns of prejudices, meets women and men in the cities, and is educated concerning the world.
After this time of travel and education, Émile returns and marries Sophy. The closing paragraphs of the novel are of great importance because the rhetoric reveals a couple of the state of innocence—a primary love unit of two people together, alone yet with a friend.

Happy lovers, worthy husband and wife! To do honour to their virtues, to paint their felicity, would require the history of their lives. How often does my heart throb with rapture when I behold in them the crown of my life's work! How often do I take their hands in mind blessing God with all my heart! How often do I kiss their clasped hands! How often do their tears of joy fall upon mine! They are my joy and they share my raptures.

Here, in the state of nature and innocence we see the love between husband and wife and friend, a basic or primary love unit and another person without tension and we see it fraught with positive connotations and results without any negative or destructive feelings. This is the male-female ideal in the condition of innocence.

When we approach the subject of George Sand and marriage, we might expect to encounter a fierce blast of revolutionary energy, denouncing this institution of feminine bondage, disrupting the social relations between the sexes, and shouting the new feminine order. We expect to be faced with a *femme fatale*, "an ogress in quest of fresh and tender food" as one critic describes Sand. Julia Ward Howe says that in her own youth she read Sand's novels at "stolen hours, with waning and still entreated light, . . . in a dreary winter room with a flickering candle warning us of late hours." She adds, "Grown mothers ourselves, we quietly removed them as far as possible
from the young hands about us, and would rather have deprived them of the noble French language altogether than have allowed it to bring them such lessons as Jacques and Valentine."

Yet, when we read very far into many of her novels, we are surprised to find not a denunciation of marriage but a rather level-headed assessment of the marriage of agreement or arrangement which is contracted as a matter of economic or social advantage without regard for the feelings of the woman. We find not a fight against marriage, but a fight for true marriage. As Ethyl Staley says, "This combat against the social barriers of marriage is frequent in George Sand." It is one thing to hate men and marriage and quite another to hate social imposition and moral depravity which result in households mal assorté. Staley summarizes the view of marriage in some of Sand's novels by saying:

Whatever vicissitudes they may have to endure because of it the union of the lovers is confirmed by marriage for Genieve in André, Fiamma in Simon, Edmée in Mauprat, Yseult in the Compagnon du tour de France, Arsene in Horace and in the leading characters of Consuelo, Mademoiselle de Quintinie, the Pêche de M. Antoine, Daniella, Constance Verrier, and the Ville Noire.

In a footnote she adds:

Seillière in George Sand, Mystique, etc., says that George Sand presents family life and marital fidelity in the Diable aux Champs, Mauprat, Evenor et Leucippe, Daniella, Constance Verrier, Jean de la Roche (as far as plot is concerned), Le marquis de Villemer, Vaïvèdre, Antonia, Monsieur Sylvestre, Cesarine Dietrich, Flamardane, Les deux frères; p. 305 he quotes Jean de la Roche, Confessions d'une jeune fille, and Daniella as showing her opposition to the 'marriage de convenance.'

Sand's was a "fertile, a maternal nature." She said of herself, "Dr. Favre said one day that every soul is dominated by one supreme
Her novels are replete with examples of women who, like Sand herself, seek fulfillment in marriage, some of whom find it and some of whom do not. Some of those characters who do find physical, emotional, and spiritual fulfillment in marriage are those we can see as living in the state of nature.

Because her great heart was so open to the reality of "the people," she, unlike Rousseau, did not have to fabricate an Émile and a Sophy to tell the story of natural love. Her problem was just the opposite: how does the artist get all of the truth of the real natural experience into the confines of a story. In the form of a dialogue between two writers in the introduction to François le Champi, Sand discusses this problem:

'Come, begin, tell me the story of the 'Waif,' but not in the way that you and I heard it last night. That was a masterly piece of narrative for you and me who are children of the soil. But tell it to me as if you had on your right hand a Parisian speaking the modern tongue, and on your left a peasant before whom you were unwilling to utter a word or phrase which he could not understand. You must speak clearly for the Parisian, and simply for the peasant. One will accuse you of a lack of local colour, and the other of a lack of elegance. But I shall be listening too, and I am trying to discover by what means art, without ceasing to be universal, can penetrate the mystery of primitive simplicity, and interpret the charm of nature to the mind.88

That is the problem of telling a story of natural love; how to get life into a language and form proper in both the civilized and primitive dimensions. How, as Rousseau also asked, does one present a romance of fidelity and transparence to a world accustomed to infidelity and opacity! Finally, as she explains in La Mare au
Diable, Sand decides to take this course:

The best the artist can hope for is to persuade those who have eyes to see for themselves. Look at what is simple, my kind reader; look at the sky, the fields, the trees, and at what is good and true in the peasants; you will catch a glimpse of them in my book, but you will see them much better in nature.

Whereas Rousseau and Hawthorne in *Emile* and "The Great Stone Face" presented men in the state of nature through the "suppose" and allegorical forms, for Sand this natural life was outside of her window at Nohant in the Berrichon peasant. For her the state of nature was tangible and real.

To show her portrayal of this real world, I will discuss Germain and Marie in *La Mare au Diable*. Their relationship best shows how Sand saw the innocence and transparency of love between men and women in the state of nature. I could just as well have chosen Albert and Consuelo at the end of *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt*, "that beautiful couple, so pure before God, so chastely happy before men."

I might also have chosen François and Madeleine in *François le Champi* who, after trials and lengthy separation, finally consummate their mother-son love:

So when François saw all at once that she was still young and as beautiful as the blessed Virgin, his heart gave a great bound, as if he had climbed to the pinnacle of a tower. He went back for the night to the mill, where his bed was neatly spread in a square of boards among the sacks of flour. Once there, and by himself, he shivered and gasped as if he had a fever; but it was only the fever of love, for he who had all his life warmed himself comfortably in front of the ashes, had suddenly been scorched by a great burst of flame.

Operating within the sentimental tradition here, Sand shows the entrance of the consummation of love and chastity in the heart of a
good man. The love of Fadette and Landry in *La Petite Fadette* is another of the many examples that could have been chosen for this study of male-female relations in the state of nature.

The story of Germain and Marie in *La Mare au Diable*, however alike it is in structure and plot to these others, is unique in several ways. Like Emile and Sophy, Germain and Marie fall in love (sentimental and romantic love) in the beginning of their relationship. Like Emile and Sophy also, this romantic love, though not openly acknowledged at the beginning as it is in *Emile*, is not the end of male-female relations but the beginning of them. As in Rousseau's picture, this couple grows from passion to friendship to mutual respect and reverence to final love and marriage. This is an important "natural" process. I also choose this story because it is a novelette of innocence of a kind very similar to Hawthorne's picture of love above earthly passion and instinct in "The Great Stone Face," "Drowne's Wooden Image," and *The House of the Seven Gables*.

The novel is short, having only eighty leisurely pages. It has sixteen chapters whose division clearly indicates the plot and the social and moral development of the characters. I separate the structure and the plot in the following manner not because they are complicated or to make the story appear sophisticated or involved because neither is the case. Rather, I do so to make overt how Sand saw the love and marriage process in the state of nature and to make clear the social-moral frame in which she set that process.
Chapter I The Frame

This chapter is a continuation of the author's thoughts on Holbein's painting, "The Dance of Death" which shows a peasant driving an ox while a skeleton, representing death, acts as ploughboy to the farmer. Sand acknowledges that most peasants are dull and labor with no poetry in their lives, but she promises that "true happiness will be theirs when mind, heart, and hand shall work in concert in the sight of Heaven and there shall be a sacred harmony between God's goodness and the joys of his creatures." Then she shifts immediately to a particular farmer in real-life fields. Here he stands before her with his oxen and his son. She denies Holbein as regards this man when she says, "The whole scene was beautiful in its grace and strength; the landscape, the man, the child, the oxen under the yoke; and in spite of the mighty struggle by which the earth was subdued, a deep feeling of peace and sweetness reigned over all." This man is Germain and this is the frame for the love of a natural farmer and his little peasant neighbor.

Chapters II-V The Family

In these chapters we meet this peasant Germain. He is about twenty-eight years old and is a "skilled husbandman." We meet his father and mother-in-law, Father and Mother Maurice, we meet his children, and we meet the neighbor woman Mother Guillette and her sixteen year-old daughter Marie. We learn that Germain's wife Catherine died two years before and that the three children are too big a burden for the two old grandparents. Father Maurice advises
Germain to court a widow named Guerin, the daughter of a friend in a distant town. Obediently but with mixed emotions he consents:

Germain had always lived soberly, as industrious peasants do. Married at twenty, he had loved but one woman in his life, and after her death, impulsive and gay as his nature was, he had never trifled with another.  

This is the natural "code" of fidelity, if you will, and it is meaningful to remember that this is the "terrible" George Sand who is saying it with such conviction.

Mother Guillette hears that he is going; so she asks if he will escort Marie to a town near his destination where the girl has been hired as a maid. He agrees, and with complete trust all around he and Marie set off on his horse. They encounter Germain's son, Petit-Pierre on the road and at Marie's persuading they take him along on the trip. The scrupulous sense of decorum in this story seems contrary to our usual notions of Sand's own "morality."

Chapters VI-X Lost on the Heath

They travel until dark and, as the night settles in, Germain gets confused in his directions. They dismount to figure out where they are, the horse runs away, and they decide to try to make the best of the situation for the night.

Germain has noticed little Marie's virtues such as her ease with children, her modest appetite, and her general good sense. Further, as she makes a bed for the child, makes a fire in the damp and dark, and happily makes their uncomfortable situation tolerable, he sees she is "a clever girl" with "a kind heart." She cooks some food and produces from her bags the left over wine from their meal at
the inn on the way. "You are the most thoughtful girl I have ever met," Germain says. Then, knowing full well its implications, he adds, "Little Marie, the man who marries you will be no fool."98

As a natural maiden, she acts totally innocent although she is deeply affected by his suggestions. When he begins to push their conversation to marriage and to him and to her, she evades him completely. After an evening prayer, Petit-Pierre falls asleep "on Marie's breast" with the words, "Little Father . . . if you wish to give me a new mother, I hope it will be Marie."99 They speak briefly of his prospects and of hers, but it is a thinly veiled declaration of his love. Chaste and innocent, she says he is too old for her and puts him off gently but firmly.

He spends the night in passionate torment, and at one point, he reaches over to kiss Petit-Pierre "who had one arm about Marie's neck, and made such a mistake that Marie felt a breath, hot as fire, cross her lips. . . ."100 Sand tells us "Little Marie was so innocent that she believed" his excuse, but we learn later she is far more aware and wise.

Later in the dark they walk around the camp, discuss the question of each of their marriage prospects but get nowhere with their feet or mouths. In the morning a woodcutter tells them the way and soon Germain approaches his "Widow Guerin" and Marie her employer.

Chapter XI-XIII The Town

Vanity and lust--that is what they find at their respective destinations:
The Widow Guerin had a good figure and did not lack freshness, but her expression and her dress displeased Germain the instant he saw her. She had a bold, self-satisfied look. . . . Her elaborate dress and forward manner inclined Germain to judge the widow old and ugly, although she was certainly not either. He thought that such finery and playful manners might well suit little Marie's years and wit, but that the widow's fun was laboured and over bold, and that she wore her fine clothes in bad taste . . . , and the widow was not sorry to display her pretty china and keep a table like a rich lady . . . , and the artificial manner of the widow, who kept lowering her eyes with a smile as a woman does who is sure of her calculations . . . . Yet the widow laughed as though she admired all of the other suitors' foolishness. . . . As they all walk to Mass, the roads were filled with people, and the widow marched proudly along, escorted by her three suitors, taking an arm, first of one and then of another, and carrying her head high with an air of importance. She was eager to display the fourth to the eyes of the passers-by; but Germain felt so ridiculous to be dragged along in the train of a petticoat where all the world might see, that he kept at a respectable distance . . . .

There are women of nature and women of the world, and since Germain, like Émile, has met a "natural" one and has fallen in love with her he can now know "the instant" he sees the woman of the world the falsity of her life. Like Ernest and his ability to know the face of truth and virtue when he sees it, Germain is immediately repulsed by this "Widow Guerin" of the town. "All the trouble and annoyance of the past few hours made Germain long to be with his child and with his little neighbour."

His "little neighbour" and son had fled the house of her employer because upon arriving the vile and lusty fellow propositioned her, tried to rape her, and when she fled from his property he chased after her to seduce her or force her to be silent. Germain and the farmer meet on the road and find Marie and the boy at the same moment. After the farmer asks to speak to Marie again in private and
again offers her money and speaks of illicit relations, she throws his money in his face and Germain threatens him with such strength that he flees.

Chapters XIV-XVI The Return and Marriage

As they return to their own village, Germain speaks of how important it is to have an "older" man to protect a young girl and hints of his love, but again she avoids him. When they get back, Germain languishes for days because of the unfulfillment of his love. Mother Maurice finally gets him to tell her of his love for Marie and the old woman visits Marie and arranges for a visit from Germain. He goes to the Mother Guillette's home and he and Marie engage in a brief modesty-search conversation in which Marie finally is able to speak of her innocent and chaste love: "'Oh, Germain,' she sobbed, 'didn't you feel that I loved you?'" Like the ending of Emile, Sand concludes her study of the natural man and woman in this manner:

Then Germain had gone mad, if his son, who came galloping into the cottage on a stick, with his little sister on the crupper, scourging the imaginary steed with a willow branch, had not brought him to his senses. He lifted the boy and placed him in the girl's arms.

'See,' said he, 'by loving me, you have made more than one person happy.'

The basic love unit of Germain and Marie has been formed in the presence of a third person which adds to the solidity of the dyad. This is George Sand's portrayal of love and male-female relations in the state of nature.
As an introduction to Hawthorne's portrayal of male-female relations in the natural state, I will summarize and discuss his story "The New Adam and Eve." This is a story similar to those of Émile and Sophy and Germain and Marie.

In "The New Adam and Eve" Hawthorne presents his clearest picture of male-female love in the state of nature. The story is a "suppose"-type of tale which tells of the day of doom when man is wiped off the earth. Then he says, imagine a new Adam and Eve on their first morning. Like Rousseau's hypothetical Émile and Sophy and Sand's peasant-artists, this new Adam and Eve are a way of looking at men and women as they were initially in nature and of speculating on their basic nature and subsequent development in society.

In terms very similar to those of Sand's in her preface to François le Champi and to those of Rousseau's in the first of Émile, Hawthorne speaks of the difference between the "growth of nature" and the world's "artificial system." A small "tuft of grass" betokens the one and "every lamp post and each brick of the houses" the other. This new Adam and Eve have no trouble distinguishing between the things of nature and the things of the world because "all the phenomena of the natural world renew themselves" whereas "The marks of wear and tear, and renewed decay . . . distinguish the works of man. . . ." In language like both Rousseau's and Sand's Hawthorne describes the natural and social states:

We who are born into the world's artificial system can never adequately know how little in our present state and circumstances is natural, and how much is merely the interpolation of the perverted mind and heart of man. . . . It is only through
the medium of the imagination that we can lessen these iron 
fetters, which we call truth and reality, and make ourselves 
even partially sensible what prisoners we are.104

Applying the "medium of imagination" as regards his couple, 
Hawthorne has them visit various buildings left by the old 
inhabitants. Of the law and judgment buildings he reflects:

Oh Judgment Seat, not by the pure in heart wast thou established, 
nor in the simplicity of nature; but by hard and wrinkled men, 
and upon the accumulated heap of earthly wrong. Thou art the 
very symbol of man's perverted state.105

The words "man's perverted state" could be directly out of Rousseu's 
first or second Discourses. Because the jail is now empty it, like 
the whole jail of an earth this natural couple is discovering, is now 
"a solitude" and has lost "something of its dismal gloom." Eve drops 
a champagne bottle and as the liquid spills out Hawthorne says that 
men used the drink as "recompense" for the calm lifelong joys which 
he had lost by his revolt from Nature.106

In the bank the "glittering worthlessness" of money has no 
power of attraction over them and here in this domain of materialism 
Adam and Eve "have discovered the mainspring, the life, the very 
essence of the system that had choked . . . the original nature of 
the first inhabitants in its deadly grip." In one of the most 
extended parts of the story Adam and Eve go into a library and 
encounter the books. Throwing away the book of poetry she has 
picked up, Eve "laughs merrily" and says:

'My dear Adam, . . . you look so pensive and dismal. Do fling 
down that stupid thing; for even if it should speak it would 
not be worth attending to. Let us talk with one another, and 
with the sky, and the green earth, and its trees and flowers.
They will teach us better knowledge than we can find here.  

Hawthorne agrees with Eve and says that the library is the fatal "Tree of Knowledge" because it contains "all the perversions, and sophistries, and false wisdom;" "all the narrow truth;" "all the wrong principles and worse practice;" "all the specious theories;" "all the sad experience;" "and the whole heap of ... disastrous lore."  

"But, blessed in his ignorance, [Adam] may still enjoy a new world in our worn out one," Hawthorne concludes.

Hawthorne says that if Adam and Eve were to choose a symbol for Death as they visit the cemetery, "it would be the butterfly soaring upward, or the bright angel beckoning them aloft, or the child asleep, with soft dreams visible through her transparent purity."

"Transparent" and "purity" in the child-like state of nature characterize the state of innocence and nature.

As Adam and Eve encounter a church, they kneel outside to pray and Hawthorne observes, "Purity and simplicity hold converse at every moment with their Creator." After they have been inside for a moment, Adam tells Eve, "'Let us go forth and perhaps we shall discern a Great Face looking down on us.'" Eve responds "'Yes; a Great Face, with a beam of love brightening over it like sunshine.'"  

As in the story of Ernest where the natural man recognizes the "beam of love" from heaven, so too do these natural people sense the source of goodness and life:

In the course of the world's lifetime, every remedy was tried for its [sin's] cure and extirpation except the single one, the flower that grew in heaven and was sovereign for all the miseries of earth. Man never had attempted to cure sin by LOVE!
Observing the mansions and the hovels and the disparity between them which is so confusing to this new couple, Hawthorne says, "A wretched change, indeed, must be wrought in their own hearts ere they can conceive the primal decree of Love to have been so completely abrogated. . . ."

The "primal decree of love" is the key to this story of "The New Adam and Eve" and to Hawthorne's philosophy of the state of nature. Man's selfishness and vanity has transformed nature into an artificial world where natural love between men and women cannot survive. Man was not born evil, but in the development of his social capabilities he has changed his nature.

Finally, when the possibility of death enters the discussion, Adam says:

'But should our earthly life be leaving us with the departing light, we need not doubt that another morn will find us somewhere beneath the smile of God. I feel that he has imparted the boon of existence never to be resumed.'

Eve's response summarizes the social and moral meaning of male-female relations in the state of society and again shows the importance of the primary love unit: "'And no matter where we exist,' replies Eve, 'for we shall always be together.'"

For my most complete study of Hawthorne's portrayal of life in the state of nature, I will now analyze his third novel, The House of the Seven Gables. In it we see the themes of innocence and transparence, of the primary love unit and marriage, and of the falsity of the world developed fully.

In April of 1851 Hawthorne published The House of the Seven Gables. He had actually finished writing it around January 26, 1851.
As the book neared its completion, he began to read the manuscript to his wife Sophia who was five months pregnant. Here is Sophia's and Randall Stewart's description of those days:

Several days earlier, in the evening, Hawthorne had begun to read the manuscript to his wife. 'Oh joy unspeakable!' Sophia wrote in her diary. 'Before he told me he should read, I was anticipating a drowsy time on the couch--she was five months' pregnant--'but the spell of his voice and the power of the book kept me marvelously awake till ten.' While Sophia did her sewing during the following day, she could think only of Maule's well. And after she had listened on successive evenings to the story's progress and close, she wrote: 'There is unspeakable grace and beauty in the conclusion, throwing back upon the sterner tragedy of the commencement an ethereal light, and a dear home-loveliness and satisfaction.'

So she pronounced her judgment on a novel which has as its major female character a girl-woman named Phoebe--"one of Hawthorne's names for his bird-like Sophia," in what was of all his novels the "most characteristic of my mind, and more proper and natural for me to write." In its view of woman embodied in Phoebe, in Hawthorne's attitude toward male relations with this kind of woman, and in the moral (Phoebe) and social (Holgrave) themes, this novel is Hawthorne's finest treatment of male-female relations in the state of innocence or nature.

I am fully aware of the D. H. Lawrence--Leslie Fiedler--Frederick Crews view of Phoebe and of Hawthorne's other "Good Good Women" and of these critics' questioning of the maturity of the "happy ending" and general quality of this novel. Closely equating Phoebe with Hawthorne's wife Sophie whom Fiedler calls "an ethereal ice-lady," these critics when they come to The House of the Seven Gables find themselves either sputtering to a tongue-tied ending.
like that of Lawrence who concludes with a series of question marks ("? ? ?"), just dismissing the whole thing as does Fiedler by calling it Hawthorne's "most sentimental and philistine" work, or changing their whole approach to Hawthorne as does Crews when he says to speak of this novel critics must "review their methodology." What they are all saying is that the book is very different from "Hawthorne" as they define him and that it is therefore outside of his (and their) central concerns. Because these critics use this novel and other writings like it to denounce this type of woman and the "happy" resolution, they have made it emotionally and psychologically naive and professionally disrespectful to see the book as "straight"—without Freudian bent—and sincere.

I am also aware of Randall Stewart's excellent study of Mrs. Hawthorne's revisions of Hawthorne's journals and American Notebooks. Certainly her revisions and changes do suggest a prudery and a perception of his works and life that might lead us to judge her harshly. Acknowledging the merits of these analyses, I suggest here, quite to the contrary, an interpretation of Hawthorne's wife and of his relationships with her and of The House of the Seven Gables which accepts the love story, the happy ending, and Hawthorne's characterization of Phoebe as straight and sincere. Such a view does not hurt Hawthorne's reputation and it certainly makes his overall fiction and his life more intelligible.

This interpretation is not new in its general tone since there is scholarly acceptance of this optimism in Hawthorne's life and in
this novel. Randall Stewart sets this tone when he says, "if The House of the Seven Gables was not Hawthorne's greatest work, he enjoyed writing it more than any other." Stewart includes Phoebe and Holgrave in his list of characters who are brightened by the light of Hawthorne's belief that trials do "enrich" human lives and increase our "capacities for happiness." F. O. Matthiessen acknowledges that "The balance [of head and heart] which prevents disaster is symbolized in the union of Holgrave and Phoebe," and it is he who suggests that Sophia is embodied in the character of Phoebe. Finally, to read The House of the Seven Gables as a love story set into the larger canon of Hawthorne's works and requiring some overall sense of perspective for appreciation is what my study intends, and this is what R. R. Male means when he says that "To the traditional definition of the romance as a love story, Hawthorne added a dignity that stemmed from his deep understanding of the relation between man and woman, space and time, comedy and tragedy." To his belief in love's realization in the state of nature, Hawthorne added his belief in its destruction in the state of society, and its possible but tentative reclamation in the higher moral state. Male's belief that it is a tragic process or construct which gives meaning to all of these stages is very close to the overall construct proposed here. From that larger perspective we see that there is "dignity" in the simple, the pure, the happy love.

First, the whole question of Hawthorne and Sophia needs comment because the novel with its Phoebe and its happy, romantic,
and sunny quality takes on meaning as we consider the relationship between the author and his wife.

In a letter in 1839 to Sophia Peabody during their courtship, Hawthorne sets the proper stage for this brief study of his relationships with her:

... because we have met in Eternity, and there our intimacy was formed. So get well as soon as you possibly can, and I shall never doubt that you are the same Sophie who has so often leaned upon my arm and needed its superfluous strength. I have never, till now, had a friend who could give me repose; all have disturbed me, and, whether for pleasure or pain, it was still disturbance. But peace overflows from your heart into mine. Then I feel that there is a Now, and the Now must be always calm and happy, and that sorrow and evil are but phantoms that seem to flit across it. [126]

He is thirty-five years old and has spent many of his last years in absorption and writing. His need for "a friend who could give me repose," a friend who could sustain his faith, and a friend who could bring him calm and happiness was intense and was fulfilled in Sophia. In the deliberate misspelling of Sophia as Sophie, which he often does, Hawthorne suggests that for him, a reader of Émile both early and late in his life, this woman is like Rousseau's ideal, his Sophy, and this Hawthorne the lucky Émile.

As the courtship progresses, the tone of Hawthorne's letters and journals remains the same but deepens in intensity:

I drew nearer and nearer to you, and opened my heart to you, and you came to me, and will remain forever, keeping my heart warm and renewing my life with your own. You only have taught me that I have a heart,—you only have thrown a light, deep downward and upward, into my soul. You only have revealed me to myself; for without your aid my best knowledge of my self would have been merely to know my own shadow,—to watch it flickering on the wall, and mistake its fantasies for my own real actions. [127]
This is a different Nathaniel Hawthorne from the one we are used to, and no where surrounding such letters is any sign of what Lawrence calls "savage irony" or mockery. Hawthorne ends a letter of October 1840 with the words, "'God bless you, you sinless Eve!'" There is no indication that her effect on him was debilitating or castrating; rather, it seems overtly fulfilling and healing and stimulating.

The love letters and correspondence with Sophia during his Brook Farm period and their engagement are like the American Notebooks in their positive tone. These letters are happy and loving and the picture he composes of her is of a lovely woman both physically, mentally, and morally. On June 20, 1842 (they were married on July 9, 1842) he ends his letter to her with these words: "'I love you! I love you! I love you!'" We usually do not think of Hawthorne in this light. In a tone very similar to that of his Old Manse period when he was so happy with Sophia in their cottage away from everyone, he writes late in the summer of 1842 of his new wife:

Methinks my little wife is twin-sister to the Spring; so they should greet one another tenderly,—for they both are fresh and dewy, both full of hope and cheerfulness; both have bird-voices, always singing out of their hearts; both are sometimes overcast with flitting mists, which only make the flowers bloom brighter; and both have power to renew and recreate the weary spirit. I have married the Spring! I am husband to the month of May!  

This springtime and natural world quality of Sophia's influence is very much like Rousseau's and Sand's presentations of natural love and innocence. He seemed to live what both of them experienced only briefly and dreamed of constantly. His life centered around a
positive love and marriage relationship and he knew that men and women can and should be fulfilled through love and marriage and family. This is the point of The House of the Seven Gables.

Phoebe Pyncheon is the heroine of the story. To summarize the many, many sentences and paragraphs in the novel which describe her is difficult because they cover a surprisingly wide range of characteristics. To dismiss her as a "snow-maiden" of frigid purity as several critics do is to miss the point of the novel and is to do great harm to her characterization.

Physically, Phoebe is slender, young, blooming, and cheerful, with good health and the magnetism of innate fitness. She is very pretty, as graceful as a bird, and sincerely pleasant. As Clifford says, nothing more beautiful—nothing prettier at least—was ever made than Phoebe.

She is goodness personified. Her wholesome heart, native kindliness, and genuine sympathy give her a moral depth that at one point Hawthorne calls a church-going conscience. She is like a prayer, offered up in the homeliest beauty of one's mother tongue. She is a religion in herself, warm simple, true, with a substance that could walk on earth and a spirit that was capable of heaven. The atmosphere of loveliness and joy which surrounds her comes of a soul capable of looking into the infinite.

A certain basic social stability results from such moral depth and Phoebe is therefore obedient to common rules, is of that trim orderly, limit-loving class of country-girl. She shocks no
canon of taste, is admirably in keeping with herself and never jars against surrounding circumstances. Because she prefers the well-worn track of ordinary life, wildness is no trait of hers and all extravagance is a horror to her. She tells Holgrave that his social theories of change and rapid progress in a shifting world make her dizzy. Nevertheless, there is something true and real about her. Hawthorne tells us that holding her hand you felt something; a tender something; a substance, and a warm one: and so long as you should feel its grasp, soft as it was, you might be certain that your place is good in the whole sympathetic chain of human nature. The world is no longer a delusion.

This does not mean, however, that she is a recluse who hides from the world. Quite the opposite. From this reservoir of moral conservatism comes a practical freedom and vitality that is remarkable. Her natural tunefulness which breaks out in song and makes her seem like a bird or stream betokens the cheerfulness of an active temperament, finding joy in its activity and, therefore, rendering it beautiful; it was a New England trait, the stern old stuff, Puritanism with a gold thread in the web. As she sells in the cent shop, her ready mind and skillful handiwork join with her native truth and sense to produce a saleswoman beyond compare. She makes the labor of the house seem as play and as Uncle Venner says, there was a spiritual quality in Phoebe's activity. As Angels do not toil, but let their good works grow out of them, so did Phoebe. She whips the old house into shape, runs the shop, takes care of the garden, tends Clifford,
and is generally full of energy and activity.

Yet, her prowess is most marked in the domestic-garden-maternal area. Here she has a natural magic and exercises a homely witchcraft. Like the fire upon the hearth which warms everyone, Phoebe's presence makes a home about her. Her deliciously fragrant coffee and scrubbed cleanliness combine with her motherly sentiment and soft, warm spirit to gladden a whole semi-circle of people who sit around her fire.

That is Phoebe! As she nears the end of the book, Hawthorne downplays most of these traits and plays up her growing physical maturity and womanliness. As Holgrave takes her hand in his in the vacant old house at the end of the book, she is all of these traits fulfilled in a passionate, mature and loving woman. Little wonder Holgrave sees in her his own completion and happiness and is willing to sacrifice for her. Hawthorne knew how wise Holgrave was in this choice.

Holgrave is an interesting insight into Hawthorne's view of man in general, of American man in the nineteenth century, and of himself in particular. Holgrave's observer role in the novel has symbolic implications beyond my interest here, but generally he is a man with deep New England reserves like Phoebe's. He has like reservoirs of deep moral strength and potency. His, however, are dissipated, scattered, and formless. "... in what he had and in what he lacked ... Holgrave might fitly enough stand forth as the representative of many compeers in his native land." 138
In his twenty-eight years of wandering life, Holgrave "had never lost his identity." In all of his homeless wanderings throughout the world and his many occupations he still has been true to himself. He has been a country schoolmaster, a salesman, a political editor, a peddler, a dentist, and is now a daguerreotypist. As a supernumerary official he has travelled to Italy, France and Germany. He spent some months in a Fourierist community, and has lectured on mesmerism. Out of his mouth come many of the socialist and perfectionist doctrines one encounters so often in the novels of George Sand.

But in all of this shifting of exteriors, "he had never violated the innermost man, but had carried his conscience along with him."

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. The true value of his character lay in that deep consciousness of inward strength, which made all his past vicissitudes seem merely like a change of garments; in that enthusiasm, so quiet that he scarcely knew of its existence, but which gave a warmth to everything that he laid his hands on; in that personal ambition, hidden--from his own as well as other eyes--among his more generous impulses, but in which lurked a certain efficacy, that might solidify him from a theorist into the champion of some practicable cause.

His "deep consciousness of inward strength" is like Phoebe's depth and strength and its basis is transparence and morality. When he has the chance to exercise an unholy influence over Phoebe as she is overcome with his reading of his paper on Alice Pyncheon, we learn a great deal about him in his decision not to do so:

His glance, as he fastened it on the young girl, grew involuntarily more concentrated; in his attitude there was the consciousness of
power, investing his hardly mature figure with a dignity that did not belong to its physical manifestation. It was evident, that, with but one wave of his hand and a corresponding effort of his will, he could complete his mastery over this good, pure, and simple child, as dangerous, and perhaps as disastrous, as that which the carpenter of his legend had acquired and exercised over the ill-fated Alice.

Let us, therefore,—whatever his defects of nature and education, and in spite of his scorn for creeds and institutions,—concede to the daguerreotypist the rare and high quality of reverence for another's individuality. Let us allow him integrity, also, forever after to be confided in; since he forbade himself to twine that one like more which might have rendered his spell over Phoebe indissoluble.  

However, despite these qualities, Phoebe makes a meaningful observation which strikes at one of his other traits. She says, "'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 such as I have seen acted in the hall of a country hotel.... I do not like this. The play costs the performers too much, and the audience is too cold-hearted." He acts throughout the novel as if he is external to its action. This kind of character, however, is frequent in Hawthorne's fiction and seems to portray a trait of his own remarked upon by his contemporaries.

Finally, at the end, as Holgrave tries to convince Phoebe that she should accept him and his love, he makes many things about himself clear:

'Ah, Phoebe!' exclaimed Holgrave, with almost a sigh, and a smile that was burdened with thought. 'It will be far otherwise than as you forebode. The world owes all its onward impulses to men ill at ease. The happy man inevitably confines himself within ancient limits. I have a presentiment that, hereafter, it will be my lot to set out trees, to make fences,—perhaps, even, in due time, to build a house for another generation,—in a word, to conform myself to laws, and the peaceful practice of
society. Your poise will be more powerful than any oscillating tendency of mine.'

That is Holgrave. Like many of the restless men of his age, Holgrave has run far and wide in search of some way to express himself in a fulfilling way. It is no mistake that when Clifford runs away at the end of the novel and spouts many of Holgrave's theories to an uncomprehending old man on a rushing train, and that he speaks in terms much like those used to describe Holgrave. Until the end Holgrave is running away, shouting jargon that has social but little moral meaning. The story is not as much Phoebe's as it is Holgrave's, and one wonders if it is not as well Hawthorne's study of the man who married Sophia more than it is of that New England woman herself.

The love story of Phoebe and Holgrave works itself out amid several other stories. All, however, are related and all have their place in the structure of the novel. For the purposes of analysis of the love story, the structure of the novel will be used, as was the case in the analysis of La Mare au Diable, so that the stages of the love process can be seen in relation to other developing themes.

Chapters I-IV The Pyncheons, Maules, Hepzibah, and the Cent-Shop

These four chapters provide the historical information for the story and its particular setting and plot in the 19th century.

Chapter one begins with a description of the present House of the Seven Gables on Elm Street and then traces its genealogy and the genealogy of the Pyncheons who built it and the Maules who cursed them for it. Old Colonel Pyncheon was a man of "iron energy
of purpose" and he fought over the land and its ownership with a commoner known as "Wizard" Maule. Maule was executed later for witchcraft, but not before he cursed the Colonel that he would choke on his own blood. Then Pyncheon built his family mansion, the present House of the Seven Gables, on the spot where Maule's hut had been. Symbolic of the curse, when the home was built, Maule's well in back turned brackish and hard. Thomas Maule, son of the wizard, built the house and his craftsmanship is attested by the quality of the house and its preservation even to the middle of the nineteenth century.

The story of later generations is told, until the moment in the 19th century of this present story, and then the chapter ends.

Chapters II and III discuss the present resident of the house, Miss Hepzibah Pyncheon, an ugly old patrician lady who is now forced to open a cent-shop to support herself. Even though her cousin Jaffrey Pyncheon who owns the house is well-to-do, he will give her nothing and she will not beg. The agonies of aristocracy entering the plebian world of money and trade are the subject of these two chapters.

Chapter IV is more of the same descriptions of Hepzibah's agonies, but at the end of this chapter Phoebe Pyncheon enters the shop.

Chapters V-VII, Phoebe and Love's Beginning

Because I have described Phoebe elsewhere, I need only summarize the plot here. She enters the cent-shop and, for the
first time since an ancestor named Alice Pyncheon lived in the house, a pure and sparkling young girl comes to live in the house. Chapter V is entitled "May and November" and is a contrast between Phoebe's young efficient and active beauty and Hepzibah's old decaying and dull ugliness. Hawthorne calls his comparison that between "new Plebianism and old Gentility." Old Venner enters, and he is a Rousseauist peasant-artist so much like Sand's Gaffer Patience and Hawthorne's own Ernest of "The Great Stone Face." Also introduced is the other boarder in the house, Holgrave, the young daguerrotypist-socialist.

Chapter VI is entitled "Maule's Well" and is a pure romantic-naturalistic study of bees, robins, and a miniature flock of Pyncheon chickens said to have been the size of turkeys in the old days. Phoebe and Holgrave meet in this natural-pastoral setting and although there is a maidenly reserve in Phoebe's greeting, it is not long until "her own youthfulness sprang forward to meet his." They discuss photography and photographs as revelations of the soul, and this discussion makes clear that at this point in the novel they are two quite different people. He turns the care of the garden over to her and in true socialist fashion says, "'So we will be fellow-laborers somewhat in the community system.'" They part with her unfavorably impressed by a "gravity" or "sternness" about him. Symbolically, she dreams that night as "through the thin veil of a dream" of someone else besides the present two female inhabitants of the house.
Chapter VII is entitled "The Guest" and it begins with this important line: "When Phoebe awoke, which she did with the early twittering of the conjugal couple of robins in the pear-tree. . . ."

The love imagery of the natural garden and the initial hesitant but generally favorable feelings between Phoebe and Holgrave suggest that we will see this "conjugal couple" continue their budding love affair. The guest she dreamed about is not around when Phoebe comes down and she helps Hepzibah prepare breakfast. Meaningfully, Hawthorne says:

The early sunshine--as fresh as that which peeped into Eve's bower while she and Adam sat at breakfast there--came twinkling through the branches of the pear-tree, and fell quite across the table. All was ready now. There were chairs and plates for three. A chair and plate for Hepzibah--the same for Phoebe,--but what other guest did her cousin look for?

We look for Holgrave--and romance; Hepzibah expects her brother Clifford. He has been in prison thirty years for supposedly killing his uncle who really died of natural causes with symptoms which coincided with the curse of Wizard Maule generations before. Clifford is old, feeble, and mentally unbalanced and he has just returned from prison the night before.

This suggestion of another in the house and of the extra place at the table which is surrounded by love imagery is of extreme importance to the development of the love story because Clifford's taking of the third chair begins a mock "love" story which foils that of Holgrave and Phoebe. Like Germain's possibility of marrying the widow Guerin or Marie's possibility of marrying a young man her own age in the village, Clifford's interest in Phoebe--which is described in far more overtly sexual terms than is Holgrave's--suggests a
possible ménage à trois complication.

With Clifford's entrance the whole story shifts to a discussion of beauty and vague hints and suggestions concerning the "cloddish" Clifford, lover of the beautiful, and of the Pyncheon family history.

Chapters VIII-XI  Judge Pyncheon, Clifford, and Phoebe

We return now to the cent-shop and to the Pyncheon world. The cold and evil Judge Jaffrey Pyncheon is described in chapter VIII, especially as he contrasts with Phoebe. When he learns who she is, he tries to kiss her and just prior to the moment of contact, she "drew back." He is absurd in his kissing of the "empty air." Thus we meet him as a tyrant and snake in his world but as a fool in a world dominated by Phoebe. He demands to see Clifford and when he shoves Phoebe aside to go inside the inner house, Hepzibah bars the way "like a dragon . . . in fairy tales." Jaffrey wants to see Clifford to find out from him where a deed is hidden which gives the Pyncheon's right to vast tracts of eastern land. Hepzibah drives him off as one driving off the devil and the chapter concludes with a word about Jaffrey's "native poison."

Chapter IX is a study of Clifford as he contrasts with Phoebe. His great and delicate love of beauty immediately draws him toward her and Phoebe "soon grew to be absolutely essential to his daily comfort. . . ." She sings for him, and to mock this "love" affair Hawthorne says she adapts to "the twittering gayety of the robins in the pear-tree. . . ." This, of course can refer to Hepzibah and
Clifford, but these pages are a study of Clifford and Phoebe. We cannot mistake, however, the "love"-sex meaning of Clifford's words in this statement:

There was something very beautiful in the relation that grew up between this pair, so closely and constantly linked together, yet with such a waste of gloomy and mysterious years from his birthday to hers... He was a man, it is true, and recognized her as a woman. She was his only representative of womankind. He took unfailing note of every charm that appertained to her sex, and saw the ripeness of her lips, and the virginal development of her bosom. All her little womanly ways, budding out of her like blossoms on a young fruit-tree, had their effect on him, and sometimes causes his very heart to tingle with the keenest thrills of pleasure.  

Hawthorne admits that she can only be a "symbol" for Clifford, but we sense that this old man represents a pull away from her true love and union with Holgrave. For her the affair is that between a "nurse, the guardian, the playmate,—or whatever is the better phrase,—and the gray-haired man."  

Chapter X is an excursion of Clifford and Phoebe into the pastoral garden and again is a mockery of the Holgrave-Phoebe love and of their meeting in the garden in chapter VI. Phoebe is linked here with the flowers, and Clifford's "garden-life" with his Eve is overt: "It was the Eden of a thunder-smitten Adam, who had fled for refuge thither out of the same dreary and perilous wilderness into which the original Adam was expelled." But this Eden has another Adam in the Garden, and, despite Clifford's cry, "'I want my happiness!'" Hawthorne declares, "fate has no happiness in store for you."
Chapters XII-XIV
Holgrave and Phoebe

Now Hawthorne returns to his love story. The Clifford complication is here resolved and Holgrave and Phoebe now get a chance to discuss life and each other more at length.

Earlier in Chapter X during an evening discussion, Phoebe observes of Holgrave, "How pleasant he can be!" and in Hawthorne's quiet language of love that is a big moment in this love affair.

We now learn that although they are very similar externally as "characters proper to New England life,' they are internally quite "unlike." Because of his words of change and flux and her solid commitment to stability, she holds back in this scene and he does not make "very marked advances." Yet, Hawthorne says "Phoebe and he were young together" at this moment.

Holgrave tells of his life, of his interest in Clifford, and of his own character. Hawthorne observes of Holgrave and Phoebe as Holgrave tells her of his life, "But, had you peeped at them through the chinks of the garden fence, the young man's earnestness and heightened color might have led you to suppose that he was making love to the young girl." Holgrave admits just prior to this that she had "made the House of the Seven Gables into a home to him, and the garden a familiar precinct."

They discuss his beliefs in the need to burn down houses and destroy the past. Holgrave says the strange desire "to plant and endow a family . . . is at the bottom of most of the wrong and
Of course she does not agree.

He then reads to her a manuscript he has written on her ancestor, Alice Pyncheon. Chapter XIV records the close of this story of mesmerism which tells of the power of a man named Matthew Maule over Alice. As he finishes his story, Holgrave realizes that Phoebe is losing consciousness and that she is falling under his power. He has "integrity" and, because of his "reverence for another's individuality," he awakens her and breaks the spell.

Then Hawthorne shifts into some of his most lyric love prose. He says the garden seemed "transfigured by a charm of romance." Holgrave feels his youth and vitality and Phoebe the "charm in this brightening moonlight." She says she feels older than when she came, and he says it is because she has loved:

'You have lost nothing, Phoebe, worth keeping, nor which it was possible to keep,' said Holgrave, after a pause. 'Our first youth is of no value; for we are never conscious of it until after it is gone. But sometimes--always, I suspect, unless one is exceedingly unfortunate--there comes a sense of second youth, gushing out of the heart's joy at being in love; or, possibly, it may come to crown some other grand festival in life, if any other such there be. This bemoaning of one's self (as you do now) over the first, careless, shallow gayety of youth departed, and this profound happiness at youth regained,--so much deeper and richer than that we lost,--are essential to the soul's development. In some cases, the two states come almost simultaneously, and mingle the sadness and the rapture in one mysterious emotion.'

'I hardly think I understand you,' said Phoebe.

'No wonder,' replied Holgrave, smiling; 'for I have told you a secret which I hardly began to know before I found myself giving it utterance. Remember it, however; and when the truth becomes clear to you, then think of this moonlight scene!' 156

That explanation of man's "second birth" into love is like that of Rousseau's Émile. This "second youth, gushing out of the heart's joy at being in love" is Émile's and Phoebe's second birth. Phoebe's
coy, "'I hardly think I understand you,'" is an example of the moral quality of love in the state of nature like that of Marie in the light of Germain's love in George Sand's story. Phoebe nervously says Hepzibah needs her inside and although their conversation continues, the love rhetoric has been spoken. Phoebe goes in, says goodbye to all, and the next day returns to her home in the country for a few days rest. As she says goodbye to Clifford, he looks at her carefully and says:

'When I first saw you, you were the prettiest little maiden in the world' and now you have deepened into beauty! Girlhood has passed into womanhood; the bud is a bloom! Go, now!—I feel lonelier than I did.'159

Thus, as Phoebe turns from a maiden into a woman, she is no longer a fit playmate for Clifford and he knows it. She has felt love in the garden and in the moonlight she has blossomed: "'Girlhood has passed into womanhood. . . . '" We realize as well that no evil or sin or darkness was necessary for this maturing. It came according to innocence and nature.

Chapters XV-XVIII The First Resolution: Jaffrey, Clifford, and Hepzibah

With Phoebe gone from the house (and we later learn that Holgrave is gone as well), the tone of the story shifts radically as Judge Jaffrey Pyncheon enters again. In a diction of darkness, emptiness, threat, evil despair, sighs, "perilous emergency,"160 Hawthorne tells the story of Jaffrey's return to find out from Clifford where the deed is. Hepzibah tries to hold him off again. cannot, runs to get Holgrave who she discovers is gone, and then
(Chapter XVII) goes to Clifford's room. He is gone too. Then, returning to the main rooms, she meets Clifford who has an "expression of scorn and mockery" on his face and who declares to her, "'The weight is gone.'" He demands that she leave the house with him immediately; so they go, board a train, and, in Hawthorne's language of motion, frenzy, and flight, flee from the house and the corpse of Jaffrey in the library.

Clifford comes to life during this short journey and out of his mouth comes socialist-progressive notions such as the destruction of the past, mesmerism, and electricity. Paradoxically, the old man who listens to him is remarkably like Judge Pyncheon and thus serves as a mockery of Clifford's flight and his denial of the past by fleeing from it.

As Clifford's false energy dissipates, he and Hepzibah abandon the train at a desolate station near an old church, which is described in terms exactly like those used in the beginning of the novel which introduces us to the House of the Seven Gables. Falling on her knees, Hepzibah offers a prayer for help. As will be clear when they return to the house and find Phoebe who came "like a prayer" into their lives, this affirmation of moral goodness without the past (house) and without the future (train) leads them to the happiness Phoebe represents in the present.

Chapters XIX-XX The Second Resolution: Holgrave and Phoebe

These are the chapters of love in the book and it is here that the story is resolved, not in the final chapter XXI. The shift
in language and tone between Chapter XVIII wherein Hawthorne-Holgrave-Clifford mock the dead body of the judge and Chapter XIX entitled "Alice's Posies" is like night and day. Clearly, this chapter should be seen as a continuation of Chapter XIV "Phoebe's Goodbye." The alternating structure throughout the novel between love and evil explains this shift and we see that chapters XI-XVIII were the climax of those other plot ingredients. Now the conclusions of the love story.

Chapter XIX is presided over by Uncle Venner. This prophet of nature is pushing his wheelbarrow and is "the earliest person stirring in the neighborhood the day after the storm." Nature is beautiful, all is alive, growing, happy, and "bright gold." Alice's flowers which grow in the angle of the two front gables of the house are in bloom. "They were flaunting in rich beauty and full bloom today, and seemed, as it were, a mystic expression that something within the house was consummated."

As Holgrave comes up to the house after his absence, Old Venner says, "'And, Mr. Holgrave, if I were a young man, like you, I'd get one of Alice's Posies, and keep it in water till Phoebe comes back.'" Holgrave (who we learn later is a Maule) responds, "'I have heard . . . that the water of Maule's well suits those flowers best!'" Our minds go back to Holgrave's first meeting with Phoebe in the garden in a chapter entitled "Maule's Well," where he tells her not to drink of the water because it is "bewitched." Warning her away from himself, then, he now sees, because of changes in him and in her and because of the death of Jaffrey and Hepzibah's
prayer, that he can love her and that a merging of her blood with his can flower and yield good fruit.

Holgrave goes into the house, finds the dead judge, surmises all, and then Phoebe comes up the walk toward the house. Hawthorne's description of her at this point is very important:

It was Phoebe! Though not altogether so blooming as when she first tripped into our story,—for, in the few intervening weeks, her experiences had made her graver, more womanly, and deeper-eyed, in token of a heart that had begun to suspect its depths,—still there was the quiet glow of natural sunshine over her. Neither had she forfeited her proper gift of making things look real, rather than fantastic, within her sphere. She goes up to the door, knocks, and the door opens by "some unseen person's strength." She goes in and the "door closed behind her." Because it is so dark in the house and so bright outside, she can't see who is there, but, in the subdued but most passionate love language in the book, Hawthorne says, "Before her eyes had adapted themselves to the obscurity, a hand grasped her own, with a firm but gentle and warm pressure, thus imparting a welcome which caused her heart to leap and thrill with an indefinable shiver of enjoyment . . . ."

She learns of the situation concerning the death of Jaffrey and the flight of Hepzibah and Clifford, and she admonishes Holgrave to open the doors and to call in the neighbors. He senses something else to be done, and draws her near to try to make his feelings known both to her and to himself. Hawthorne describes what is happening in these words:

On the contrary, he gathered a wild enjoyment,—as it were, a flower of strange beauty, growing in a desolate spot, and blossoming in the wind,—such a flower of momentary happiness he
gathered from his present position. It separated Phoebe and himself from the world, and bound them to each other, by their exclusive knowledge of Judge Pyncheon's mysterious death, and the counsel which they were forced to hold respecting it. The secret, so long as it should continue such, kept them within the circle of a spell, a solitude in the midst of men, a remoteness as entire as that of an island in mid-ocean; once divulged, the ocean would flow betwixt them, standing on its widely sundered shores. Meanwhile, all the circumstances of their situation seemed to draw them together; they were like two children who go hand in hand, pressing closely to one another's side, through a shadow-haunted passage. The image of awful Death, which filled the house, held them united by his stiffened grasp.

This strange growth of life out of death is a fulfillment of the historical and love themes in the novel. He, like Phoebe, is flowering here and feels a great need for her to know how he feels:

'Could you but know, Phoebe, how it was with me the hour before you came!' exclaimed the artist. 'A dark, cold, miserable hour! The presence of yonder dead man threw a great black shadow over everything. . . . The world looked strange, wild, evil, hostile; my past life, so lonesome and dreary; my future, a shapeless gloom, which I must mold into gloomy shapes! But, Phoebe, you crossed the threshold; and hope, warmth, and joy came in with you! The black moment became at once a blissful one. It must not pass without the spoken word. I love you!'

She challenges his love because of the many differences in their nature and in their beliefs. He says that he can change, but she does not want him to do it for her. Finally, he says, "'Do you love me?' asked Holgrave. 'If we love one another, the moment has room for nothing more. Let us pause upon it, and be satisfied. Do you love me, Phoebe?'" "'You look into my heart,' said she, letting her eyes drop. 'You know I love you'". This beautiful and tender moment of love, so like that of Marie and Germain and of Émile and Sophy, is framed in the following imagery:

And it was in this hour, so full of doubt and awe, that the one miracle was wrought, without which every human existence is a
blank. The bliss which makes all things true, beautiful, and holy shone around this youth and maiden. They were conscious of nothing sad nor old. They transfigured the earth, and made it Eden again, and themselves the two first dwellers in it. The dead man, so close beside them, was forgotten. At such a crisis, there is no death; for immortality is revealed anew, and embraces everything in its hallowed atmosphere.170

Thus it fulfilled the "two robins in a pear-tree" image introduced early in the novel and the meaning of the sunlight on the table of Adam and Eve.

Then Hawthorne says, and many critics see this as a denial of the new love, "But how soon the heavy earth-dream settled down again!" This is not a denial because the next word is "'Hark!'" and Phoebe says someone is at the door. Holgrave says, and we should remember Emile's ability to face the world once his love is solidly attached to Sophie, "'Now let us meet the world! . . . Let us open the door at once.'" They could not open to the world until their love was declared and strong.

Clifford and Hepzibah enter, embrace their dear Phoebe and are like beings resurrected. Knowingly and like Emile's tutor and Germain's child, Clifford joins the couple together and declares:

'It is our own little Phoebe!--Ah! and Holgrave with her.' exclaimed he, with a glance of keen and delicate insight, and a smile, beautiful, kind, but melancholy. 'I thought of you both, as we came down the street, and beheld Alice's Posies in full bloom. And so the flower of Eden has bloomed, likewise, in this old, darksome house to-day.'171

For Hawthorne, the primary love unit surrounded in love by dear friends in transparence and purity exemplifies male-female and human relations in the state of nature.
We have seen that in the works of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and George Sand there are people and human relations which are simple and honest, based on moral purity and transparency, and set in a society of fulfillment and human possibility. Male-female relations in this state of nature are simple, romantic, and consummated two by two to the mutual benefit of lovers and friends and all concerned in the love affair.

This "natural" resolution to human relations is not always possible for men and women, however, especially in the state of society or war.
CHAPTER III

HUMAN RELATIONS AND MORAL CONDITIONS
IN THE STATE OF SOCIETY OR WAR

As we have seen, Rousseau knew what it meant to live at Les Charmettes with Mme. de Warnes in innocent bliss, Hawthorne knew what it was like to escape with his Sophie to the Eden of the Old Manse, and Sand knew the absolute pleasure of the country life in rural Berry. Innocence is real and possible in this world. But these moments are rare and hard won. Most men and women during most of their lives live in the state of war or society, where opacity and non-communication characterize relations, especially those between adult men and women.

Rousseau presents life lived under these devastating conditions in Les Confessions and La Nouvelle Héloïse. In his first Discourse he argued that civilization and science had corrupted morals and destroyed man's capacity for open transparence. In these two pieces he demonstrates how this destruction occurs. We do not usually consider La Nouvelle Héloïse as a novel of destruction and opacity, of masks and veils. I would argue, however, that Rousseau was not working in the sentimental or romantic traditions in La Nouvelle Héloïse, but he was more of a psychological realist or
pessimist as he explored human relations in society. This world of human opacity, of masks and veils and darkness, is typically the one we think of when we hear the name Nathaniel Hawthorne. *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Blithedale Romance* are studies in human opacity and male-female destructiveness in the state of society. Hawthorne found in *La Nouvelle Héloïse* not only the psychology of opacity which he too had observed but also a character configuration of three adults in an extremely unstable relationship which seems to embody the relations in this state. In stories like "Rappaccini's Daughter" and "Alice Doane's Appeal" as well as many others, Hawthorne uses the destructive and unstable *ménage à trois* to portray human opacity and non-communication.

In her early novels like *Indiana*, *Valentine*, and *Jacques*, George Sand in a similar manner portrays the destructiveness of male-female relations in the social state. In her later work she is more inclined to resolve the unstable triangles and to restore transparency and communication. This makes her far more than Rousseau or Hawthorne a participant in the sentimental tradition. She can be a tough psychological realist, seeing the sources of human separation, but her nature led her more to pictures of life lived in the states of innocence and higher morality than to portraits of life in society.

All three authors in their works depicting life in society focus on three characters or sets of three characters. With images of masks, veils, and darkness, with obstacles, deceptions, and concealments, they show man and woman denying each other and thereby
frustrating their love and their lives. Opacity, darkness, confusion—these are the conditions all three authors portray as they show the failure of love and family in the state of war. A representative statement which shows these opaque and frustrated male-female relations is made by Indiana in Sand's *Indiana* when she tells Ralph that she would have loved him, "but your mask deceived me." Many of Hawthorne's stories like "The Man of Adamant," "Young Goodman Brown," and "The Minister's Black Veil" are likewise stories of masks and deceptions and misunderstandings between men and women which results in the frustration of their love and their family. This is also true of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, where Julie's "masks" frustrate not only her love relationship with Saint-Preux but her idyllic life with Wolmar at Clarens and her relations with her cousin Claire.

Before analyzing specific works to show how Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand portrayed male-female relations in the state of war, I need to comment on the Freudian implications of male-female relations in this state. All three authors in their pre-Freudian age probe the psychological reasons for and manifestations of opacity and frustration. It is this "modern" feeling for male-female psychology which makes Hawthorne's and Rousseau's works so fascinating to contemporary scholars. Sand also had deep insight into male-female sex-love needs and into repressions and guilt conflicts. I will mention later a scene in *Mauprat* where her male hero is chasing the central female character on horseback. As they gallop in an increasing frenzy, Sand uses subtle language of sex, repression and desire.
that seems straight out of D. H. Lawrence. From her lack of follow-up and avoidance of further symbolism, it seems clear Sand was pushing images and meaning that she did not critically understand. Yet she many times comes very near a consistent sexual symbolism. For example, with as much subtlety and skill as we find in either Rousseau or Hawthorne, she balances her central female character in *François Le Champi* on a thin line between being Francois' mother, friend, sister, and lover and Sand maintains the balance for many pages. This novel is much like "Alice Doane's Appeal" where a woman is strangely lover, sister, and mother. We see in *La Nouvelle Héloïse* the too close relation between Julie and Claire, and we wonder at the physical and emotional proximity of Arthur and Roger in *The Scarlet Letter*. All three writers, especially in their studies of human relations in the state of war, use sexual imagery and probe sexual relations with satisfying realism and intensity. It is this realism and insight which divorces their major works and characters from the sentimental and romantic traditions. These writers use the conventions and techniques of these traditions, certainly, but there is literary and moral significance and wholeness in their works beyond these traditions.

This chapter will first present an analysis of three similar scenes in the writings of these authors. These scenes are very similar in character relations and setting and demonstrate in like manner the destructiveness of male-female relations in the state of war. Then I will analyze and explain *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, The
Scarlet Letter, and Jacques as studies in human relations and moral conditions in the state of society.

Of Beatrice, Julie, and Consuelo: The Gardens of the World

In three moments in the literature of these three writers we find remarkably similar moral and social comments being made on life in society through character arrangement and setting. Hawthorne's "Rappaccini's Daughter," Rousseau's "Elysée" chapter in part IV of La Nouvelle Héloïse, and Sand's "Pavillon" chapters of La Comtesse de Rudolstadt are all intense demonstrations of the struggle between contending male forces for legitimacy or consummation as represented by the winning of the female who stands at the apex of each ménage à trois or triangular relationship. In each instance this male struggle for female acceptance is frustrated because of the shroud of non-communication and opacity which encloses the female. This opacity is represented by the "hidden" garden or location of each of the female characters. By isolating these three scenes and studying them closely, we can see in miniature what these writers accomplish on a larger scale in their novels.

To establish an understanding of the basic plots and character triangles of each of these pieces and to make clear the particular settings of these stories, I will summarize them first.

"Rappaccini's Daughter" is the story of a young Italian named Giovanni who comes to Padua in northern Italy to go to school. He is quartered in an old Dantean house in a room with a window over-
looking a beautiful garden. The garden is the creation of Doctor Rappaccini who has learned the secrets of nature's power. To lift his spirits in his dark room, Giovanni looks down upon the garden from his window and observes the richness and luxuriance of the plants. In the center of the garden is a ruined fountain out of which bubbles pure water and grows a purple-blossomed flower of deep beauty. As he observes the garden, he notices Rappaccini working among the plants, but he is disagreeably affected when he notices that the sickly and sallow doctor seems to avoid contact with his plants and therefore wears gloves and even a mask. Rappaccini calls his daughter Beatrice to come out of the house and to care for the purple plant in the middle of the garden. She enters the garden and cares for the plant as if for a sister. As Giovanni observes Beatrice's actions, night falls and she and her father go inside. He is left to himself and he dreams of "the flower and the beautiful girl," both "fraught with some strange peril" (1047).

The next day he again observes the garden from his window and finds it quite normal and natural in the open light of day. During the day he calls on the elderly Doctor Baglioni, a friend of Giovanni's father, to whom he brings letters of introduction. In their conversation the subject of Rappaccini comes up and Baglioni "testily" denounces Rappaccini's experiments and accuses him of loving science more than human life. Giovanni mentions Rappaccini's daughter and Baglioni speaks of her as a great beauty and as one very well acquainted with the science of her father.
Giovanni buys a bouquet of flowers and returns to his quarters and his window and in the afternoon sunlight sees Beatrice come out of the "antique sculptured portal" and into the garden. His feelings are a mixture of hope and dread, but when she appears he sees she is even more beautiful than he had remembered, and then he notices her "simplicity and sweetness" and her resemblance in dress to the purple flower in the fountain. Beatrice embraces the plant and calls it sister and then picks a brilliant flower to adorn her bosom. Giovanni thinks he sees a drop of sap from the severed flower fall on a lizard and kill it instantly; he fancies that he sees a butterfly come from outside the walls, however, and then die as it enters the air of the girl's breath.

She looks up and sees him and we are reminded that he is a "beautiful" young man with "glistening gold among his ringlets" (1050). Impulsively he throws his bouquet of flowers to her. She thanks him, picks up the flowers and hastily returns to her home. Giovanni imagines he sees the flowers wither in her hands.

Because of the growing love for her he feels in his heart and the increasing horror of her in his imagination, he is torn between her beauty and her terrible power. Therefore, he avoids the window for many days, and like one possessed he walks the streets of Padua in a wild trance. One day he meets Baglioni. The old man wishes to speak to him but Giovanni is feverish and impatient and wants to avoid him. As they talk, Rappaccini passes and as he goes by he looks so intently at Giovanni that Baglioni tells the youth he is the object of a Rappaccini experiment of some kind. When the lad leaves,
Baglioni vows to "foil" Rappaccini and this experiment.

When Giovanni returns to his ancient lodgings, the old housekeeper Lisabetta attracts his attention and for gold shows him into the garden through a secret and hidden passageway so that Giovanni, as if by some impelling fate and magic, finds himself below his window in the garden. Again the strangeness of the plants in the garden is disagreeable to him, but the "rustling of a silken garment" turns him from these thoughts.

He and Beatrice speak of her knowledge of science and it is clear she knows very little and that Baglioni really did not know her at all. As she speaks, the truth of her words and the transparency of her soul dispel his doubts and fears, and his company relieves her extreme loneliness so that as brother and sister they forget all else; Beatrice even forgets her "sister" plant for the first time. When Giovanni is reminded of the plant, he reaches out to pick a blossom but she screams and forces his hand away. She tells him that to touch the plant would be fatal, and while hiding her face she runs from him. Following her with his eyes, Giovanni sees Rappaccini observing him from the "shadow of the entrance."

Even though his hand later burns as if poisoned from Beatrice's touch, Giovanni loves her, ignores his imaginings of her poisonous power, and returns to the garden often to be with her.

After a "considerable time," Baglioni visits Giovanni in his room and after telling him a tale of a poisonous maiden given by an enemy to Alexander the Great, he remarks on the flower-like perfume
of Giovanni's room. Giovanni struggles to defend Beatrice against Baglioni's accusations, but he too doubts her in his mind. Baglioni then leaves with him a vial of a potion which he says will return Beatrice to humankind. Giovanni accepts it and by so doing accepts Baglioni's view and thus "defiles ... the pure whiteness of Beatrice's image" (1060). He decides to conduct an experiment to test her, so he again buys a bouquet of flowers. The result is, to his horror, that his own touch withers the plants and when he blows his breath on a spider he kills it.

In anger he rushes into the garden and with "venomous scorn and anger" accuses Beatrice of poisoning him. She is innocent, sees what her father had done, and begs Giovanni not to scorn her love. He is incapable of deep love and in his ignorance, thinking himself her savior, he gives her the vial given him by Baglioni. Rappaccini then enters, bids Beatrice give Giovanni a blossom from the purple plant, and in the attitude of a priest raises his hands above the couple to bless them. They shrink from him and then he reminds Beatrice of the value of her beautiful but terrible power. She responds by saying she only wanted to be loved, drinks the potion and dies at their feet. Baglioni, we learn as he speaks accusingly to Rappaccini, has been observing the scene from Giovanni's window.

The "Elysée" scene of interest to us here in Rousseau's La Nouvelle Héloïse is presented in several letters in part IV. In part III the love between Julie and Saint-Preux is discovered by Julie's mother and father and with the mother's death, caused in part by the
discovery, and the father's categorical and tyrannous assertion of authority, Julie denies Saint-Preux and accepts her father's will and her father's choice of M. de Wolmar as her husband. She is married, and at the end of part III she has become a mother and Saint-Preux is sent away on a four-year voyage around the world.

Part IV opens with a letter from Julie to Claire, her inseparable cousin, who shortly before Julie's marriage married M. d'Orbe and now is a widow. Julie invites her to bring her daughter and come to live at Clarens with her and Wolmar and their three children. Julie wants Claire to come because she wants advice as to whether to tell Wolmar of her past relationship with Saint-Preux or to continue to feel like a dissembler and keep it a secret. Claire says she will come and gives Julie information about Saint-Preux's return. The next letter is from Saint-Preux to Claire, telling her that he is home and begging her to let him arrange to see Julie. Claire has served as the go-between for their love affair from the very beginning and it is to her that Saint-Preux writes and through her that Julie receives information concerning him. Whatever Julie's true sentiments, Saint-Preux has not changed or lost his deep and passionate love for her. Then, a letter is given to Saint-Preux in which Wolmar asks him to come and live with them. In a P.S. Julie adds, "Come, my friend, we await you eagerly. I should be pained if you were to refuse us" (283). Julie has told Wolmar all and now he wants Saint-Preux to come to Clarens to live with them.

Claire welcomes him back and tells him, "Monsieur de Wolmar ... intends to cure you, for he says that neither Julie, nor he,
nor you, nor I can be perfectly happy without that" (284). Saint-Preux writes to his English friend Lord Bomston and tells him of going to Clarens, of seeing Julie, of embracing her in front of her husband and children, of her motherhood, and of the life they live there. Wolmar at one point, Saint-Preux tells Bomston, takes "his wife's hand and mine," clasps them together, and thus officially sanctions the physically chaste but emotionally adulterous ménage à trois of Clarens. Other letters go back and forth between all of the parties, but the ideas of honor, duty, and virtue as they relate to happiness, passion, and love dominate the discussions.

Then, in Letter XI from Saint-Preux to Lord Bomston we get an account of Saint-Preux's excursion into Julie's garden or Elysee. This is a garden located near the house but completely hidden which Julie herself has created. Saint-Preux as he enters thinks he has all of a sudden been thrown onto a desert island at the end of the world because it is so beautiful and secluded, but then Julie and Wolmar begin to tell and show him how artifice has achieved the natural appearance. Then he is left by himself to wander here and there until Julie comes and gets him, and the three of them then go to see the aviary. They descend to the bottom of the orchard and there, as Wolmar spreads seed on the pond, they see the birds of the garden. There follows a discussion on birds and people in the garden and the question is debated as to who is the host, who the guest, or who (as Saint-Preux worries) the prisoner.

As they discuss the tranquil life of these birds which allows them to lay their eggs and enjoy their garden in peace, Julie's
mention of "inseparable mates, the zeal for domestic duties, paternal and maternal tenderness" (313) obviously depresses the lover Saint-Preux. Wolmar sees his mental state and tells him he should feel paternal affection because he has "friends, and these friends have children" (313). This leads to embracing all around and then to discussions on fish, Julie, art, nature, and artifice in the garden. The excursion concludes with a discussion that brings emotions to the surface which have been running as an undercurrent all this time. Saint-Preux asks Julie why she went to all of the trouble to plant this garden when there is another (the one they hid in years before to steal their first kiss) on the other side of the house which is "so charming and so neglected?" (312) She is embarrassed and Wolmar reprimands him, and the excursion comes to a close.

As George Sand's novel Consuelo ends, the innocent and chaste but low-born heroine Consuelo agrees on his deathbed to marry Prince Albert of Rudolstadt to satisfy his dying wish. She came into his life at a time of intense emotional and spiritual crisis and he loves her deeply, but she is a-sexual, boyishly adolescent, and in her chastity and purity she does not love him. They are married, he dies, and she happily renounces any claim to the inheritance and privileges attendant to her new name and station and then leaves Bohemia with her old singing master Porpora for the court of Frederick the Great in Berlin.

La Comtesse de Rudolstadt, the sequel to Consuelo, begins with the featured singer in Frederick's Berlin opera house. At the concert, as the story begins, she faints on stage in the middle of
her part when she sees a figure in the audience who looks to her like Albert de Rudolstadt. In her home later she is visited by the king who has a partially paternal and partially amourous regard for her because she once saved his life and she is quite attractive. Thus begins a series of strange encounters with ghosts and court intrigues which finally lead Consuelo to a confrontation with Frederick. She is too honest, which results in his anger and her imprisonment in the Chateau de Spandaw in the country.

Before her rescue from the prison, Consuelo records lengthy socialist-utopian-humanitarian thoughts in her journal, and she speaks at length of one secret society called "The Invisibles" (XIX, 312). This society has a reputation for severity and beneficence which Consuelo does not understand at this time.

Her imprisonment is cut short when she is rescued by her friend Karl, and she escapes Spandaw, Berlin, and Germany. She is hooded as they take her from Spandaw and when she comes to herself again, she finds herself in a rapidly travelling carriage with a man with a black mask or hood over his head. Karl is driving the horses and he is the only one allowed to speak to her. Mysteriously, the hooded one remains totally silent.

After several days and several near tragedies, she finds herself intensely drawn to the gentle yet unknown hooded man. He saves her life while carrying her across a swollen stream, and as her passions awaken, she finds that she loves him. As the journey continues for several days, these feelings increase until she and the hooded man kiss and she pledges herself to him with a cross of
her mother's as token.

After more travel the carriage finally comes to a strange country and Consuelo is deposited in a country pavillon and garden with only one servant, a hooded older man named Matteus.

As she is escorted into the pavillon, she asks if it is not a "great and beautiful prison" (XXIII, 354) and as she examines it she encounters little notes pinned on the furniture which inquire as to the purity of her soul. She then opens the window and looks out on a garden planted in the English style. There are flowers and trees and streams all cultivated "with intelligence and love" (XXIII, 355). Yet, when she is in it she feels captive because of the impenetrable obstacles or walls which enclose it. Despite its beauty, she is lonely and "She soon fell into a deep melancholy, and . . . ennui . . ." (XXIV, 372).

One evening she finds her lover in her garden and, although he still will not speak to her, he falls at her feet, kisses her robes, and leaves her a letter. It tells of his love and of his desire to be with her even if it means giving up the secret society and denying "The Invisibles." She writes in return, asking him to take off his mask, to explain his connection with "The Invisibles," and to explain his intentions. Later, when the masked Matteus comes in, he says a certain Chevalier named Liverani was caught in the garden and taken to prison; he is her masked lover.

She petitions to plead Liverani's case before a "tribunal of the Invisibles" (XXVI, 385), and before the group of twenty men in black and white masks she is told they are only interested in her as
the Countess of Rudolstadt. If she wants to renounce her husband Albert and to assume her music master's name, she can, but in doing so she must leave the pavillon, return to the world of society, and they will bother her no more. She asks them not to banish but to instruct her; so they tell her to abide by their decisions and they send her back to her garden to wait and to be tested.

Thus she realizes her dilemma; Albert is not dead and she is in love with another; must she "suffer from a devotedness into which love did not enter" (XXVIII, 406) or embrace a love without sanction? The days in the garden and pavillon are a testing to see if she can remain true to Albert.

The Chevalier Liverani manages to write to her and she realizes she loves him deeply: "Passion had at last invaded the peaceful and noble heart of Consuelo" (XXIX, 3). One evening out of fear she finds a way of escaping from the garden and in an evening's adventure in an old ruined castle she overhears a conversation in which she finally confirms that Albert is alive and also learns that he knows of Liverani and that he approves of her love for him. This realization wounds her pride, that he should be capable of this kind of sacrifice and that she has not been; so she contemplates the sacrifice of her love for Liverani "to my dignity, to my conscience" (XXX, 20).

Finally, in what Sand presents in terms of rites of initiation, Consuelo walks an incredibly shaky tightrope between passion and sacrifice, is made to face man's pettiness and cruelty to man, is made aware of higher moral and social laws ascribed to by the secret
society, and finally stands before the tribunal ready to choose between Albert and Liverani.

She renounces both and falls to the ground; she is revived and told to look as they remove Liverani's mask to reveal Albert.

All three of these scenes are similar in several important ways. Notice the similarities in the triangular or *menage a trois* configuration in each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lover</th>
<th>Woman</th>
<th>Father-Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rappaccini's Daughter&quot;</td>
<td>Giovanni</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie's &quot;Elysée&quot;</td>
<td>Saint-Preux</td>
<td>Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo's &quot;Pavillon&quot;</td>
<td>Liverani</td>
<td>Consuelo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before speaking further of these triangles and their significance, I need to mention setting.

The setting in all three is composed of several locations, all of which surround the central garden. "Rappaccini's Daughter" has an old building on the one side with a window overlooking the garden and a building with a sculptured portal on the other side. The garden is the center of the story with the two framing buildings more windows overlooking or doors opening into the garden than full-blown houses. The window is associated with Giovanni, and the important relation between him and Baglioni is stressed at the end when Baglioni observes through Giovanni's window. The portal is associated with Dr. Rappaccini and somewhat with Beatrice, and the garden is associated with Beatrice and somewhat with Rappaccini. The ancient and gloomy condition of Giovanni's room is stressed in the opening scene and the contrast between its darkness and the garden's
"sunlight" is an important effect. Also, Rappaccini's portal with its lack of meaning beyond its use as an entrance is in sharp contrast to the bright and detailed life of the garden. It is merely a door; there is no suggestion of a mother, a family, or a home there.

A secret passageway leads into the garden from Giovanni's house and he has to force his way through the narrow passage and overgrowth to get into the garden. "His withered guide led him along several obscure passages and finally undid a door, . . . Giovanni stepped forth, and forcing himself through the entanglement of a shrub that wreathed its tendrils over the hidden entrance, stood beneath his own window. . . ." (1054).

The entire story, except for a scene in the town of little physical consequence, takes place in this setting of window, garden, and portal.

Rousseau's physical setting in the chapters of Julie's "Elysée" is very similar though arranged differently. The garden itself is set near the large house at Clarens but it is totally hidden. "The dense foliage which surrounds it makes it impervious to the eye" (304-305). Like Beatrice's garden which is entered only through a secret passageway, this one is entered through a "hidden" door which is "always carefully locked" and which leads to "two narrow passageways" made by trees and shrubs. As he enters it, Saint-Preux says, "I no longer saw by which way I had entered, and, perceiving no door, I found myself there as if fallen from the sky" (305). We get the same sense when Giovanni comes through "the
hidden entrance" and "stood beneath his own window in the open area of Dr. Rappaccini's garden" (1054).

On the opposite side of the house is another wooded area or grove where, as Julie tells Claire, "all the misfortunes of my life began" (316). Here the youthful Saint-Preux and Julie first kissed under Claire's negligent eye and this is the "fatal spot" where on the following day Wolmar takes the two of them, makes them hold hands, and along with telling them his story tells them of his plans for their virtuous ménage à trois.

Between the two gardens is the family house which Wolmar runs with total efficiency and control. Saint-Preux describes it at length in his letters to Lord Bomston. All at Clarens is useful, productive, secure, efficient, proper, and honest. Wolmar has no passions and his administration, however cold, is beneficent if its conditions and terms are accepted.

The "fatal" and wild grove is associated with Saint-Preux, the well-ordered and impersonal household with Wolmar, and the hidden garden with Julie. Wolmar has had a big hand in the order and cultivation of the garden as does Dr. Rappaccini, the "distrustful gardener," and so we must say that the deep moral and social relations of these gardens associate them with Beatrice and Julie but also with the two fathers or husbands.

Here, then, in Julie's "Elysée" chapters, as in "Rappaccini's Daughter," we have the action taking place in settings of great importance as they relate to the characters.
Sand has also created her moral and social landscape in *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* in this manner. From her "pavillon" or summer cottage where she is being held prisoner by The Invisibles, Consuelo overlooks the garden and she can see not far off the large and beautifully kept fields and houses of the manor lord who provides space and support for the secret society of The Invisibles. Of her small garden which is totally inclosed, Sand says, "Lofty walls, masked by a thick vegetation . . . bounded [it] on every side" (XXIV, 371). Like the hidden passages into Beatrice's and Julie's gardens, the only way into Consuelo's garden is through a secret moveable grating under which the small stream flows out of the enclosure. Also, as in the cases of Beatrice and Julie, it is through this secret passageway that the lover enters the hidden or private garden of the woman.

In addition, there is a wild and ruined old castle near by which is "a remnant of the middle ages," a "vast edifice" all in ruin (XXIX, 3-4). This is reminiscent of Giovanni's room in the old house. Albert-Liverani is living in this wild and deserted old building and it is when she hides out there one stormy night that she discovers that Albert is still alive and that he approves of her love for Liverani. The wildness of the dwelling and Liverani's wild, dark, and dangerous passion are alike.

The well-ordered manorial fields and houses are associated by Sand and in Consuelo's mind with Albert and The Invisibles. The small pavillon and enclosed garden are directly associated with Consuelo.
And the ruined edifice and wild woods with Liverani. Here, too, the central action revolves around a place of ruin and wildness, a hidden or secret garden, and a house or mansion.

We can graphically summarize these relations between character and setting by this chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ruins or Groves</th>
<th>Hidden Gardens</th>
<th>Efficient Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rappaccini's Daughter&quot;</td>
<td>Giovanni</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>Rappaccini &amp; Baglioni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie's &quot;Elysée&quot;</td>
<td>Saint-Preux</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Julie's father and Wolmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo's &quot;Pavillon&quot;</td>
<td>Liverani</td>
<td>Consuelo</td>
<td>Albert and The Invisibles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of this linking of setting and character is that the central tension of each story involves these locations and the characters associated with them. Granted this use of setting and of characterization is not unique to Rousseau, Sand, and Hawthorne and granted both are stock techniques of the sentimental and romantic traditions, I would still argue that for these three writers the use of setting and characterization is intended to show a destructive environment which is peculiar to one stage of human moral development. Unlike other writers, these three do not use this particular relation between setting and character for the story or plot or for the particular meaning of the story at hand, but rather to contrast the other two stages of moral development: innocence and higher morality.

All of these stories have a basic love unit of two which is trying to establish itself which means that the lover is trying to
win the beloved and get her to come with him; if she does, there is no triangle and, as we have seen, all three authors believed that resolution possible. If she does not, for many possible reasons, a triangle of relations results which mutually encourages the opacity and hiding and deception which destroys the basic love unit as well as the other male-female relations surrounding this unit.

Giovanni falls in love with Beatrice and she with him. Hawthorne says:

By all appreciable signs, they loved; they had looked love with eyes that conveyed the holy secret from the depths of one soul into the depths of the other, as if it were too sacred to be whispered by the way; they had even spoken love in those gushes of passion when their spirits darted forth in articulated breath like tongues of long hidden flame (1057-1058).

This struggling of the two in the basic love unit for completion and consummation is the central fact of the story. The realization of the love unit would be the story's "natural" conclusion, the conclusion most deeply to be wished as an affirmation of love and of the hearth and family.

The same struggle is at the heart of La Nouvelle Héloïse and is demonstrated in Julie's "Elysée" chapters. The letters between the two lovers in the first two parts of the book are exquisite love poetry. Julie writes to Saint-Preux just prior to their night of joy:

'Come then, heart of my heart, life of my life, come and be reunited with yourself. Come under the auspices of tender love to receive the reward for your obedience and your sacrifices. Come to swear, even in the midst of pleasures, that from the union of hearts they draw their greatest charm (122).
Against all obstacles this basic pair struggle to be recognized as legitimate lovers. If Saint-Preux can get Julie not only to love him but actually to join her life to his against father, honor, society, and all else, then we would have a "natural" conclusion.

Also, in La Comtesse de Rudolstadt, the young couple is striving for acceptance. Consuelo has had boy friends before like the singer Anzoleto, but she has never loved. Even Count Albert who loves her cannot thaw her virgin heart. Then she encounters Liverani on the wild carriage ride from Spandaw and in his mysterious and hooded person she finds her passions stimulated and maturing. Sand makes clear that when Consuelo kisses Liverani it is her first taste of passion and love. His first billet or love letter is the first she has ever received. Of this moment of love Sand says:

Not a thought troubled the ineffable security of that instant of love felt and shared as by a miracle. It was the first in her life. She had an instinct or rather a revelation of it, and the charm was so complete, so profound, so divine, that it seemed as if nothing could remove it. The unknown appeared to her a being apart, something angelic, whose love sanctified her. He lightly passed the tips of his fingers, softer than the tissue of a flower, over Consuelo's eyelids, and on the moment she again fell asleep as by an enchantment (XXI, 338).

She writes in her journal, "Oh! but I am beloved. I feel it so certainly. Be certain that I do not deceive myself, and that I love this time really--would I dare say, passionately! Why not? Love comes to us from God!" (XXII, 341). Liverani has won her heart and has awakened her natural passions and has made her a woman. There is no question in Sand's book but that this is "natural" and good. The striving of this couple for legitimacy is the driving energy of the majority of the novel.
However, as we look at the working out of the events of each story, this basic struggle of the two people in the love unit is constantly thwarted, blocked, and finally destroyed. Why is this so in these stories? Who or what comprises these obstacles? What does this destruction mean to these three authors?

When Sand resolves her triangle and its destructiveness by unmasking Liverani and revealing Albert or by thus merging two sides of the triangle, she demonstrates one of the barriers to the consummation of the basic love unit: the third party, the father or authority figure. Albert the husband and his advocates the powerful Invisibles, Rappaccini and Baglioni, and Julie's father and Wolmar—all represent the power of authority, property, and order.

For example, when Consuelo falls in love with Liverani, she is a married woman who has pledged herself to Albert forever. Therefore, as Liverani is masked, so too must their love be hidden. When brought before the tribunal when Liverani has been discovered in her garden and taken to prison and she wants to plead his case, Consuelo is asked point blank if she approaches the tribunal as the Countess of Rudolstadt or as Consuelo the Porporina. They will not tolerate her defection from virtue and duty to passion and illegitimate love. She loves against the will of the elders and of her husband. This need for control, order, and obedience despite the feelings in the hearts of the lovers is a destructive obstacle to the growth of natural and transparent love and the establishment of hearth and family.
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This parental power is also a force for destruction in "Rappaccini's Daughter." Here this power has two facets, complicating it even further. One of Hawthorne's strokes of genius is to have Baglioni pronounce the last judgment on Rappaccini's fatal experiment and to have him do it from Giovanni's window. Baglioni is an authority figure and he exercises great control over Giovanni's mind. When the two first speak of Rappaccini, Baglioni says Rappaccini's theory is "that all medicinal virtues are comprised within those substances which we term vegetable poisons" (1048). The word "poison" is Baglioni's term; "virtues" is Rappaccini's. As is clear throughout the entire story, Rappaccini's "science" is not destroying Beatrice or the garden; whatever its strangeness and adulterous "comixture," it is not the absence of growth and richness but the excess of it that is so noticeable. As Giovanni becomes more and more embued with the garden's "virtues," he, too, becomes more healthy. "... his features had never before possessed so rich a grace, nor his eyes such vivacity, nor his cheeks so warm a hue of superabundant life" (1061). All terms like evil, monster, poison, horror, etc. come from Baglioni's influence on Giovanni. As is symbolized in Baglioni's potion which kills Beatrice, he is the "poisoner" in the story.

Every time Giovanni meets him, he does so with impatience because Baglioni hates Rappaccini and has made clear to Giovanni the "evil" of Rappaccini's work; so to Giovanni this Baglioni is a judgment on him: to love Beatrice is to fall into Rappaccini's snare of evil experimentation.
Yet, Hawthorne allows only Beatrice to name the true "evil" of Rappaccini's science. All others speak the evil that they themselves conjure out of their own weakness. Beatrice is beautiful; she is brilliant, pure, full of sunshine and transparency "like the light of truth itself." As Giovanni glimpses in his highest moment, "There is something truer and more real than what we can see with the eyes and touch with the finger." But Giovanni cannot sustain this faith and he defiles her image with his "shallowness of feeling and insincerity of character" (1060). Baglioni feeds these traits and as Rappaccini has a positive effect on both Beatrice and Giovanni individually, Baglioni poisons both.

That is not to say that Rappaccini is not guilty of destroying the basic love couple. His "poison" is quite a different thing. His science is a search for the virtues of the natural world. Rappaccini's work brings good health, beauty, purity, sunshine, and all of these are good traits. He is the creator of a world beyond our mortal world where beauty and power meet in an ideal society. Rappaccini is a reformer, a social engineer who is trying to breed a race of people who stand "apart from common men . . . and common women." He is creating people who have "marvellous gifts" of life and potency.

As Baglioni, with his need to "thwart Rappaccini" for his own base motives, who will not tolerate Rappaccini because he violates "the good old rules of the medical profession," poisons by making men act their worst, so Rappaccini poisons them into being more than mortals are suitable of being. When Beatrice says, "'I would fain have been loved, not feared,'" (1064) the tragic meaning
of the story is overt. Neither Baglioni nor Rappaccini was willing
to rely on love alone to help the love couple. Both were manipu-
iating, experimenting, observing, fighting, fearing, etc. Therefore,
there was that in Giovanni and that in Beatrice that made their love
impossible. As Beatrice with her "quick spiritual sense" realizes,
"there was a gulf or blackness between them which neither he nor she
could pass." Whence that gulf? It is Baglioni and Rappaccini who
face each other from the window and portal at the end of the story
and they both symbolize the gulf men create in the lives of others.
Together they destroy the basic love unit.

This parental corner of the triangle is a destructive element
in La Nouvelle Héloïse also. Because this novel will be discussed in
detail in connection with The Scarlet Letter and Indiana, suffice it
to say here that the opposition of Julie's father to her love for
Saint-Preux is a major barrier to its legitimate consummation.
Julie's mother could have been won over, perhaps is, but the father
is intransigent in his refusal. Lord Bomston says this best in a
letter to Claire:

Happy are those whom love unites as reason would have done and
who have no obstacle to surmount or prejudices to combat! Such
would our two lovers be without the unjust resistance of a
stubborn father (163-4).

This English Lord foreshadows the end of the book when he says, "The
tyranny of an obstinate father will plunge you into the abyss . . .
and you will be sacrificed to the chimera distinction of rank" (168).
Julie tells her father that she realizes she is being disposed of as
property, and thus her "father" barrier reaches its most threatening
climax when he strikes her, knocks her down, and, unknown to him, causes her miscarriage (143).

The father prevails, she marries Wolmar, and now another "father" controls her life. With all of its advantages, Clarens cannot successfully cover or dissipate the energy of the novel towards the realization of the Saint-Preux--Julie love. In spite of children, virtue, and duty, Julie lives in boredom and dies unfulfilled. Her final letter of open declaration of love for Saint-Preux and her hope for a union "in the eternal dwelling," underscores the magnitude of her sacrifice to "duty" and to the destructive selfishness of her father and M. de Wolmar.

As we answer the question, why cannot the love unit be realized, one answer is because authority opposes passion, especially passion with no social status and social sanction, and forces it to be illegitimate. The fathers or father figures in each story experiment with, control, manipulate, and regulate love, and thus they represent a barrier to natural love.

Another obstacle to the success of the basic love unit is the nature of the lover himself. In each case, the male is too passionate, too dependent, too easily swayed, too "feminine" to really be a "husband" to the woman. There is a danger, a threat in these lawless ones that sets the woman as well as the father against them.

Giovanni falls passionately in love with Beatrice almost immediately upon seeing her. The first night after seeing her for the first time he dreams "of a rich flower and beautiful girl" and, despite intimations of peril and fanciful imaginings, her image takes
possession of him and he loses interest in everything else.

It mattered not whether she were angel or demon; he was irrevo-
cably within her sphere, and must obey the law that whirled him
onward, in ever-lessening circles, towards a result which he did
not attempt to foreshadow (1053).

He is deliberately described in the same terms as the butterfly that
flies over the garden wall because he is without anchor, without
meaning apart from her, outside of her garden. He had longed while
at his window to stand "face to face" with her and to snatch "from
her full gaze the mystery which he deemed the riddle of his own
existence" (1054). Yet, his passionate need makes him a prisoner;
it gives him venomous breath and destructive capabilities. His
lawless passion is symbolized when he gets admitted by the pimping
Lisabetta "among those flowers" (meaning Beatrice) and, as they
play together and come to her sister plant, he asks her for a blos-
som which she promised him sometime before. Then, without waiting
for an answer he reaches out to take a blossom. Beatrice jerks his
hand away and after this crisis he looks and there is the father
watching in the shadows of the portal. The sexual overtones here
seem clear. Giovanni overstepped his bounds and his burning hand
with her print on it is his reminder that getting close to the
garden-woman is very dangerous, especially with the father looking on.

Saint-Preux is also nothing without Julie. His total
dependence on her, his lack of home, of station, of friends, of
feelings apart from her make him insist, demand, that she love as
he does. Claire says, "What misery you cause to those who love you
.... Be fearful lest the death of an afflicted mother may be the
last effect of the poison you have poured into the heart of her
daughter, and lest an extravagant love may at length become the
source of your eternal remorse" (227). It is interesting that like
Giovanni Saint-Preux is called a poisoner and that his love has the
effect of consuming and destroying. He is a threat to all that
Julie has known and hoped for all of her life: home, parents, honor,
virtue, respect, etc.

Liverani also seems to have no life outside of his courtship
of Consuelo. We first see him on the long carriage ride and he seems
to have nothing other than her safety to live for. When he is
captured in her garden, he goes to prison which suggests that he is
either waiting for her or locked up because of her all of the time.
Free, like a butterfly, and constantly drawn toward her, he is her
lover but also her greatest danger. If she satisfied his demands for
total love which flies in the face of duty, honor, sacrifice, and
virtue, then none of these attributes can be hers. Consuelo is
asked, "Can you have two loves at the same time in your heart?"
"Yes," she answers, "two different loves. A woman loves her
brother and her husband at the same time." Then the questioner
asks, "But not her husband and her lover" (XXXII, 50). With the
one goes all honor and social-moral sanction; with the other passion
and disgrace.

Yet, in the final understanding of these obstacles of
father and lover, the crucial point of the triangle and the great
source of danger is not theirs. The woman herself is the major
obstacle to the culmination and legitimacy of the basic love unit. Within her the central clash between the animal needs of sex and love and the social-spiritual-moral needs of virtue, honor, and duty are embodied. Torn equally between these two domains or locations as represented by the lover and the father, the woman, as is especially clear in Consuelo's case, walks a tightrope.

To conclude this analysis of these three garden scenes, another aspect of the woman's role needs to be considered. She is the apex of the triangle and it is her acceptance that is so crucial to both the father and the lover. But all three authors negate their women even in that which is most feminine: their sexuality.

We finally realize that however much the gardens are associated with the three women, it is the father or authority figure who is behind them in mind and spirit. Rappaccini is the creator of the garden world, and Beatrice, the "sister" shrub, and Giovanni's love all have life in the garden under his watchful eye. Julie's garden is a model of Wolmar's beliefs. He does more explaining than does Julie about how it was created. He justifies the aviary, the fish pond, the choice of the spot—all justifications come from him, not from Julie. He says to them as they all three sit in the grove on the other side of the house and as they hold hands:

If I have any ruling passion, it is that of observation. I like to read the hearts of men. . . . I do not like to play a role but only to see others playing them. . . . If I could alter the nature of my being and become a living eye, I would willingly make this exchange. . . . Without caring about being observed, I need to observe them, and though they are not dear to me they are necessary (317). Wolmar has encouraged Julie to build her garden as she has done
since her mother's death to observe her, to watch what she does. He has invited Saint-Preux there to watch him and to watch them together. Likewise, Albert puts Consuelo into the pavillon garden because he can come into it at will in the night and watch her. He is often in the garden at night, watching and she only discovers him by accident. It is his pavillon garden and she is being watched closely.

Therefore, when these father figures introduce the lover into the garden on purpose, we have a strange perversion. Notice the almost exact similarity and the sexual implications between the entrances to Beatrice's and Julie's gardens:

This place, although quite close to the house, is so hidden by a shady walk which separates them that it is visible from no part of the house. The dense foliage which surrounds it makes it impervious to the eye, and it is always carefully locked. I was no sooner inside and turned around than, the door being hidden by elders and hazel trees which permit only two narrow passageways on the sides, I no longer saw by which way I had entered, and perceiving no door, I found myself there as if fallen from the sky (304-5).

His withered guide led him along several obscure passages, and finally undid a door, through which, as it was opened, there came the sight and sound of rustling leaves, with the broken sunshine glimmering among them. Giovanni stepped forth, and, forcing himself through the entanglement of a shrub that wreathed its tendrils over the hidden entrance, stood beneath his own window in the open area of Dr. Rappaccini's garden (1054).

The narrow passages, the dense foliage, the terms like "forcing," "entering," "penetrating," and "pushing" that are used in these and nearby passages are overtly sexual as are the use of the hidden doors closely guarded and locked, the dense shrubbery, and the complete separation of the world now entered and the one just forsaken.

Rappaccini, Wolmar, and Albert are deliberately introducing the lover
into the woman's private world to watch them. Albert is deliberately playing this game by enjoying the caresses meant for the lover. Albert's cloak of detachment is just thinner than that of Wolmar and Rappaccini; his vicarious enjoyment of the lovers' struggles more immediately satisfied.

In the state of war or society the struggle of the basic love unit is thwarted from all sides: lover, woman, and father-husband. Sand tries to solve the destructiveness of these tripartite relations by merging Liverani the lover and Albert the husband into one, thus saving Consuelo's virtue and soul from a perverse kind of trespass. But Rousseau and Hawthorne do not so resolve the destructive triangles: father and lover do not merge; Julie and Beatrice are compromised by both lover and father until death frees them.

Hawthorne speaks for Rousseau and for himself when he summarizes:

O, weak, and selfish, and unworthy spirit, that could dream of an earthly happiness as possible, after such deep love had been so bitterly wronged as was Beatrice's love by Giovanni's blighting words! No, no; there could be no such hope. She must pass heavily, with that broken heart, across the borders of Time--she must bathe her hurts in some fount of paradise, and forget her grief in the light of immortality, and there be well (1063-4).

Only in death is the triangle resolved: on earth there is no family, no hearth, no love. This is what the merging of setting and characterization in "Rappaccini's Daughter," Julie's "Elysée" chapters, and Consuelo's "Pavillon" chapters mean.

All three authors again develop this destructive triangle with similar themes but like results in other works. Because La Nouvelle Héloïse is of far greater complexity than I have developed
it in this introductory study of the three gardens, I will continue my analysis of this novel as I also study The Scarlet Letter and Jacques. Here, as in the three sections and stories studied previously, opacity, masks, veils, duplicity, and deception characterize human relations and moral conditions in the state of war.

La Nouvelle Héloïse

Timothy Scanlan in his dissertation on La Nouvelle Héloïse speaks of Jean Starobinsky's La transparence et l'obstacle (1957) as "a turning point in Rousseau studies."

Since that book, works by Ronald Brimsley, Lester G. Crocker, Hans Wolpe, Scanlan, and others have taken the novel as its own best source, have relied less on the biography of its author, and have begun a process which seems to indicate a depth of complexity unperceived by previous students of Rousseau. Wolpe makes this new attitude toward La Nouvelle Héloïse plain:

I believe that the studies of Rousseau's biographers have only been destructive to La Nouvelle Héloïse. Psychologically, Clair D'Orbe is as fascinating as Emma Bovary. Jean-Jacques' "Land of Chimera" is as convincing as that of the most learned of novelists.

Wolpe concludes that "It is quite remarkable that no one has yet called attention to the psychological ambiguity of La Nouvelle Héloïse." Marshall Berman based most of a book on what he sees as Julie's repression or denial of herself in the novel, and other studies like that of Renée Lelièvre's "Julie D'Étanges Ou La Maternité Frustrée" show that even Julie's "Project" to get pregnant and its later abortion have a depth of meaning unrecognized before.
study of Claire's role in the "psychological triangle"\(^\text{10}\) of Julie--Saint-Preux--Claire is very enlightening and rewarding. Starobinski's study of opacity and transparence in the "Haut Valais" and "Fête de Vendanges" (festival of the grape harvest) scenes as well as in the Clarens and after scenes is truly liberating in its insight into the literary and psychological depth of the book.\(^\text{11}\) Scanlan adds the idea of communication and separation to Starobinski's idea of opacity and transparency and shows how the novel progresses through four stages of communication-noncommunication toward its denouement which is "After Clarens" or in heaven.\(^\text{12}\)

This idea that the novel is not resolved at the end, that Julie has not become virtue spiritualized, that opacity (hypocrisy and self-deception\(^\text{13}\)) not transparence reigns at Clarens, and that Rousseau is negating Julie's decisions not applauding them is quite new to Rousseau criticism. As Ronald Grimsley concludes, "To the question, 'Where is happiness to be found?' \textit{La Nouvelle Héloïse} does not return a simple answer." He shows that the answer is not in "erotic passion" as represented by Saint-Preux, that it is not in the "static, idyllic perfection of Clarens," and that it is not in the "friendship" of great souls such as those of Claire and Julie. "Ultimately," Grimsley says, "Rousseau is induced--with Julie's death--to transfer the whole question to the plane of eternity."\(^\text{14}\) Scanlan agrees: ". . . in the final analysis Clarens must be termed a failure . . . , the only lasting transparency is to be achieved after death."\(^\text{15}\)
This present analysis of La Nouvelle Héloïse derives its legitimacy from these other works. I will refer to them when necessary, but the textual reading and analysis are my own. It is the attitude, stance, approach, and tone of these writers toward Rousseau's novel that is essential here, not any one particular conclusion.

I contend that Rousseau set up character triangles in La Nouvelle Héloïse which frustrate the legitimate consummation of the basic love couple of Saint-Preux and Julie. By setting his characters in an extremely unstable relationship, he shows how deceit and deception enter into male-female relations and in consequence demonstrates how destructive society as most men and women live it is to moral and family life. I will use the vehicle of structure and plot to analyze the Saint-Preux--Julie--father and Wolmar triangle and the Saint-Preux--Julie--Claire grouping.

As to the structure of the novel, the critics differ in their opinions. Grimsley says that most critics agree "that there are three phases to the novel--the passionate love-story, the happy virtuous life in the idyllic society of Clarens, and the philosophical and religious discussions of the last section." Scanlan says there are four divisions: "The 'Before the Fall' or golden age of transparency and communication extends from the first of the novel to the end of Part I where the two young lovers engage in sexual relations." Second is "The Aftermath" which covers the many separations
and "attempts to find peace and equilibrium" and goes to Saint-Preux's return from his trip around the world. Third is "Clarens" where "in some ways excellent communication and transparency seem to have been established" but "in the final analysis Clarens must be termed a failure. . . ." Then, in his last section entitled "Beyond Clarens," Scanlan concludes that "the only lasting transparency is to be achieved after death." 17

Rousseau himself divided the novel into six parts which basically deal with 1) the initial love, the sexual relations, and the father-abortion scene; 2) the struggle of the two lovers for some kind of relations, the marriage of Claire, Saint-Preux's trip to Paris, and the discovery of their love letters and sexual relations by Julie's mother; 3) the turbulent Saint-Preux and Julie relations surrounded by Julie's mother's death, the insistence of her father that she marry Wolmar, her marriage and religious conversion, and Saint-Preux's four-year voyage around the world; 4) Saint-Preux's return, Wolmar's invitation for him to live with them at Clarens, Julie and Saint-Preux's relations there, Wolmar's philosophy and character, and Wolmar's experiments with Saint-Preux's virtue; 5) Saint-Preux's perceptions of life at Clarens, Claire's reunion at Clarens with Julie, Lord Bomston's "Laura" affair which is a test of Saint-Preux's virtue, and Claire's love for Saint-Preux; and 6) Claire and Julie and Saint-Preux at Clarens, Julie's rescue of her drowning son, Julie's death, and Wolmar's, Julie's, and Claire's final letters.
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For my analysis, however, I will summarize the novel by analyzing six "projects" carried out by characters in the story in their attempts to avoid normal male-female relations, or, in some cases, in their attempts to establish normal male-female relations. These constant attempts especially to avoid commitment or control cause the opacity and obstacles which result in the destructiveness of the state of society.

I. Saint-Preux's Project: Sexual Conquest

The first letters are brought to a conclusion in Letter XXIX when Julie and Saint-Preux have their first sexual relations. That is the moment of his satisfaction and of Julie's degradation and loss of virtue. From the beginning of their love affair there is an obvious difference between Saint-Preux's lawless passion and demand for sexual fulfillment and Julie's cold and circumscribed desire for control and a pure and celestial love. He continually wavers between an acceptance of her demands that he control himself, that he sacrifice his passion to honor and duty and a demanding of his physical rights as her lover. She wavers between the need in her heart for a lover and the rejection of her whole being of that lover's physical demands. Thus, this first series of twenty-nine letters is a combat between them that in no way can be called happy or innocent love or even complicated love as we have seen it exhibited in the state of nature.

In Letter XIII Julie does finally consent to meet Saint-Preux in a grove near a chalet owned by her uncle M. D'Orbe. There,
under his cousin Claire's negligent eye (indeed, Claire kisses him first) the two lovers experience their first physical contact. It sets the consuming flame of his passion burning which is so excessive for her that she faints. Immediately afterward Julie commands him to leave on a trip and thus effectively throws cold water on the whole dangerous affair.

While on the trip to the Haut Valais Saint-Preux describes life as he finds it there and we realize how far from the state of innocence or nature is his love affair with Julie:

It was there, in the purity of that air, that I plainly discerned the true cause of my change of humor and of the return of this interior peace which I had lost so long ago. In fact, this is a general impression that all men experience, although they all do not observe it, for in the high mountains where the air is pure and thin, one breathes more easily, his body is lighter and his mind more serene. Pleasures are less ardent there, the passions more moderate. Meditations take on an indescribably grand and sublime character, in proportion to the grandeur of the surrounding objects, and an indefinable, tranquil voluptuousness which has nothing of the pungent and sensual. It seems that in being lifted above human society, one leaves below all base and terrestrial sentiments, and that as he approaches the ethereal regions, his soul acquires something of their eternal purity (65).

"Oh, my Julie!" he concludes, "I wept saying tenderly, would that I could spend my days with you in these unknown places, fortunate in our happiness and unknown to the world! Would that I could here collect my whole soul in you alone and become in turn the universe to you" (68). Because she will not commit herself to him because she does not love him more than she loves her family and cannot find a workable balance between the absolute and consuming passion of her lover and the absolute and final authority of her parents, Julie is in an impossible position. Thus, Saint-Preux's dream of them
together and alone in love is an indication that they are not in his dream-world of natural innocence but are, rather, in the state of confusion and opacity.

When he returns from his trip at Claire's call because Julie is ill and is calling out for him, his destructive and wild passion is at its height and her meek defenses at their lowest. In Letters XXVIII and XXIX Julie tells Claire of Saint-Preux's demand that she elope and of her father's idea of her as property and as a slave. The coming consummation of her "love" affair is described in the words and tone of calamity, defeat, and ruin. Indeed, the description of their sexual union is a description of struggle, of "insurmountable barriers," of danger, and of torment. There is none of the innocence and purity of natural love about this courtship.

Julie says she finally gave in to him because of "pity" and not because of love. She says:

A hundred times I witnessed his struggles and his victory. His eyes would sparkle with the fire of his desires. He would rush toward me in the impetuousness of a blind passion. But he would stop himself suddenly; an insurmountable barrier seemed to have surrounded me, never to be overcome by his impetuous but chaste love. I dared watch this dangerous spectacle too much. I myself was troubled by his fits of passion. His sighs oppressed my heart. I shared his torments when I thought I was only pitying them. I saw him trembling with emotion, ready to lose consciousness at my feet. Perhaps love alone would have saved me; oh my cousin, it is pity that destroyed me (78).

From her description we see that she did not enjoy the troubling event. Earlier she told Saint-Preux, "... my excessively tender heart needs love but ... my senses have no need of a lover" (43). Her idea of love is a "guiltless passion," "the union of love and innocence seems to her to be paradise on earth" (44).
was of their enjoying sex together in seclusion; hers is of their enjoying innocence together in her home amongst her family. He makes this contrast between them overt when he says in Letter XXI:

The attentions of a tender mother and of a father for whom you are the only hope, the friendship of a cousin who seems to live only for your sake, a whole family for whom you constitute the ornament, an entire town proud of your having been born there—all these engage and divide your affection, and what is left for love is only slight compared to what the claims of family and friendship take from it. But I, Julie, alas! Wandering, without a family and almost without a country, I have no one on this earth but you. Love alone is all I possess (61).

Thus, at this moment of first physical consummation, he is reduced to a quivering bundle of passion at her feet (this is important to remember when we see how her father persuades her to marry Wolmar) and she to a kind of prostitute who gives out sex because of confusion and pity. In other words, this sex is a denial of her personality and inner truth. She says:

... the impossibility of ever realizing our hopes, the necessity of concealing this impossibility from him, the regret I felt for deceiving so submissive and so tender a lover after having flattered his expectation—all these were battering down my courage, all were augmenting my weakness, all were disordering my reason. I have to destroy my parents, my lover, or myself. Without knowing what I was doing, I chose my own destruction. I forgot everything but love. Thus, one unguarded moment has ruined me forever (78).

This is not love in the state of nature which fulfills and satisfied by allowing one man and one woman to join together in legitimate marriage. Julie is caught in a triangle with her father and her lover and her own personality all demanding different resolutions. Saint-Preux's passion is his only reason for living and the satisfaction of his sexual need the violent force of his life. Julie is ruined not because she is no longer a virgin, but because she gave
herself out of pity to satisfy the demands of a man's tyrannical passion. This prostitution is not to her or to his benefit and his triumph here is clearly a disaster when we consider their overall relations. Saint-Preux's "project" has been achieved but in its course has come misery and anguish. The masks and veils or obstacles which need not have come between them before are now necessary: he must now dissemble and she must hide her wound.

II. Julie's Project: Pregnancy

After a letter of consolation from Claire to Julie, we are presented with a letter from Saint-Preux to Julie which asks her why she feels so guilty for what has happened, why the "warring," the bitterness and the misery of this "consummation" of their love. He then asks why her chagrin, remorse, and repentance which is so humiliating to him. Then he shows he does not understand her by asking, "Have you not obeyed the purest laws of nature? . . . The tie which unites us is legitimate" (82). The truth is that he has obeyed his nature but that she has not. Thus her chagrin and now her coldness. A near-total opacity exists between them now. No communication, no transparency. But there has never been total, state of nature, communication or transparency between them. Julie in her next letter to him is inaccurate only in limiting this change to the present. She says, "That happy time is no more. Alas, it cannot return, and as the first consequence of so cruel a change, our hearts have already ceased to understand each other" (83). They have not completely understood each other even in their time of innocence. It
is Julie's dream of "that sweet enchantment of virtue . . . that is vanished like a dream" (83) and not their love. Now, she says, they are "common lovers" whose "mad joy," "attacks of frenzy," "fits of passion," "delusions of the senses" are just another expression of what "even the most brutish mortal can enjoy" (84). This is their full entrance into the world of war and society.

In her realization and desperation Julie then tries another way of resolving her impossible state of combat between lover and father. This is her first "project." In Letter XXXIII she tells Saint-Preux again to restrain himself but this time she does not put him off in the same way as before. She concludes this letter with one of the most interesting complications in the novel. She speaks of seeing him at social gatherings and of meeting him in society and then says she prefers a more "solitary and peaceful life."

Besides, there may come a time when I should be forced into a greater seclusion. Would that it had already come, this desired time! Prudence as well as my own inclination require that I accustom myself beforehand to habits which necessity may demand. Ah! If from my error could spring the means of amending it! The sweet hope of one day being . . . but inadvertently I say more than I wish about the design which preoccupies me. Forgive me this mystery, . . . and all that I can tell you at present is that love, which occasioned our misfortunes, is to bring us relief from them (86-87).

Her "design" or "project" is to get pregnant and thereby force her father to recognize this love: "And, if from my error could spring the means of amending it." She says in Part III Letter XVIII that "I wished to form a project which would constrain or force my father to unite us" (253F).17 She felt that "The first fruit of our love would tighten our sweet ties" and that if heaven (le ciel) would
give her a baby it would be her return to virtue in maternity and the return of their happiness (253F). Thus her improbable project of returning to virtue not through love or marriage but through pregnancy and maternity.

Because her project includes his common "brutish" sex, there is a sense of balance which now enters the letters between the two lovers. Letters XXXIV through XXXVIII are some of the loveliest romantic passages in love literature. In Letter XXXVII she tells him her parents are leaving for some time and that he can come to her often. Then, in a strange relapse into her coldness and virtue and before the final yielding-capturing, Julie sends him away again on a humanitarian errand on behalf of a servant girl and her lover. Letters XXXIX through XLIX are exchanged between the two separated lovers, but there is a calm about them because Julie knows she will satisfy him. She lectures him on virtue and self control, and he calls her his "pretty preacher" and accusingly says, "... it is useless to wish to put off my rightful deserts and ... a starving love is not nourished by sermons. ... All the morality you have offered is very good, but ... the chalet is still better!" (107)

Then, as if to get him ready, she baits him in Letter L by demanding that he be modest and in control of himself. His response in LI begins by his saying her letter freezes his blood, which it was intended to do because in Letter LIII she unfreezes it and unhinges him in an erotic invitation to her room and to a night of love. Critics have not been able to reconcile this letter with Julie's
"coldness," but as Mauzi demonstrates, Julie has a "project" in mind and as is clear from her letters she has been waiting for the right time. 18 The time is now; so, despite all obstacles and dangers, she uses the language of common lovers and says, "Oh how I see your heart beating! How I read in it your ecstasies, and how I share them!" "Come then, heart of my heart, life of my life, come and be united with yourself" (121-122).

This is her second prostitution, but this time she wills it and plans it and is using romantic love as a way to regain her virtue. Virginity is gone but maternity is possible. Daughter or mother; never wife or lover!

His description of entering her bedroom, seeing her clothes, her gown, her corset with its "two gentle curves," and his sense of her presence which, he says, "penetrate[s] my entire being," (123) is erotic love poetry at its most suggestive and is a masterpiece of irony on Rousseau's part when we understand how foreign all of this is to Julie's nature.

Thus, in this second coupling as described by Saint-Preux in Letter LV we have a sub-conclusion of a romantic love which seems to contrast sharply with the warring love in the beginning but which is actually very consistent with both Saint-Preux's personality and Julie's. She is using him not loving him, and this time the sex is for her purposes as well as for his.
III. The Father's Project: Abortion, Death, and Marriage

Now the novel shifts back and picks up the "father-lover" theme. Letters LVI through LXIII entirely shift in tone and subject to a verbal fight over Julie between Saint-Preux and the English Lord Bomston which brings the subjects of honor, rank, birth, and father back into the drama. Although Bomston's generosity averts an actual duel, the real duel between father and lover and daughter and lover is sharpened by all of this emphasis on honor and birth.

Bomston takes upon himself the task of converting M. d'Etanges to the idea of a marriage between Julie and Saint-Preux and, as Claire makes plain when she speaks of the "inflexible father" in Letter LXII, there is to be no compromise. M. d'Etanges' daughter will not marry a commoner. Later we learn that the father has already promised Julie to M. de Wolmar (Part III; Letter XVIII) so we understand how Julie is now headed for the final choice and showdown.

She is pregnant as she planned. In Letter LVII she tells Saint-Preux to stop the stupid duel because "perhaps at this moment I am to bear [the name] of mother" (130). In Letter LVIII he reminds her of "the uncertainty of your present condition" (136). In becoming pregnant she has stilled his violent passion; now, if the same act can only convert her father.

The climactic moment is recorded by Julie in Letter LXIII to Claire. The father stomps into the mother's room, ready for a quarrel when he learns of the daughter's intentions to marry Saint-Preux. A typical figure out of the sentimental tradition, he rants.
and raves and finally, when Julie dares cross him, he hits her. Julie says, "... he beat me mercilessly" and, despite the mother's attempts to intervene, Julie's father continues to hit her. "I stumbled, I fell, and my head struck the leg of a table, which caused me to bleed" (143). He melts, of course, and later, in a "natural" scene which Julie calls "the most delightful moment of her life," (144) the father and daughter and mother kiss and seemingly all make up.

The next morning he "tenderly" but "in polite but precise terms" forbids her to ever see or speak to Saint-Preux again. In contrast to the superficial yet safe joy of family she is experiencing, there is the joy of the baby in her womb, and she asks Claire if Heaven has not "destined" her union with Saint-Preux. As long as Heaven favors her baby, she will oppose the father. Then, in a note she adds, "I quite fear that my fall yesterday may have some consequence more disastrous than I had thought. Thus all is finished for me; all my hopes abandon me at once" (146). In one of the most moving statements in the novel in its sad longing, she tells Saint-Preux in Part III, Letter XVIII that "Heaven rejects projects conceived in crime; I did not merit the honor of being a mother" (253F). After the abortion, Claire sends Saint-Preux away and smooths everything over. She tells Julie:

All has been done, and in spite of her imprudence my Julie is safe. The secrets of your heart are buried in the shadow of mystery; you are again in the midst of your family and your people, cherished, honored, enjoying a spotless reputation and a universal esteem (148).
In this condition—"betrayed by destiny" and rejected by Heaven--Julie enters a state of "stupidity which renders me almost insensible and permits me to use neither my passions or my reason" (253F). She is incapable of action and what Claire declared above as her safety in "the midst of your family" is a negation of her personality. Caught between a father and a lover, neither of whom will yield, she just backs out of the story. The father is winning and his project succeeding. Total opacity and non-communication reign between all of the parties.

Saint-Preux is physically absent the whole ninety pages of Part II. His observations on Paris and society are Rousseau's and, even to Saint-Preux's trip to a whore house, he is the typical sentimental languishing lover. Julie does not even care enough to really berate him for his infidelity; she just preaches to him like a wooden preacher and concludes with a hollow maxim, "... he who can be deceived twice on these occasions was not actually deceived the first time" (223). Her wooden lack of real concern here contrasts sharply with the next and final letter in Part II which in an incoherent overflow of panic and dismay tells him that their love letters have been taken. "All is ruined! All is discovered..., we are destroyed!" (223-224) She does not care what he does to satisfy his animal needs in Paris; she is concerned about keeping her relations with him hidden.

Part III begins with five of the most pointed and therefore most revealing letters in this part of the novel. They also bring to a conclusion the final sub-climax of the first major movement of the
Claire writes to Saint-Preux and in a highly rhetorical letter tells him the letters were discovered by the mother and that all has been hidden from the father. Claire again smoothes everything over. She denounces Saint-Preux for corrupting "a chaste girl" and "unscrupulously dishonoring a whole family to satisfy a moment of ardor" (228). Then, in words we will have occasion to recall later in this analysis, Claire says:

But what use is it to go back over the past? It is now a matter of concealing this odious mystery under an everlasting veil, of effacing the slightest trace of it if possible, and of assisting the goodness of Heaven which has left no visible evidence (228).

Deceit, duplicity, and opacity are the words which best describe conditions amongst these characters generally. Julie, Claire tells Saint-Preux, has been reduced to nothing and is now physically dull as well as spiritually debased. She, especially, is a character of opacity and non-communication.

Saint-Preux writes a very meek and respectful letter to Mme. d'Étanges in which he says he does not wish to "break the sweetest, the purest, the holiest tie that has ever united two hearts," (230-231) but that he will stay away if they can find a husband as "worthy" of her as he is: "Ah, let him be found." It is obvious, however, that he does not see that as possible.

Then, in a biting and nasty letter he writes to Claire and denounces her for her cruelty and for her role in separating them and making their relationship opaque. Repeating the word you or your
over and over, Saint-Preux accuses her of destroying their love and of coming between them. In a most revealing statement, he makes the quality of his love and of Claire's mode of operating transparent to the reader:

Ah, what is a mother's life, what is my own, yours, even hers, what is the existence of the whole world next to the delightful sentiment which united us? Senseless and fierce virtue! I obey its undeserving voice; I abhor it while I do everything for it... Yet, I shall obey. I shall become, if possible, insensible and ferocious like yourself (232).

He has no idea what his "delightful sentiment" and sweetest, purest, holiest love is doing to Julie. Critics often speak of her egotism, but hers is at least an urge to virtue where his is an urge to consumption, possession, and reduction.

Claire is now marred and as Mme. D'Orbe she writes back to him and tells him to "be a man," to make the sacrifices required for honor and virtue, and to be patient. (233-234).

The next and climactic letter for this first movement is Letter V which begins, "She lives no more" (234). It is from Julie to Saint-Preux and Julie berates herself and accuses herself of "matricide," accuses Heaven of creating her to be miserable and guilty, and tells him that "it is all over" (235). With her need for his concern making her hand shake, she speaks from her head rather than her heart and says:

If you have any respect left for the memory of a bond so dear and so disastrous, by that I implore you to fly from me forever, to write me no more, to sharpen my remorse no longer, to allow me to forget, if possible, what we were to each other. May my eyes look upon you no more; may I never more hear your name; may remembrance of you come no longer to disturb my heart (236).

As Julie later explains to him, this second rejection of her by
Heaven--the death of her mother as well as the death of her baby--ended her will to oppose her father. "The memory of my mother effaced my thoughts of you" (256F). On his knees at her feet (like Saint-Preux when he won her over to their first night of ruinous sex), her father begs her with tears and on his knees to remember her mother, to be obedient, and to do as he wishes and marry M. de Wolmar. She submits out of exhaustion and pity to his pleas; thus we see her third prostitution and the success of the father's project.

The father has succeeded. He unknowingly killed the baby and thereby destroyed Julie's project and Saint-Preux's hopes. When Saint-Preux hears of the abortion, he says, "Thus . . . there will remain no living memorial of my good fortune. It has disappeared like a dream that was never real" (153). The father has not only cut Saint-Preux's hopes off, but Claire tells Saint-Preux that the death of the mother is a natural result of the father's basic disposition:

If it is necessary to attribute her death to grief, this grief comes from further back, and it is her husband alone who is to blame. Unsteady and inconstant for a long time, he wasted the fire of his youth on a thousand objects less worthy of inspiring affection than his virtuous companion . . . , he treated her with that inflexible severity with which unfaithful husbands are accustomed to aggravate their faults. My poor cousin has felt the effects of it. A vain obstinacy about his nobility and that rigidity of disposition which nothing softens have produced your misfortunes and hers (239).

Thus in this triangle between father--daughter--and lover, Saint-Preux has achieved one victory with the violence of his passion; Julie has almost achieved another with her pregnancy; but the father has won out with his tears and brutality, "his nobility and . . .
rigidity of disposition." These masks and veils, deceits and persua-
sions, characterize male-female relations in the state of war and contention.

IV. Julie's Second Project: Escape Through Religion and Marriage

We can call Clarens Julie's second "project" because as she has tried to solve the tensions between Saint-Preux's consuming passion and her father's absolute will by pregnancy, she now tries to solve these same tensions by negating herself and total agnegation. In Part III, Letter XV Julie, who has had a case of smallpox, tells Saint-Preux that his coming to her bedside and contracting smallpox from her to die if she dies wins her deepest affection. But she says, she must divide herself between "blood" and "love." Her resolution is a piece of confused but understandable sophistry which shows how destructive relationships are in the state of war:

My resolution is taken; I will not grieve any of those I love. Let a father enslaved by his promise and jealous of a vain title dispose of my hand as he has pledged; let love alone dispose of my heart; let my tears incessantly flow into the bosom of my tender cousin. Let me be vile and unhappy, but let all who are dear to me be happy and content if it is possible. May all three of you constitute my only existence, and may your happiness make me forget my misery and my despair (251).

That is a solution of opacity and withdrawal, but the tensions have become so great and there is so little prospect of resolution that she can no longer contend with them. His response to her statement above stands as a reminder to the reader of the violence of his "love." When he reads in her letter that she might marry another,
he responds:

Before you might be debased in that fatal union, abhorred by love and condemned by honor, with my own hand I should plunge a dagger into your breast. I should drain your chaste heart of blood which infidelity might not taint. With this pure blood I would mix that which burns in my veins with a fire that nothing can extinguish. I would fall into your arms, I would yield my last breath on your lips... I would receive yours... Julie dying... Those eyes, so charming, dulled by the horrors of death... That breast, the throne of love, torn open by my hand, gushing forth copious streams of blood and life... No, live and suffer; endure the punishment for my cowardice. No, I wish you lived no longer, but I do not love you enough to stab you (252).

Ironically he says, "Listen to one who loves you" in the next paragraph. The violence and blood imagery are a revelation of his state of mind and although cowardice would stay his hand, we see why she cannot face his "love." When he says, "No, I wish you lived no longer,..." we see that he gets his wish as she abnegates and withdraws into total opacity. It is ironic as well that as Saint-Preux speaks these violent words, Julie is being married to Wolmar.

To avoid Saint-Preux and his love, to avoid the violence of the father and the guilt associated with her mother's death, Julie follows M. de Wolmar to the altar. What begins, however, as an act of despair ends up a spiritual consummation and fulfillment, and if we do not understand what happens to Julie at the altar and why, the rest of the novel, indeed, the whole of it, will not make sense.

Letter XVIII of Part III is Julie's explanation of all of these events, as she finally makes explanation to Saint-Preux, as she understands and does not understand them. Here we find the reasons behind her otherwise incomprehensible statement to Saint-Preux in
Letter XX: "If with the feeling I had before for you and the knowledge I have now, I were free again and mistress of my own choice of a husband--I call upon God, who deigns to enlighten me and who reads my inmost heart, to witness my sincerity--it is not you whom I should choose, it is Monsieur de Wolmar" (262). What has taken place to justify such a statement? She has learned that religion and marriage--like pregancy before--can be put between herself and destructive and violent forces and that she can live with men--as she desired to live in the beginning--in purity and virtue. Now, she tells Saint-Preux her sentiment for him "is as pure as the light which shines on me" (263). She has escaped into her version of the Haut Valais: Clarens.

In Letter XVIII she tells Saint-Preux that as she approached the altar with Wolmar, she sensed the hypocrisy of saying the words of one marriage with her mouth while feeling the bonds of another union in her heart. She says she felt like "an impure sacrificial victim who divides the sacrifice where they kill it" (260F). As she stands like a perjurer, the music of the organ strikes her as do the words the minister speaks. She begins to feel the sudden revolution of an interior feeling. An unknown power seemed to pass through the disorder of her affections and to reestablish the laws of duty and of nature in her soul. "The eternal eye who sees everything . . . read then the bottom of my heart." Therefore, she spoke the words of acceptance with a mouth and a heart in accord. She was "changed" and she felt "reborn."
She then rehearses what her soul found in God and religion and tells Saint-Preux to "love the Eternal Being" as she does because "All is changed between us. It is necessary that your heart change. Julie de Wolmar is no longer your old Julie" (262). Her marriage to Wolmar, she says, "delivers me from a servitude much more fearful and my husband becomes dearer to me for having restored me to myself." In marriage she had found the way to solve the tension between father and lover and between sex and virtue: Marry the father and become wife and thereby force the lover to love at a distance. Julie is a complicated—yet simple—woman, and she is amazingly consistent throughout the novel.

V. Wolmar's and Julie's Projects: Clarens

As I now discuss this fifth segment of the novel, it is important to show the similarities between Wolmar's project at Clarens and Julie's project there. Contained within the life being lived in this household are possible but unrealized resolutions to the tensions of the novel. As we add Wolmar to the picture and as he and Julie live at Clarens alone, we resolve the father-lover-woman triangle and do not create others which complicate the male-female problems which were so destructive in the first half of the novel. This "Clarens" or place of light is on one hand, an obvious state of nature with all of the positive connotations that Rousseau associated with that innocent state.
Wolmar is a fifty year old military man who was a friend of M. d'Étanges in the service. Because Wolmar did Julie's father a favor, the father introduced the man to his daughter. Wolmar says he experienced the first and only love of his life when he saw Julie embrace her father (318). Three years later Wolmar returned to court Julie and with the mother's death and other tensions and the destruction of Julie's hopes he is accepted and they marry. Even though Wolmar is of high birth, he had lost his wealth. M. d'Étanges, therefore, gave him his country estate called Clarens. Thus Wolmar and Julie set up their family in this ancestral home. Julie and Wolmar have two children and their life is an ideal time, of purity, reasonable equilibrium, and good health.

Because Rousseau's interests are not with life at Clarens with Wolmar and Julie and their children, however, he passes over the five or so years of their married life with the turn of a page. At the end of Part III Julie is just becoming a mother and Saint-Preux is just leaving for a four-year trip around the world. Therefore, when we speak of "Clarens," we must distinguish in our minds between the "Clarens" of Wolmar and Julie which takes place only in flashback or remembrance and the "Clarens" of Julie, Wolmar, Saint-Preux and Claire of the second half of the novel. The "Clarens" of the lost five years is an ideal situation, and Rousseau uses it as a foil to all else in the book (like the same foil quality of the Haut Valais). Because this ideal is set entirely outside of his narrative, it seems clear we are not to see it as a true possibility given these people and these tensions; this "Clarens" is an ideal outside of the
destructions of the state of war. It is a home, a family, a happy hearth, but it is not possible for these characters.

In order to understand either "Clarens," we need to know more about Wolmar. In Part IV Letter XII Wolmar explains to Julie and Saint-Preux what kind of a man he is and what his desires and motives are. This is the first time in their six years of married life that Wolmar has explained himself to Julie; so we see that although the life they lead is supposedly one of openness and transparency, Wolmar is in some way outside of the life they are living. He has stood outside of the "passion" of life and found his joy in making others happy. He says he has "a naturally tranquil mind and a cold heart," that he is "insensible" and has "no passion" in him. He says his "only active principle is a natural love of order" which leads him to see in "the well contrived concurrence of the accidents of fortune and the actions of men" a "beautiful symmetry."

If I have any ruling passion, it is that of observation. I like to read the hearts of men. Since my own gives me few illusions, since I observe coolly and without self-interest, and since long experience has given me some insight, I hardly ever am mistaken in my judgments. This advantage is also the whole recompense my self-love receives from my constant studies, for I do not like to play a role but only to see others playing them. Society is agreeable to me for the sake of contemplation, not as a member of it. If I could alter the nature of my being and become a living eye, I willingly would make this exchange. Thus my indifference toward men does not make me at all independent of them. Without caring about being observed, I need to observe them, and though they are not dear to me they are necessary (317).

This "oeil vivant" says that he loved Julie from first sight with "the passion of virtue" which "alone dominates and keeps all the rest in a state of equilibrium." He saw Julie's "extreme dejection" because of
the violence of Saint-Preux's love, he saw that her "heart was exhausted by love;" so he planned to have his joy in restoring Julie to herself and in "curing" Saint-Preux of his violent passions:

My children . . . stay as you are, and we shall be content. The danger consists only in opinion. Have no fear of yourselves and you will have nothing to fear. Think only of the present and I answer to you for the future. I cannot tell you more today, but if my plans are carried out and if my hope does not betray me, our destinies will be better fulfilled, and you will both be happier than if you had belonged to each other (321).

Later he tells Claire, "... my part will be to behold three worthy people concur to promote the happiness of the house and to enjoy in my old age a repose for which I will be indebted to them" (328). His motives seem beneficent and fatherly.

Wolmar is an experimenter, an observer, and Clarens is his project of reform and of happiness. For six years now he has been preparing Julie for the final stage of her moral perfection. This is to bring her into association again with Saint-Preux and Claire and to use his influence and her virtue to "cure" Saint-Preux of his violent passion so that all can live together in a happy ménage à trois.

Therefore, as we see Saint-Preux returning from his voyage, as we see Wolmar officially extend Saint-Preux an invitation to come and live with them, we see the final movement of Wolmar's dream working itself out. The rhetoric, the tone, and the events as Rousseau gives them here all speak well of Wolmar's motives and achievements. Rousseau did not see him as a totalitarian dictator or as a Skinnerian behavioral scientist because Wolmar's basic motive is his love for Julie--however dispassionate and methodical in
comparison to that of Saint-Preux. His beneficent technique does not limit or proscribe the human personality but rather tries to enlarge it. Saint-Preux does mean it when he says of life with Wolmar:

What pleasures, known too late, I have enjoyed these past three weeks! How sweet it is to pass one's days in the midst of a tranquil friendship, sheltered from the storm of impetuous passions! My Lord, what a pleasant and affecting sight is that of a simple and well regulated house in which order, peace, and innocence prevail, in which without show, without pomp, everything is assembled which is in conformity with the true end of man! The country, the seclusion, the tranquillity, the season, the vast body of water which is offered to my eyes, the wild aspect of the mountains—everything here reminds me of my delightful Isle of Tinian. I see fulfilled the ardent desires which I conceived so many times there. Here I lead a life according to my inclinations; here I find a society agreeable to my heart (301).

He had envisioned in the Haut Valais an "Isle" similar to this and if it were possible for him to enjoy his passions here this would be his own idea of happiness.

Julie is "actually more beautiful and more sparkling than ever. Her charming features are even improved; she has put on a little more flesh, which only adds to her dazzling fairness" (288). Thus Saint-Preux describes her when they meet again. Like Beatrice under Rappaccini's care, Julie is obviously happy and contented and Wolmar's way of life is conducive to her growth and happiness.

The only trouble with Wolmar's experiment or project (as with Rappaccini's) is that its final phase which brings Saint-Preux back into the picture assumes that Julie has been changed or that her virtue is solidly established. Wolmar has not really understood Julie or Saint-Preux and therefore his bringing of them together will
have results he has not foreseen. Although his reasonable world is happy when he and Julie are alone, he has naively thought that it would remain so with the lover in the household also. Thinking that he is creating a society of pure and honorable friendship, Wolmar is setting up the tensions again which were so destructive in the first half of the book. When Julie is dying and he perceives that she is happy to die, he is startled and feels deceived. His "Clarens" has been her "Clarens" until his project includes the lover; that is precisely what Julie's "Clarens" does not include.

She finds life in Wolmar's world exactly what she needs to shelter her from the violence of her lover and of her father. Like her conversion to Christianity, Julie's life at Clarens is an escape from passion into a higher realm of pure and virtuous activity. Wolmar is a cold, passionless man whose delight in purity and virtue and control is very similar to Julie's own delight in these traits. He is her father without her father's inflexibility and narrowness, and he is Saint-Preux devoid of passion. Why should she want either a father or a lover?

Wolmar thinks he has changed her nature, but she has just used him in her project of escaping from the tensions of the state of war. She is happier with Wolmar at Clarens than she has ever been or could ever be with Saint-Preux and her honest telling him so is sincere.

The success, however, of her "project" is abruptly threatened with Wolmar's invitation to Saint-Preux. Julie does love Saint-Preux
deeply despite all of the damage his love does to her; so even though his entrance into her home does pose a threat, she wants desperately to believe Wolmar's project successful and so she concurs with the invitation. What happens, however, is that when Saint-Preux enters it is as if the novel begins all over again. The father/husband--daughter/wife--lover triangle is restored. As in the beginning of the novel, Julie's first action now is to write to Claire and ask for her help. Saint-Preux's presence destroys her "cover" of marriage or at least seriously threatens it and so the tensions begin all over again for her. As she desperately tells Wolmar, "... you sport cruelly with your wife's virtue" (332).

Thus we see that as long as Wolmar's "Clarens" remained in its stages of innocence and isolation it agreed beautifully with Julie's "Clarens" or escape from the tensions which surround her when she exposes herself to a father or husband and a lover. When Wolmar's project includes the lover, however, it destroys Julie's "Clarens" and opacity and strained communication return to her life.

VI. Saint-Preux's Second Project:
The Tension of Passion

In Letter I of Part IV Julie writes to Claire and asks her opinion as to whether she should tell Wolmar of her sexual relations with Saint-Preux. Julie has enjoyed the openness and transparency of Wolmar's "Clarens" but she, too, has her reasons for not being totally transparent. She has kept these relations a secret, supposedly, because her father made her swear that she would not tell Wolmar about her other lover. As the time comes for Saint-Preux to
return, however, she becomes anxious and therefore inquires after Claire's advice.

This is the first we have heard from Julie for six years of married life and she reveals herself in many ways. Even though Julie says she hates her odious error of the past, she admits that Wolmar "does not respond enough to my liking. His head is not turned by love as mine is" (274). Notice how Julie's real feelings get out in spite of her as she says this to Claire:

You are not only necessary to me when I am with my children or with my husband, but above all when I am alone with your poor Julie; solitude is dangerous precisely because it is pleasant for me and because I often seek it without intending to. It is not, you know, that my heart still feels the effects of its old wounds; no, it is cured, I feel. I am very sure of it; I dare believe myself virtuous. It is not the present that I fear; it is the past which torments me. There are memories as fearful as the original sensation. I grow tender in reminiscing, I am ashamed to feel myself crying, and I only cry the more because of it. These are tears of pity, of regret, of repentance; love has no more share in them. Love is nothing to me now, but I lament the misfortunes it has caused. I weep for the fate of a worthy man whom indiscreetly nourished passions have deprived of tranquillity and perhaps life. . . . Ah my dear! What a soul was his! . . . How he could love! . . . He deserved to live. . . . He will present before the Supreme Judge a feeble soul, but one which is sound and loves virtue. . . . I endeavor in vain to drive away these sad thoughts; every moment they return in spite of me (276-77).

Is she "cured?"

When she and Saint-Preux first embrace as he comes to live at Clarens, Saint-Preux says, "A sacred ecstasy kept us tightly embraced in a long silence, and it was only after such a delightful shock that our voices began to be confused and our eyes to intermingle with tears" (287). Of these first hours together again, Julie tells Claire in joy:
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Be that as it may, I tell you again without shame that I retain very sweet sentiments for him which will last as long as I live. Far from reproaching for these sentiments, I congratulate myself for them; I should be ashamed not to have them, as for a defect in my character and the mark of a wicked heart. As for him, I dare believe that next to virtue he loves me best in the world. I feel that he prides himself in my esteem; I pride myself in turn in his, and I shall deserve to keep it. Ah! If you saw with what tenderness he caresses my children, if you knew what pleasure he takes in speaking of you, cousin, you would recognize how dear I still am to him (294).

That is a clever way of putting all of the love off onto him. Julie is delightfully transparent to the reader when she says, "As for him, I dare believe that next to virtue he loves me best in the world." The feelings might be pleasurable, but she is courting disaster. Wolmar is foolishly naive as is shown on this first day when he takes their hands in his, clasps them together, and declares to Saint-Preux, "Embrace your sister and friend" (291). He does not know what he is doing to both of them.

All seems very brotherly and sisterly until the Elysee scene which has already been considered. While walking through the garden which is so clearly of Wolmar's precise inspiration, Saint-Preux asks, "I have only a single objection to make in regard to your Elysium, . . . but one which will seem serious to you. It is that it is a superfluous amusement. For what good did you make a new place to walk, having on the other side of the house some groves, so charming and so neglected?" (312) Those groves on the other side of the house are those in which Saint-Preux and Julie kissed for the first time. Wolmar knows of that experience and is harsh with Saint-Preux, telling him, "... learn to respect the place where you are.
It was planted by virtuous hands" (313). The scene quickly breaks up at this point, but in a letter to Claire Julie describes the events of the next day when Wolmar takes the two of them to the "charming and so neglected" grove. Julie says, "Approaching this fatal spot, I felt my heart throbbing frightfully, and I should have refused to go in if shame had not checked me and if the recollection of a word which was spoken the other day in the Elysium had not made me fear the interpretations of my refusal" (316). Looking over at Saint-Preux, she finds him "pale and changed, and I cannot tell you what uneasiness all that caused me" (316). This uneasiness and fear is typical of the scenes of the first of the novel. The tension between the three characters is beginning again.

An important event occurs at this time which virtually uncovers the veil of false transparency that covers Clarens and exposes the opacity and duplicity that has sustained it for so long. Wolmar has gone and he has left Saint-Preux and Julie at Clarens alone. It is a part of his experiment and one of his last "tests" of their virtue.

Saint-Preux and Julie go on a boat ride and because of a storm they are forced to go ashore at Meillerie, the spot where Saint-Preux came earlier in their story when Julie in her fear of passion sent him away from her. It was the scene of his wildest passion and sacrifice. He shows her around and describes the rocks and crags and wildness and tells her how he suffered there. She is frightened and takes his hand, looks at him tenderly, and then pulls
away. "'Let us go, my Friend. The air of this place is not good for me'" (336). Night falls before they can leave the island.

As they sit in the moonlight, his old violent passion comes upon him and he contemplates suicide for the two of them:

But to find myself with her, to see her, to touch her, to speak to her, to love her, to adore her, and almost possessing her again, to feel her lost forever to me, that was what threw me into a fit of furor and rage which by degrees disturbed me to the point of despair. Soon I began to turn over deadly projects in my mind, and in a fit of passion, which I shudder to think of, I was violently tempted to hurl her with me into the waves and to end my life and my long torments in her arms. This horrible temptation finally became so strong that I was obliged to let go her hand suddenly and go to the bow of the boat (338).

When he collects himself and returns to her side, he takes "her hand again. She was holding her handkerchief; I felt it very damp. 'Ah,' I said to her softly, 'I see that our hearts have never ceased to hear each other!' 'It is true,' she said in a changed voice, 'but let this be the last time that we will speak in this manner'" (338). When they finally do arrive safely on the shore at Clarens, he says he "perceived by the light that her eyes were red and quite swollen." In conclusion, he tells Bomston, "I have felt the most lively emotions of my life" (338). Clarens and Wolmar have not cured Julie; Saint-Preux is not being changed. Saint-Preux is again pushing her toward destructive passion and sex and she demands that he stifle his needs and hide his intentions.

This ends Part IV. Julie's project for avoiding the tensions of Saint-Preux's passion has been shattered by Wolmar's project for curing them. We begin to see that despite his beneficence and good intentions, Wolmar is a horror for Julie, exactly like her father in
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effect however different in method.

In Part V we continue the pressure of Saint-Preux's need for passionate fulfillment and recognition. It has a depressing effect on Julie. This part begins with a series of letters between Saint-Preux and Bomston on the "secret grief of Madame de Wolmar" (347). Rousseau delays and delays telling us what this "secret grief" is; we suspect that it has something to do with Saint-Preux. Rather, or so we are told, she is unhappy because Wolmar is an atheist. Yet, her complaint about his religion is of the same source as her complaint about his coldness in love. At one point she says, "Alas! the spectacle of nature, so lively, so animated for us, is dead in the eyes of the unfortunate Wolmar..." (350). Thus, a "veil of sadness... covers their union..." (351). This is very strange for life in a transparent world such as Clarens is supposed to be. Saint-Preux and Wolmar surprise Julie at her prayers, and by her reaction we suspect that she is undergoing extreme anxiety which probably has very little to do with Wolmar's religion:

He began to step lightly; I followed him on tiptoe. We came to the door of the study; it was closed. He opened it suddenly. My Lord, what a sight! I saw Julie on her knees, her hands clasped together, her face in tears. She arose hurriedly, wiping her eyes, hiding her face, and trying to escape; I never saw similar confusion (352).

Aside from what it means for a husband to feel it his right to sneak up on and surprise his wife in her privacy this way, are we to suppose that her tears and her guilt and her confusion are the result of being caught praying for Wolmar's conversion? Religion was one
aspect of her escape from passion and it appears now it is reasserting itself as passion again bids for control in her life. She is again in the middle of the state of war and in this condition of crisis is desperately groping for security. Saint-Preux in asserting himself and demanding satisfaction is driving her again toward "the abyss" (32-33).

VII. Claire's Veil and Julie's Third Project: The Inseparables

When Claire finally comes to live with all of them at Clarens, this "Clarens" is quite a different place from what it was in the first six years of secluded married life. Consider Saint-Preux's description of the wild scene of Claire's reunion with Julie and contrast it with the whole idea of Wolmar's decorum, coldness, and equilibrium and of Julie's matronly, saintly maturity:

Claire . . . flew to her friend, crying in an ecstasy impossible to describe. 'Cousin, forever, forever, until death!' . . . This sudden appearance of Claire, that fall, her joy, her agitation—all took hold of Julie to such a point that, having stood as she extended her arms, with a very piercing cry she let herself fall back and grew faint. Wishing to raise up her daughter, Claire saw her friend turn pale. She hesitated; she did not know to whom to run. Finally, seeing me pick up Henriette, she rushed to aid the fainting Julie and fell with her in the same condition. . . . As for me, seized, ecstatic, out of my mind, I paced in long strides about the room without knowing what I was doing, uttering broken exclamations and making convulsive movements which I could not control. Wolmar himself, the cold Wolmar, felt himself affected. Oh sentiment, sentiment! Sweet food of the soul! Where is the iron heart which you have never affected? . . . Instead of running to Julie, this happy husband threw himself into a chair in order to contemplate this ravishing sight eagerly. . . . 'Let me Wolmar enjoy the happiness which I am savoring and which you Saint-Preux share. What must it be for you? I never felt anything like it, and I am the least happy of the six.' (355)
Despite his own "Happiness," there is much more going on here than Wolmar realizes. Saint-Preux describes the activities a little later in these words: "Entering the fine hall for dinner, on every side the two cousins saw their initials formed with flowers and wound together. Julie guessed immediately the source of this solicitude; she embraced me in a fit of joy." Claire wants to do the same but is embarrassed. Wolmar will not have such hiding of emotion at Clarens; so, "blushing, she decided to imitate her cousin. This blush, which I noticed only too well had an effect on me which I could not explain, but I did not feel myself in her arms without emotion" (356). Now we begin to perceive a triangular configuration of characters that has existed all along through the novel but which has never broken out into the open before: Julie--Saint-Preux--Claire.

We need to rehearse the Julie--Claire relationship briefly here to be able to understand all that this passionate reunion means for these three characters.

No less than ten times in the novel Julie and Claire are referred to as the "inseparable" cousins. In several places theirs is called a "holy and pure friendship" (79), a friendship more devoted than Claire's love for M. D'Orbe (146), "a holy friendship" (79), and a "divine friendship" (147). It is to Claire that Julie writes after her first and second sexual experiences, it is to Claire that she appeals for protection against Saint-Preux both early and late in the novel, and it is to Claire she gives Saint-Preux at the end.
Also, if we look carefully at when Claire enters into Julie's life and what she does, we begin to see that it is always in times of trouble and her first action is usually to send Saint-Preux away. When Saint-Preux first declares his love, Julie writes to Claire to ask her to come and help her keep him at a distance; when she has lost her virginity, she writes to Claire for comfort; when she is again threatened by Saint-Preux's love when he comes to Clarens at the end, it is to Claire that she writes.

But most important is Claire's role as the one who covers up for Julie. When Julie aborts her baby, it is Claire who assures her that all is hidden:

All has been done, and in spite of her imprudence my Julie is safe. The secrets of your heart are buried in the shadow of mystery; you are again in the midst of your family and your people, cherished, honored, enjoying a spotless reputation and a universal esteem (148).

As she sends Saint-Preux away at this time, Claire tells Julie that she "went forward to your friend, and, my heart heavy with sobs, I pressed my face to his. I no longer knew what was happening; tears clouded my sight, my head began to spin, and it was time for my part to be finished" (155). She covers up and sends the lover away with a lover's farewell. That is a good friend.

When the love letters are discovered and Julie feels all is lost, Claire helps again to get everything hidden and concealed from the father and then writes this to Saint-Preux:

It is now a matter of concealing this odious mystery under an everlasting veil, of effacing the slightest trace of it if possible, and of assisting the goodness of Heaven which has left no visible evidence (228).
In a later letter she tells him that because of his obedience she loves him as if he were her child (238).

Acting as the go-between for Saint-Preux and Julie during Saint-Preux's four-year voyage, Claire receives word of his return and of Julie's and Wolmar's invitation and she writes to him one of the happiest and most flirtatious letters of the book:

The last time you saw me I was a serious matron and my friend was dying; but now that she is well and I am single again, here I am completely as gay and almost as pretty as before my marriage. One thing at least which is certain is that I have not changed toward you, and that you will tour the world many times before finding in it someone who loves you as I do (284).

Remember, that is Claire not Julie speaking. Both of these women love Saint-Preux and both of them share a deep female relationship that is most interesting as well.

To pursue the Julie-Claire relationship somewhat further, we remember that they are often referred to as the "inseparable cousins." Rousseau's language to describe their relationship is sometimes very suggestive. At one point, for example, as Claire learns of the possibility of coming to live with Julie and Wolmar at Clarens, she says to Julie, "I understand you, I penetrate you, I pierce to the profound depths of your soul" (304F). The obvious sexual connotations are present in other passages as well. Thus the triangle of Julie--Saint-Preux--Claire is one of complexity. Hans Wolpe suggests a lesbian relationship between Julie and Claire and there are certainly passages which seem to suggest such a relationship. One need not go that far to agree that Julie and Claire enjoy having Saint-Preux in common and that having the "inseparable cousin" either
watching or reading about the love is important to the quality of the love itself. Having Saint-Preux in common is also a way of either loving each other or of hurting each other. Why is Claire so quick to send Saint-Preux away and to cover up any trace of him? Why is Claire so intimately involved in his farewells and homecomings? Saint-Preux accuses Claire of being "ferocious," "cruel," and "fierce" in her actions. Her letters to Saint-Preux are some of the nastiest, most acid-filled letters in the novel; yet, they can also be filled with very gentle emotion and love. Julie at one point suggests that Claire's sending Saint-Preux away after her abortion was the act of a traitor (254F).

One final comment needs to be made on Claire as a barrier. All of the veil imagery in the novel is associated with Claire and it suggests that Claire is an obstacle between Julie and Saint-Preux. Her intrusive love or jealousy or hatred, like the interference of Julie's father and Wolmar, upsets the normal male-female and family consummation and furthers the work of disaster and destruction.

All of this veil imagery as it associates with Claire is most important in the last of Part V and all of Part VI. In Letter IX in Part V Saint-Preux tells Claire of a dream he had:

I thought I saw your friend's worthy mother on her death bed, her daughter on her knees before her, bathed in tears, kissing her hands and receiving her last breath. I saw again that scene which you once described to me and which will never leave my memory.

'Oh my mother,' said Julie, in a manner to rend my soul, 'she who owes her life to you is taking yours from you! Ah! take back your favor. Without you, life is but a dreary gift for me.'

'My child,' her tender mother replied, '... we must fulfill our destiny. ... God is just. ... You will be a mother in your turn. ...'
She could not finish. . . . I tried to raise my eyes and look at her; I saw her no more. In her place I saw Julie. I saw her; I recognized her although her face was covered with a veil. I gave a shriek, I rushed forward to put aside the veil, I could not reach it, I stretched forth my arms, I tormented myself, but I touched nothing.

'Friend, be calm,' she said to me in a faint voice. 'The terrible veil covers me. No hand can put it aside' (364-365).

He says he continues to struggle but that the "impenetrable veil" continually eludes his hands and hides from his eyes "the dying person it covered." Julie's mother blends into Julie whose voice is an echo of Claire's. Claire told Saint-Preux these words in a previous letter: "It is now a matter of concealing this odious mystery under an everlasting veil, of effacing the slightest trace of it if possible, and of assisting the goodness of Heaven which has left no visible evidence" (228). The death of the mother, the "odious mystery," the cause of all of this sadness is Saint-Preux's passion for Julie. But it is Claire who represents all that keeps Saint-Preux and Julie from facing their problems and working them out: she hides, veils, smooths over, and conceals.

Bound up closely with this association of the veil and Claire and the separation of Julie and Saint-Preux are events which show Claire as a barrier to their love.

When Saint-Preux comes to Clarens to "tear the veil away" because he fears his dream is a foreshadowing of Julie's death, he comes up to the Elysium and hears voices. Julie and Claire are talking, and he does not intrude. He describes Claire's voice as having "something indefinably languishing and tender" and Julie's as her "usual affecting and sweet accent but also one that was peaceful
and serene" and Claire is "indefinably languishing and tender." We learn later that he did hear what was being said on the other side of the veil of "hedge and some bushes" and this was the cause of a sudden change in him. Claire was telling Julie of her love for Saint-Preux. Saint-Preux pretends that the "veil" has been lifted from his relations with these women, for in a letter to Bomston he says, "... it is lifted forever, this veil with which my reason was obscured for a long time. All my unruly passions are extinguished. I see my whole duty and I respect it. You are both more dear to me than ever, but my heart no longer distinguishes between you and does not separate the inseparables." "Oh Julie! Oh Claire!" (367) The secret which Saint-Preux discovers through the veil of the hedge is that Claire loves him and that she and Julie have been discussing that love and the possibilities of marriage between Claire and Saint-Preux.

When Julie dies and Claire comes into the death chamber with a "veil of gold embroidered with pearls which Saint-Preux had brought back from the Indies" and comes over to the death bed and lowers the veil over Julie's face, we have symbolized the final "separation" of Julie and Saint-Preux. It is important that Claire be the one who lowers the veil because that has been her role throughout the novel. As she places the veil over Julie's face, Clarie says in a piercing voice, "Acursed is the unworthy hand which ever lifts this veil. Acursed is the impious eye which looks on this covered face" (562F). To cover or hide Julie's passion and human expression, to serve as a barrier between the two lovers, has been Claire's role throughout the
However, Claire is acting as a "veil" in another capacity as she places this final covering on Julie. Julie was very pleased to discover that Claire loved Saint-Preux because like pregnancy and Clarens she senses that she can use Claire to shield her from Saint-Preux's passion which is so terribly threatening to her at this point in the story. The love of Saint-Preux and Claire can be legitimate and acceptable and in Claire's relations with Saint-Preux Julie sees her chance to enjoy him vicariously. So, Julie tells Saint-Preux that it is not good to be celebate and that she has a "project" (509F). She proposes that Saint-Preux marry Claire because "the dear and sacred knot will unite us all and we will be more than sisters and brothers." Without danger, here is a way of again avoiding the dangers and demands of physical love. If she can marry him to Claire, then she can enjoy him just as Claire has been doing through Julie throughout the novel.

We must remember here that Julie has said that Clarens bores her because of its continual goodness and happiness (528F). She is in need of a stronger dose of love than Wolmar can give, but she is afraid of all the vows and virtue that she is supposed to respect and which have served so well to hide her from the passion she now seeks. Therefore, she puts her mind almost totally to the prospect of a marriage between her lover and her friend. Part IV, Letter VI is Julie's first letter to Saint-Preux in seven years and it is a letter totally concerned with the prospect of his marrying Claire. She
writes to him once more in Letter VIII. Letter IX is the one of Fanchon Anet which tells of Julie's little boy falling in the water, Julie's rescue, and her over-exertion and serious illness. The next letter, Letter X, is from Wolmar to Saint-Preux, telling him that Julie is dead. Julie's letter written just before her death but only read afterward is also a discussion of a possible Saint-Preux--Claire marriage.

Why this desperate interest in her two friends? It is her last chance to enjoy Saint-Preux without having to sin to do so. Their marriage can rescue Clarens from disaster. So, to get them to marry is her third "project."

Yet, when she realizes that she is going to die, she sees that an even better "veil" (death) will put her out of the tense conflict of her life at Clarens. Therefore, she confesses all and in doing so seals herself up in the veil of death and consciously negates any possible happiness the others may have found in each other. On her death bed, she opens up and speaks to Wolmar without fear. He sees that she is happy to die and he says, "I have seen through you. You are rejoicing in death. You are glad to leave me. Remember your husband's conduct since we have lived together. Have I deserved so cruel a sentiment from you?" (402) It is interesting to note that this is the first time he has been able to "see through" her here in the place of light, this Clarens; their relationship has been opaque all along. Later, in her death-bed letter to Saint-Preux which Wolmar reads, she confesses: "I have for a long time deluded myself. This delusion was advantageous to me; it vanishes the
moment I no longer need it. You had thought me cured of my love for you, and I thought I was too. Let us give thanks to the One who made that delusion last as long as it was useful. Who knows whether, seeing that I was so close to the abyss, I might not have lost my head?" (405)

After effectively destroying Wolmar, Julie then makes sure Claire and Saint-Preux will not marry. Because she knows they will not marry because of Claire's willingness to sacrifice for her and Saint-Preux's misguided sense of dedication to her, Julie seems to be mocking them when she bids them to join. Claire, of course, covers Julie with the veil and refuses to even talk about marriage with Saint-Preux. She thus cuts him off again from any happiness and in doing so makes final Julie's project to end all in her death. She still is Julie, however, and at the end beckons Saint-Preux to an illusive love: "No, I do not leave you; I go to wait for you. The virtue which separated us on earth will unite us in the eternal dwelling" (407). She has finally escaped them all; here is a project that succeeded.

In *La Nouvelle Héloïse* Rousseau demonstrated in a creative medium what he felt were the barriers to innocent and fulfilling male-female and family relations. Julie's inability to accept responsibility for the physical part of her being, Saint-Preux's inability to see what the affects were of his violent passion, Julie's father's inflexibility and narrowmindedness, Wolmar's naive ignorance of his wife and of the human need for passion, Claire's ability to shut out emotion--all are demonstrated through the use of unstable triangular
character relationships. In the state of war or the condition of society of which he spoke in his first and second Discourses relations between humans, especially men and women, are characterized by duplicity, opacity, and non-communication. Obstacles and destruction are the end of relations in the State of War.

The Scarlet Letter

At one point in Hawthorne's novel, Pearl again asks Hester, "But in good earnest now, mother dear, what does this scarlet letter mean?" (190) Hester contemplates the sincerity of the request and the maturity of her daughter. Yet, when the child asks again, Hester lies and answers, "I wear it for the sake of its gold-thread" (191). The seriousness of Hester's deceit and duplicity here, even though to just a child, is understood when the author adds, "In all the seven bygone years, Hester Prynne had never before been false to the symbol on her bosom." Pearl had tried to "establish a meeting point of sympathy" (190) with her mother, but Hester denied her. These two drives, the deep need for open and honest human bonds and communication and the opposite need for concealment and opacity are the two central tensions or movements in The Scarlet Letter.

As with the character relations in La Nouvelle Héloïse, those in The Scarlet Letter are of the state of society since "meeting points of sympathy" and love, family attachments, and male-female love and affection are constantly thwarted and eventually destroyed. The basic love unit of Julie and Saint-Preux is never realized and Julie goes to her death frustrated and unfulfilled as her lover, her
husband, and her friend stand near her, equally frustrated and empty. This is likewise the case with Hester Prynne and Arthur Dimmesdale as well as with Pearl and Roger Chillingworth.

It is well to emphasize here that the character triangles established by Rousseau and Hawthorne and Sand are unstable relationships. The triangle in civil engineering is a strong shape, but in human affairs it is very unstable. When the third person enters into a basic love relation, as Rousseau has shown in the interference of M. d'Etanges, Wolmar, and Claire, the two lovers are under extreme pressure to yield to another besides the lover. If either of the lovers gives in to the pressure, allowing the third party power in the love relationship, and if either begins to deceive and conceal, either from the lover or from the third person, the basic love unit is threatened.

As we have seen, Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand all believed it possible for the individual or the basic love unit to be innocent, happy, and to endure. In the state of nature, transparency and openness characterize human relations and with the sacrifice that comes of sympathy for others comes stability in male-female relations.

As we turn now to The Scarlet Letter, we see Hawthorne's depiction of male-female relations in the state of society or war, and we realize how different it is from his portrayals of those relations in the state of nature and how similar Hawthorne's picture is to that painted by Rousseau. Of course, this similarity to Rousseau's work in and of itself is not of absolute or isolated
significance because the triangular character configuration is common to many novels, especially of the Sentimental Tradition. However, when we see that these two writers, and as we will see with Sand as well, use the triangular form as a moral and philosophical construct rather than a literary device, when we see this triangular form in the perspective of their total philosophy, then we realize that it has a significance found in few other novels and in the works of few other novelists. Melville in *Pierre* and Flaubert in *Madame Bovary* build their plots on a triangular character pattern. Yet, it is not the pattern that is of significance in those books: it is a device. When we look at their other works, there is no other distinct pattern or system of characterization to serve as contrast to the triangle. For them, as for most authors who use it, the tripartite pattern is a literary device. This is not the case with Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand. For them this pattern is a definite sign of the instability of human relations in the state of society as contrasted with the stability of those relations in the state of innocence and, as we shall see, in the higher moral state.

Several important statements are made by students of Hawthorne that will lead us into an analysis of *The Scarlet Letter*. Edwin Fussell in Frontier: *American Literature and The American West* speaks of the "family feeling" that is everywhere absent in the novel:

*The Scarlet Letter* is a tragedy of privation and discontinuity. If the act of love lies entirely outside its limits, that is not primarily because Hawthorne dared bring it no nearer, but because this theme demanded the exclusion. Through participation in historical processes beyond their understanding, each of the persons in *The Scarlet Letter* is grievously wounded, and only Hester and Pearl in any way recover. Wives have no husbands, children no fathers, fathers no daughters. The family is not a
family, or, rather, is two grotesquely overlapping families. Yet time and again, family feeling flares up, usually bringing with it erotic longing: in the Governor's mansion, on the midnight scaffold, and in the forest, where the parents behold the child 'with a feeling which neither of them had ever before experienced.' At such moments we realize what is missing from all the other pages. For the most part, it is the young husband and father who is most conspicuously absent from the group portrait, the most alienated of all the novel's people, the most irresponsible and guilty contributor to its action. 19

Fussell's perception that "what is missing" is either a father, or a mother, or the family is important to the meaning of The Scarlet Letter and to this study. As Allen Flint says in "The Saving Grace of Marriage in Hawthorne's Fiction," "The state of isolation deprives these characters of normality [in family relations] and, for the most part, the chance for happiness." 20 When the individuals separate, conceal, and deceive, they cut the ties of family and morality and set destruction into motion. That is the situation Hawthorne found in La Nouvelle Héloïse and repeated in The Scarlet Letter.

To understand how this drive to isolation and fragmentation of males and females and families, we need to understand its opposite drive. "The remedy that Hawthorne's fiction most often presents," Flint says, "is marriage and familyhood." 21 As we see in stories like "The Great Carbuncle" and novels like The House of the Seven Gables, the way to happiness is a male-female relationship characterized by transparency and seclusion from contending third forces. As Flint concludes, "Thus marriage, family, and the domestic hearth mark the way for those of Hawthorne's characters who achieve contentment and happiness." 22
To demonstrate the failure of human relations in *The Scarlet Letter* and to show that this failure is an expression of Hawthorne's belief in the destructiveness of male-female complication in the state of society or war, I will first discuss two basic love units, that of Master Prynne and Hester, and that of Arthur and Hester, and then show how deceit and concealment enter these relations as third parties intrude, and then I will show the effects on the main characters of these triangular human relations in the state of war.

**Two Basic Love Units**

As should be pointed out more often than it is, the story of *The Scarlet Letter* begins many years before the book actually opens in Salem, Massachusetts. This is of importance because the personalities of Master Prynne, Hester, and Arthur are quite different than they become in the text itself. For example, when Master Prynne becomes Roger Chillingworth, particular changes occur in his character for special reasons which, in Hawthorne's mind, have relevance particularly to this Salem community and this New England.

The story actually begins and ends in Europe with a European flavor or feeling. In this European setting the first basic love unit involving our principal characters, Hester and Master Prynne, takes place. An understanding of this story is essential to an understanding of the love between Hester and Arthur and the change in Master Prynne when he becomes Roger Chillingworth.

First, I will consider Master Prynne. Because his general similarity to M. de Wolmar is so striking, I will use Wolmar as a way
to understand certain elements in the character of this Master Prynne.

We first meet Prynne when he is in the "autumn" (186) of his days. He lived with his new, young bride in "a Continental city." Before coming to the new world, he and his bride "dwelt in Amsterdam" (120-121) where he pursued knowledge as a scholar. In one place in the novel we learn he was "an eminent Doctor of Physic, from a German University" (155). In New England he was "heard to speak of Sir Kenelm Digby, and other famous men" (115). Hawthorne says of Master Prynne's decision to stay in Salem, "Roger Chillingworth was a brilliant acquisition" to New England (154).

Prynne himself reminds Hester that his life "had been made up of earnest, studious, thoughtful, quiet years, bestowed faithfully for the increase of mine own knowledge, and faithfully, too, thou this latter object was causal to the other,—faithfully for the advancement of human welfare (186). His eyes grew dim from poring "over many ponderous books" (119-120) and when we first meet him in The Scarlet Letter he has a "pale, thin, scholar-like visage" (119-120). Importantly, as he tells Hester, he was "'a man thoughtful for others, craving little for himself,—kind, true, just, and of constant, if not warm affections'" (186). That sounds like a description of M. de Wolmar. Prynne asks Hester, "'Was I not all this?'" and she answers, "'All this, and more.'" The author says of him, "Old Roger Chillingworth, throughout life, had been calm in temperament, kindly, though not of warm affections, but even, and in all his relations with the world, a pure and upright man" (160).
This goodly older man married a young beauty named Hester.

He tells the story this way:

I,--a man of thought,--the bookworm of great libraries,--a man already in decay, having given my best years to feed the hungry dream of knowledge,--what had I to do with youth and beauty like thine own! Misshapen from my birth-hour, how could I delude myself with the idea that intellectual gifts might veil physical deformity in a young girl's fantasy! ... But, up to that epoch of my life, I had lived in vain. The world had been so cheerless! My heart was a habitation large enough for many guests, but lonely and chill, and without a household fire. I longed to kindle one! It seemed not so wild a dream,--old as I was, and sombre as I was, and misshapen as I was,--that the simple bliss, which is scattered far and wide, for all mankind to gather up, might yet be mine. And so, Hester, I drew thee into my heart, into its innermost chamber, and sought to warm thee by the warmth which thy presence made there (127-128).

That is a very sympathetic portrayal of Master Prynne, and we question why in fact he could not enjoy "a household fire" and "simple bliss."

We learn more when we get Hester's side of the story:

... she thought of those long-past days, in a distant land, when he used to emerge at eventide from the seclusion of his study, and sit down in the firelight of their home, and in the light of her nuptial smile. He needed to bask himself in that smile, he said, in order that the chill of so many lonely hours among his books might be taken off the scholar's heart. Such scenes had once appeared not otherwise than happy (188).

Why, then, were they not happy and content in Amsterdam? About two years prior to the moment of the opening of the novel with Hester and her infant on the scaffold Master Prynne was minded to leave Amsterdam "'to cross over and cast in his lot with us of Massachusetts. To this purpose, he sent his wife before him, remaining himself to look after some necessary affairs'" (120-121). The wife came to Salem, but of Master Prynne, as a townsman says, "'no tidings have come of this learned gentleman. ...'" Prynne adds to our knowledge
of where he has been when he tells the townsman, "'I am a stranger, and have been a wanderer, sorely against my will. I have met with grievous mishaps by sea and land, and have been held in bonds among the heathen-folk, to the Southward; and am now brought hither by this Indian to be redeemed out of my captivity" (120). Thus this Odysseus-like character appears on the New England scene, "clad in a strange disarray of civilized and savage costume" just at the moment that his wife stands on the scaffold in shame, the babe in her arms and the scarlet "A" on her bosom.

Why he left Amsterdam, why he sent his wife on ahead, how he came to be lost are all questions unanswered, but it is clear that this voyage and separation destroyed whatever "home" feeling they shared. Maybe the basic love unit could have remained in tact if they had stayed in Europe; Hawthorne seems to suggest that even there the "love" was not deep and true. In his selfish desire for warmth and affection, Prynne tried to take unto himself a new life but it was "feeding itself on time-worn materials, like a tuft of green moss on a crumbling wall" (120). Prynne asks Hester, "'What did I do with youth and beauty like thine own.'" Roger admits that their marriage was his "folly" and her "weakness" and he says he does not blame her for her inconstance: "'Mine was the first wrong, when I betrayed thy budding youth into a false and unnatural relation with my decay. . . . Between thee and me, the scale hangs fairly balanced (128). This is his perception of things and it suggests that all was not well even in Europe.
Hester later comes to understand that past relation in other lights than she considered it when in Europe and she exclaims, "'Yes, I hate him' repeated Hester more bitterly than before. He betrayed me! He has done me worse wrong than I did him" (188). As she reflects back on their marriage "through the dismal medium of her subsequent life," she sees that time with him as "among her ugliest remembrances." Thus the author concludes, "And it seemed a fouler offence committed by Roger Chillingworth, than any which had since been done him, that, in the time when her heart knew no better, he had persuaded her to fancy herself happy by his side" (188).

Prior, then, to the opening pages of The Scarlet Letter, an old world drama is played out which underscores the traditions of marriages of convenience, loveless unions, and all-consuming intellectual pursuits. Like young Julie's marriage to the older Wolmar, a like marriage of unnatural linking of youth to decay, beautiful and young Hester joints Master Prynne in what at the time was neutral enough but with separation and a young love became dismal and repulsive.

To underscore the "European" flavor of this setting or "beginning" of The Scarlet Letter, we also need to look carefully at Hester. As she stands on the scaffold,

... she saw again her native village, in Old England, and her paternal home; a decayed house of gray stone, with a poverty-striken aspect, but retaining a half-obliterated shield of arms over the portal, in token of antique gentility. She saw her father's face, with its bald brow, and revered white beard, that flowed over the old-fashioned Elizabethan ruff; her mother's, too, with the look of heedful and anxious love which it always wore in her remembrance, and which, even since her death, had so often laid the impediment of a gentle remonstrance in her
daughter's pathway. She saw her own face, glowing with girlish
beauty, and illuminating all the interior of the dusky mirror
in which she had been wont to gaze at it (118).

Hester is of humble origins which once had aristocratic claims, but
when she married Prynne it is her youth and beauty which are her
value not her family. We therefore suppose that her marriage to the
great Doctor meant many steps up socially and was probably of great
importance financially to her father and family. Hester tells Roger
in their opening interview in the prison, "'I felt no love, nor
feigned any'" (128). Like Julie's marriage, it was probably
arranged by Master Prynne and her father, leaving Hester little or
no say in the matter. Weary and full of realization when he meets
her in the prison, Prynne tells Hester that the marriage was one of
folly and weakness, feeling towards it much as Wolmar felt when he
realized Julie's true feelings before her death.

As we see her on the scaffold, Hester is almost excessive
in her beauty and magnificence. From her "dark and abundant hair"
to her "figure of perfect elegance, on a large scale" to her
shining beauty and "Divine Maternity," Hester is described in terms
of startling beauty. Later as Hawthorne describes her needlework,
he says "She had in her nature a rich, voluptuous, Oriental
characteristic,—a taste for the gorgeously beautiful, which, save
in the exquisite productions of her needle, found nothing else, in all
the possibilities of her life, to exercise itself upon" (133). With
such beauty and tastes, Hester does not surprise us when she finds a
more worthy object for her "Oriental" and rich love than Prynne.
Our surprise, however, is that she chose Dimmesdale; at least we are surprised if we forget that he, too, did not spring to life full grown in Salem. He, too, had a European past and when we understand it we can then appreciate his role in the formation of the second primary love unit between him and Hester.

We learn that Arthur Dimmesdale "had come from one of the great English universities, bringing all the learning of the age into our wild forest-land" (123). His "scholar-like renown still lived in Oxford" (154) and this "young" man has "high native gifts" along with his "scholar-like attainments" (123). He is very eloquent with considerable "religious fervor" and Hawthorne says, "He was a person of very striking aspect, with a white, lofty, and impending brow, large, brown, melancholy eyes, and a mouth which, unless when he forcibly compressed it, was apt to be tremulous, expressing both nervous sensibility and a vast power of self-restraint" (123). His voice, like his face, is very striking and appealing, and Hawthorne describes that voice as "tremulously sweet, rich, deep, and broken" which causes all hearers' hearts "to vibrate... into one accord of sympathy" (124).

It is not hard, then, to see Hester's overwhelming attraction to him and to know why he was so attracted to her. Both young, both strikingly beautiful and handsome, both with exquisite and refined taste, and both with much loneliness and emotional need. Their love should have been of the state of innocence and nature and from the passion that they share in the forest we surmise that their love did have its season of joy and innocence.
Before the novel opens, the two basic love units are experienced and broken. The Prynne-Hester love unit was probably doomed from the beginning, but we are sympathetically given Prynne's side of the story so that we can see that this good and true man, concerned with the welfare of others and seeking some comfort for himself, is not all to blame for the demise of their love. Inherent in Hester's nature were the seeds of the dissolution as well.

The Dimmesdale-Hester love unit is more immediately our concern as the novel opens, but we sense that it was not so doomed and should have been realized. It is the opacity and deceit and non-communication which destroy this basic love unit that The Scarlet Letter documents. Thus Master Prynne loses that identity and becomes Roger Chillingworth, Arthur hides his true self, and Hester must conceal both her own luxurious nature and femininity and her passionate love. Only in Europe at the time before the beginning of the pages of the novel and at the end when the essential story is completed is Master Prynne like M. de Wolmar. In Europe he is good and true however cold; in America where the drama is a cosmic one with devils and angels and eternal damnation he takes on a type role as the "Black Man" and devil. Roger-Prynne understands this shift in role as we see when he tells Hester, "'Ye that have wronged me are not sinful, save in a kind of special illusion; neither am I fiend-like. . . .'" (187) This "special illusion" is Hawthorne's Puritan drama of the New England culture of the seventeenth century with nineteenth century overtones.
Another change Hawthorne effects to create his "special illusion" is to make the Puritan divine, Arthur, a weak, cowardly soul who plays a part in the drama similar to Julie's in La Nouvelle Héloïse. He it is who must run from passion, who must bear the biting edge of the lover-authority conflict, who must devise and justify ways to avoid commitment and transparence. Julie is beset on all sides by father, lover, home, honor, passion, etc. and as she stumbles from one to the other, deceiving herself and all of them, she destroys herself and them as well. Arthur, likewise, is beset by the strong and passionate Hester, the powerful Puritan fathers, the Puritan community, the Puritan "God," and the vengeful Roger Chillingworth. He, too, stumbles from one to the other and in his final egotistical avoidance of them all through death is like Julie in her deathbed veiling.

Finally, Hawthorne makes Hester the strong-passionate lover like Saint-Preux--the dangerous one. Saint-Preux is an outcast, a wanderer, a homeless person without roots or a past. He is strong, aggressive, passionate and demanding. Hester, also, seems rootless, homeless, without husband or country; she, too, is described as strong willed, passionate, and emotionally powerful.

Perhaps we can now see what Hawthorne "borrowed" from La Nouvelle Héloïse and how he adapted it for his "American" purposes and "special illusion." The beneficent but flawed Wolmar becomes Roger Chillingworth, the weak and desperate Julie is transformed into Arthur Dimmesdale, and the strong and dangerous lover Saint-Preux is Hester Prynne. Thus, by placing these bigger-than-life
allegorical connotations on his characters—devil, Godly minister, and Eve-Mary—Hawthorne creates a cosmic Puritan pattern and sets up the ingredients for a New England drama.

Despite these changes, Hawthorne did not change the purpose for which Rousseau brought his characters into being: to show the destructiveness of confused human relations when opacity and non-communication enter male-female relation. The "tragedy" of Julie and Saint-Preux is the "tragedy" of Arthur and Hester. Thus we now turn to the story itself and to the destruction of the Arthur-Hester basic love unit. In order to see how the love unit is broken apart, it is first necessary to show its realization before the novel begins and in the forest scene in chapters XVII through IXX.

As to the love between Hester and Arthur before the novel opens, there are some things we know from circumstantial evidence. Sometime about one year before the story opens with the woman on the scaffold, and about one year after Hester left Amsterdam to come to New England, she and her young minister lover had sexual intercourse together which resulted in a pregnancy and a baby. As Roger discovers concerning Arthur, "'This man, . . . hath inherited a strong animal nature from his father or his mother'" (160) and is capable of wild things "in the hot passion of his heart" (165). Later, as Arthur returns from his forest interview with Hester, we learn that his is "that violence of passion, which—intermixed, in more shapes than one, with his higher, purer, softer qualities—was, in fact, the portion of him which the Devil claimed" (199). Even
though toward the end he himself wonders how he came to trespass into the domain of sin, we must conclude that when he and Hester first sexually consummated their love, he was passionate, strongly so, and willed the union.

In the forest Hester says, "'What we did had a consecration of its own. We felt it so. We said so to each other. Hast thou forgotten?'” He hushes her but admits, "'No; I have not forgotten'" (200). He loved her too as she loved him and he said so at the time and now indicates that he still feels that way. Indeed, Hawthorne says, Hester "still so passionately loved!" (199) and Arthur says, "'Neither can I any longer live without her companionship; so powerful is she to sustain,—so tender to soothe!'" (203) The depth of powerful emotion is mutual and powerful.

Two people, alone, lonely, with deep passionate nature who come together in love,—here is the basic love unit of the story and Hawthorne stresses in the forest scene that it is a legitimate "consummation."

As to their love in the later chapters, we see that this passionate and "consecrated" love which results in the pregnancy and in the infant is never denied by either of them (however much they fail to acknowledge it). The high point of the love story of the novel is the moment of return to the atmosphere of that early love. I would like to summarize chapters XVII through IX to show that Hawthorne affirms this basic love unit and intends for it to serve as a contrast to all else that is happening in the tale.
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Hester and Arthur meet in the forest alone. Pearl goes some distance away to play and the two "lovers" sit together, cold hand in cold hand, trying after seven years of separation to establish communication again. They speak of their broken and miserable lives and then Hester tells Arthur that Roger is her husband. After a moment of dark separation where he in pain says, "I cannot forgive thee," they are reconciled and he forgives her. Then they open deep transparent communication again, speak the words of love remembered, and are "true" again to themselves and each other. Hester proposes that they flee New England to begin a new life, and when he learns that she will go with him, he agrees.

The next chapter, XVIII entitled "A Flood of Sunshine," is interpreted by critics many ways, but rather than an affirmation of their running away it seems more all nature's response to requited love between a man and woman. It is a chapter of reaffirmation of love and human, natural sympathy. Yes, they are not in "the wild, free atmosphere of an unredeemed, unchristianized, lawless region," but the rhetoric of the passage is openly joyful not ironic or mocking. The words "love," "joy," and "light" are the key words in this passage and only in the beginning of the novel are the words "love" and "joy" used over and over in a positive way. Remember the picture of Hester as she stands on the scaffold in the beginning, as she was when love and maternity came into her life, as you read this passage from chapter XVIII:

Oh exquisite relief! She had not known the weight, until she felt the freedom! By another impulse, she took off the formal
cap that confined her hair; and down it fell upon her shoulders, dark and rich, with at once a shadow and a light in its abundance, and imparting the charm of softness to her features. There played around her mouth, and beamed out of her eyes, a radiant and tender smile, that seemed gushing from the very heart of womanhood. A crimson flush was glowing on her cheek, that had been long so pale. Her sex, her youth, and the whole richness of her beauty, came back from what men call the irrevocable past, and clustered themselves, with her maiden hope, and a happiness before unknown, within the magic circle of this hour. And, as if the gloom of the earth and sky had been but the effluence of these two mortal hearts, forth burst the sunshine, pouring a very flood into the obscure forest, gladdening each green leaf, transmuting the yellow fallen ones to gold, and gleaming adown the gray trunks of the solemn trees. The objects that had made a shadow hitherto, embodied the brightness now. The course of the little brook might be traced by its merry gleam afar into the wood's heart of mystery, which had become a mystery of joy (204).

Hawthorne concludes this radiant and sunshine-filled passage, saying, "Love, whether newly born, or aroused from a death-like slumber, must always create a sunshine, filling the heart so full of radiance, that it overflows upon the outward world." Then, significantly, he says, "Hester looked at him with the thrill of another joy" and reminds him of their child, Pearl.

Outside of human law as defined and practiced in Salem in New England, outside of nominal religion is a dimension of human affection that has a "consecration" of its own. Some would argue that both are deluding themselves and that Hawthorne is baiting the romantically-inclined reader in this passage quoted above. However, as we consider Hawthorne's rhetoric generally, the diction, images, and the patterns of this passage are not those of irony or mockery or delusion. In fact, I would argue that here is the only moment of truth (aside from that similar one which took place before the novel opens) in the book, and it is by this passage that we must judge all
else that happens.

Thus the basic love unit of Arthur and Hester is established in two places in the narrative: before the story begins and in the forest. If this love unit were realized, the characters would be living in the state of nature; since the love unit is not realized, then we can look to find the sources of opacity and non-communication which cause the destruction of the love unit. As in La Nouvelle Héloïse, the destructions in The Scarlet Letter spring from intrusive third persons or elements which cause deceits and concealments. I will therefore turn now to a discussion of these deceits and concealments to show their causes and effects.

I will begin with a comment on Master Prynne who becomes Roger Chillingworth. His deceit is evident from the beginning pages of the book. When Hester recognizes him in the crowd as she stands on the scaffold, "He slowly and calmly raised his finger, made a gesture with it in the air, and laid it on his lips" (120). Silence, he commands, as he waves his finger and places it on his lips. In the interview with Hester in the prison, he asks, '"One thing, thou that wast my wife, I would enjoin thee,' continued the scholar. 'Thou has kept the secret of thy paramour. Keep, likewise, mine!'" (129)

He thus commands her to conceal his true identity and then totally obliterates his past by changing his name. He tells Hester, '"Enough, it is my purpose to live and die unknown'" (129). Later we are told:
He resolved not to be pilloried beside her on her pedestal of shame. Unknown to all but Hester Prynne, and possessing the lock and key of her silence, he chose to withdraw his name from the roll of mankind, and, as regarded his former ties and interests, to vanish out of life as completely as if he indeed lay at the bottom of the ocean, whither rumor had long ago consigned him (153).

He denies his own heritage, his name, his wife, his past and covers up his ties to Hester, deceiving the entire community. His secret role as revengeful destroyer comes as much from this total obliteration as it does from his need to find Hester's lover. By not going up and standing on the scaffold by Hester and her baby, by not making his role as husband known and claiming what is rightfully his, by not supporting this woman openly in her time of trial, Master Prynne cuts the ties of love and family and forms bonds or "iron-links" of hate. His, as the pages of the book begin, is the first of the deceptions and destructive concealments and, Hawthorne seems to say, the most destructive.

Another man who will not stand forward is the father of the baby. Reverend Dimmesdale conceals his role in Hester's shame and in the disgusting role of hypocrite he queries her as she stands on the scaffold. We sense in his words that he really would like Hester to name him. Since he cannot get up the moral courage to confess himself, to stand by the woman he loves, he seems to hope she will say his name and thus let the truth come out. But she will not tell. With a sigh of relief, this cowardly and egocentric man of God says when Hester is silent, "'Wondrous strength and generosity of a woman's heart! She will not speak!'" (124) By his silence and by his cowardly hiding behind Hester's sense of loyalty he is saving
his own skin and reputation, but he is in the process destroying his basic love ties to Hester and the infant: he is denying his family and his hearth.

A final scene which shows Arthur's opacity and duplicity is the moment after his election sermon when he steps up onto the scaffold and beckons Hester and Pearl to come and stand with him. Unlike his midnight excursion to this same scaffold earlier where his "revelation" of his guilt is a mockery of transparence and open communication, this standing up takes place in the noonday sun; however, like the midnight farce, here too he conceals the truth. After his election sermon and as the procession marches away from the church, Arthur stops, climbs to the platform of the scaffold, and cries, "'Hester, come higher! Come, my little Pearl'" (233). He is at the absolute pinnacle of his reputation. When he finished his sermon, "Never, from the soil of New England, had gone up such a shout! Never, on New England soil, had stood the man honored by his mortal brethren as the preacher!" (232) Standing in the crowd is Hester who realizes as he passes her on the way into the church that "there could be no real bond betwixt the clergyman and herself." "She could scarcely forgive him." Later Hawthorne again underscores the growing distance between this "sainted minister" and "The woman of the Scarlet Letter" (230).

When, therefore, he climbs the scaffold and calls her up, she is extremely reluctant to go. He is soon to die, he is the hero, and now he is going to soothe his conscience by making a public spectacle of her again. Hester responds to his "'Is not this better,' murmured
he, 'than that we dreamed of in the forest!' with "'I know not! I know not! . . . Better? Yea; so we may both die, and little Pearl die with us!'" (234). He is using her for his own needs and is disregarding what affect his "confession" will have on her.

Then, in two of the most cruel, callous and opaque statements in the novel, Arthur first says to her:

'For thee and Pearl, be it as God shall order,' said the minister; 'and God is merciful! Let me now do the will which He hath made plain before my sight. For, Hester, I am a dying man. So let me make haste to take my shame upon me!' (234)

Note the repetition of "me," "my," and "I". Hester has been betrayed by him from the beginning of the pages of the novel to the end. The other cruel statement follows his public "disclosure" of his relation to Hester and Pearl and whatever is imprinted on his breast. Hester desperately asks:

'Shall we not meet again?' whispered she, bending her face down close to his. 'Shall we not spend our immortal life together? Surely, surely, we have ransomed one another, with all this woe! Thou lookest far into eternity, with those bright dying eyes! Then tell me what thou seest!'

He then responds:

'Hush, Hester, hush!' said he, with tremulous solemnity. 'The law we broke!--the sin here so awfully revealed!--let these alone be in thy thoughts! I fear! I fear! It may be that, when we forgot our God,--when we violated our reverence each for the other's soul,--it was thence-forth vain to hope that we could meet hereafter, in an everlasting and pure reunion. God knows; and He is merciful!

All of the rhetoric and energy of the novel make a lie of what Arthur is saying here. His complete denial of Hester and Pearl and his lack of human sympathy and feeling is his worst crime in the book. Here he is one with Master Prynne who likewise denies Hester's
ties to him and obliterates his chance for love and family. As he continues to speak to her, his egocentric ignorance is even more clear:

'He hath proved his mercy, most of all, in my afflictions. By giving me this burning torture to bear upon my breast! By sending yonder dark and terrible old man, to keep the torture always at read-heat! By bringing me hither, to die this death of triumphant ignominy before the people! Had either of these agonies been wanting, I had been lost forever! Praised by his name! His will be done! Farewell!' (236; underscores mine)

The sarcasm and mockery of Arthur in these passages is Hawthorne's most bitter. Arthur's denial of a human tie because of a sense of cosmic drama is both Arthur's and Roger's act of destruction.

Arthur Dimmesdale denies family ties, denies the woman who has suffered publicly for his shame, denies the child born of his weakness and passion, and like Julie, escapes from all of his problems in death and rationalization. He conceals and deceives to the end.

Finally, Hester also is guilty of deceits that have disastrous results. She "will not speak" the name of her child's father, she keeps Roger's identity secret, she puts off, misleads and finally lies to Pearl, and she deceives Arthur with a scheme of escape that ignores the reality of Pearl and the Scarlet A.

When Hester lies and conceals, Hawthorne usually makes the seriousness of it clear to the reader. Hester, for example, as she tells Arthur that Roger is her husband, says, "'In all things else, I have striven to be true! Truth was the one virtue which I might have held fast, and did hold fast, through all extremity; save when thy good,—thy life,—thy fame,—were put in question! Then I
consented to a deception. But a lie is never good, even though death threaten on the other side" (199). Strange counsel from one so given to lies and deceit.

All of the major adult characters, then, in playing out of their roles in the triangles of the drama, succumb to fear, to pressure, and to opinion and lie about or conceal or misuse the truth. Mouthing the theme of the book, Pearl tells Arthur on the midnight scaffold, "'Thou was not bold!--thou wast not true!'" (177) and Hawthorne adds at the end of the novel, "Be true! Be true! Be true! Show freely to the world, if not your worst, yet some trait whereby the worst may be inferred" (238). Although addressed specifically to Arthur's case, this admonition and moral seem to be the point of the entire story: be transparent with open communication.

The causes for the deceits and concealments then are fear and ignorance or malicious design, and each of the three major characters in the tripartite relationship is guilty of adding to the general opacity of the story. Now we turn to a consideration of the effects of this duplicity and darkness on the characters. If destruction and tragedy were "dark necessity" as Roger tells Hester, then the effects of all human actions would end in that kind of ruin. But all of our authors say that there are ways of avoiding these destructions. Therefore, when we see them occur, we realize how infinitely sad such avoidable misery is. I will first speak of the effects of concealment and deceit on all of the characters generally, and then I will summarize briefly the effects on each individual.
Consider this list:

"dismal labyrinth of doubt" (142) Hester
"dark labyrinth of mind" (182) Hester
"dismal maze" (187) all
"gloomy maze of evil" (187) all
"moral wilderness" (192 and 202) Hester
"The Minister in a Maze" (211) Arthur
"labyrinth of misery" (230) Hester and Arthur

The most pervasive images of the emotional and spiritual condition of these humans are those of the labyrinth, the maze, the wilderness. Hester, especially, suffers from the labyrinth and maze conditions because she does not have the guilt in relation to a religious system as Arthur does or the consuming motive and purposes of Roger. Because of the general untruth of all of their lives, she, the one most affected socially-externally and the one least able to do anything about it spiritually-internally because she is a woman, is thrown into chaos and thus she is the one we feel most deeply wronged. Yet, all of these characters stumble around in the "dismal maze" of this opaque story.

Turning to the individual characters, Hester develops a "stony crust of insensibility" (125) to others around her; her isolation, banishment, and essential outcast condition cause her to hate and wither. Since little Pearl is an outward manifestation of Hester's inward condition, this description of Pearl is of great importance: "She never created a friend, but seemed always to be sowing broadcast the dragon's teeth, whence sprung a harvest of armed enemies, against whom she rushed to battle. It was inexpres-
sibly sad--then what depth of sorrow to a mother, who felt in her
own heart the cause!" (140) Hester becomes "statue-like . . . with a marble coldness" (180-181). We certainly can understand how these conditions caused her to venture into the speculative realms which "made her strong, but taught her much amiss" (203). Hers and Arthur's is a "ghastly emptiness" (187) where there has been no repentance (188) and no redemption (182).

This marble, cold, empty, withered woman, when we first meet her in the novel, is described this way (and we suppose she was like this when she came from Amsterdam):

The young woman was tall, with a figure of perfect elegance on a large scale. She had dark and abundant hair, so glossy that it threw off the sunshine with a gleam, and a face which, besides being beautiful from regularity of feature and richness of complexion, had the impressiveness belonging to a marked brow and deep black eyes. She was ladylike, too, after the manner of the feminine gentility of those days . . . , her beauty shone out, and made a halo of the misfortune and ignominy in which she was developed (115-116).

She is such a beautiful woman that Hawthorne says a Papist might have been reminded "of the image of Divine Maternity," "that sacred image of sinless motherhood," by Hester holding her baby on the scaffold of ignominy. The deceits and concealments and the environment of hate and scorn rather than an environment of family and love make her an old, ugly, and dry woman:

All the light and graceful foliage of her character had been withered up by this red-hot brand, and had long ago fallen away, leaving a bare and harsh outline, which might have been repulsive, had she possessed friends or companions to be repelled by it. Even the attractiveness of her person had undergone a similar change. It might be partly owing to the studied austerity of her dress, and partly to the lack of demonstration in her manners. It was a sad transformation, too, that her rich and luxuriant hair had either been cut off, or was so completely hidden by a cap, that not a shining lock of it ever once gushed into the sunshine.
To underscore the next sentences, I will set them off from those quoted above:

It was due in part to all these causes, but still more to something else, that there seemed to be no longer anything in Hester's face for Love to dwell upon; nothing in Hester's form, though majestic and statue-like, that Passion would ever dream of clasping in its embrace; nothing in Hester's bosom, to make it ever again the pillow of Affection. Some attribute had departed from her, the permanence of which had been essential to keep her a woman (180-181).

This "sad transformation" is the reverse of the transformation which I will describe as part of the higher moral state. This "transformation" diminishes and withers the characters so that in the state of war or society they appear ugly and cut off and hidden. Like a statue once pure and full, Hester and the rest become defaced and sullied and opaque.

Hester flowers again in the forest when Arthur opens up again to her and they hold hands and speak the words and make the actions of love. But when Pearl refuses to come back from her play to where Hester and Arthur together await her in the forest, when the girl will not return but insists on the retrieval of the discarded "A", the last flowering of Hester's womanly beauty is squashed and the withering of her inward love and strength is complete:

With these words, she advanced to the margin of the brook, took up the scarlet letter, and fastened it again into her bosom. Hopefully, but a moment ago, as Hester had spoken of drowning it in the deep sea, there was a sense of inevitable doom upon her, as she thus received back this deadly symbol from the hand of fate. . . . Hester next gathered up the heavy tresses of her hair, and confined them beneath her cap. As if there were a withering spell in the sad letter, her beauty, the warmth and richness of her womanhood, departed, like fading sunshine; and a gray shadow seemed to fall across her (209).

"Now that she is sad" and the "withering spell" cast, Pearl will
return. Note the diction of the passage just quoted: "inevitable
doom," "deadly symbol," "hand of fate," "evil deed," "doom," "heavy
tresses," "confined," "withering," "sad," "departed," "fading," "gray
shadow," etc. The rest of the denouement is downhill for this woman
with her "mask of frozen calmness" (128). Arthur dies, Roger dies,
Pearl is married and although happy she is absent, and Hester lives
out her life in Salem, helpful and wise, but broken, sad, and alone.

The affects of the conditions in the state of society on
Arthur are of a kind with those I have shown occurred to Hester.

When we first meet Arthur, he has an "apprehensive, half-
frightened" look (123). He is "emaciated," and has signs of "decay"
(155). As guilt tortures him and conscience burns his heart, he is
a "poor, forelorn creature" (167) who becomes almost a shadow (169).
He knows he is "a pollution and a lie" and in her perverse need for
relief punishes himself with a "bloody scourge" in masochistic relief
and atonement (171).

It is the unspeakable misery of a life so false as his, that it
steals the pith and substance out of whatever realities there
are around us, and which were meant by Heaven to be the spirit's
joy and nutriment. To the untrue man, the whole universe is
false,—it is impalpable,—it shrinks to nothing within his
grasp. And he himself, in so far as he shows himself in a false
light, becomes a shadow, or, indeed, ceases to exist (170).

Like a shadow, Dimmesdale is a mockery of righteousness and honesty.
When he climbs the scaffold at midnight, his act is over and over
called "a mockery" and Hawthorne wonders what right crime has to
align itself with such a "poor, miserable man!" (171) His "nerve
seemed absolutely destroyed" and "His moral force . . . abased until
it grovelled helpless on the ground. . . ." (178) After seven years of the story have passed, he has become "'all falsehood!--all emptiness!--all death!'" (198)

When Arthur leaves Hester in the forest and returns to the town, he has agreed to flee. This is a falsehood to his profession and to his moral system, which for a man already false is even more serious than his falsehood to Hester in this Puritan domain or context. The last three chapters excluding the final one (XXI-XXIII) are masterpieces in mockery much like the Jaffrey Pyncheon mockery chapter of The House of the Seven Gables. Hawthorne holds up for ridicule and mockery this ghost of a minister and his complete delusion of "triumphant ignominy."

Roger Chillingworth, also, is destroyed by the concealment and the opaque human relations he spawns and shares in the story. Periodically Hester notes, "'What a change had come over his features,--how much uglier they were,--how his dark complexion seemed to have grown duskier, and his figure more misshapen, . . ." (150) Further on the people in the village "affirmed that Roger Chillingworth's aspect had undergone a remarkable change . . . , there was something ugly and evil in his face" (159). Hester, when she meets him in the forest in chapter XIV is "shocked" at the "change" in him. Hawthorne with Hester concludes, "In a word, old Roger Chillingworth was a striking evidence of man's faculty of transforming himself into a devil" (184). Here we have a negative transformation similar to Hester's "withering." Later Hester speaks to him of "'the hatred that has transformed a wise and just man to
a fiend!" (187) The key word in these statements is the word "transformation" and its meaning of negating and denying and obscuring.

Two brief scenes show best what Roger has become: when he discovers the "A" or whatever he discovers on Arthur's breast as Arthur sleeps, and when Arthur ascends the scaffold and stands in broad daylight with Hester and Pearl. In the first instance when Roger draws aside Arthur's garment and looks at his breast, this is what he does:

... he threw up his arms towards the ceiling, and stamped his foot upon the floor! Had a man seen old Roger Chillingworth, at that moment of his ecstasy, he would have had no need to ask how Satan comports himself when a precious human soul is lost to heaven, and won into his kingdom (166).

The second instance is when Roger sees Arthur with Hester and Pearl on the scaffold, just after Arthur dies:

Nothing was more remarkable than the change which took place, almost immediately after Mr. Dimmesdale's death, in the appearance and demeanor of the old man known as Roger Chillingworth. All his strength and energy--all his vital and intellectual force--seemed at once to desert him; insomuch that he positively withered up, shrivelled away, and almost vanished from mortal sight, like an uprooted weed that lies wilting in the sun (238).

Note the vocabulary: "withered up, shrivelled away", "vanished", "uprooted." Common to all of these characters in a condition of the state of society is this withering and uprooting.

Two final comments on the affects of these concealments on these characters and others in the novel need to be made--first the perverse relation of Arthur and Roger, second, the role(s) of Pearl in the drama, and finally the role of the Puritan religion, elders,
The basic love unit is destroyed when third persons intrude between the two lovers. A strange instance of this was noted in *La Nouvelle Héloïse* in the relation between Julie and Claire. These "inseparable" cousins were so close it was almost impossible for Saint-Preux to get to Julie for Claire, and at the end Claire will not be his in marriage because of Julie's "presence." It is intriguing how much space Hawthorne devotes to the Arthur-Roger relationship. In fact, this relationship is the intimate "marriage" of the novel. From chapter IX to the end, it is Roger and Arthur that are the central "lovers."

Hester, in a tone of "consternation" but yet we sense with a feeling of anger and jealousy, tells the shipmaster who has just told her Roger will ship with her, "'They know each other well, indeed, . . . . They have long dwelt together'" (223). We are told that an "intimacy . . . grew up between these two cultivated minds," and that Roger's mind was brought "into such affinity with his patient's" that almost all was known and acknowledged between them (157). We have mentioned the revelation scene where Roger exposes Arthur's naked breast and is intimately and deeply stirred by his intimacy and rape. Of course there is no overt mention of homosexuality just as there is no mention of a lesbian relation between Julie and Claire, but there seems to be no doubt in either case that these attachments with members of the same sex are barriers to attachments with members of the opposite sex. The point is that Roger's and Arthur's relationship, whatever its physical form, is so total and absorbing
as to be exclusive of all other claimants such as Hester or Pearl. Arthur and Roger seem to love and then hate, but Hawthorne suggests their relation might be even more complex:

'It is a curious subject of observation and inquiry, whether hatred and love be not the same thing at bottom. Each, in its utmost development, supposes a high degree of intimacy and heart-knowledge; each renders one individual dependent for the food of his affections and spiritual life upon another; each leaves the passionate lover, or the no less passionate hater, forlorn and desolate by the withdrawal of his subject. Philosophically considered, therefore, the two passions seem essentially the same, except that one happens to be seen in a celestial radiance, and the other in a dusky and lurid glow. In the spiritual world, the old physician and the minister--mutual victims as they have been--may, unawares, have found their earthly stock of hatred and antipathy transmuted into golden love (238).

This love-hate intimacy of these two men is one of the contributing factors in the separation of the basic love couple and to the destructiveness of the novel.

As for Pearl's roles in the novel, I argue that she has about ten different roles to play. Three of the most important and the three which form a paradox of great significance in this study are 1) her role as a link between Arthur and Hester, as a bond or tie or chain; 2) her role as a divider, a separation or barrier to Arthur's and Hester's coming together in love; and 3) as a mockery of them both as long as they continue to be untrue either to themselves, to each other, or to her.

Her role as a link is described as the three stand together on the midnight scaffold: "... and little pearl, herself a symbol, and the connecting link between those two" (175). Hawthorne says of Pearl while Arthur and Hester converse in the forest, "In
her was visible the tie that united them. . . . And Pearl was the oneness of their being." Hester says to Arthur, "'She loves me, and she will love thee'" (207).

Although she is the link which ties Arthur and Hester together, she is in reality not a link until they acknowledge her as theirs. In fact, as long as they conceal their ties, she is an obstacle and a barrier to them. If Hester had not become pregnant, they could have loved again and again, we suppose. The baby is the sign of their love to the community and therefore forces them to disavow one another and her as long as they conceal their union and refuse the legitimacy of the baby. Pearl will not return to her mother in the forest because Hester has taken off the scarlet "A" and thrown it away. But the "A" is Pearl; it signifies the act which gave her existence and to deny the "A" is to deny Pearl. So, the two, because they will not make her legitimate at "noontide," must separate and accept the threat and barrier that this third person forces into their union.

Until Hester and Arthur are willing to acknowledge her, Pearl also is a mockery of their duplicity and insincerity. That is why Pearl laughs at Arthur's declaration on the midnight scaffold that "'I shall, indeed, stand with thy mother and thee, one other day, but not to-morrow'" (174). The mocking child persists with her question of when until the minister says, "'Then, and there, before the judgment-seat, thy mother, and thou, and I must stand together. But the daylight of this world shall not see our meeting!'" (175)
Significantly, "Pearl laughed again." Pearl mocks and teases Hester in the same manner throughout the entire novel.

As to Pearl's roles, then, we say that she is the link which binds them, the greatest threat and barrier to their love, and the most biting mockery of their insincerity and duplicity. Only when Arthur in his ambiguous way recognizes her on the noonday scaffold can she become a woman and be fulfilled as a human being. When the minister kisses Pearl, "A spell was broken" (236) and "Pearl's errand as a messenger of anguish was all fulfilled." Her tears fall and they become "the pledge that she would grow up amid human joy and sorrow, nor forever do battle with the world, but be a woman in it." Whatever the true affect on Arthur and Hester of this noonday scene, the affect on Pearl is dramatic and in a real way places her outside of the action of the novel. She goes to Europe, marries, has children, and apparently is happy and living in a state of nature or a state of higher morality.

Finally and briefly, one intrusive force into the basic love unit and family which Arthur and Hester could build is the Puritan system which so encircles Arthur. In some way he climbed outside the walls of its iron law long enough to mate with Hester and to love her. Never, however, in the entire rest of the novel is he able to question spiritually, intellectually, or morally the right of the system to be absolute. Thus, as Hester comes to know, this man is so entirely encompassed within the Puritan cosmology and egocentric mind-set that there can be no bonds or links outside of that system for him—no bonds of love with Hester, no bonds of parentage with
Pearl, no bonds of family with them both. Like the idea of honor or virtue or home in Julie's mind in La Nouvelle Héloïse which so effectively block Saint-Preux's attempts to get Julie to come and be his, the Puritan theology and social reality is destructive to Hester's attempts to secure his love. For Hawthorne there is no "system" or force or belief more precious than the open and honest love between a man and a woman which leads to the establishment of a family and a hearth or home.

In conclusion, The Scarlet Letter is a description of destructive male-female relations in the state of war or society. Because of intrusive third parties or forces, the primary characters of the love unit conceal, lie, and distort in order to satisfy the pressures and demands of all the parties. The desired goal of Hester and Arthur and Pearl, as Hester tells her daughter, is home and family:

'But in days to come, he will walk hand in hand with us. We will have a home and fireside of our own; and thou shalt sit upon his knee; and he will teach thee many things, and love thee dearly. Thou wilt love him; wilt thou not?' (210)

That cannot be realized in this case, for Arthur completely withdraws himself, Hester conceals Arthur's involvement with her and Roger's identity, and Roger intrudes into Arthur's life to aggravate his guilt and disorientation. Hester "groped darkly, and stretched forth her cold hands, and found him not" (226). That is an appropriate summary for male-female relations in the state of war. After the family is destroyed and split forever by the ocean and death, Hester speaks of a future time,
when the world should have grown ripe for it, in Heaven's own time, a new truth would be revealed, in order to establish the whole relation between man and woman on a surer ground of mutual happiness . . . , and showing how sacred love should make us happy, by the truest test of a life successful to such an end (240).

"How sacred love should make us happy"—that is the ideal; how sad is the reality in the state of society.

**Jacques**

As we now discuss George Sand's *Jacques* and its treatment of male-female relations in the state of society, we can best make the transition with a statement by R. W. B. Lewis in *Trials of the Word*. He says that at the end of *The Scarlet Letter* Hester is the advocate of a "religious humanism" which Hawthorne says exists outside of traditional religious experience and outside the usual interpersonal practices of the world. Lewis continues:

> It would be a religion founded on the doctrine of the inviolable sanctity of the individual human heart; and one in which the human relation—above all the relation between man and woman—itsfelf shaped by allegiance to that doctrine (by the mutual reverence of heart for heart), would become the vessel of the sacred, the domain of the consecrated.23

We have seen examples of a man and woman who were able to live this kind of "religious humanism" in Phoebe and Holgrave in *The House of the Seven Gables*, in Rousseau's Émile and Sophy, and in Sand's Germain and Marie. Of Holgrave in Hawthorne's novel, Lewis says:

> It is because he refuses to repeat his ancestor's blasphemous act and to make his spell over the girl indissoluble, that Holgrave becomes fitted for that highest kind of human relationship: a marriage, based not on human empire but on mutual reverence, a modest example, one supposes, of the right relation between man and woman prophesied by Hester Prynne.24

233
This "right relation between man and woman" is the object of Rousseau's, Hawthorne's and Sand's philosophies and writings. That is the moral wholeness which sets their works apart from almost all other writers. Benedetto Croce, in an article on George Sand which is generally unfavorable to her but which is highly accurate in many ways, says this of her works:

Georges [sic] Sand was undoubtedly one of the most noteworthy representatives of European moral life in the twenty years prior to the revolution of 1848. She represented this practical side of life chiefly and energetically by means of a strange Utopia, which may be termed 'the religion of love.' This Utopia, owing precisely to its religious element, was distinguished from the sensiblerie of the eighteenth century, and bore the mark of the new times, times without a God and yet desirous of a God. From the point of view of this religion, the value and meaning of life are to be found in love, just in love, understood sexually.25

Although Croce is implying a more sexual or passionate love than I think Sand meant when she spoke of love as maternal or spiritual, his identification of her "religion of love" seems very accurate. The "value and meaning of life are to be found in love, just in love," and Sand's works that I have read demonstrate the realization or frustration of this goal. We have seen how Hawthorne also believed in a "religious humanism" such as that preached by Hester at the end of The Scarlet Letter. Both philosophies are similar in their honest, open, and total commitment of the heart in male-female relations. When that "love" is missing or is compromised through deceit or concealment, both writers with Rousseau insist that destruction ensues and the results are what we have seen as male-female relations in the state of war. The failure of religious humanism or the religion of love is the meaning of La Nouvelle Héloïse and The Scarlet Letter and
it is the meaning of *Jacques* as well.

**The Sand-Musset Affair**

The novel *Jacques* is intimately connected with Sand's love affair with Alfred de Musset. Although this brief look at the history which surrounds the book will be presented chiefly to show how dangerous it is to interpret Sand's novels using their history as a basis, this series of events is of great interest to students of her life or of French romanticism and it shows how important a novel *Jacques* is in her canon.

Unhappily married to Casimir Dudevant since September of 1822, Aurore Dupin, Baronness Dudevant (George Sand), after an adulterous relationship with Aurelien de Seze in 1825 and with Stephanie de Grandsagne (reputed to be the father of Sand's daughter Solange), made the acquaintance of Jules Sandeau in the spring of 1830. This love led her to leave her husband and two small children at Nohant in Berry and to go to Paris to live with Jules.

Lodged officially in the middle of Parisian affairs in the quai Saint-Michel, she and Jules became the center of life of berrichon compatriots and joined intensely into the heady life of Louis Napoleon's new "republic" and of the life of the romantic generation of 1830. Brandes gives this summary of the events of these years and of the participants:

In 1824 Delacroix exhibits his Massacre of Scios, a picture with a Grecian subject and a reminiscence of Byron, in 1831 *The Bishop of Liege*, which illustrates Scott's *Quentin Durward*, in May 1831 *Liberty at the Barricades*. In February 1829, Auber's opera, *La Muette de Portici*, makes a great sensation; Meyerbeer's
Robert le Diable follows in 1831. In February 1830 Victor Hugo's Hernani is played for the first time at the Theatre Francais; in 1831 Dumas' Antony is a grand success. The authors Dumas and Hugo, Delacroix the painter, the sculptor David d'Angers, the musical composers Berlioz and Auber, the critics Sainte-Beuve and Gautier, Frederic Lemaitre and Marie Dorval the scenic artists, and corresponding to them, the two great daemonic musical virtuosi Chopin and Liszt—all these make their appearance simultaneously.

Seldom, however, in the world's history has the mutual admiration accompanying an artistic awakening been carried to such a pitch as it was by the generation of 1830. It became positive idolatry. All the literary productions of the period show that the youth of the day were intoxicated with the feeling of friendship and brotherhood. Hugo's poems to Lamartine, Louis Boulanger, Sainte-Beuve, and David d'Angers; Gautier's to Augo, Jehan du Seigneur, and Petrus Borel; De Musset's to Lamartine, Sainte-Beuve, and Nodier; and, very specially, Sainte-Beuve's to all the standard-bearers of the school; Madame de Girardine's articles; Balzac's dedications; George Sand's Lettres d'un Voyageur—all these testify to a sincere, ardent admiration, which entirely precluded the proverbial jealousy of authors.

These young Romanticists felt like brothers, like fellow-conspirators; they felt that they were the sharers in a sweet and invigorating secret; and this gave to the works of the school a flavour, an aroma like that of the noble wines of a year when the vintage has been more than ordinarily good. Ah! that bouquet of 1830!

This is the world in which Aurore (Sand) and Sandeau established themselves as they came to Paris. Aurore played a role that would be hers increasingly when she came "to the graceful, fluttering Sandeau to whom she dreamed of being mistress, housekeeper, and mother" says André Maurois. 27 She was mother as well to a whole group of young men who, Maurois says, were "more or less in love with her"—Felix Pyat, Emile Rengault, Fleury, Bagriel de Plant, Gustave Papet, and others. 28

In collaboration with Sandeau, she wrote and published Rose et Blanche in December of 1831. She published Indiana in May of 1832 under the name of G. Sand rather than the J. Sandeau, J. Sand, or J. S. which she and Sandeau used on their joint works.
She spent the summer of 1832 at Nohant, but returned to Paris and Jules in the fall. By late fall of 1832 their affair was all but over. She had left Nohant and Casimir to find freedom, but Sandeau was not man enough to provide it for her and she was again restless and dissatisfied. After several attempts at reconciliation, in the early months of 1833, "she made the break complete, as a man would have done."29

Valentine appeared in November of 1832 and early in March of 1833 she had a brief relation with Prosper Mérimée, friend of her mentor Sainte-Beuve. Mérimée tried to woo her, failed and persisted then until she took him to her apartment where she brazenly donned a negligé, and, "guilty of a lack of modesty," killed his desire. Maurois says, "the evening ended in a wretched and ridiculous fiasco" which was soon rumored all over Paris by Marie Duval and Dumas the elder--Sand's friends.

In late spring of 1833, the history behind the novel Jacques begins. Sand was a contributor to the magazine Revue des Deux Mondes, which in June gave a great dinner for its regular contributors. Her friend Gustave Planche took her and she found herself, as Maurois says, "sitting next to Alfred de Musset." He was twenty-three (she was twenty-nine), and a young "golden-haired youth who was beautiful as a God." He was a Byronesque dandy whose life was being dissipated away with drink and women. She was an appealing woman with beautiful large black eyes, "so brilliant and so soft" and her "olive-hued" face appealed to him immediately.30
By July 29th or so of 1833, despite her very real reluctance to have anything to do with him, he fell in love with her and on that date declared his love openly to her. He appealed to her maternal sense ("I love you like a child") and she finally installed him in her apartment. There she worked on her third novel Lélia and he wrote poetry.

In response to a need they both felt to get away and to travel together, on December 12, 1833 they left for Venice, Italy. The trip was a disaster from the beginning as cold weather, sickness, short tempers and frayed nerves made it a quick end to their love.

As they arrived in Venice on December 31 or so, Musset declared to her that he did not love her any more and to avoid her spent his time "sampling new alcoholic drinks" and seeking the "embraces of the dancing-girls."

He came home one morning in a state of sickness and total collapse which Maurois says "may have been due to genuine mental derangement, to brain-fever, or to typhoid." She called in a doctor named Pietro Pagello, a young twenty-six year old Venecian. They watched over Musset for many days and nights and as he improved they fell in love.

He continued to improve during February and March and on March 29th he left Venice for Paris. Sand stayed in Venice with Pagello for five more months, finishing Jacques, her fourth novel which she had been writing since Lélia and during all of the Musset relationship. When she finished, she sent the novel to Musset in Paris and after she returned in July, she saw it published on September 238.
20, 1834.

Thus, whatever else our interest in the book, if it in any way records the feelings and relations of these two great people, it is worth our time. As Brandes says:

Here for the first time in modern civilization the masculine literary creative mind and the feminine come into contact—the highest, finest development of each. The experiment (which was ere long to be repeated in England, on approximative lines, in the case of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning) had never been made on so grand a scale. These are the Adam and Eve of Art. They meet and share the fruit of the tree of knowledge. The curse, that is to say the quarrel, follows; he goes his way, she hers. But they are no longer the same. The works they now produce are of a different stamp from those which they produced before they met.33

The work Sand produced which came from the relationship specifically is Jacques, and in it is certainly the aura of the Sand-Musset moment—when, as Maurois concludes, "two lovers of genius lived in agony, each tearing the other's heart to shreds."34

I think the reader can see that if one is not careful, the historical facts take over from the fiction and it is very difficult to read the novel without seeing it as autobiographical. All of the biographers and critics that I have been able to read see the novel and the Sand-Musset story as direct equivalents. Maurois's Lélia, for example, dismisses the novel itself with a nod after spending many pages on the history, as if telling the Musset story is of far more significance than anything in the book. This is his disappointing judgment on the novel: "It is true that many of Sand's novels are well below the level of her letters and her gifts."35 Maurois agrees with Balzac who, quotes Maurois, "found the book 'false and empty.'"36 Sand's recent biographer declared Jacques "one of the least
consequential of her books."\textsuperscript{37}

Although Janis Glasgow uses Jacques as the subject of her last important chapter in her "Psychological Realism in George Sand's Early Novels," she too analyzes it as a reflection of the Sand-Musset experience and fails, in my opinion, as a consequence to do the novel justice.

She equates Sand herself with two of the main characters and Musset with the other two. Thus, the two of higher quality, more noble, more elevated characters--Jacques and Sylvia--are considered the two parts of Sand's personality. Jacques is passion and Sylvia cold control. The two characters of lesser quality, the average and more physical characters--Fernande and Octave--are considered the two parts of Musset's personality.

Sand, who translated her own psychological reactions to Sylvia and Jacques, endowed both Fernande and Octave with qualities of the poet in order to study her emotional experience with him in two different fictional relationships.\textsuperscript{38} Glasgow is certainly correct when she stresses that "Sand repeatedly states that Jacques and Sylvia are but one being while Octave and Fernande form the other."\textsuperscript{39} To go, however, from this truth to the Sand-Musset equation need not happen. To say Jacques and Sylvia are Sand is to miss the beauty of Fernande's innocence which in its clear level-headedness and almost heroic integrity must certainly be Sand also. Further, to equate Sand with Jacques too closely is to accuse her of mocking herself since she clearly is not in complete sympathy with Jacques at all times in the novel. In his weak stupidity and egocentric pride one would expect him to be equated with Musset.
rather than with Sand. Octave also is not so clearly Musset. We could argue that his romantic honesty and his commitment to open love is more Sand than Musset. Finally, we could argue that Jacques' impatience with Fernande's weakness is like Musset's exasperation with Sand's physical weakness in Genoa and Venice. 

Thus, to interpret the story as autobiography cheapens the characterization and dissipates the quality of the psychology.

An additional comment on the historical and literary facts which surround this novel needs to be made. One's interpretation of the book in large part depends on how one understands or interprets the character Jacques. In her novel Le Dernier amour Sand suggests we view him with the greats of the "romantic malady" or melancholy school:

C'était une époque encore agitée par l'irruption des vues passionnées du romantism, l'époque des René, des Lara, des Werther, des Obermann, des Childe Harold, des Rolla, types des meurtris, des déshérités ou des fatigués de la vie. Jacques était un petit bâtard de cette grande famille de désillusionnies qui avaient eu leur raison d'être, historique et social. . . . Il était l'obermann du mariage. 41

The connection of Jacques with Senancour's Obermann is important because she seemed to be especially interested in this character. Étienne Sénancour wrote his Obermann in 1804 but not until Sainte-Beuve "discovered" it in 1833 did it receive a reading. On May 15, 1833 Sand published in Revue des Deux Mondes an article entitled "Obermann" which must have been written at Sainte-Beuve's bidding. Lélio came out in August of 1833 and her next novel, Jacques, appeared the following September of 1834.
Thus, the criticism of Lélia and Jacques often makes reference to Senancour and the Obermann-type hero. Obermann was a series of letters written from day to day by a man incurably melancholic, full of self-doubt and desolation whose vital energy had been eaten away by the mal du monde. This kind of introspective, candid, and confessional literature was popularized by such heroes of Sand’s as Rousseau, Goethe, Byron, and Chateaubriand. Sand totally identified with René and Saint-Preux and she was interested enough to write about Obermann and Childe Harold.

The questions, then, are to what extent Jacques is intended to be this kind of hero and if he is, is Sand sympathizing or condemning his malady?

As to the first question, the answer seems to be yes and no. As Jacques stands in the high mountains at the end, chanting his poetic lines in the crisp coolness and the snow, he is right out of Obermann and René. Some of Jacques' letters are definitely of the "romantic malady" school (XXIX, LI, LXXXI, and LXXXIX in addition to the two final letters are good examples). Today these letters of self-doubt, of questioning and confusing, of chewing on one's innards--back and forth--seem like egocentric melodrama, but it is in these passages that Jacques is one with the others of the mal du siècle, the ones morally and spiritually askew, for whom the world and its workings are meaningless and the cause of pain and suffering.

However, there are other letters of Jacques' that seem more "normal," if you will, and which portray him interested in others and in their happiness. Some even portray his happiness. As Fernande
struggles to remain loyal to him, Jacques actually drops his "obermanienne" melancholy and seems to respect and esteem her as a real father or brother might.

The answer to the second question, whether Sand sympathized or condemned Jacques' Obermann-type moments, is that she condemns him for them. We sense in her portrayal of Sylvia and Fernande that Jacques' blighted sense of the past and his despair with the present are unnecessarily destructive. Sand can portray the melancholy type accurately, and she sees the inherent destructiveness clearly enough to ridicule.

The attitude taken in this study of Jacques, therefore, is that Sand knew her sources and used them well. She did not sing melancholy dirges for idle persons in torment, but rather she exposed their egocentric insensitivity. Good mental and emotional health characterizes Sand's fiction, and it is this quality which makes her thrust so different from that of Senancour or from Balzac, Stendahl, and Flaubert.

I would argue that the novel is a study of the failure and the success of friendship and love in their many and complex forms. Stimulated and energized, surely, by her experiences with Musset—certainly wiser as a result—she built the novel to show far more complex philosophical and moral male-female relations than her single (however suggestive) relation with de Musset.

Like La Nouvelle Héloïse and The Scarlet Letter, Jacques is a study of the struggle of basic love units for legitimacy and realization amid destructive outside forces which are depicted in the
novel as third characters in tripartite character patterns.

The Story of Jacques

Since I will interpret Jacques by discussing characters and character relations and not plot, I will here summarize the plot for the readers' understanding. The book, like La Nouvelle Héloïse, is epistolary in form, with 97 letters exchanged. In table form, the chapters break down into these general divisions:

1. Upcoming marriage of Jacques and Fernande, letters I-XVI (pp. 1-16)
2. Marriage bliss, letters XIX--XX (19-20)
3. Marriage troubles, letters XXI-XXXVII (21-37)
4. Sylvia-Octave theme, letters XVII-XCIII, and XXXIV (17-18, 34)
5. Octave and Fernande and romance, letters XXXVIII-LIV (38-54)
7. Trip, separation, death, trouble, letters LXVII-LXXVI (67-76)
8. Jacques' decline, madness, letters LXXVII-LXXX (77-87)
9. Realization of the Octave-Fernande love, letters LXXXVIII-XCIV (88-94)
10. Jacques, Sylvia, his suicide, letters XCV-XCVII (95-97)

The story opens with letters between Jacques and his friend-sister Sylvia and between Fernande and her friend Clemence. Fernande is to marry Jacques soon and letters I-XVI discuss the pros and cons from all sides. Fernande is concerned that Jacques (aged 35) is too old for her since she is but sixteen. Clemence warns her
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against the marriage when Fernande tells her of rumors and stories of Jacques' "singularities" and Fernande complains that he is not more open with her. Despite her fears, Fernande decides to go ahead with the marriage. Her transparency and youth cause her to doubt, fear, and cry excessively and Jacques is loving but opaque as to his past. Jacques and Sylvia in their letters discuss abstractions such as friendship and love, pain and suffering. They feel themselves superior beings with special capacities to love and suffer. Sylvia wonders why he is marrying at all and he explains his need for innocent and young love.

In letters XIX-XX both Fernande and Jacques write to their friends to tell of their marital bliss. Jacques has taken Fernande to an almost hidden estate called Dauphiny where he obviously wants to shelter her innocence from society and especially from Fernande's mother and to preserve their passionate love without intrusion. She is overwhelmed by his attentions, his wealth, and the vastness and beauty of the estate.

Startlingly, with this Edenic marriage only months old, trouble starts. Letters XXI-XXVII record the sad progress of his lofty silences and moody moments of pain and impatience and her increasing fits of crying, begging for love and attention, and despair. Clemence says I told you so and gives advice as does Sylvia to Jacques. Fernande explains that she is pregnant and hopes that this will help bring Jacques back to her. Through months of boredom, silence, and agony, they made each other miserable until the twins are born (a boy and a girl).
Interposed here and picking up a theme introduced earlier are chapters wherein Jacques writes to Sylvia and asks her to come and live with (between) the two married people. Sylvia, in letters XVII, XVIII and XXXIV, tells Jacques about her mediocre lover Octave and asks Jacques to explain her "brother-sister" connections with him so that Octave will be free from his suspicions of Sylvia's relations with Jacques and can love her.

In answer, Jacques tells her that his father had relations with a woman who became pregnant. Because this woman also had relations with another man at the same time and no one knew whose baby it was, the little girl infant was left in a foundling hospital. On his deathbed the father confessed to this deed and gave Jacques his son a note on which the name of the mother was written and he also gave him one-half of a Saint's picture, the other half of which they hung around the baby's neck when they abandoned her.

Jacques tells Sylvia that at first his anger with his father and the woman was so intense that he loathed the thought of this infant "sister," but later, he says, he came to desire to find her. He finally located her (Sylvia) at the home of a Swiss peasant family and took her to live with and to be educated by him. Thus, Sylvia lives at his expense and under his protection, and as far as he is concerned she is his sister.

Returning to the Jacques-Fernande plot, we see that in this time of marital conflict Jacques writes and asks Sylvia to join them. In disdain she tells Octave that she does not love him anyway and leaves without telling him where she is going. Fernande, with
Clemence's crass and narrow advice, fears Sylvia's relations with Jacques also, but Sylvia is so full of life and genuine concern that Fernande's jealousy is put to a disquiet rest. Her sense, however, that Sylvia is superior to her remains and Jacques' obvious delight in kissing and receiving Sylvia troubles her.

With letter XXVII, Fernande's letter to Clemence, telling how the three of them spend their time, we hit the emotional center of the novel. Fernande's and Jacques' love is now little more than friendship even though both still try to call it and imagine it love. Jacques is fulfilled by Sylvia's presence and Fernande is diverted in nursing her twins.

The second emotional movement begins in letter XXVIII and runs to letter LXII. Letter XXVIII is from Fernande to Clemence, telling of a ghost or robber whom she has seen around the estate. Several mysterious occurrences take place; for example, a man appears at her window whom she thinks is Jacques. She throws him her golden bracelet only to discover it is the stranger. This, of course, is Sylvia's lover Octave who has come to try to win Sylvia's love again. However, as Octave tells Herbert, he is innocently enjoying Fernande's total simplicity and fear.

What begins as play, however, quickly grows more intense since Sylvia disdains Octave and Fernande is so much alone and in need of compassion and tenderness. Octave is honest, however, and Fernande totally transparent, innocent, and faithful to her husband. Octave gets Fernande to intercede for him with Sylvia and they meet several times in secret to form plans, both coming closer together in
a romantic way but neither really meaning anything by it other than friendship.

Jacques by accident catches Octave kissing her and quickly flees on a trip. He writes to Sylvia and tells her his wife is unfaithful and deceitful, but Sylvia questions Fernande and Octave and writes to reassure Jacques that Fernande loves him and that what he thought was a kiss was an innocent exchange in the garden with words of friendship. Sylvia explains that Octave is playing the romantic lover game and that Fernande has been helping him woo Sylvia. Jacques returns and love does also for the estranged couple as Jacques treats Fernande with more consideration, and all seems well.

Octave, however, has fallen deeply in love with Fernande. Thus, letter LV from him to her in which he openly and boldly declares his love (like Saint-Preux to Julie) is the beginning of an intense, dangerous, and painful period for all. Fernande keeps him at a distance, but, in letter LXII, Jacques says that he sees she has fallen deeply in love. Letter LXI is crucial to the progress of this love since in it Octave complains to Fernande for weaning her babies and allowing Jacques to return to her bed. His love has now become sexually possessive and openly in need of consummation.

In an attempt to salvage her virtue, Fernande in letter LXIII asks Jacques to take her away for a while. Octave demands in anger to know why, and letter LXXI is Fernande's first open declaration of her love for him.

The trip, however, is disastrous as Octave is in despair, Fernande is so wrought up as to be sick, and the little baby girl at
home with Sylvia becomes very ill. Jacques returns to care for the
daughter without telling Fernande of the illness, and Octave hurries
to Fernande. Gossip entrudes and spreads, of course, and a M. Borel
writes and tells Jacques he had better come and get his wife before
she is ruined. Fernande hears of the note and falls into despair
because of what surely must be her ruin.

When Fernande, Octave, and Fernande's mother return to
Dauphiny, Jacques pretends not to have received the note from M.
Borel, welcomes all, and then tells Fernande that their daughter has
died. Even this sorrow does not prevent Mme. de Theursan, the "bitchy"
mother, from falsely accusing Jacques and Sylvia of adultery and
prostitution. In anger, Jacques produces the half of the Saint's
picture and the note with this woman's name on it. Fernande's
mother is Sylvia's as well. Jacques' revelation destroys the
woman and Sylvia sadly learns who her mother is and that Fernande is
her sister. These revelations end the second movement of the story.

The third comprises letters LXXVII to XCIV. Jacques sees that
Fernande and Octave are deeply in love and like a weak Wolmar backs
out of the picture. Rumor, however, of his relations with Sylvia and
of Fernande's promiscuity spread in Mme. de Theursan's town and Jacques
in madness and pain goes there, kills one man and wounds another in
duels. His need is to punish and to avenge his loss, but he soon
realizes that he is being foolish.

When their little boy dies, Sylvia bids him return and when
he does he realizes he has no place any more amongst them. By
accident he reads letter XCII from Octave to Fernande in which he
learns she is pregnant with Octave's child. Recognizing the legitimate rights of love, he renounces his lesser rights as husband and leaves for good.

The final brief movement is a three-letter exchange between Jacques and Sylvia in which they profess and explain their love and friendship. She invites him to escape with her, to adopt children, and to raise them and marry them to each other, thus beginning a new social order. He tells her that as she was growing up he forced himself to renounce the possibility of loving her and thus cannot love her other than as a brother and father. Separated to the end, Jacques and Sylvia go their different ways: she to help Fernande her sister, and he to his death. He makes his death appear accidental so that Fernande will not suffer from thinking she killed him, also leaving her free to marry Octave.

The Basic Love Units and the Destructive Triangles

1. Jacques, Sylvia, Fernande

The ideal love unit in the novel is that of Jacques and Sylvia. They are, as Sand has the characters repeat several times, "on the same level," as if one soul were animating them both. Both have seen the world and human social activity ("the social creed") and in the true spirit of Rousseau have declared it false. The two are therefore aloof and scornful with their "disdainful silence" (II 114) and "superb pride" (170). The result is that they are left to communicate only with each other. For him, she is above all women on
earth (139) and for her, as she says, "... what I love best in the world is you, Jacques; you know it; my life belongs to you; I owe everything to you; I have no other duty, no other happiness, in this world, than to serve you" (II 27).

This aloof disdain, although it makes them soul-mates, makes them appear cold, silent, and impenetrable to others. Octave calls them "these two beings of ice" (II 83) and Fernande complains that Jacques is "silent as a tomb" and "an impenetrable abyss" (71). Fernande also speaks of Sylvia's "soul of bronze" and queries, "is she a woman?" (II 6-7).

Thus available only to each other, Jacques and Sylvia should be married. With Fernande we ask, "Why are they not married? They would be on the same level" (II 50). They do not marry, as we learn at the end, because Jacques was never able to be sure she is not his sister; so he made an "absolute and eternal sacrifice" of his deep feelings as she became a woman. Early in the novel Sylvia asks him for a love beyond friendship (62-63). He also says to her that "There is between us a sentiment stronger than love" (55) "my sister before God" (II 169-170), but she does not understand this abnegation and laments, "He who is apart from all other men, inspires me with, and feels for me, only friendship. Friendship is also a sort of love, immense and sublime in certain moments, but insufficient" (62). He remains dumb to her words, and thus maintains his strange role as "colossus of austere uprightness" (48).

The novel, therefore, approaches its end with Sylvia and Jacques unfulfilled and alone. We have little sympathy for Jacques'
egocentric and childish rantings about how he has suffered and how
miserable his life is. On the contrary, we realize with Sand how he
has wronged Sylvia who has loved him all along. Jacques, like many
of Hawthorne's male characters, denies the woman he loves and who
loves him and sets disaster on its painful track. Fernande discerns
the problem and explains:

Jacques is too severe and inexorable; he treats Sylvia too much
as a man; he does not divine the weaknesses of a woman's heart,
and does not comprehend, as I do, what weariness and suffering
must be hidden beneath this courage (177).

Sylvia herself laments:

It appears, then, that life should be divided into two parts--
intimacy with love, devotion with friendship. But it is in vain
that I would persuade myself that I am content with this arrange-
ment; it is in vain that I repeat to myself that God has
treated me bountifully in giving me a lover such as Octave, a
friend such as yourself: I find love to be very puerile,
friendship very austere. I would have for Octave the veneration
which I feel for you, without losing the sweet tenderness and
the lively solicitude which I feel for him. Insensate dream!
We must accept life as God has made it. It is difficult to do
this, Jacques--it is very difficult (62-63).

That Jacques is able to tightly keep the mantle over his deep feelings
for her in the light of her pleading shows how fiercely he has denied
her. Even when the various tragic consequences of his opacity and
her willingness to let him have his way have brought them to her
renunciation of love and his denial of life, she, like Hester to
Arthur in the forest, tries to entice him to love with an idealistic
plan of escape:

Come, let us go; let us forget all that we have suffered: you,
through having loved too well--and I, through not having been
able to love enough. If you choose, we will adopt some orphan:
we will imagine it to be our child, and we will bring it up in
our principles. We will bring up two of different sexes, and
some day we will marry them together in the sight of God, with no other temple than the desert, no other priest than love; we shall have formed their souls to truth and justice, and perhaps there will be, thanks to us! one pure and happy couple upon the face of the earth (II 165).

Sylvia, like Hester Prynne, wishes for another day when there can be "pure and happy couples upon the face of the earth." Sylvia's wish for love and acceptance is as Rousseau's need for companionship. She is not able to realize hers, but he is fulfilled in fiction through his Emile and Sophy. As is usual in the state of war, however, Jacques like Arthur Dimmesdale is too wrapped up in his own world of self-torture to hear the woman's voice.

Here in this pair of idealists and in this dream of marriage, adoption, family, and hearth is the sad dissipation of the most worthy love unit in the novel. Opacity, non-communication, renunciation, and despair characterize these relations.

In this triangle of Jacques--Sylvia--Fernande there is also the love unit of Jacques and Fernande.

We are never sure of Jacques' motives for marrying this sixteen year old "child." In the beginning of the book, Jacques, like Wolmar and Prynne, seems to be deliberately recreating a state of innocence and Eden to see if he can avoid social evil and preserve innocence and love and enjoy companionship and repose in his battered "old" age. He snatches Fernande away immediately after the marriage and takes her to his obscure forest retreat Dauphiny. She tells him of her "golden dreams" of the "handsomest prince" (69-70) and in her innocence and transparence, with her soul as "pure as crystal" (II 26),
she is his perfect companion as he abandons himself to this project almost like a child himself.

I came here to enjoy my happiness mysteriously, far from the inquisitive glances of importunate fools. I thought it useless, at the least, to oppose the modesty of my wife to the effrontery of other women, and the insulting smile of men. We have had none but God for witness and for judge of what is most holy in love, of what society has succeeded in making hideous or ridiculous. During a month, nothing has yet impaired our happiness; not the smallest grain of sand has fallen into the bosom of this smooth and limpid lake. Bending over its transparent waters, I contemplate with ecstasy the sky which is reflected in their bosom; attentive to the slightest perturbation which could threaten it, I am on my guard lest the grain of sand should draw an avalanche after it (99-100).

Fernande in this secluded environment exudes happiness and exclaims, "... all this was like a fairy-tale, or a child's dream" (93).

But within days almost, he writes to Sylvia, "I know not whose foot it is that has slipped, but the grain of sand has fallen" (112). Eden is over and love is dwindling. Both ask why their love has ended so quickly and Sand makes the answer plain to the reader and to Fernande, but Jacques is too self-centered to understand:

Oh, if there were not at the bottom of all this, something of reality, we should not be where we now are. Jacques has had sorrows which he hides from me, with a kind intention, no doubt; but he has been mistaken; if he had revealed to me the first, I should not have desired to question him about the others; while now, I always imagine that he is hiding some mystery, and this does not seem to me to be just, for my soul is open to him, and he may read in it at every instant (124).

Emphasizing the fact of his opacity and non-communication, Fernande later adds, "... but I counted on joys which I do not find with him--more ease, more openness, more companionship" (138). She is transparent and he is opaque. This condition of non-communication is typical of the state of society and it is the symptom of the
diseases of concealment and deceit. Jacques is enveloped in his "mantle of silence" in which his blighted sense of the past distorts all he is and does in the present.

We realize that perhaps his motive in marrying Fernande was not love after all. He knew their "love" could not last because he did not desire her as a lover in the first place. He tells her he can promise only to "respect" her and that he will treat her as a father and brother. Over and over he calls her "child" and refers to Sylvia and Fernande as "my two daughters" (148). We come to realize that he is taking his father's role and loving the illegitimate and forsaken Sylvia and her sister Fernande whose mother is the hated whore who abandoned the first and is poisoning the life of the second. Jacques' moodiness and melancholy seem to be more the result of knowing who Mme. de Theursan really is than the product of an evil and oppressive world.

Because of his emotional confusion, however, he is never able to separate his lover, father, brother roles and is, therefore, like Obermann before him, emotionally impotent. Although he does impregnate Fernande and she does bear twins, these children die with the demise of their mother's love, a sign that the union that brought them into being was sterile. It is very important to mark the similarity in this detail with the stories of Saint-Preux (whose child is aborted) and Arthur Dimmesdale (whose child is unacknowledged).

We see that both of these basic love units of Jacques and Sylvia and Jacques and Fernande fail because Jacques is so enclosed
and withdrawn and opaque.

This destructiveness of Jacques is one reason why it is so difficult to accept Glasgow's thesis that Jacques and Sylvia are Sand herself. It would be easier to believe them a composite of Musset. Speaking of other of Sand's novels and characters but also describing Jacques accurately, Craigie makes this point:

She [Sand] discovered that a great deal of the suffering in this world is due not so much to original sin, but to a kind of original stupidity, an unimaginative, stubborn stupidity. People were dishonest because they believed, wrongly, that dishonesty was somehow successful. . . . George Sand tried to point out the advantage of plain dealing, and the natural goodness of mankind when uncorrupted by a false education. 45

Why should we sympathize with Jacques' mask of suffering, his impenetrable veil, his loss of faith in man's ability to love and to sustain that love? I think Sand saw through Jacques' weaknesses. That is why she is so generous with him as he matures into a father and a kind man toward the end. The basic love unit of Jacques and Sylvia fails because of Jacques' intrusion of the past on their love; the basic love unit of Jacques and Fernande fails because of Jacques, of course, but also because of Sylvia's intrusion.

As we consider Sylvia's complication of the Jacques-Fernande love unit, we leave the confused complexity of Jacques' motives and meanings and enter the open area of usual plot complication.

Jacques never confides in or opens up to Fernande because his innermost thoughts are always revealed to Sylvia. To Jacques, Fernande is inferior to him and to Sylvia, and Fernande feels the insult deeply. "I fancied myself his equal, and I am not" (138). She
speaks of his "haughtiness" towards her (127) as he treats "her altogether as a child of ten" (138).

Fernande is very worried when Jacques proposes that Sylvia, the "unknown," come and live with them. Even his assurances that he does not love her except as a brother do not entirely satisfy Fernande because of his obvious delight in the prospect of her coming. When Sylvia does arrive, Jacques kisses both, draws them in his arms and exclaims, "Let us live together--let us love each other . . . . Oh, my two daughters!" (147) Certainly Wolmar's delight in the Julie-Claire relation and in his father relation to both is being imitated here by Sand.

But Jacques and Sylvia speak to each other in a dialect Fernande cannot understand and they thereby exclude her. Any affection Jacques displays is toward Sylvia or the babies. Fernande's friend Clemence who is usually misinformed and a nuisance accurately enough calls "this triple friendship," "this romantic trinity" dangerous (130). In her sordid way she, like Fernande's mother (both creatures of the world of gossip and war), sees only sexual danger from such a triangular relationship. The emotional separation caused by this ménage à trois is far more serious. Fernande tells Octave:

Do you see, Octave, I am treated here like a child of four; my husband and Sylvia imagine that I am not in a state to comprehend their sentiments and their thoughts. They have both taken refuge in a world which they believe accessible only to themselves; they pitilessly close the entrance against me, and I live alone between two beings who cherish me, and who know not how to testify it to me! (II 10)

Excluded, Fernande finds her love for Jacques progressively destroyed
even though she respects him, remains loyal, and finds Sylvia a good friend. Because of Jacques' inability to open up and love and because of Sylvia's intrusion into their marriage, Jacques, Fernande, and Sylvia mutually destroy each other. All are sincere, all are motivated by intentions they feel justified; yet because of Jacques' opacity and the others' meekness, all suffer.

2. Sylvia, Octave, Jacques

There are two "intrusive third persons" in this triangular character pattern: Octave into the Sylvia-Jacques relation and Jacques into the Sylvia-Octave relation.

I have shown how Jacques and Sylvia are forced to love as brother and sister by Jacques' uneasy knowledge of their possible blood ties. Their love unit, therefore, never materializes and ends in failure and death. Octave, like Fernande, is still an intruder or a barrier to the Jacques-Sylvia relation even though it might be argued that Jacques is a far more essential barrier.

Sylvia, on the other hand, like Jacques with his Fernande, has a lover named Octave and another named Herbert. She probably would have married Octave and maybe even Herbert if it were not for Jacques: he not only destroys her life through his own imposition of the past, but his very person also causes Sylvia to disdain those who might love her.

In Sylvia's first letter to Jacques concerning Octave, she says the relationship is more that of a mother and child than that of a woman and her lover. "It is I," she says, "who have to be the man" (62). That sounds like Sand. She tells Jacques of Octave's
weakness and childishness and then ends by comparing him unfavorably with Jacques (61-62). As Jacques made Fernande feel like a child by comparing her with Sylvia, so Sylvia makes Octave feel childish by holding him up to Jacques.

She yields to none of my imperfections, she pardons none of my defects; she draws arguments from them all, to show me how superior her soul is to mine (168).

So Octave makes Sylvia's aloofness plain. Octave calls her cold, scornful, proud, disdainful and indifferent. He speaks of her "soul of brass" and angrily says it "is pride which makes a demon of you" (120-121). He also knows the reason for this haughty aloofness:

This Jacques is certainly a fine man, but one with whom his coldness of character and reserve of manners have never allowed me to be on very familiar terms, and against whom, moreover, I have felt terrible sensations of jealousy. I now have reason to know that I have been unjust and gross in my suspicions. But I owe him a grudge for having shared in the superb pride with which Sylvia for a long time refused to reassure me, by explaining to me their consanguinity and the nature of their relations to each other. I owe him a grudge, also for being Sylvia's type of all that is grandest and most beautiful in the world; the only soul worthy to fly on the same level with her own through the fields of the empyrean; in a word, the object of a Platonic love, and of a romantic worship, of which I am not jealous, but which causes me no small mortification (170-171).

Because Jacques is "Sylvia's type of all that is grandest and most beautiful in the world," Octave is left out entirely and he knows it. Jacques is an impossible barrier for Octave to surmount.

At one point in the novel Jacques tells her that Herbert loves her and that she should consider marrying him. Here, perhaps, is Sylvia's chance to break out and find a love she can consummate. However, like Julie offering Saint-Preux to Claire on her death bed, Jacques pours the cold water on Sylvia's interests in Herbert by
saying:

You will never be made happy by love, Sylvia. You will seek a long while for a being worthy of you, and, if you find him, you will have the same fate as I: it will be too late; your heart will be too old for you to be loved long. Besides, there is too complete a discord between our manner of being and that of all other men, for us ever to be able to find our like in this world (II 159).

He goes on to say that love is of two kinds, love for man, and maternal love. "Be a mother then: marry Herbert" (159-160). This strange advice which has so little conviction behind it comes from Jacques' envisioning of a world of "Octave and Fernande, Herbert and You [Sylvia]" all living together. This kind of neutral and communal love Jacques sees as possible for Sylvia and thoughts of it made a "divine calm" descend "for an instant into my heart," Jacques says (160). Yet we learn later that he knows Sylvia will not marry Herbert and that she will remain "eternally [his] brother" (89).

The Jacques-Sylvia relation fails, the Jacques-Fernandes relation fails, and the Sylvia-Octave and Sylvia-Herbert relations fail. Either Jacques' knowledge of the past, Jacques himself, or Sylvia's intrusion destroys all of these possible basic love units.

3. Octave--Fernande--Sylvia and Fernande--Octave--Jacques

When we come to the end of the novel, we are left with two character triangles that push for resolution.

As Fernande loses love for Jacques and is alienated from him by his inexorable silence, as Sylvia intrudes between her and her husband, Fernande is ripe for another lover. Also, as Sylvia in no uncertain terms tells Octave, "I have no love for you" (II 29) and
he realizes "Ah! I have never loved Sylvia!" (II 76), we see that he, too, is ready for the establishment of another love relationship.

Octave comes to Dauphiny to court Sylvia and immediately meets Fernande, who is "the prettiest, rosiest, little jewel of a wife you can imagine" (171). He flirts but does not seduce and we feel from Sand's treatment of him that Octave, like Hawthorne's Holgrave, is an honest and honorable fellow. He has no roots and, like Saint-Preux, desires "no other end" than "that of loving and being loved" (169). He is a transparent man whose deeds are all done in the open and with an integrity of heart. Like Fernande, he is an open person with a "pure heart" (II 7).

He is still enamoured of Sylvia at the beginning of his stay at Dauphiny; so for a brief period there is a love triangle between Octave--Sylvia--Fernande.

To Herbert Octave speaks of "these two huntresses, more beautiful than all the nymphs of Diana--the one dark, tall, proud, and audacious--the other fair, timid, and sentimental--both mounted on superb horses, and galloping noiselessly over the woodland moss: all this is like a dream, and I do not wish to wake" (172). This statement refers to a hunting expedition and Octave's reactions to Sylvia and Fernande as they ride on their horses. As Octave's passion increases, he dreams about these two women:

How often have I pressed in my arms a phantom which wore her [Sylvia's] features and your [Fernande's] own, and whose long ebony tresses, mingled with flakes of golden silk, fell over my shoulders and lay upon my heart! In the delirium of those happy nights, I called to you both by turns, I invoked your affection, and I seemed to see both of you descend from heaven.
and kiss my forehead; but insensibly the features of Sylvia were effaced, and the phantom appeared to wear yours only (II 44).

For Octave, at least, there is no character triangle because Sylvia blends so pleasurably into Fernande. Practically, however, there is a problem because Fernande is married and Sylvia unwilling to love him at all. Sand rarely pushes her images into symbols. In these passages where the two huntresses ride their horses, one whose "long ebony tresses" mingle with the other's "flakes of golden silk," we wish she had developed the latent symbolism further: Hawthorne and Leslie Fiedler certainly would have!

As Sylvia fades from the picture, the Octave--Fernande love unit comes into full focus. His open declaration of love for her creates their love unit, but it also creates the potentially destructive triangle of Octave--Fernande--Jacques. Octave tries to explain this triangle away by saying:

Jacques and Sylvia make one, you and I make another; they perfectly understand each other in everything, and we understand each other in the same way (II 44).

Well enough, but Jacques is still her husband. As Fernande struggles against Octave's consuming passion, Jacques watches her closely and admires her honest struggle. She does not know that he is aware of her growing love for Octave; so she in desperation tries to establish a stable ménage à trois between them all: "... have Jacques' cipher replaced [on the golden bracelet she gave Octave by mistake] without effacing your own; let them both be interlaced with mine, and let your heart never separate me from him nor from yourself" (II 56). In the state of society and war, however, such a relationship is not
We can argue that Fernande is playing out George Sand's own desire for a similar ménage à trois resolution to her Musset love affair. Schermerhorn records that Alfred de Musset, after he returned to Paris, began sending Sand and her Venetian lover Pagello letters of love "à la Werther and La Nouvelle Héloïse." As Sand read "Alfred's self-sacrificing words" which are clearly those of a Wolmar, Sand says, "'Oh, why,' sobbed George, with her head on Pagello's shoulder, 'can't I lie between you two and make you both happy without belonging to either of you?'"45

Fernande desires just such a "safe" triangle which, as Sand knew, was a wish and not possible in the state of society.

Jacques decides to back out of the picture since his deep belief in the divine nature of love makes him recognize that what was once his is his no longer, marriage or no marriage. Honorably, as he sees Fernande's struggle for transparence even in this time of passion, Jacques, much like Roger Chillingworth at the end of The Scarlet Letter when he endows Pearl, plays the noble part and leaves them to their love with his endowment if not his blessing. Octave names him accurately and puts this scene in perspective for this study when he says, "Poor Fernande! Your husband is a poor copy of M. de Wolmar" (II 82).

When Jacques learns that Fernande is pregnant with Octave's child and reads Octave's words to Fernande that "the children that we have together will not die," (II 150-151), Jacques acknowledges that "Fernande is no longer my wife, she is Octave's" (II 161). Then,
after making sure his death will appear an accident, he jumps from a cliff in the snow-covered mountains, thus resolving the final triangle.

We are left, then, with one basic love unit that appears stable and capable of enduring. Octave and Fernande are both children, both romantic lovers, both passionate, and both capable of living in transparent harmony. The end of the story is one of tragedy as Sylvia denies life and Jacques ends his; so we do not feel the novel has a "happy" ending. Yet, here in the ashes is a love like that of Emile and Sophy and of Phoebe and Holgrave: alone, separate, secure and of the state of nature. In a stroke Sand repeats the tragic consequences of the unstable character relations in La Nouvelle Héloïse and The Scarlet Letter and duplicates Hawthorne's resolution of these unstable relations in Pearl's endowment and marriage. In Fernande and Octave is hope. Rousseau, however, saw no such possibility in La Nouvelle Héloïse.

In conclusion we can make these observations: Hester Prynne believed "that, at some brighter period, when the world should have grown ripe for it, in heaven's own time, a new truth would be revealed in order to establish the whole relation between man and woman on a surer ground of mutual happiness" (240). The "old truth" Hawthorne described in The Scarlet Letter and we have seen how destructive to human life he felt that truth to be. George Sand's Jacques is a companion piece to The Scarlet Letter and The Blithedale Romance because it is also a study of the present destruction and the search
for "a surer ground" for male-female relations. Jacques, like
Hester and Zenobia, declares:

I have no doubt that [marriage] will be abolished when the human
race shall have made some further progress toward justice and
reason: a tie more humane, and not less sacred, will take its
place, and will ensure the well-being of the children who shall
spring from the union of one man and one woman, without
fettering the freedom of either (37).

Like Hawthorne, however, Jacques realistically but sadly admits, "but
at present men are too gross and women too cowardly, to seek a nobler
law than the law of iron which rules them. . . . The improvements of
which some generous spirits dream, cannot be realized in such an age
as ours" (37).

This belief in a future condition of male-female relations
without fetters and limitations is the substance of Julie's last
remarks to Saint-Preux when, finally, she feels her "heart no longer
hides anything." She tells Saint-Preux to marry Claire and enjoy "a
legitimate passion" and "an innocent happiness" which she certainly
did not enjoy herself. To Saint-Preux she prophesies:

No, I do not leave you; I go to wait for you. The virtue which
separated us on earth will unite us in the eternal dwelling. I
am dying in this sweet hope, only too happy to purchase at the
price of my life the right of loving you forever without crime
and of telling you so one more time" (407).

In the future, she speculates, their criminal love can be legitimate
and innocent in a world of happiness and peace.

At the core of each of these novels is a man and a woman whose
love is above, outside of, the social definitions and limitations
of marriage. Because of this "illegitimacy," others intrude into
these basic love units and cause concealment and deceit which destroys
not only the love unit itself but all associated individuals as well (except in the special cases of Pearl and Octave and Fernande). That destruction is the meaning of the state of society or war and Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand wrote important novels to demonstrate this destruction and this society. All three could see the disintegration of the self in their rapidly changing world of industrialism, materialism, and science and all showed that the destruction most to be feared as a result of these forces was that which occurs in the home between a man and a woman.

Yet, these three writers were not finished writing. The future could be now if men and women, even though beyond the state of innocence and embroiled in the state of war, could work openly with honest communication to resolve the triangles and instabilities and establish a new transparence and morality between them, here and now, and thus create the higher moral state.
CHAPTER IV

Human Relations and Moral Conditions in the Higher Moral State

When man and woman find themselves in society, beyond the state of nature and innocence and embroiled within the opacity and immorality of the state of war, is it possible to find a way to transparence, open communication, and morality again? If it is possible, how is it achieved and what is the condition or quality of life of those who gain this higher moral state? In the writings of Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand are works which show that men and women in society can achieve a higher moral condition. How it is achieved and how one lives this life vary slightly, but the surprising similarity between their demonstrations of achieving this state suggest that these three moralists, synthesists, and humanists should be studied together. In their writings is a philosophy of social and moral life which makes a wholeness of the fractured and fracturing world of the late eighteenth and early and mid-nineteenth centuries.

Rousseau's portrayal of men and women transcending society and becoming transparent, open, and moral takes two forms: philosophical-utopian speculation as in the Contrat Social and personal autobiography as in the Réveries du promeneur solitaire. The first is
positive and social in its tone and content and the second is negative and isolated which leads me to conclude that Rousseau wished for and preached an ideal state of higher morality which he could not practically see or feel realized among men.

The imagery Rousseau uses to demonstrate man's rise above society is usually that of unvelling, discovering, or maintaining the basic goodness with which man is born but which is covered, defaced, or threatened by the forces of society. *Émile* is his study of the possibility of educating a man and woman from society toward nature or what is natural to them in the state of nature. His education teaches man to obey natural rather than man-made laws and thus to live a moral life in society among men. The *Contrat Social* is his formulation of a social-moral order based on natural law where man's social self is stripped away and as he is thus "denature" or changed from what he became as he moved from the state of nature to the state of society, he becomes a blend of natural law (state of nature) and morality (higher moral state). Finally, his *Rêveries* are his personal and lonely recognition that in this real world, when one discovers natural law and tries to live it, life in the higher moral state is the life of isolation and solitude. Henry Thoreau seemed to find this condition desirable; Rousseau was a more social being and therefore was never reconciled to such solitude.

For Hawthorne this higher moral state is intimately bound to the philosophic-theological idea of felix culpa and to Christian symbolism, although Hawthorne's overall philosophy, like Rousseau's
and Sand's, is humanistic and not specifically Christian. "O felix culpa, quae talem et tantum meruit habere redemptorem" declares the Exultet for the Catholic Holy Mass¹ ("Oh fortunate blame, which merits a Redeemer of such a kind and so great"). Adam's fall is good because through Christ man can attain an even higher state than the one from which he fell. In order to rise to the higher moral condition, man and woman in society must experience the fall or sin of the corrupting social life, recognize that fall, and then struggle to ascend above it. In this ascension the individual achieves a "salvation" or "redemption" beyond anything possible prior to the fall. Similar to the Christian system of Garden of Eden, lone and dreary world, and resurrection-salvation, Hawthorne's view of man's moral development in society has a pre-sin or corruption, a sin, and a post-sin or corruption division. (I need to stress the words development in society because he as well as Rousseau and Sand created some individuals who maintain their natural innocence, never allow society to be a part of them or to deface them, and never fall; these are the moral, whole, and happy individuals we have described as living in the state of nature.) In stories like "The Great Carbuncle," "The Maypole of Merry-Mount," and in a novel like The Marble Faun Hawthorne shows, as does Rousseau in the Contrat Social, that even in the destructive environment of the state of society individuals and couples can achieve transparence and morality. In stories like "Feathertop," like Rousseau's Réveries, Hawthorne demonstrates the isolation, pain and solitude that can come with a
struggle for a higher moral condition.

Sand's solutions to the destructive evil of society are very similar to those of Hawthorne and Rousseau. In *Francois le Champi*, a novel of the "roman champêtre" period of around 1848, her human situation is complex and potentially destructive but because of moral choices and commitments to family and home the characters resolve the destructive triangles which in her state of war novels frustrate the basic love couple and destroy the home and family. This novel ends in a higher state of morality, sexual love, and happiness with a basic love unit separated and alone. In a novel she wrote late in her career, *Le Marquis de Villemer*, Sand demonstrates again that for her the higher moral state is the moment of resolution when adult love, both sexual and spiritual, is isolated in a love couple and lived in society. Like Hawthorne in "The Great Carbuncle" Sand in her novel *La Comtesse du Rudolstadt* resolves the triangular complexity of her characters by having the couple with their children live a kind of rural, vagabond life of a peasant-artist within the society of men.

Because of Sand's active reform interests, she believed in the real and immediate possibility of life in the higher moral state, and, because she was active in positive political and social change in a way neither Rousseau nor Hawthorne seemed interested in, her portrayals of life in this moral condition contain no characters whose brooding, despairing, or isolated solitude is complete, justifiable, and enduring like those in Rousseau's *Rêveries* or Hawthorne's "Feathertop." On the contrary, *Francois le Champi* and *Mauprat*, the works which will be studied here, are typical and well written examples
of men and women together in the higher moral state.

One scene in *The Marble Faun* is important to rehearse briefly because it shows one way Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand resolved the unstable tripartite character configurations which seem in all of their works to be essential to male-female destructiveness, opacity, and non-communication. At the end of *The Marble Faun* Donatello, Miriam, and Kenyon, with the carnival crowd of Rome swirling as a sea around them, reach out to each other for the last time and form a "linked circle of three" with their clasped hands. Then, when they say "farewell" and release their hands, "the uproar of the Carnival swept like a temptuous sea over the spot, which they had included within their small circle of isolated feeling." When these three people form their "linked circle" of "isolated feeling" as friends with the basic love unit of Donatello and Miriam strengthened by Kenyon's friendship, Hawthorne returns to a pattern of character relations which is at the heart of life in the state of innocence: a basic love couple and a friend such as Emile and Sophy plus the tutor, Holgrave and Phoebe plus Clifford, or Germain and Marie plus the boy Petit-Pierre. Human relations and moral conditions in the higher moral state are, therefore, a return to those conditions that existed in the state of nature. The difference between these similar conditions in these two states is what had to be experienced to achieve the transparence, openness, and morality, to achieve the human harmony, family, and hearth. In the state of nature these traits and unions exist initially or "naturally" and the challenge is to maintain them
in the face of the opacity and deceit in society; in the higher state these traits and unions must be chosen and willed because opacity and deception are the "natural" condition in society and the original innocence must be uncovered or discovered.

To show that this drive to achieve the higher moral condition is a central tension in the writings of Hawthorne, Rousseau, and Sand, I now turn to a specific analysis of selected works.

Rousseau and the Higher Moral State

To demonstrate Rousseau's belief in the higher moral possibility, two of his philosophical writings will be discussed. The Contrat Social (1762) optimistically demonstrates man's ability to act in the social state to transform himself and his institutions into those of a higher moral order. The Rêveries du promeneur solitaire (1782-1789) pessimistically and with power demonstrates man's private and individual alienation from the social world which results from his need to maintain and develop his personal transparence and moral integrity.

Before discussing these two works in detail, there is a basic principle of Rousseau's philosophic system that needs to be explained.

Rousseau's entire corpus is a comparison and contrast among the state of nature, the social state, and the higher moral or natural state. The basic difference among these states, aside from man's different physical, intellectual, and moral capacities in each, is where the power or law is located and how it is administered.
Consider in this statement from *Emile* the importance of the two ideas, "dependence on things" and "dependence on men":

These are weighty considerations, and they provide a solution for all the conflicting problems of our social system. There are two kinds of dependence: dependence on things, which is the work of nature; and dependence on men, which is the work of society. Dependence on things, being non-moral, does no injury to liberty and begets no vices; dependence on men, being out of order, gives rise to every kind of vice, and through this master and slave become mutually depraved. If there is any cure for this social evil, it is to be found in the substitution of law for the individual.

In the state of nature there is a natural power or force manifest in "things"--gravity, the weather, soil, etc.--which is above all individuals. Man, therefore, is "dependent" on nature, on these forces, for the good that comes to him (food, shelter, family, strength) and the bad (drought, disease, death). He is "naturally free" to do anything he chooses, but nature dispenses consequences on a cause-effect basis and is swift, just, and inexorable in its "rewards." No man, therefore, has more "freedom" than any other in this world so a "natural equality" exists. The man with ten cows and the man with none both die of the plague. The sun shines, the rain pours, and, depending on chance, one man is favored and another destroyed. This "dependence on things" makes competition and aggression among men meaningless and so, even though reason and conscience are not yet developed, this is a condition of contentment and stability among men.

"... dependence on men," Rousseau says, "being out of order, gives rise to every vice. ..." The state of society began when the first man staked out his property line and said, "This is
mine! He became the "real founder of civil society."

Social and economic inequality based entirely on men's power and will thus enters the natural order. Kings, social-political factions, wealthy barons, clergy and church--these became the power and the law and men became dependent on them for protection, food, clothing, shelter, statue, social law, custom, etc. Mothers looked to social authorities for advice on child rearing rather than trust their "natural" instincts; young men and women played frivolous and immoral games within the approving social structure as they grew into manhood and womanhood rather than learn respect, gratitude, and natural relations as Émile was taught to do. Only in a condition where a higher law--a law above all men, all factions, or purses, "beyond the power of any individual will"--can man be dependent on things and not on men. Thus:

If the laws of nations, like the laws of nature, could never be broken by any human power, dependence on men would become dependence on things; all the advantages of a state of nature would be combined with all the advantages of social life in the common wealth. The liberty which preserves a man from vice would be united with the morality which raises him to virtue.

This combination of the two "advantages" of the natural and social states is a good definition of the higher moral state:

natural law in the civil state, yielding "civil liberty" and allowing "moral liberty." This is the basis upon which Émile (state of nature) and the Contrat Social (higher moral state) were written.

The Contrat Social

In his Appendix to the "Discourse on the Origin of Inequality" (1755), after showing how depraved and degraded man has become as he
moved away from the state of nature, Rousseau asks, "What, then, is to be done? Must societies be totally abolished? Must meum and Tuum be annihilated, and must we return again to the forests to live among bears?" After chidingly advising those whose "primitive innocence" can be "resumed" to "retire to the woods," he more realistically (yet still with a touch of irony) says:

As for men like me, whose passions have destroyed their original simplicity, who can no longer subsist on plants or acorns, or live without laws and magistrates . . . , those, in short, who are persuaded that the Divine Being has called all mankind to be partakers in the happiness and perfection of celestial intelligence, all these will endeavour to merit the eternal prize they are to expect from the practice of those virtues, which they make themselves follow in learning to know them.8 (underscore mine)

Like in the doctrine of felix culpa, this notion of an upward progression towards "perfection" and virtue suggests that the movement out of nature into society is to be lamented but that it can also be used to man's higher good if man will it to be so.

How, we might ask, does man act in this higher social condition? One brief answer is given in Rousseau's Appendix to the second Discourse:

They will respect the sacred bonds of their respective communities; they will love their fellow citizens, and serve them with all their might; they will scrupulously obey the laws, and all those who make or administer them; they will particularly honour those wise and good princes, who find means of preventing, curing, or even palliating all these evils and abuses, by which we are constantly threatened; they will animate the zeal of their deserving rulers, by showing them, without flattery or fear, the importance of their office and the severity of their duty.9

The action of good citizens within the social state is the way to achieve the moral state for Rousseau. Such actions as "love," "serve,"
"obey," and "honour" are possible under the "General Will" (the natural force above all men) because men are no longer competing with other men, all have goods according to their needs, which then allows the nobler civic, mental and moral gifts to be realized.

"What, then, is to be done?" One answer is to remake society according to natural law rather than social law so that each man and woman can be a good citizen as Rousseau has described such a person. That is the project described in the Contrat Social. Recognizing that "Human institutions are one mass of folly and contradiction" and that "Man is born free, and yet we see him everywhere in chains," Rousseau in the Contrat Social describes how institutions can be changed to make a higher moral world possible.

"My design in this treatise," Rousseau explains at the beginning of the Contrat Social, "is to inquire whether, taking men such as they are, and laws such as they may be, it is not possible to establish some just and certain rule for the administration of that civil order" (5). In four brief chapters or "Books," he sets forth his "Social Compact" and its implications and technicalities. Since books two through four are technical definitions and refinements, I will only treat here the abstractions set forth in book one.

As he did in his Discourses Rousseau sets his stage in the Contrat Social by going back to his hypothetical "First Societies" to show that the most distinguishing fact of that life was a "common liberty" because of the dominance of natural law. Yet, he says, there were pressures which made this condition unstable and he talks
about the rights of the strongest and of slavery to show how man converted "force into right" and enslaved others on "the basis of conventions" not on natural principles because there is no authority of one man over another in nature (6-13).

Therefore, sometime in history, "men in the state of nature . . . arrived at that crisis when . . . this primitive state [could] therefore subsist no longer. . . ." (14). This is the time for the formation of the "Association" Rousseau calls the "Social Compact." In this book he ignores the usual movement of natural society into the destructive social state; he will establish a correct natural society from the beginning of man's social life.

The Compact has several essential characteristics. First, it is based on the "General Will."

The articles of the social contract will, when clearly understood, be found reducible to this single point: the total alienation of each associate, and all his rights, to the whole community; for, in the first place, as every individual gives himself up entirely, the condition of every person is alike; and being so, it would not be to the interest of any one to render that condition offensive to others (15).

If, therefore, we exclude from the social compact all that is not essential, we find it reduced to the following terms:

Each of us places in common his person and all his power under the supreme direction of the general will; and as one body we all receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole (15).

Rousseau explains that when a person enters into this kind of compact, when he or she "alienates" his or her "natural liberties," then a higher kind of "civil liberty" is granted to all which allows for the development of the highest levels of conscience and "moral liberty."
Second, this General Will is the Soverign power and it is above all private or individual will it, like natural law in the state of nature, "guarantees" each person "his absolute personal independence." The Sovereign, therefore, is always just, severe, and inexorable in its actions and, "by its nature, is always everything it ought to be" (17).

A sub-topic of this Sovereign and its administration of law and power is Rousseau's concept of the "Legislator." This man is "in every sense a most extraordinary man" (36). He must preside over the state. The Sovereign or General Will is always higher than the Legislator. The Sovereign is the General Will (like God and God's law) and the Legislator (like a prophet) administers it without pause or discrimination.

Finally, Rousseau speaks of the crucial issue of equality and property:

Each member of the community, at the moment of its formation, gives himself up to it just as he is: himself and all his forces, of which his wealth forms a part. By this act, however, possession does not change in nature when it changes its master, and become property when it falls into the hands of the Sovereign; but as the forces of the city are infinitely greater than those of an individual, it is better secured when it becomes a public possession, without being more justifiable, at least with respect to foreigners. As to its members, the State is made master of all their wealth by the social contract, which within the State serves as the basis of all rights; but with regard to other powers, it claims only under the title of first occupancy, which it derives from individuals (20).

The statement, "The State serves as the basis of all rights," is the heart of the matter. Of course those who argue that Rousseau was an advocate of totalitarianism can use such statements as this to
support their theory. I have read all of his works which surround such a statement and I find his notion of the General Will, the Sovereign, or as he calls it here, the State, is for Rousseau a "fatherly" and patriarchal concept which is beneficent in its moral and social quality.

Because no man is above the law and because all men chose the law, then the law must be for the ultimate good of each one individual and the immediate good of all collectively. This is the logic behind the Social Compact.

Finally, I quote an extensive passage which spells out clearly what this higher social compact is and how social man can be adapted to live within it:

Those who dare to undertake the institution of a people must feel themselves capable, as it were, of changing human nature, of transforming each individual, who by himself is a perfect and solitary whole, into a part of a much greater whole, from which he in some measure receives his being and his life; of altering the constitution of man for the purpose of strengthening it; of substituting a moral and partial existence instead of the physical and independent existence which we have all received from nature. They must, in a word, remove from man his own proper energies to bestow upon him those which are strange to him, and which he cannot employ without the assistance of others. The more those natural powers are annihilated, the more august and permanent are those which he acquires, and the more solid and perfect is the institution: so that if each citizen is nothing and can do nothing but when combined with all the other citizens, and the force acquired by the whole from this combination is equal or superior to the sum of all the natural forces of all these individuals, it may be said that legislation is at the highest point of perfection which human talents can attain (35-36).

In order to make a society of a higher moral order, the "natural" social man (what he calls above as man's "natural powers" in society) must be changed radically and entirely. His "own proper energies"
(attained as man moved from the state of nature to the state of society) must be removed because a depraved and wicked society is that kind of man's only possibility. Because man's social character is now his "natural" way of acting, those "natural powers" must be "annihilated." When these degraded social characteristics have been eliminated and all committed to the General Will, then man is combined with all, has gained "civil" and "moral" liberty, and is now in a society which is "at the highest point of perfection which human talents can attain."

The Contrat Social or the higher moral order is Rousseau's answer to the question, "What can be done?" Base society on natural rather than man-made law, combine all men and property together under one Sovereign called the Universal Will, appoint a divinely inspired legislator, and expect all men and women to be good "citizens" and you will accomplish Rousseau's ideal of life in the higher moral condition.

Yet, there are societies so corrupt and full of malice and hatred and there are individuals so threatened and alienated in such a world that positive, action-oriented solutions are of no effect. What, then, can be done in this situation? Where then is the higher moral state? Rousseau's answer to this query is his Rêveries du promeneur solitaire.

Rêveries du promeneur solitaire

After Émile was banned by the Parliament of Paris in 1762, Rousseau was driven into exile first into Switzerland and then into
England. Book twelve of his *Confessions*, dated 1762, begins:

Here begins the work of darkness in which I have been entombed for eight years past, without ever having been able, try as I might, to pierce its hideous obscurity. In the abyss of evil in which I am sunk I feel the weight of blows struck at me; I perceive the immediate instrument; but I can neither see the hand which directs it nor the means by which it works. Disgrace and misfortune fall upon me as if of themselves and unseen. When my grief-stricken heart utters groans, I seem like a man complaining for no reason. The authors of my ruin have discovered the unimaginable art of turning the public into the unsuspecting accomplice of their plot, who does not even see its results.12 (Underscores mine)

To the student of linguistics, Rousseau's works are a goldmine. The tone of disaster, threat, and fear are well established by the repetitions and echoes of the words I have underlined. Elsewhere in the *Confessions* he refers to the "obscure and tortuous windings of the tunnels which lead" to the plots of his accusers who, "throughout Europe" with "a cry of unparalleled fury" have unleashed their "unanimous hostility" on him.13 Many are the critic-psychiatrists who have practiced their skills on Rousseau's reactions to his persecutions from 1762 to the time of his death. Alienated, resentful, suspicious, and alone, he felt "the whole world had gone mad. . . ."14 Certainly the world felt he had.

His *Confessions* and their sequel, the *Rêveries*, were published between 1782 and 1789 after his death in 1778. Both are a record of his alienation from the state of society, but they are quite different in style and tone. The *Confessions* is combative, defensive, tough in the manner of the state of society. To me they are a companion piece to the tragedy of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*. The *Rêveries*, on the other hand, is more serene, brooding, and resolved in its
alienation. There is a sense of moral rightness or understanding in them which, in its far more mature and quiet way, makes it a closer companion to the *Contrat Social*. It, too, is a demonstration of mortal man striving for a better society; now, however, this man is alone and in pain as he achieves his condition or state of moral integrity.

I use the *Rêveries* to summarize Rousseau's final comment on the higher moral state because it is less visionary, less action-oriented, less an intellective "solution" and more a realistic, thoughtful, and mature questioning. Although our image of what the higher state is like and who lives in it is certainly not so clear in the *Rêveries* as in the *Contrat Social*, the tentative answers that are given and the feelings exposed in the *Rêveries* are a more moving and true reflection of human strength and potential.

The *Rêveries* are a group of ten "Promenades" or mental-emotional excursions into Rousseau or the "Solitary" himself. They were written in the solitude of his last years when he was a fugitive from the law and anathema to the Enlightenment intellectuals and religious establishment of Europe. The *Rêveries* were written as he approached death in his late seventies; a week or so before he died he worked on the unfinished Tenth Promenade.

Unlike the *Contrat Social* which has the positive prescriptive vigour of a middle-aged reformer whose schemes, however intellectually wise and well stated, are nevertheless abstractions and idealizations, the *Rêveries* are descriptive and introspective, brooding and emotional
rather than intellectual. One does not leave them ready to change mankind or the world; one leaves with deepened awareness and with widened and wiser perceptions of men and life.

Because there is little linear (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) logic to the Promenades, I will approach them thematically as it seems Rousseau intended.

The Promenades seem to be a random description of three states of being. The base condition, which serves as the fundamental one and against which he will contrast the other two, is the state of society or the world of social men and institutions. The second state of being is the condition of solitude or isolation. Although he has been forced into isolation against his will, Rousseau or the Solitary has learned the value of solitude and has profited by it. Thus we may say that this state of solitude is partially equivalent to the higher moral state. It is not entirely equivalent, however, because this isolated condition, however tranquil and necessary, is not happiness. Thus there is another possibility and in his *Rêveries* Rousseau several times shifts into a dream or reminiscence of a time of past happiness. In these reveries he enters what I will call the state of remembered happiness.

The world, then, is rejected, and the dream, however appealing, is merely a dream, leaving solitude and brooding. My discussion of these three states will show that despite its pain and despite the appeal of the dream, Rousseau's mature acceptance of the middle condition of isolation and reflection is our signal that, as far
as he is able to understand for most moral men and women of integrity, here, in solitude, is the higher moral state.

The world or the state of society described in the *Reveries* is the same society we have defined and described in our discussion of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, *The Scarlet Letter*, and *Jacques*.

During his time of prosperity and success when he published his three famous works in the mid 1760's, Rousseau became a social man and joined the world and its standards and perceptions. When he would leave the city to find calm in nature, he found himself changed:

I carried with me the agitation of vain ideas which had occupied me in the salon; the remembrance of the company which I had left there followed me. In solitude, the fog of self-conceit and the tumult of the world darkened to my eyes the freshness of the groves and troubled the peace of my retreat: however much I might fly to the depths of the woods, an importunate crowd followed me everywhere, and veiled all Nature for me (170).

The shock of realizing what was happening led him to detach himself "from social passions and their dismal throng" and re-establish his contact with Nature (170). In an early Promenade he speaks of his "reform":

I quitted the world and its pomps. I renounced all fine apparel; no more sword, no more watch, no more white stockings, gold thread, coiffure. . . . I uprooted from my heart the cupidities and the covetings which gave a value to all I had quitted. I renounced the post which I then occupied. . . . (62).

He later concludes that he could never be "truly accustomed to civil society where all is worry, obligation, duty. . . ." (132).

When he did "reform" himself and "refound Nature with all its charms" (170), he realized that people too much in the world have
"a lack of natural sensibility . . . because their mind is too much occupied by other ideas and does not yield . . . to the objects which strike their senses" (139). They cannot see the beauty and natural processes in plant life because all they can think of are medicinal or economic uses for the herbs.

But these dangers of the social condition are benign compared to its capacity for causing bitterness, "betrayal and hatreds" (143). Rousseau describes the world's turning against him this way:

I saw everything remain without exception in the most iniquitous and absurd system that the infernal spirit could invent; when I saw that, in regard to me, reason was banished from all hands and equity from all hearts; when I saw a frantic generation yield itself entirely to the blind fury of its guides against an unfortunate man who did not do, nor wish, nor return evil to anyone; when, after having sought for a man, it was necessary finally to extinguish my lantern and to cry, 'There are no more,' then I began to see myself alone on earth and I understood that my contemporaries were nothing in relation to me but mechanical beings, who only acted upon impulse, and whose actions I could only calculate from the laws of movement (161).

Infamy and treason took me by surprise. What honest soul is prepared for this sort of suffering? It would be necessary to merit them in order to foresee them. I fell into all the snares which were dug beneath my feet. Indignation, fury, delirium seized upon me; I lost my direction. My head was turned, and in the horrible darkness in which they have not ceased to keep me plunged, I perceived neither a gleam to guide me, nor a support, nor a foothold to stand firmly on and to resist the despair which carried me away. How could I live happy and tranquil in this frightful state? (159)

Whether these "blind furies" were real or not or whether they are a literary or philosophical device to show the deceit and unreality of the social state, Rousseau cannot abide in the world they create and begins "to see [himself] alone on earth . . ." It is this sense of being apart from the evil forces, even though painful and disorienting,
that characterizes the Réveries. The First Promenade begins with the
haunting wanderer's lament: "Here am I, then, alone upon the earth,
having no brother, no neighbour, or friend, or society but myself"
(31). The world is an emotional location for Rousseau: it can be
a world of friendship and companions and is happiest when this is so,
but it is also the domain of deadly enemies and is most painful when
this must be so. Cut off as he is from this external world of evil,
the Solitary is forced to leave society and turn in upon himself.

Then, not to hate them, it was necessary to fly them; then, taking
refuge in the common mother, I have sought in her arms to
withdraw myself from the attacks of her children; I have become
solitary, or, as they say, unsociable and misanthropic, because
the wildest solitude appears to me preferable to the society of
the wicked. . . . (143)

In this stand is the central point of the Réveries: it is preferable
to be alone than to be a part of the society of the wicked. Society
is no longer an alternative for him and he is forced into a choice
which he makes as a matter of moral and personal integrity.

Alone now and in solitude, he finds himself, and the crucial
question becomes, "But I, detached from them and from all, what am I
in myself? That is what remains to be discovered" (31). Solitude
has led him to life's basic question and he is wise enough to
accept solitude and try to face up to this question and not to
continue hating the external world.

First he recognizes that he is alone and rather than hate it
he tries to accept it:

All is ended for me upon the earth; none can now do me good or
ever. There remains for me neither anything to hope for nor to
fear in this world, and now I am tranquil at the bottom of the
gulf, a poor unfortunate mortal, but as undisturbed as God Himself. ... I am upon this earth as upon a strange planet, whence I have fallen from that which I inhabited (37).

This tranquility may or may not be entirely sincere because he still gets angry and distraught at the plots against him in the world, but over and over he speaks of his tranquility (33), the "two months that have gone by since full calm was re-established in my heart" (55), his resignation and rediscovery of peace (55), his discovery "of full quietness and ... absolute repose" (36), the "profound indifference" (41) he feels concerning others stealing his works, and his hours of "solitude and meditation" (43). "In this deplorable state, after long agonies, instead of the despair which seemingly should be finally my lot, I have rediscovered serenity, tranquility, peace, even happiness. ..." (160). When forced into isolation, The Solitary found a reservoir within himself of great meaning. "I have learned how to bear the yoke of necessity without murmuring. ... I was reduced to myself alone and finally regained my balance. Pressed on all sides, I remained in equilibrium" (160).

Balance, equilibrium, serenity, peace--these are very important discoveries for any man to make in this life even if they are made by this Solitary so late in life. "I have returned to the law of my nature, and have thereby recovered my first health" (142-143). For me that line is the theme of the Rêveries. Forced to brood upon himself, Rousseau discovers within himself a meaning in life and is made whole. Hence the peace and tranquility of his solitude.

Yet, for Rousseau the social man, this discovery of his moral self and moral location is not happiness. "I am tranquil at the
bottom of the gulf, a poor unfortunate mortal..." (37). Later he speaks of his as "the saddest lot that has ever befallen a human being" (155). Why is he so much in pain when so much has been gained? It is because for this Solitary the highest moral state should be a shared condition. He calls himself "the most sociable and loving of human beings" (31) and spends many pages telling of his love for children and of doing good.

One of the most revealing examples of Rousseau's need for sociality and conception of what social life in a higher moral condition might be like is found in the Sixth Promenade. He mentions the ring of Gyges which will grant any wishes asked of it. "I have often asked, in my day-dreams, what use I should have made of this ring" (130). He says he would ask for "one simple thing: that would be to see all hearts contented." Then, in an amazing role shift, our solitary becomes the Legislator of the Contrat Social and begins to use what power the ring would give him to do good:

Always just without partiality, and always good without weakness, I should have equally preserved myself from blind suspicion and implacable hatred, because seeing men as they are, and reading easily the very depths of their hearts, I should have found very few sufficiently amiable to meet all my affections, very few sufficiently odious to merit all my hatred, and their deceitfulness even would have disposed me to pity them, by the certain knowledge of evil which they do to themselves in trying to do it to others. Perhaps, in moments of gaiety, I should have been childish enough sometimes to work miracles; but perfectly disinterested for myself, and having nothing but my natural inclinations for law, for each act of severe justice, I should have performed a thousand of clemency and equity; a minister of Providence, and a dispenser of its laws, according to my power, I should have performed miracles wiser and more useful than those of the Golden Legend and of the tomb of St. Medard (130-131).
His zealous feeling of need to help others and to arbitrate on their behalf reveals how desperate his need for social contacts and actions with others. "All things considered, I believe that I shall do better to throw my magic ring away before it has made me do some foolish thing," he finally concludes. He realizes that in this world with "men as they are" and with him as he is that he might do something drastic and thereby do more damage than good. Thus he is thrown back upon himself and solitude again. His enemies have "torn from [his] heart all the sweetness of society" (35). His is alone again.

In this solitude the Solitary does find a way to have happiness and society through recall and imaginative reverie of the past:

... the reading of my reveries will recall to me the pleasure that I tasted in writing them, and thus making reborn for me times gone by, will, so to say, redouble my existence. In spite of men I shall still enjoy the charm of society, and I shall live decrepit with myself in another age, as if I were living with a younger friend (40).

These "times gone by" are an escape from the present into the past to live a happiness neither the world nor solitude can give. It is a world of innocence, of the love of Emile and Sophy, and of the beauties of Nature. "I do not exist now," he says, "except in memories" (43). He mentions two "dreams" of greatest happiness: living at the Island of St. Peter and living with Mme. de Warens.

After being driven from Paris to Neufchâtel and Motiers in Switzerland in 1765 because of Emile's supposed blasphemies, Rousseau was allowed to live on a small island called St. Peter or La Motte near Neufchâtel. In the Réveries he speaks of that time in these
I was allowed to pass only two months in this island, but I
could have passed there two years, two centuries, and the whole
of eternity, without being weary one moment, although I had
not, with my wife, other society than that of the receiver, of
his wife, and of his servants, who all were in truth very good
people, and nothing more; but that was precisely what I needed.
I count these two months as the happiest time of my life, and
so happy, that it would have sufficed me throughout life, without
for a single moment in my soul the desire for a different state
(105).

As a summary to this reverie and to the idea of a state of happiness
like the Island of St. Peter, the Solitary says:

But if there is a state where the soul finds a position suffi­
ciently solid to repose thereon, and to gather together all its
being, without having need for recalling the past, nor to climb
on into the future; where time counts for nothing, where the
present lasts forever, without marking its duration in any way,
and without any trace of succession, without any other sentiment
of privation, neither of enjoyment, of pleasure nor pain, of
desire nor of fear, than this alone of our existence, and which
this feeling alone can fill entirely; so long as this state
lasts, he who finds it may be called happy, not with an imperfect
happiness, poor and relative, such as that which one finds in
the pleasures of life, but with a sufficing happiness, perfect
and full, which does not leave in the soul any void which it feels
the need of filling. Such is the state in which I found myself
often at the Island of St. Peter, in my solitary reveries... (113).

This happiness which is "perfect and full" is an ideal any man or
woman might desire. Finding it in a dream, however pleasant momentar­
ily, is finally unfilling.

The Solitary has another reverie of like sweetness. In his
final writing he remembers his protector, friend and lover, Mme.
de Warens, whom he met some fifty years ago. The pages in the
Confessions which describe Rousseau's youthful but deep love for and
associations with her were clearly some of his most pleasurable
writings. Their life at Les Charmettes is little less than a

paradise for him here in the Réveries as he recalls it and it was no less a paradise for him as he described it in the Confessions. Of this time he says, "There is not a day when I do not remember with joy and tenderness this unique and brief time of my life, when I was fully myself, without mixture and without obstacle, and when I can truly say I lived" (194). Because this joy is mental only and has no concrete substance, it does not fill him now as an old man or satisfy his need for joy and happiness. That life, "without mixture and without obstacle," existed for a moment and was gone and Rousseau knows it will not fill his soul now and make him whole:

Reduced to myself alone, I feed myself, it is true, on my own substance, but it is not exhausted. I suffice myself, although I chew a non-existent cud, so to speak, and though my wrecked imagination and my exhausted ideas do not furnish any food to my heart (158).

As the image of the feeding, the "non-existent cud," and the starving heart indicate, this dream state, however happy for a moment of escape, is not finally as satisfying or meaningful for an old man as his discovery of and repose in himself in the solitary solitude and silence of the state of commitment and morality.

Rousseau, then, saw the higher moral state as a philosophically constructed state in the Contrat Social and as a painfully real way of life in the Réveries du promeneur solitaire. In both man finds the law or will above mere men and strives to live it and find peace if not happiness. Because Rousseau's own life ended so painfully, his final descriptions and speculations are gloomy and essentially pessimistic, but even in this gloom there is his clear sense of what
is possible and how it could be attained if men and society could be changed. Much of Rousseau's intellectual energy went into his battle against society and the opacity and deceit of social men; far too little of his energy and insight went into changing that social man into a man of the higher moral state. Granted Émile shows how moral man can be developed, but Rousseau clearly indicates in that book that the tutor must begin at the moment of birth to rear the child according to Nature's laws. How does grown man return to morality? The Contrat Social seems to say that some superior force and union can mold men into moral and civil beings, but finally this is mere speculation. The Rêveries, in my mind, are the true realization on Rousseau's part that the higher moral state can be attained by an adult but only with great pain, isolation, and deprivation. He said he felt like a creature from another planet in his isolation, and perhaps that kind of total alienation from the world is the only way adults can attain the higher moral state. Hence his deep pessimism and attractiveness to modern existential philosophers.16

George Sand and the Higher Moral State

When we consider George Sand's portrayal of the human condition in this higher moral or natural state, we encounter in her writings two great aspects or manifestations of love: maternal love and friendship. Ethyl Staley in her study of Sand and Rousseau is accurate when she says "the maternal impulse" for Sand was one aspect of "divine love" and "a firm, real friendship" another.17 Ideal love, therefore, goes far beyond any physical passions or "mere physical exaltation."18
André Maurois quotes Sand as saying later in her life, "When I take stock of myself, I realize that the only two genuine passions of my life have been motherhood and friendship."  

Toesca in _The Other George Sand_ argues convincingly that all of her "love" affairs were characterized by maternal rather than romantic love. "The only person who was really loved was Maurice Sand," her son.  

Because of this constant interplay between friendship, romantic, and maternal roles, she was always at a loss for terms to describe what she was looking for in human relations and especially male-female relations. As Staley says, "She had no words to express that self-expansion, and she groped around for sister, mother, wife, any relationship that existed." Little wonder her frustration with conventional marriage notions of wife and husband, conventional adultery notions of woman as mistress and lover, and conventional filial terms of mother and son, all of which deny woman the right or need to cross boundaries toward a larger love of mother and friend whatever the other relationships. Small wonder that her voice, especially in her early works, seemed a frantic scream. Yet some saw this voice for what it really was. A contemporary named Joseph Mazzini said of her in 1847: 

And it is this which renders her doubly dear and sacred to us. She has passed through the crisis of the age. The evil that she has pictured is not her evil, it is ours. It does not come to us from her; it was and is yet around us, in the air we breathe, in the foundations of our corrupt society, in the hypocrisy, above all, which has spread its ample cloak over all the manifestations of our life. Only whilst we, partly from incapacity, partly from cowardice, have been silent at the risk of allowing the evil to become a fatal sore, she has spoken; she has, with a daring hand, torn away the veil; she has laid bare the festering wounds, and she has cried to us: Behold your society!
Certainly her energies as a "feminist," "socialist," "revolutionary," and "passionate lover" indicate some of the ways she tried to expose the "fatal sore" of her society. But if we only see these labels and do not see the pervading and continuous undercurrent which gives energy and meaning to all of these expressions, then we do not understand George Sand. In her Le Secrétaire Intime she gives the key to all of her activity and the key word she uses to describe human relations in the higher moral state:

> Human nature is frail and full of miserable passions. One only is great and beautiful, and that is Love. But it is a divine flame, which must be guarded as they used to guard the sacred fire in incense jars on a golden altar; it is a perfume which must be wrapped up and sealed lest it pass off in a vapour.²³

This precious and rare "flame" of love is not the cheap formula of sentimental love so typical of female writers in the novel tradition and with whom Sand is so often confused. Her imagery of the sacred "incense jars on a golden altar" and of the precious perfume that must be carefully "wrapped up and sealed" demonstrates how fragile and special this "Love" is in this world. For her this love is a compound of maternal and friendship emotions and commitments which cannot grow or culminate or operate in conventional ways in conventional society. Hence her search for some way to show its fulfillment which has often made her seem rebellious. In her introduction to Le Compagnon du Tour de France she says her novels are questions "addressed to the men of my time" to which she received no answers:

> 'I asked . . . what was the morality of marriage. . . . I was twice answered that I was a dangerous questioner.' 'I allowed myself to ask of it . . . how it understood and how it explained love. This new question threw criticism in a real fury.' 'I asked again, and this time in the name of a man, as I had before
'in the name of the woman, what was the ideal of marriage. This time it was still worse.' 'I asked my age what was its religion. I was told that this preoccupation of my brain wanted actuality.' 'I asked what was social right, and what was human right. . . . I was answered that I wished to know too much.' 'If questions be crimes, there is a way of stopping them: that is, to answer them. . . .'

If some of her books are questions, and we have seen that Jacques is an example of her finest, then others are answers. François le Champi and Mauprat are representative. As Mme. Karenine says of Mauprat, the key to Sand's answer is "transformation and . . . rebirth under the effect of love and the influence of a superior being." Not as grand perhaps as felix culpa in its cosmic sense or as philosophically profound as the social compact, her drama is worked out without complicated literary technique or deep philosophy: her change takes place in the hearts of men and women. She is more immediately optimistic and involved in the changing of human lives than either Hawthorne or Rousseau. This gives her works an immediacy and practicality rarely found in the works of the other two. She seems closer to her characters than do Rousseau or Hawthorne as she paints them in the higher moral state; she treats them like her children--or her friends.

Mauprat

We have seen in earlier chapters that Sand believed in a state of innocence where men and women naturally respect each other and where in their innocence and pure love they establish homes and families. Also, we have seen her literary picture of the state of War or society where egotism, ignorance, opacity, and intrusive
third persons destroy innocence, transparence, and love between men and women and consequently destroy homes and families. Now, we will consider another belief she demonstrated in several of her novels. This is her belief in a higher natural state where men and women, after the loss of original innocence and pure love, experience the destructiveness of the state of society, and then, through education and love, are able to climb to a level where male-female relations are once again based on knowledge, esteem, and true love and are again characterized by transparence and open communication.

Mauprat is Sand's finest literary expression of this higher human possibility. In this novel she demonstrates through her two principal characters her belief in the possible transformation of man through education and in the power of a strong woman's love. Overtly patterned on Rousseau's Émile and similar to Hawthorne's transformations in The Marble Faun, Mauprat is a description of the process of education which Sand, Rousseau, and Hawthorne, saw as necessary for life in the higher moral condition. The life of Bernard Mauprat is the demonstration of this education. In her character Edmée, Sand has created a woman of great complexity whose insistence on a higher moral love transforms Bernard yet almost makes their union impossible because of the stern and uncompromising quality of her ideas. Staley calls this quality which Edmée exhibits a "Yearning for something more perfect" than just physical love and husband-wife relations. Staley says that Sand's connecting "of the passion of love with divinity" causes physical love alone to be insufficient. "And in cases where the physical and the divine elements were not properly
balanced there would arise the consciousness of a great emptiness, and an eternal yearning after the unattained (and perhaps the unattainable)." The "perfect union," as Edmée and Sand know, must be "sanctioned by divinity." After a description of the circumstances surrounding the writing of Mauprat and a summary of the plot of the novel, I will discuss Bernard's education and Edmée's role and the reasons for her actions.

Mauprat was published in April, May, and June of 1837 in the Revue des deux mondes. George Sand had begun to write the novel in March of 1835 soon after the publication of Jacques (September, 1834) and André (March, 1835). Even though she began Mauprat early in 1835, she set it aside and wrote Simon (January, 1836) and other shorter works like Lettres à Marcie (February-March, 1836).

While at her ancestral home at Nohant in November, 1835, she worked on Mauprat as she awaited the decision on her divorce from Cassimir Dudevant. Maurois lends an aura of mystery to this time when he says, "In the silence of the great house she wrote an excellent cloak-and-dagger novel, Mauprat." She did not finish the novel at this time and in January of 1837 she again returned to Nohant to finish the book.

When I discussed Jacques, I spoke of the influence on the novel of Alfred de Musset and his trip with her to Venice. The background of Mauprat involves another pianist and man of genius, Franz Liszt. Many in Paris said that she and Liszt were lovers, but
the evidence seems to suggest a deep intellectual and spiritual affinity with no physical relations. Liszt was in love with the beautiful and rebellious Countess Marie d'Agoult who flaunted her love for him in the disapproving faces of her royal family and even bore him an illegitimate daughter named Blandine.

In August of 1826 Sand, her son Maurice, and some friends joined Liszt, Marie, and some of their friends in Geneva where, as the Piffoels family (Sand's playful name for the group), they wrote, played, talked, and generally enjoyed a time of creative and intellectual sharing.

Sand and Liszt were thrown into very close proximity during these weeks in Geneva and because the two were very similar in many ways, this creative closeness was of great stimulation to both of them. Both were mystically inclined, both possessed an overdose of religious enthusiasm not associated with institutionalized religion, and both were overtly and actively social conscious. Liszt introduced Sand to the Abbé Félicité de Lamennais and both became disciples of this Breton priest who, as Maurois says, felt it "the duty of nineteenth-century catholicism to be liberal, socially-minded and democratic." Maurois adds, "Lamennais, at once prophet and plebian, believed that he had been marked out to achieve the regeneration of the church."

Here, then, in Liszt and Lamennais, in that perfect "mixture of religious faith and social enthusiasm," Sand found the stimulus to her genius expressed in Mauprat.
Yet we must not forget that she had another source of instruction she was using during this time which gave a context and boundaries to this new influence and that was the ideas of her master Jean-Jacques Rousseau. It is not too much to say that in Bernard's education in Mauprat we have the concrete duplication and fulfillment of Émile and the Contrat Social.

This is the background to Mauprat and, as has been maintained throughout this study, her novels are far more aesthetically significant than these statements of historical background alone would suggest.

As to the plot of the novel, Mauprat is a recounting by old Bernard Mauprat of his life history. Two visitors come to meet him and while there they entice him to tell them his story. He tells them of his birth and of his mother's and father's deaths when he was very young. He also tells of being taken as a small child by his uncle Tristan Mauprat to live at Verenne in Roche-Mauprat, a wild place where the animal-like old man lived the life of an overlord and bandit with his eight sons.

By age seventeen and in this environment Bernard has all but lost his tendencies toward natural goodness and becomes almost as savage as his cousins and uncle. One evening a young woman his same age stumbles into the midst of these crude fellows when she gets lost while hunting in the area with her father. She is Bernard's cousin Edmée who is of a different branch of the family which prides itself on its benevolence and enlightened characteristics.
Bernard and Edmée are shut up together in a room and through her pleading and finally promising to marry and to give herself to him and to no one else, Edmée stops his lusty bravado and gets him to save her. As they are escaping, a gun battle breaks out between the local police and the Roche-Mauprat gang and most of the cousins are killed. Bernard and Edmée escape with the Chevalier, Edmée's father, and go to the beautiful and wealthy estate of Saint-Severe where Edmée and her father live. The obvious hell-heaven imagery in connection with the two locations accentuates the depravity of the first and the goodness of the second.

At Saint-Severe Bernard is treated as a son and is given all of the best opportunities, but his savage upbringing seems to preclude his "becoming" educated and worthy of Edmée. His words, actions, and habits are so rough and crude that the contrast between him and her is immense. She forcefully and icyly rejects his every bid for her attention or affection, giving him no chance to rest in his savagery.

Finally one night he overhears her tell the Abbé that she is contemplating suicide and that she carries a dagger at all times to kill herself if Bernard forces himself on her. This realization of what his crudeness and stupidity are doing to her causes him to submit to Edmée's desire that he be educated by the Abbé.

Even though he achieves much and is quick of wit, Bernard is still repulsed by Edmée and she will still not marry him or have much to do with him. Thus, in order to ease the tension and vary their domestic situation, the entire family goes to live in Paris for a season. After this sojourn, which polishes Bernard even more but
still finds Edmée rejecting him, he joins LaFayette's troops and goes to America for six years.

Despite the increased learning and sensitivity he acquires in America, when he returns, Edmée still refuses to let him love her. One day as they are riding in a fox hunt, they get separated from the others and find themselves near the dreadful Roche-Mauprat at a frightful place where Gaffer Patience, a peasant friend of Edmée's, used to live called Gazeau Tower. Despite these surroundings, Bernard's passions are aroused and he forces her close to him and kisses her bosom. She violently rejects him and turns to mount her horse and ride away. He stumbles away from her in a state of total rejection, and he has not gone far when two gun shots ring out. He returns and finds Edmée shot in the chest and dying.

Because of his proximity and certain mumbled words Edmée speaks before she passes out, Bernard is accused of shooting her and is put in prison. At his first trial he is declared guilty but then events begin to change. Edmée does not die and is now recovering. Friend Patience who at first was one of those most adament in his belief of Bernard's guilt, now discovers who the real gunman was. Two of the savage Mauprat boys, John and Anthony, were not killed that night in the gun battle at Roche-Mauprat and it was Anthony who shot Edmée. Both criminals returned to the area disguised as Trappist monks and it was Anthony's plan to kill Edmée so Bernard would be blamed and to kill as a consequence the old Chevalier and thus inherit Saint-Severe and all of the Mauprat wealth.
Before Anthony is exposed at the second trial, Edmée appears at the court room and declares her love for Bernard. After Bernard's acquittal and after her father's death some time later, she and Bernard are married. They have six children and during a long life they do works of social and revolutionary importance for "the people." With old Bernard ending his account with his personal philosophy of life, the story closes.

Of central importance here is the idea that marriage and the higher moral happiness of eternal felicity cannot just happen to people who live in the state of war. Divine love is sacred, must be struggled for, and guarded carefully. The man must be transformed to be able to truly love the woman; and the woman must be strong until he is prepared and then she must be capable of softening and becoming his partner. My task now is to show how Bernard is transformed and how Edmée is softened. As in the Contrat Social and Rêveries and as we will see in Hawthorne's The Marble Faun, these "transformations" of men and women as individuals or as couples are essential to life in the higher moral state.

Bernard's Transformation

In her "Lettres à Marcie" published in Le monde (Lamennais' magazine) in February and March of 1837, Sand makes this important comment:

Women complain of their state of slavery. . . . Let them wait until man has first freed himself . . . something else is more important for the moment, the permanence of a morally improved plane of living. . . . Whatever harnesses the instincts, fortifies the will, and leads human emotions into regulated
channels helps establish God's kingdom on earth, which is nothing else than the supremacy of love and truth on earth. 

This "morally improved plane of living" can exist only when women get men to change their instinctive and habitual animal ways and live a higher law. Women are always slaves unless their men are wise enough not to be masters. Thus the moral growth of the man and the wise guidance of the woman are necessary components of this higher human state for George Sand.

Bernard's transformation from an animal to Edmée's husband is a central part of the plot of Mauprat. As Bernard himself explains:

I am an old branch, happily torn from a vile trunk and transplanted into good soil, but still knotted and rough like the wild holly of the original stock. . . . When one has to struggle for forty or fifty years to transform one's self from a wolf into a man, one ought to have a hundred years longer to enjoy one's victory. . . . The kind fairy who transformed me is here no more. . . . (Underscores mine)

When Bernard first speaks of his childhood, we get a distinct impression that the estate of Varenne at Roche-Mauprat owned and presided over by uncle Tristan is a literal hell and we also are impressed that Sand intends this hell to be a representation of the social state. Bernard says that even the lizards who now inhabit the ruins of the estate are better housed than he was when old Tristan forced him there as an orphan (7). The old man whipped him and threw him to the savage competitions of his wicked sons who were so full of "secret hatred and churlish jealousy" (8) that the boy was quickly forced to take their ways to survive. Thus his "education" into the state of society out of the state of innocence began here in this "filthy mire." Old Tristan "was a treacherous animal of the
carnivorous order, a cross between a lynx and a fox" (16) and his eight sons were "veritable brutes, capable of any evil, and completely dead to any noble thought or generous sentiment" (18).

Left alone most of the time with his cousin John, the worst of them all, Bernard's innate goodness and capacity to know good and evil dimmed and, as he says, "I became somewhat hardened," "the fibres of feeling grew tougher," and he began to acquire "as vile a disposition as my companions" (23). The scene which shows his level of depravity (told in much the same spirit of confession as Rousseau used in his Confessions) is where he and some friends come upon Gaffer Patience near the Gazeau Tower. Gaffer has a tame pet owl near him and as the boys talk to the old man, Bernard throws a rock and kills the owl. Then he belligerently stands up to the irate Patience and has no sense of pity or remorse.

This is the seventeen year old reprobate who confronts his cousin Edmée in the inner rooms of Varenne. She and her father have been out hunting and she has become lost. Not knowing whose house it is, she stops and asks at Varenne for help. The evil brothers immediately recognize her and quickly shut her up with Bernard, intending to kill both of them. Bernard thinks they put her with him because he had boasted at supper that the next woman captured was his.

Despite these evil intentions, he has instantaneous feelings of respect for Edmée (60) and at one point he falls in rapture and worship at her knees (70). He realizes that "an extreme dullness
covers his higher capacities" and that he is best compared to a wolf (72). Edmée seems to realize the war going on inside of him between respect and lust and she tries to draw out his higher and nobler qualities. As a result of her efforts, he says, "The Lynx in me was subdued; the man rose in its place; and I believe that my voice had a human ring, as I cried for the first time in my life: 'Yes, I love you! Yes, I love you!' (72-73). He says her caresses and kisses "recalled, I know not how or why, my mother's last kiss" (73). Edmée tames his Varenne or social wildness and gets him to help her escape.

The trip to Saint-Severe begins the second state in Bernard's "education." Sand makes clear throughout this section how far Bernard has to go to be capable of a higher moral law. She makes constant references to his "savage instincts" (100) and says he felt at Saint-Severe "like a wounded wolf" (95) and "inclined to roar like a caged lion" (101). "Brute-like," he says, "I saw only with the eyes of the body" (125) and his wants "were not the wants of a civilized being" (118).

Le Blanc, Edmée's serving girl, on one occasion provides a picture of Bernard that also shows his animal ugliness. She says, "'He looks like a bear, a badger, a wolf, a kite, anything rather than a man!'" (106-197). "'Heavens,,' she adds, "'what a savage.'" And her final judgment on this "hulking dog" (108) is that "'He will always be positively ugly'" (109).

He, too, realizes that something quite extraordinary (however painful) is happening to him to change his animal ugliness into
animal attractiveness. One cause of his awareness of change is the
goodness of Edmé and her father. "The affection and generous ideas
of this noble old man had moved me profoundly, and I was conscious
of a new nature, as it were, awakening within me" (99-100, underscore
mine). This goodwill, he says, was "a new language" for him (102):

All this tenderness of which Edmé was the object, this family
affection so completely new to me, the genuinely cordial relations
existing between respectful plebians and kindly patricians--
everything that I now saw and heard seemed like a dream (92).

His intense feelings for Edmé also take on new meaning since
she absolutely rebukes any physical or animal advances he makes.
Finally, as his love begins to come under some control, he begins to
see that his feelings of love for her are "the first affections of
my life. . . . I had the passions of a man in the soul of a child"
(103). His social body had developed as had his social need for
deceit and opacity, but his soul or moral capacity had remained dormant.

The key to Edmé's intentions regarding him is education, and
the source of her ideas on education is Jean-Jacques Rousseau. "Edmé
had fired her vast intellect with the burning declamations of Jean
Jacques" (125). She "had drunk of this living fount with all the
eagerness of an ardent soul" (126). Like Émile's tutor, Edmé is now
being tutor to Bernard. From the time when he tries to disobey her
as they first flee Roche-Mauprat and she says, "'Sit down again, and
be quiet; I command you!'" (83) until these experiences he has in her
home, he acknowledges the "superiority over me which was really hers"
(84). He earlier said that as a result of her influence "The Lynx
in me was subdued; the man rose in its place; and I believe that my
voice had a human ring. . ." (72). In her "order and tone of authority" (133) she tells him "'I will never be yours . . . if you do not make some change in your language, and manners, and feelings . . . . Improve your manners, improve your mind, and we will see. . . . One cannot reason with brutes'" (134). Thus she "forces" him into a higher moral condition similar to that force Rousseau advocated in the Contrat Social.

One evening they meet by accident near a small chapel and have one of their first extended conversations. As she tries to explain her need for a man capable of living a higher law, he admits, "'There are so many things I do not know or have never thought of'" (142). Then, she explains:

'Education will teach you, Bernard, that you ought to think about the things which must concern you--about your position, your duties, your feelings. At present you see but dimly into your heart and conscience. And I, who am accustomed to question myself on all subjects and to discipline my life, how can I take for master a man governed by instinct and guided by chance?' (142)

This conversation, he says, "opened a new world to me" (142).

Then we have a scene of epiphany which is a high point in the novel aesthetically and the close of this second stage of Bernard's moral growth. After Edmée leaves the chapel, Bernard goes out into the fields which are so beautiful under the moon and stars:

For the first time in my life I realized something of the voluptuous beauty and divine effluence of the night. I felt the magic touch of some unknown bliss. It seemed that for the first time in my life I was looking on moon and meadows and hills. I remembered hearing Edmée say that nothing our eyes can behold is more lovely than Nature; and I was astonished that I had never felt this before. Now and then I was on the point of throwing myself on my knees and praying to God: but I feared that I should not know how to speak to Him, and that I might offend
him by praying badly. Shall I confess to you a singular fancy
that came upon me, a childish revelation, as it were, of poetic
love from out of the chaos of my ignorance? The moon was lighting
up everything so plainly that I could distinguish the tiniest
flowers in the grass. A little meadow daisy seemed to me so
beautiful with its golden calyx full of diamonds of dew and
its white collaret fringed with purple, that I plucked it, and
covered it with kisses, and cried in a sort of delirious
intoxication: 'It is you, Edmée! Yes, it is you! Ah, you no
longer shun me!! (144-145)

In this beautiful scene of natural communion and awakening we see that
his capacity for softness and moral love is developing. In conclusion
to this moment of revelation he says that the next day "I was no
longer the man of the day before, and never again was I to be quite
the man of Roche-Mauprat" (153).

The third stage in Bernard's moral development is one that
includes many experiences over several years, and it is Bernard's time
of greatest measurable growth. Suffering is the key word in this
section and the constraint that Bernard must impose on his brutish
inclinations and habits causes him to suffer greatly, somewhat as
the Solitary in Rousseau's work suffered. He realizes this need for
pain, however hard it is for him to accept the fact.

On the whole I ought to have accounted myself lucky, on giving
up the rough and perilous trade of a cutthroat, to find so
many unexpected blessings--affection, devotion, riches, liberty,
education, good precepts and good examples. But it is certain
that, in order to pass from a given state to its opposite,
though it be from evil to good, from grief to joy, from fatigue
to repose, the soul of a man must suffer; in this hour of birth
of a new destiny all the springs of his being are strained almost
to breaking... (157).

The event which finally forces his transition out of his past
crude state into the state of higher possibility is a conversation
which he hears by accident. He has fled from the house in emotional
pain because Edmée's fiance, M. de la Marche, is there with Edmée and
Bernard is extremely jealous. Lying in the solitude of the grass and
the night, Bernard is all of a sudden aware of Edmée and the Abbé
walking near him in deep conversation.

She tells the Abbé that Bernard's brutishness and lack of
restraint and refinement are oppressive to her. She could possibly
love him, but now she is merely doing battle with him. Most interest-
ingly, she sees the similarity between her situation with Bernard
and Julie's situation with Saint-Preux. "I have read La Nouvelle
Héloïse, and I shed many tears over it. But, because I am a Mauprat
and have an unbending pride, I will never endure the tyranny of any
man." (163). She will not be Julie, cowed by the passion of a man,
but she will be Julie and die to escape an impossible and complicated
love affair. Bernard must either be made to be worthy of her love or
she must die unwed and unfulfilled because of her promise to him
never to marry or to give herself to anyone but him.

As he listens, Bernard for the first time sees the larger
picture of his relations with Edmée:

Now I understood all the odious reality of the part I had been
playing. In the bottom of Edmée's heart I had just read the
fear and disgust I inspired in her. . . . This night of agony
was for me the clearest call of Providence. At last I understood
those laws of modesty and sacred liberty which my ignorance had
hitherto outraged and blasphemed. . . . I was so terrified at
having been in danger of seeing her die in my arms; I was so
horrified at the gross insult I have offered her while seeking
to overcome her resistance, that I began to devise all manner
of impossible plans for righting the wrongs I had done, and
restoring her peace of mind (170-171).

From this hour I felt: my love descending from the wild storms of
the brain into the healthy regions of the heart. Devotion seemed
no longer an enigma to me. I resolved that on the very next morning I would give proof of my submission and affection (171).

We wish that Saint-Preux could have had a like revelation. In the morning Bernard goes to Abbé Aubert and willingly begins to study and take the lessons he has so forcefully been denying and avoiding. Edmée's question to the Abbé, can "a body . . . made for animal life" learn things of "the spirit?" (166) now promises a positive answer.

Here begins the actual "teaching" of Bernard. As he studies, Edmée takes a more positive role in his development. She reads the philosophers to him and as he demonstrates some "moral force" (178), she responds with more attention. "But in this, imbued as she was with the teachings of Émile, she was merely putting into practice the theories of her favorite philosopher" (178). Thus, the moral possibility is beginning in Bernard's life and he is finally moving "from the state of a man of the woods to that of an intelligent being" (178). The "woods" here certainly refers to the state of society or war and not to the state of nature.

As his intelligence increases and his learning compounds, like the youth he is, he becomes vain and proud of what he knows and his ability to argue and expound it. This vanity, another "false direction" (186) his education takes, makes all around him suffer. He has not yet developed a sense of taste and decorum and even as he becomes more moral he is constantly offending the Chevalier and causing Edmée to suffer.

In this tense atmosphere the family decides to go to Paris and in passages like those which describe Saint-Preux and Émile in
Paris, Bernard is introduced to high society. "This visit marked a new phase in my life," he says (189). Although the decadence of the city made this atmosphere seem "like a vast hospital" (192) to him, this exposure to the outside society of Paris is most important in his "moral and philosophical development" (193). He says he discovered new "faculties of which I had never suspected the use [and] I felt the vibrations of all my fibres filling my soul with unknown harmonies" (192). We are not misled, however, into accepting Bernard's naive feelings of "harmonies" because Edmée's rejection of the entire society makes obvious its superficiality.

As he continues to learn of society and to develop his own higher resources, Edmée becomes increasingly cold and icy towards him because of the oath that binds her to him. She would love him and be loved for spiritual reasons not because of a forced bond. So, whenever he turns toward her in passion, she becomes cold and hard. At one point she asks if he has enough generosity to release her from her word. Of this he says:

I hesitated for a moment. A cold sweat broke out all over me. I looked at her full in the face; but her eyes were inscrutable and betrayed no hint of her thoughts. If I had fancied that she really loved me and that she was putting my virtue to the test, I should perhaps have played the hero; but I was afraid of some trap. My passion overmastered me. I felt that I had not the strength to renounce my claim with a good grave; and hypocrisy was repugnant to me. I rose to my feet, trembling with rage (210). Later she asks outright, "... can you understand that you ought to give me my liberty and abandon your barbarous rights?" (212) He is not ready yet for such a higher moral step and his immersion in the "barbarous rights" of society is painfully overt.
Although his education is progressing, he still is not ready to be her husband and "master" because he is still not capable of living a higher moral law--knowingly, willingly.

To avoid her recriminations and his feelings of inadequacy, he takes a drastic step and quickly ships for America to join in the war for American independence with LaFayette's troops. Like Saint-Preux, who also goes to America when his love for Julie becomes most explosive, Bernard flees Edmée to avoid his own passions. In America he distinguishes himself and polishes further many of the virtuous traits he has developed in the past. Friendship is one of these traits that is spawned and matured in the new world. Bernard makes friends with an American named Arthur who is an amateur botanist whose high ideals and keen mind enoble Bernard. "His teaching revived in me the consciousness of intellectual life. He enlarged my ideas and also enobled my instincts" (221).

He revealed to me the wonders of a large part of the physical world, but what he taught me of chiefest value was to learn to know myself, and to ponder over my own impressions (222).

Sand, like Rousseau in Émile, is making a moral man and the emotions and commitments of friendship are essential. Staley in her study of Sand remarked on Sand's belief in friendship as an emotion and a human tie far greater than mere physical love or passion. Staley speaks of the "supremacy of friendship over love" (physical love) and of Sand's belief in "a sympathy" "beyond mere physical exaltation." As Bernard develops the ability to be a friend to Arthur, so also he is developing the ability to be a friend to Edmée. Staley says in
Sand's works, "Friendship in marriage is vaunted as a greater source of contentment than a devouring passion." Sand is making a moral man for a moral woman and Bernard here in America under Arthur's guidance is further being transformed, prepared, and polished for divine love and marriage in the higher state of love and friendship.

After six years, Bernard returns to Saint-Severe and finds the Chevalier an old man and Edmée even more a beautiful woman. In terms overtly like those which describe Odysseus' heroic return to Ithica and to Penelope, Sand brings Bernard home to his faithful friends Patience and Marcasse and to Marcasse's faithful dog, and also he returns to the woman whose moral integrity demands his greatest excellence.

Bernard is now very thoughtful of others since he has learned what it means to be a friend and how to conquer his pride and verbosity. He is now courteous and restrained and even though he says Edmée "had attained ideal perfection" (255), he is closer to her now and more worthy of her than he has ever been before. "An immense change had taken place in me during the course of six years" (257). He calls this his "social education" and now Bernard is willingly capable of sacrifice for Edmée's love and friendship. This is the real conclusion of his "education" in the novel. Sand makes us feel that Bernard is now ready for Edmée.

Edmée's Purposes

Yet, and this is a very important part of the novel, Edmée still will not respond to his love. Even her father says of her
continued aloofness, "'She has strange whims'" (281). Bernard calls her "impenetrable" (309) and of an "imperious and violent nature" (319). It is as if once she began holding him at arms length to force him to develop she is unable now that he is ready to take her arms down. We wonder if Sand has not created another Jacques who because of past complications cannot enjoy happiness in the present and future. The question Sand seems to address herself to at this point in the novel is now that Bernard is educated and polished how does the woman change her role and become his wife?

In one of the most psychologically real and satisfying scenes in all of Sand's novels that I have read, she plays out a sexual-psychological encounter between Bernard and Edmée at this point in *Mauprat* that seems straight out of D. H. Lawrence and which shows how deeply Edmée and Bernard are struggling with how they are to relate to each other.

The old Chevalier wants to go on one more fox hunt before he dies; so they all saddle up and begin the hunt. Edmée is riding a very spirited horse and she is soon at full gallop at some distance ahead of the rest of the party. Her father yells at Bernard, "'Follow her! follow her!'" (315). Bernard catches up to her by taking a cross path and she nastily tells him to "Let me have a gallop'" (316). Then she takes off again, and here is Sand's description of Bernard, Edmée, and this chase scene:

At first I experienced a horrible sense of fear; then, after a few minutes, the fear gave way to an inexpressible feeling of love and delight. The excitement of the gallop became so intense that I imagined my only object was to pursue Edmée. To see her
flying before me, as light as her own black mare, whose feet were speeding noiselessly over the moss, one might have taken her for a fairy who had suddenly appeared in this lonely spot to disturb the mind of man and lure him away to her treacherous haunts. I forgot the hunt and everything else. I saw nothing but Edmée; then a mist fell upon my eyes, and I could see her no more. Still, I galloped on; I was in a state of silent frenzy, when she suddenly stopped (136).

She wants to stop chasing and then go slowly another direction, but Bernard has been greatly excited.

I was filled with an insane desire to go on galloping. I believe my idea was to plunge deeper and deeper into the forest with her; but this idea was wrapped in a haze, and when I tried to pierce it, I was conscious of nothing but a wild throbbing of my breast and temples (317).

She breaks away from him and rides away. "Blind with rage" and digging his spurs into his horse's sides "till the blood streamed from them" (317), he overtakes her, "seizes the mare's bridle" and shouts, "'Stop, Edmée, I say! You shall not go any farther'" (318). Then he shakes the "reins so violently that her horse reared." He catches her in his arms as she gets off but she coldly and fiercely forces herself free. But with him in his present emotional state and her so close, he "was losing my head; my arms were tightening around her waist, and it was in vain that I endeavored to take them away. My lips touched her bosom in spite of myself. She grew pale with anger" (318).

This marvelously compact and psychologically read scene of chasing, taming, fighting, and independence described in terms overtly sexual and emotional but kept within the bounds of decorum is George Sand at her best. Edmée, like the galloping mare, is running strong and full-blooded but is defying anyone to tame her. Bernard's
"insane desire" to chase her, "to plunge deeper and deeper into the forest with her," on his horse with blood running down its sides is openly his expression of the need to conquer, possess, and consummate not merely sexually but as a man.

This "duel" on horseback is Bernard's final uncontrolled moment in the novel and unless something extraordinary happens, Edmee will frustrate her own designs by her fierce and inordinate coldness and pride. She has brought Bernard to the point where moral living is possible, but now she is unable to stop being master or refusing to be wife and to begin to be lover, mother, and friend.

Sand solves this dilemma with a subplot that is artistically awkward but psychologically understandable.

As Bernard stumbles blindly away from Edméé after her rejection described above, he has not gone far when there are two reports from a gun and she is shot and appears to be dying. I have already summarized the story of the brutal Anthony Mauprat who wants the Mauprat wealth and sees killing Edméé as a way to attain his goal. The important point here is that Bernard is now not only deprived of Edméé but is also to lose his life for a crime he did not commit. Sand drops the idea of his education entirely and shifts our attention now to Edméé, the trial, and justice. He is ready for Edméé, but she is not entirely ready for him and Sand now shifts the emphasis to her. In an important scene where Bernard first visits her sick bed before he goes to prison, we see Edméé in a most important light:
... I pulled the curtains aside with an eager hand and gazed on her. Never have I seen more marvellous beauty. Her big dark eyes had grown half as large again; they were shining with an extraordinary brilliancy, though without any expression, like diamonds. Her drawn, colourless cheeks, and her lips, as white as her cheeks, gave her the appearance of a beautiful marble head. She looked at me fixedly, with as little emotion as if she had been looking at a picture or a piece of furniture. . . . I fell upon my knees; I took her hand; I covered it with kisses; I broke into sobs. But she gave no heed; her hand remained in mine icy and still, like a piece of alabaster (330, underscores mine).

She knows he did not shoot her, but even now she cannot respond to him. The statue and marble-alabaster images show graphically how much she has stifled her feminine emotions to force him to develop himself. It is as if Sand has placed Edmée back in the state of society or war and is now showing her transformation into the higher moral state as well. Later when as a "veiled woman" (373) she appears unexpectedly to testify before the court, she softens, becomes a woman, and in explaining herself, mellows into a real woman. We sense that Edmée's explanations of her actions at this point are of great importance to Sand herself.

In court Edmée admits openly that she loves Bernard and when he shouts out that he is now ready for the scaffold since she really does love him, she says:

'Let them rather take me. Is it your fault, poor boy, if for seven years I have hidden from you the secret of my affections; if I did not wish you to know it until you were the first of men in wisdom and intelligence, as you are already the first in greatness of heart? You are paying dearly for my ambitions, since it has been interpreted as scorn and hatred. You have good reason to hate me, since my pride has brought you to the felon's dock. But I will wash away your shame by a signal reparation; though they send you to the scaffold, you shall go there with the title of my husband' (392).
The confused judge observes that she is accusing herself of "'coquetry and unkindness,'" and he asks "'how otherwise do you explain the fact that you exasperated this young man's passion by refusing him for seven years?'" (392) She explains that "it is a very natural and very innocent ambition to make the man of one's choice feel that one is a soul of some price, that one is worth wooing, and worth a long effort'" (393).

This bit of courtly love philosophy is not actually the point as we see when she explains herself to Bernard at the end of the novel:

'Ah, with you such as you were in those days, we should have been ruined if I had not been able to think and decide for both of us. Good God! what would have become of us by now? You would have had far more to suffer from my sternness and pride; for you would have offended me from the very first day of our union, and I should have had to punish you by running away or killing myself, or killing you--for we are given to killing in our family; it is a natural habit. One thing is certain, and that is that you would have been a detestable husband; you would have made me blush for your ignorance; you would have wanted to rule me, and we should have fallen foul of each other; that would have driven my father to despair, and, as you know, my father had to be considered before everything. I might, perhaps, have risked my own fate lightly enough, if I had been alone in the world, for I have a strain of rashness in my nature; but it was essential that my father should remain happy, and tranquil, and respected. He had brought me up in happiness and independence, and I should never have forgiven myself if I had deprived his old age of the blessings he had lavished on my whole life. Do not think that I am full of virtues and noble qualities, as the abbe pretends; I love, that is all; but I love strongly, exclusively, steadfastly. I sacrificed you to my father, my poor Bernard; and Heaven, who would have cursed us if I had sacrificed my father, rewards us to-day by giving us to each other, tried and not found wanting. As you grew greater in my eyes I felt that I could wait, because I knew I had to love you long, and I was not afraid of seeing my passion vanish before it was satisfied, as do the passions of feeble souls. We were two exceptional characters; our loves had to be heroic; the beaten track would have led both of us to ruin' (408-409).
Edmée resolves the potentially destructive triangle of lover--daughter--father by "sacrificing" Bernard to her father. That she almost sacrificed their love as well shows how thin a wire she has been walking.

Unlike Julie who was not of Edmée's strength of character and who was unable to reconcile the passion of her lover and the parental requirements of her father, or unlike Hester who was unable to re-make her lover and get him to choose her over Puritanism, or unlike Jacques whose fixation with the past does not allow him happiness, Edmée demands a "heroic" sacrifice so that her need to love "strongly, exclusively, steadfastly" can be realized. She is certainly an extraordinary woman to be able to maintain the happiness of her father while educating and polishing her love. She plays that dangerous game as she shifts between the roles of daughter, lover, wife, and mother.

Edmée demands felicity of any man who would possess her and this theme of a higher moral relation between a man and a woman (of the kind Hester Prynne and Jacques prophesied) is one of the two major themes of Mauprat. In Sand's brief introduction to the book she says, "The ideal of love is assuredly eternal fidelity" (xxii). Bernard reinforces this theme at the end when he says, "She was the only woman I ever loved; never did any other win a glance from me or know the pressure of my hand. Such is my nature; what I love I love eternally, in the past, in the present, in the future" (411-412): "... eternal felicity," a love that "had to be heroic" and "last a long time." Edmée said, "As you grew greater in my eyes I felt that
I could wait, because I knew I had to love you long. . . " (409).

Home and hearth are difficult to establish in the state of war where man's nature must be changed and woman's roles lived carefully, but as we see here in Mauprat Sand did see this consummation as possible.

The other major theme is that of education and human potential and it is an important part of her idea of life lived in the higher moral condition. Bernard summarizes this theme once in the early pages of the novel and again at the end. In the beginning he says:

The great questions awaiting an answer are these: 'Are our innate tendencies invincible? If not, can they be modified merely or wholly destroyed by education?' For myself, I would not dare to affirm. I am neither a metaphysician, nor a psychologist, nor a philosopher; but I have had a terrible life, gentlemen, and if I were a legislator, I would order that man to have his tongue torn out, or his head cut off, who dared to preach or write that the nature of individuals is unchangeable, and that it is no more possible to reform the character of a man than the appetite of a tiger. God has preserved me from believing this (19).

In the end these are his words:

Man is born with more or less of passions, with more or less power to satisfy them, with more or less capacity for turning them to a good or bad account in society. But education can and must find a remedy for everything; that is the great problem to be solved, to discover the education best suited to each individual (414).

Because man's and woman's nature can be changed through education, there is little reason why all men and women cannot become partakers of the higher moral happiness.

Mauprat, in conclusion, is the story of a great woman's maternal and friendship-based love and of the preparation of the man so that he can be worthy of being her "master." As equals in a mutually rewarding relationship, this man and this woman demonstrate
that home and hearth, love and family are possible in this world. Bernard and Edmée's relationship is certainly what Hester Prynne envisioned when she dreamed of "some brighter period, when the world should have grown ripe for it, in Heaven's own time, a new truth would be revealed, in order to establish the whole relation between man and woman on a surer ground of mutual happiness." Although Hawthorne's vision of this possibility was not as open and optimistic as Sand's, he, too, believed in the power of a great woman's love and of the transformation of man's character to make him worthy of her and capable of a higher moral life; that is what he has shown in his stories "Feathertop" and "The Great Carbuncle" and in his novel The Marble Faun.

Hawthorne and the Higher Moral State

To demonstrate Hawthorne's belief in a higher morality both in and out of society, I will first discuss "Feathertop" and "The Great Carbuncle" and then I will analyze The Marble Faun. In these works Hawthorne shows how individuals and couples can attain a position of moral integrity even though they are caught within the turbulent currents of society.

"Feathertop"

This story seems to be light in its tone, but careful study shows it to have a serious purpose. It has a tough-minded honesty that is rare even in Hawthorne's writings. The story is built around a reversal of terms central to our discussion: the hollow
scarecrow becomes a man; it sees its hollowness and desires death; in its honesty it is made full and in comparison with this new morality regular man becomes the scarecrow. The story is reminiscent of Rousseau's *Rêveries du promeneur solitaire* in its stark honesty and absolute morality as well as in its depiction of isolation and alienation.

After making a scarecrow which is so lovely she cannot stand to leave it inanimate, Mother Rigby like a good God or Galatea gives her creation the pipe of life. "'I'll make a man of my scarecrow, were it only for the joke's sake.'" So, she works her charm, and in spite of the reality of things," her "thing of straw and emptiness" comes to life. "'Thou nothing,'" she says to him (1096).

But when he is finally completed and stands before her as a man, he is very handsome and shines and sparkles. Then Mother Rigby sends him off to town to seek his fortune. Coming towards the townspeople, one of them shows his own hollowness by saying, "'But the sun dazzles my eyes strangely'" (1102). He has a star on his breast which blazes as do his buckles on his shoes. He is a personage of light and brightness and like Bernard Mauprat he is an innocent child with no moral depth.

In town he falls in love with and courts the lovely and much desired Polly. As they embrace before a mirror, she sees him in the mirror as a scarecrow, and flees from him. He looks in the mirror and sees himself as he is, and returns to Mother Rigby, saying, "'I've seen myself, mother! I've seen myself for the wretched, ragged, empty thing I am! I'll exist no longer!'" (1105).
Then we begin to see the meaning of this scarecrow change. Mother Rigby has said before, "'Art thou of the brotherhood of the empty shell'" (1097) and she has told him that he will serve as a king in "'this so often empty and deceptive life'" (1105). We remember she said, "'What if I should let him take his chance among the other men of straw and empty fellows who go bustling about the world'" (1094). Feathertop as scarecrow is man in society--empty, a shell, a scarecrow, one of the "'men of straw,'" one of the "'brotherhood of the empty shell.'"

Then a third transformation takes place. When Feathertop says, "'I've seen myself for the wretched, ragged empty thing I am,'" he takes on true moral stature and we respect his integrity in a world of scarecrows who insist on deceiving themselves and all others. He has left the social state and with his moral commitment to not living as a fraud, he wants to die. "'... his feelings are too tender, his sensibilities too deep. He seems to have too much heart to bustle for his own advantage in such an empty and heartless world'" (1106). This innocent, shining but empty scarecrow entered society as a hollow man; as a social man, he became the best and the brightest and his hollowness fit right in; but, then, in a moral act, he chooses not to live that way. Therefore, Mother Rigby takes back her pipe. "'My poor, dear, pretty Feathertop! There are thousands upon thousands of coxcombs and charlatans in the world, made up of just such a jumble of wornout, forgotten, and good-for-nothing trash as he was! Yet they live in fair repute, and never see themselves for what they are. And why should my poor puppet be the only one to know
himself and perish for it?" (1106)

Just as in the story of "The Great Stone Face" where the townspeople did not know the worst human from the Face of God on the mountain, so here the townspeople think the scarecrow one of the noble and great ones. When Feathertop comes to understand his social emptiness, he then sees the opacity, duplicity and even worse emptiness of the mass of mankind. When he decides to exist no longer as a fraud, he is taking a stand in a higher moral dimension against the hollowness of human life in the state of society. "He seems to have too much heart to bustle for his own advantage in such an empty and heartless world."

Although we see Feathertop turned back into just a straw and sticks scarecrow again with a sense of tragic loss, we also see that his moral stand was one of beauty and courage. Few characters must seal up their moral perception in their death, but many must seal it up by isolation and seclusion from social men. "Feathertop" is one of Hawthorne's most powerful short stories because of its example of commitment to life's higher moral meaning.

"The Great Carbuncle"

Other people in Hawthorne's fiction find themselves caught in the social world of deception and opacity, struggle for the true moral direction, and make the commitment to transparence and truth in the face of society. Not all must die or live in solitude like Feathertop, however. A story with two people who achieve hearth and family in the higher moral state is "The Great Carbuncle."
The plot deals with a group of pilgrims who huddle together for protection and community one evening in a hut near the base of the mountain at the top of which is the great gem or carbuncle. The gem glistens and gleams on the distant top of the mountain and many pilgrims go in search of it. As evening drives these questers together, it also allows Hawthorne to reveal each member of the group to us. There are allegorical figures named the Seeker, Scientist, Merchant, Poet, Cynic, and Dandy, and there is a real young couple named Matthew and Hannah. Sitting around the fires of wood and human companionship each member of the group tells how he would "enjoy the prize which [he has] been seeking." After the stories are told, all go to sleep and are shown the next morning searching the mountains for the sparkling gem. Only Matthew and Hannah see the gem, but all find something; some are lost, and some return to tell mankind of their findings. Only Hannah and Matthew, however, gain from the experience; all of the others are fools of the confusion of the state of society.

The drama of the story is contained in the contrast between Hannah and Matthew's relations with each other and their "search" and the relations between the others and their various searches.

The tale begins as a state of nature story with the young couple a prime example of innocence, primitive purity, and transparence. Even though they have lost some of this innocence as they traversed the "vast extent of wilderness" to get to the mountain and the hut, they are still at least more pure than any of their fellow travelers. After his harsh portraits of the other pilgrims, Hawthorne speaks of
Lastly, there was a handsome youth in rustic garb, and by his side a blooming little person, in whom a delicate shade of maiden reserve was just melting into the rich flow of a young wife's affection. Her name was Hannah, and her husband's Matthew; two homely names, yet well enough adapted to the simple pair, who seemed strangely out of place among the whimsical fraternity whose wits had been set agog by the Great Carbuncle (928-929).

Words like "handsome youth," "rustic garb," "blooming little person," "delicate shade," "rich glow," "homely names," and "simple pair" reveal Hawthorne's affection for them. They are out of place in this world of false adventurers. They are the only ones with human and not allegorical names. Their primal separation from the others is suggested when Matthew tells why he and Hannah are seeking the Carbuncle:

'Ye must know, friends, that Hannah and I, being wedded the last week, have taken up the search of the Great Carbuncle, because we shall need its light the long winter evenings; and it will be such a pretty thing to show the neighbors when they visit us. It will shine through the house so that we may pick up a pin in any corner, and will set all the windows aglowing as if there were a great fire of pine knots in the chimney. And then how pleasant, when we awake in the night, to be able to see on another's faces' (931).

However noble or well meaning Matthew's desire for the Carbuncle is, he is deceived by its glitter and Hawthorne seems to smile with the others "at the simplicity of the young couple's project. . . ." The others smile because they think that lighting a cottage a waste of such a precious gem; Hawthorne and the reader smile at Matthew's innocent confusion and simple needs. When Matthew says he would have the light because of how pleasant it would be to wake up and to "be able to see one another's faces," he is at the heart of the meaning.
of the story, but he has no wisdom with which to perceive that truth. He has undertaken a noble search for a false light. Matthew and Hannah have left the state of nature, have crossed the vast desert which separates the natural man from the social man and as social beings are competing with the other social beings for false faces and lights. This young couple is part of the state of war, and confusion and opacity are mixed with their natural innocence.

When the time for sleep comes, Hawthorne describes their innocence as it remains and he is most gentle and kind to them. Perhaps his picture of them sleeping is one of his most loving descriptions in all of his writing:

The young married couple had taken their lodgings in the farthest corner of the wigwam, and were separated from the rest of the party by a curtain of curiously-woven twigs such as might have hung, in deep festoons, around the bridal-bower of Eve. The modest little wife had wrought this piece of tapestry while the other guests were talking. She and her husband fell asleep with hands tenderly clasped, and awoke from visions of unearthly radiance to meet the more blessed light of one another's eyes. They awoke at the same instant, and with one happy smile beaming over their two faces, which grew brighter with their consciousness of the reality of life and love. But no sooner did she recollect where they were, than the bride peeped through the interstices of the leafy curtain, and saw that the outer room of the hut was deserted (935).

When we consider statements like "Separated from the rest," "a curtain of curiously-woven twigs," "bridal-bower of Eve," "hands tenderly grasped," "visions of unearthly radiance," "more blessed light of each other's eyes," "happy smile beaming," "faces, which grew brighter," we see that the light of most value is in the eyes of this couple behind their primitive curtain. The "curiously-woven" curtain that Hannah weaves with her hands while the men weave speculation is
women's gift of seclusion and heart to man if he will accept her in
the face of the Great Carbuncles of the social state. Hannah's
curtain is made of natural material of the earth and in this story
her bower serves as contrast to the task ahead of joining the pilgrims
and climbing the mountain. The frustration or denial or the sanctity
of the bower behind the "leafy" curtain is the meaning of the state of
war or society and when Hannah and Matthew leave the bower they are
leaving the true light.

The next morning, as the two awaken, they find the selfish
others gone--competing, hating, avoiding, deceiving and lusting. They
are of the world as we know it and live in it. That Hawthorne has
chosen his allegorical characters from many aspects of social life
makes clear his desire to show that all is delusion. They are all
nasty, narrow, bitter, cruel, and although when met in the hut all
but one still has "natural sympathies," all the next day die emotion­
ally and spiritual and fall victim to life in the state of war.
Hawthorne speaks of their spiritual deaths when he says, "In this
bleak realm of upper air nothing breathed, nothing grew: there was
no life but what was concentrated in their two hearts. . . ." (933)
Only Matthew and Hannah are able to preserve life.

However, the higher the young couple climbs the next day,
the less air and life and light there is, and they are in danger of
losing their lives like the others. Even though they help each other
and try to remain human, there is still cause for concern. "It was
a sweet emblem of conjugal affection as they toiled up the difficult
ascent, gathering strength from the mutual aid which they afforded"

328
Yet, they cannot continue to climb the mountain (which is symbolically and ironically a descent into the hell of the world) and remain pure.

Here is the place to mention the symbolic significance of the geography. We are told the hut is on a lower side of a mountain and that to reach it one must travel through a "vast extent of wilderness" beyond which is the village. Village, wilderness, hut, black verge: it is a climb in fact but a descent in truth. As they "climb", they leave "people" behind and cross the wilderness. We suppose Matthew and Hannah made it with their purity in tact because they are two and in love. They reach the world's congregation in the wigwam before the final ascent (descent) toward the carbuncle, which requires that they leave nature behind and suggests that if they continue, they will lose each other.

Thus, as the others continue to "climb," Matthew and Hannah finally turn and start down the mountain or symbolically ascend toward the true light. "And the lovers yearned to behold that green earth again, more intensely, alas! than, beneath a clouded sky, they had ever desired a glimpse of heaven" (933). "Green earth" here is opposed to a false "heaven."

So they turn from the "Lonely sky" which is literally above them but symbolically below them and at this moment, they make a crucial decision and discovery. Pointing downward or at least sideways, Matthew says to Hannah, "'Look! In this direction the sunshine penetrates the dismal mist. By its aid, I can direct our course to the passage of the Notch. Let us go back, love, and dream no more
of the Great Carbuncle" (934). He makes the practical decision; Hannah makes the moral discovery: "'The sun cannot be yonder,' said Hannah with despondence. 'By this time it must be noon. If there could ever be any sunshine here, it would come from above our heads'" (934). They are looking down toward home and that is the source of the light. The light which comes from the Carbuncle above them is an "awful blaze" which now threatens annihilation. It kills the Seeker, blinds the Cynic, and leads all who seek it astray or to death. Realizing that the true light is below them and not above them, Matthew presses "her tremulous form to his breast" and says, "'we will go hence, and return to our humble cottage. The blessed sunshine and the quiet moonlight shall come through our window. We will kindle the cheerful glow of our hearth, at eventide, and be happy in its light. But never again will we desire more light than all the world may share with us'" (935).

They then drink "out of the hollow of their hand" a sacramental drink of the water "uncontaminated by an earthly lip" from the lake at the shrine. Now that they have made the moral decision, the water can bless and regenerate. Because they no longer seek the Carbuncle and its shrine, it loses its power of destruction. "Then, lending their guidance to the blinded Cynic, . . . they began to descend the mountain."

. . . from the hour when two mortals had shown themselves so simply wise as to reject a jewel which would have dimmed all earthly things, its splendor waned (937).

Matthew and Hannah have chosen each other and hearth and have thus established a relationship of the higher moral state. In turning their
back on that object of great price in the world, as Hawthorne says, they become "simply wise" and capable of a higher love and happiness.

In the introduction to this chapter the term felix culpa was used to indicate the doctrinal idea of the fortunate fall. If we can break out of the mental blinders of always seeing Hawthorne in Puritan or Christian terms and see him in humanist terms, we see here in "The Great Carbuncle" an espousal of certain moral truths which are explained by the idea of a fortunate fall into society. First, innocence is real. Matthew and Hannah are possible. For Hawthorne the bower of innocent love behind the "leafy curtain" is possible in this world. We have seen that to be so in the discussion of "The Great Stone Face," "The New Adam and Eve," and the love of Phoebe and Holgrave in The House of the Seven Gables. Whatever else the others may be, these two are innocent primitives. Second, the world of society is real. The greed and lust, the evil hearts and cruel deeds, the bitterness and cynicism do exist and are accentuated by being represented in the story by allegorical figures. As we see in The Scarlet Letter and The Blithedale Romance and in a story like "The Minister's Black Veil," the false light of society, the masks and deceptions of the carbuncle-like gems of the world do destroy the human sympathies and set asunder male and female love, family and hearth. Third, once knowledge is gained, it is possible to turn one's back on the black, misty, lurid abyss of the world and return to the cottage among people in nature where love and morality are true light, where faces are transparent, and where the world is green, alive, and
beneficent. As we saw in "Feathertop" and as we will see in The Marble Faun, the cottage, family, and the green world of life are not possible in some cases without the descent to the shrine of the Great Carbuncle or the world of society. Some men and women must fall before they can make the moral rise and be "simply wise."

The Marble Faun

On February 28, 1860, Hawthorne's novel Transformation was published in London by Smith and Elder and in Boston as The Marble Faun by James T. Field. This novel was received by an appreciative audience in both countries and by April the British Transformation was in its third edition and the book seemed to be doing as well in America.

The background behind this novel begins on January 12, 1858 when Hawthorne and his family left Paris for Rome. Hawthorne had been consul to England from 1853 to 1857 and now, before returning to America, he and Mrs. Hawthorne and their children fulfilled a lifelong desire to visit Italy. They went from Marseilles to Civitavecchia by steamer and from there by coach to Rome.

On February 11, 1858 the Hawthornes visited the Roman carnival which figures prominently in The Marble Faun. They also met and associated with the American art colony in Rome where Hawthorne learned much of the arts, of sculpture, of the ruins of Rome, and of artistic theory which would also play an important part in the novel. Two painters of this colony are of special importance because they influenced the novel directly. Two young women, Maria Louisa Lander of Salem and Harriet Hosmer of Watertown, Massachusetts, Stewart says,
Hawthorne "studied with relish and insight" as he came to know "the case of the American young woman abroad." Miss Hosmer "repelled" him a little by her "mannish attire" but he admired her independence. He praised both Miss Hosmer and Miss Lander for their "almost perfect independence" and Steward says, "These two were used as material for his creation of Hilda in The Marble Faun."

The Hawthorne's spent much time looking at the ruins and paintings in Rome. Stewart says Hawthorne "repeatedly went to see Guido's "Beatrice Cenci," which Hawthorne called "the most profoundly wrought picture in the world." He also took keen interest in the sculpture of Venus de Medici which he later saw in Florence. These interests as well as his increasing dislike of nudity in modern sculpture especially also found place in his novel.

Another influence on Hawthorne in Rome and Florence was that of Catholicism which, he recorded, had "many admirable points." As we see in the chapter in The Marble Faun entitled "The World's Cathedral," Hawthorne took interest in the confessional and in its effects on the mind and soul. Steward says, "Neither Hawthorne nor his wife was in danger of becoming a Roman Catholic, but it is not entirely accidental or unconnected with family influences that his daughter Rose (who was eight years of age in 1859) later became a convert and was for many years, as Mother Alphonsa, a revered sister of mercy."

One final note on the relations between his stay in Italy and his novel needs to be given. When the family moved to Florence, they
leased a residence called Villa Montanto. Daughter Una's bedroom had a tower near by which, Stewart observed, "like so many items in the Italian journal" was "transferred bodily to The Marble Faun." This tower is like Hilda's and Donatello's towers. "Evenings, the family liked to climb to the top of the tower to see the sunset. And after the others had gone down, Hawthorne liked to stay on in the growing dusk, looking out over the tiled roofs and towers of Florence toward the misty Apennines while he meditatively smoked a cigar." Hilda's tower in the city and Donatello's tower in the Appenines are both foreshadowed here in actual experience.

After much and serious illness in the family, especially with Una and Mrs. Hawthorne, the family left Rome for America on May 25, 1959. In London, however, Hawthorne's American publisher James T. Fields offered him a proposition which made him remain in England for another year. Fields offered him 600 pounds if he would write a novel to be published in London by Smith and Elder. Since he had made no money on his consulship and was in need of funds, he agreed to write the novel.

Hawthorne had kept notebooks while in Italy and had begun a rough sketch of a story in April and May of 1858 while in Florence. This piece, posthumously published as The Ancestral Footstep, was set aside, however, as another theme kept coming into his mind. "The idea keeps recurring to me of writing a little Romance about the Faun of Praxiteles." He was writing on this idea of the Faun, then, in the spring of 1858, that summer, "and again at Rome in the fall and winter of 1858-1859."
When he arrived in England, he "went to Redcar on the Yorkshire coast" and on July 26, 1959 he began to write "'in great earnest' . . . the third and final draft of The Marble Faun." By October 17 he sent the first 429 pages to Smith and Elder and sent the remaining 79 pages on November 9. He corrected proofs during December and January of 1859-1860 and, as was stated earlier, the book was published on February 28, 1850 on London as Transformation and in America as The Marble Faun.

In addition to this publishing information, a plot summary in some detail should be helpful to the reader who is not familiar with The Marble Faun.

This novel is the story of four characters who form a friendship in Rome. Donatello is a young Italian of royal blood whose joyful disposition and spritely actions cause the others to compare him with Praxiteles' marble Faun. Miriam is a moody young woman of English-Jewish descent. She is a painter and is the object of Donatello's love. Hilda and Kenyon are Americans. She is a snow-white virgin of fair appearance who lives in a tower room which is adjacent to a public shrine dedicated to Mother Mary. She, too, is a painter but in Rome she has given up original work and has become a copyist. Kenyon is a sculptor and is in love with Hilda whose virginal aloofness keeps him totally at a distance.

These four characters and the exchanges between them on matters of art, sin/guilt, love, and religion are the story of the first 14 chapters. Donatello's striking similarity to the statue of the marble Faun and the theme of innocent and pre-civilized happiness are
discussed in these 14 chapters. Another subject is Miriam's dark past and the appearance of her evil male "model" in the catacombs of St. Calixtus and her feelings of kinship with women of ambiguous character in the past like Beatrice Cenci, Cleopatra, Jael, Judith and others. Hilda's innocence, her devotion to the great masters, and her keeping of the Virgin's shrine also occupy many of these early pages. Finally, Kenyon's views on sculpture and on the relation between sculpting and man's moral growth are discussed.

Thus, the first 14 chapters form the first movement of the novel and they deal mainly with philosophy and character analysis with little action.

The second movement of the novel, to chapter 23, however, is directly concerned with an action. Miriam's evil model who follows her everywhere and haunts her every step has finally begun to demand her attention and obedience more and more. Donatello in his animal good health senses instinctively the threat of this man to both Miriam and to himself and so the tension between Miriam's past and her possible future grows—to the snapping point.

One evening the four friends join a group of artists for a "moonlight ramble" through the ruins of Rome and we experience one of the first major climaxes of the novel. The darkness and the presence of the model so affect Miriam that at one point she strays from the rest and when alone she "began to gesticulate extravagantly, gnashing her teeth, flinging her arms wildly abroad, stamping with her foot." As one possessed, she is discovered by Donatello whom she
warns away from her: "'Cast me off, or you are lost forever,'" she tells him (680). He will not forsake her and when the group leaves the forum with its chasm or opening in the floor, Donatello, Miriam, and the model are left alone. The model comes forward towards the other two, Miriam sinks to her knees in what appears to be a prayer before him, and Donatello springs on him and forces him over the precipice to his death.

This event effects what Hawthorne calls "The Faun's Transformation" since this is Donatello's first encounter with sin and evil. He immediately becomes moody and forlorn and in his self-pity loses his interest in Miriam. She has had such a dark past that the death of this evil shadow causes her little pain and her thoughts center on the affects of the murder on Donatello. Unknown to Miriam and Donatello, Hilda was returning to get them at the exact moment of the murder and she saw and heard it all happen, even to the look in Miriam's eye which seemed to tell Donatello to do the deed. The last chapter in this series of chapters is entitled "Miriam and Hilda" and it narrates the meeting of the two when they discuss what the crime has done to them. Pure and virginal, Hilda rejects Miriam and the crime and tries to retain her innocence by rejecting the event she witnessed.

As the third movement begins with chapter XXIV, the scene shifts radically when they all (except Hilda) leave Rome and go their separate ways. Miriam disappears, Hilda remains in her tower, Donatello flees for seclusion to his ancestral estate called Monte
Beni in the Apennines in remote Tuscany, and, a short time later, Kenyon goes there to visit him. Thus the scene shifts to the castle in the mountains and to a tower where Donatello is living alone.

This shift to Monte Beni is an excursion into the world of natural beauty and healthy life, although Donatello is so heart-sick and depressed that he cannot participate in its healing affects. Donatello, through his sin, has lost the power of enjoyment, but Kenyon gets him to tell of his ancestors and to share his happy origins. Donatello gives him a drink called "Sunshine" made only at Monte Beni by Donatello's ancestors. The special property of this wine is the brevity of its exquisite flavor which begins to leave the drink the moment it is poured and is gone in minutes. A kind of nectar of the Gods, the drink loses its flavor entirely if it is ever sold for money.

Unknown to both Donatello and Kenyon, Miriam has also come to Monte Beni and is living in a secluded chapel near Donatello's tower. Donatello has rejected her, but she has discovered in her own life a great need to be near him, to love him, and to try to guide him out of his labyrinth of guilt.

She has a secret meeting with Kenyon in the little chapel and with his assurance that Donatello does love her, she agrees to meet Donatello face to face before the bronze statue of the benevolent Pope Julius the Third in the middle of the town of Perugia some days later (755). Kenyon then entices Donatello into doing some travelling and they set off. Kenyon in trying to divert Donatello from his brooding
so that when he is brought face to face with Miriam in Perugia he will accept her. Kenyon does effect a positive change in Donatello and the travelling, as it did with Saint-Preux and with Bernard Mauprat, is the means of educating and enlarging Donatello's soul and mind.

At the appointed hour, the fearful Miriam appears among the crowd at the fountain and in a tense moment stands near Donatello and awaits his verdict. Finally he calls her name and after talking out the meaning of their relationship and after some words of instruction by Kenyon, they join hands and their lives together. In words which make this union an obvious marriage, Hawthorne says of Miriam and Donatello:

His aspect unconsciously assumed a dignity, which, elevating his former beauty, accorded with the change that had long been taking place in his interior self. He was a man, revolving grave and deep thoughts in his breast. He still held Miriam's hand; and there they stood, the beautiful man, the beautiful woman, united forever, as they felt, in the presence of three thousand eye-witnesses... (776).

Naturally married, this "beautiful" man and woman now leave the scene and we return with Kenyon to Rome and to Hilda.

Chapters 36-41 are still a part of this third movement of the novel since they duplicate the time covered in the story of Donatello and Kenyon in the tower, of the travels, and of the meeting with Miriam. These chapters tell of Hilda's inner struggle against the evil she has seen and heard. Unlike Donatello who grows only as he suffers the guilt and remorse of the act, Hilda seems only able to grow as she rejects the act and evil in general and regains her former state of stainless purity. Whereas he seems to "become" stronger from
the suffering, she seems to be less spiritual as a result. Her copywork loses its meaning, all life seems void of truth, and she begins to haunt the Catholic cathedrals of Rome despite her Puritan heritage in search of solace and relief.

Then she has a momentous religious experience. "One afternoon, as Hilda entered St. Peter's in a sombre mood, its interior beamed upon her with all the effect of a new creation" (791). She wanders through the cathedral and finally comes to the confessionals, with priests who can speak many of the languages of the world. At the one marked "Pro Anglica Lingua" she pauses, and then enters to bear her soul and pour out her confession of Miriam's and Donatello's guilt. When she finishes, Hawthorne says, "It was all gone; her bosom was as pure now as in her childhood. She was a girl again." (796).

As she is getting up and leaving the confessional, Kenyon happens to discover her and they leave the cathedral together. With her burden now gone, Hilda is again able to think kindly of Miriam and to consider the plight of Donatello.

Now begins the final movement of the novel which shifts the scene to the streets of Rome at Carnival time.

Earlier in the novel Miriam gave Hilda a sealed packet and asked her to deliver it to the address on it on a certain day. Hilda's return to concern for Miriam recalls this packet to her mind and she discovers that it is now the day it was supposed to be delivered. She goes, therefore, into a dangerous part of town to the Palazzo Cenci to deliver Miriam's letter, and then she disappears.
Several days later Kenyon is still searching for her but to no avail. While walking on the crowded sidewalk, he is thrown into contact with a mendicant in a mask and a white robe who asks, "'Is all well with you, Signore?'" (816) It is Donatello's voice, but before Kenyon can respond, the crowd has swept the robed man away. Later, in a narrow street, a carriage passes him and he recognizes Miriam in it. She has the carriage stop and he sees her dressed beautifully with a brilliant red gem at her bosom and accompanied by a strange man. She tells him nothing of Hilda but mysteriously adds, as she leaves, "'Only, when the lamp goes out do not despair'" (817).

Of course, since Hilda is not there to feed the lamp, the light goes out at the shrine by Hilda's room. Even the beautiful white doves which live by the shrine fly away and all connected with Hilda thus disappears with her.

Kenyon receives a note to meet Miriam and Donatello out on the campagna so he leaves the city at the appointed time and travels about two miles to where an excavation is taking place. Even finding a buried statue of Venus cannot deter him from his quest for Hilda or relieve his heart of its ache. Donatello and Miriam come in Italian peasant costumes and they all talk together. Since Miriam and Donatello are soon to part as the law is after him for the death of the model, Miriam asks Kenyon to be patient as regards Hilda and to hear her own story of her English-Jewish ancestry. She tells of being promised as a young girl to an older marchese in her father's family. When of age, she "repudiated" the marriage contract and later
became involved, probably by association as she was in Donatello's murder of the model, in a "terrible event." We suppose, since Hawthorne links her so closely with Beatrice Cenci, that this was the killing of her father. Hawthorne is very vague on the actual nature of Miriam's guilt and we can only guess what happened and Miriam's involvement in that event. Our three characters talk of the change that has taken place in Donatello and they praise education of both the intellect and the soul.

This hour of conversation ended, Miriam tells Kenyon to be at a certain pole before a certain house on a certain carnival day, and then the friends part.

The final scene of the novel is the carnival streets of Rome. Chapter 49 is entitled "A Frolic of the Carnival" and this scene is a grotesque mockery of life and especially of Kenyon's serious anxiety for Hilda in this Carnival world of no concern. All of the fantastic creatures shout, throw, hit, or otherwise make him the object of their sport. A "gigantic female figure, seven feet high" tries to make him love her and when he will not be hers she shoots him with a popgun full of lime-dust.

Amid this "feverish dream" he meets Miriam and Donatello who are in "black masks" and for a moment the three observe a farewell which is as "'a sacred hour, even in carnival time!'" (847). Then they separate and a short time later the police arrest Donatello.

While standing at the designated pole amid this chaos, Kenyon is hit in the shoulder by a cauliflower from someone in the crowd and then he is hit on the lips by a fresh rose-bud. He looks up and
there on the balcony above him is Hilda.

In the final chapter Kenyon and Hilda discuss Donatello's change and what it means. They later encounter Miriam who is doing public penance and they hear that Donatello is in a civil prison. We are told by the author that Kenyon and Hilda soon left for America where they married. Miriam sent them a beautiful and expensive bracelet with symbolic significance ("seven ancient Etruscan gems, dug out of seven sepulchres . . . , the connecting bond of a series of seven wondrous tales. . . ." (855-856). The novel ends with these words: "For, what was Miriam's life to be? And where was Donatello? But Hilda had a hopeful soul, and saw sunlight on the mountaintops" (856).

Because Hawthorne left so many points of the plot so beclouded in romance and mystery, many readers asked for some explanation; so in the second edition of the novel Hawthorne added a conclusion which explains the mysterious packet, Miriam's background generally, her companion in the coach when she spoke to Kenyon, and Hilda's disappearance. However, he refuses to answer whether or not Donatello had pointed ears like Praxiteles' marble Faun.

The Marble Faun, of all of Hawthorne's works, is his most complete and aesthetically finest treatment of man's and woman's moral capacity for a higher quality of love and life than that lived in the state of society. In his story of Donatello, Miriam, Kenyon, and Hilda with its themes of innocence, sin, and moral growth; of woman, her roles, and her ambiguity; and of love's different yet moral manifestations we have a vision of the higher moral condition like that
which we have seen in the works of Rousseau and George Sand. I will organize my analysis of The Marble Faun under two headings, each of which will relate several important characters to an essential theme. Under the first heading I will show how Donatello, Hilda, and Miriam attain and maintain a higher moral understanding; and under the second, I will show the two different kinds of male-female unions or relations Hawthorne saw as possible in the higher human condition.

Donatello, Hilda, and Miriam: Sin, Innocence, and Femininity

A substantial critical literature exists on The Marble Faun and much of it has to do with Donatello, Hilda, and Miriam. Most of this literature, however, separates Donatello and Hilda for discussion, speaking of Donatello under the topic of felix culpa and Hilda under the heading of women, especially as to the inflexibility of her innocence and the seeming sterility of her pure virginity as she contrasts with Miriam. Donatello is usually discussed with Miriam as is Hilda, but Hilda and Donatello are rarely discussed together. I suggest that neither this separation of the two nor the usual headings produce the most insightful criticism. Rather, I would argue that only when we see how Hawthorne has structurally and thematically built major portions of the novel around Donatello and Hilda do we see his comment on innocence, sin, and moral growth in the novel. After looking at Donatello and Hilda, then a discussion of Miriam can be given in the proper perspective.
In the first movement of the novel, chapters 1-14, the focus oscillates back and forth between Donatello and Hilda and the idea of innocence, and Miriam, her model, and the theme of guilt and evil. One purpose of these chapters is to establish the innocence of both Donatello and Hilda as fact, but also to make clear through contrast that it is of two different kinds. His natural innocence will lead to a fortunate fall and moral growth in terms of a fall and subsequent rise; her religious innocence will lead to an unfortunate fall and moral growth only as a rejection of the fall and of any notion of a subsequent rise. This is why Hawthorne created Donatello as a child of nature, related to the Fauns of antiquity while he made her a pure daughter of the New England Puritans. Hawthorne never judges between Donatello and Hilda; however different they are, both kinds of moral "growth" are legitimate and valuable and both are part of the higher moral state.

In this discussion it is important that the reader keep in mind that Hawthorne's portrayal of Donatello's natural innocence is closely related to Rousseau's depiction of this same kind of character in his first and second dialogues or discourses and in *Émile*. Like Rousseau's "natural man," Donatello is a creature of a happy middle ground between man and the beasts, beyond mere brutality but not yet a participant in civilization or sin and guilt. Hawthorne, like Rousseau, also advocates experience in society and moral growth through human relations. Donatello's innocence, fall, and subsequent growth also directly corresponds to that of George Sand's Bernard Mauprat.
To show Donatello's rise from a "natural" to a "civilized" to a "moral" man, Hawthorne begins by devoting his first two chapters in the novel to establishing a strong correspondence between Donatello and Praxiteles' marble statue of an ancient faun. The statue stands in a gallery in Rome and the four principal characters in the book stand before it. Miriam is the first to suggest a relationship: "Our friend Donatello is the very Faun of Praxiteles" (594). Although they cannot get Donatello to pull back the hair which covers his ears and thus solve the "riddle" of whether or not he is in fact a faun with pointed and furry ears, they continue to pursue the idea of his being this ancient creature reborn or an ancestor of this faun still possessing all of the primitive qualities.

This question of Donatello's origins intrigues Hawthorne, Miriam, and Kenyon. Hawthorne's fascination is seen in passages like this one:

Neither man nor animal, and yet no monster, but a being in whom both races meet on friendly ground. The idea grows coarse as we handle it, and hardens in our grasp. But, if the spectator broods long over the statue, he will be conscious of its spell; all the pleasantness of sylvan life, all the genial and happy characteristics of creatures that dwell in woods and fields, will seem to be mingled and kneaded into one substance, along with the kindred qualities in the human soul. Trees, grass, flowers, woodland streamlets, cattle, deer, and unsophisticated man. The essence of all these was compressed long ago, and still exists, within that discolored marble surface of the Faun of Praxiteles (596).

Miriam adds to this picture of this natural man when she says, "'He is not supernatural, but just on the verge of nature, and yet within it.'" Kenyon adds, "'In some long-past age, he must really have existed."
Nature needed, and still needs, this beautiful creature; standing betwixt man and animal, sympathizing with each, comprehending the speech of either race, and interpreting the whole existence of one to the other" (597). Kenyon adds, "What a pity that he has forever vanished . . . --unless, . . . Donatello be actually he!" (597).

Miriam again picks up the thread and says:

'Imagine, now, a real being, similar to this mythic Faun; how happy, how genial, how satisfactory would be his life, enjoying the warm, sensuous, earthy side of nature; revelling in the merriment of woods and streams; living as our four-footed kindred do,--as mankind did in its innocent childhood; before sin, sorrow or morality itself had ever been thought of! Ah, Kenyon, if Hilda and you and I--if I, at least--had pointed ears! For I suppose the Faun had no conscience, no remorse, no burden on the heart, no troublesome recollections of any sort; no dark future either' (597).

The tone of longing and envy for this time of "innocent childhood" runs throughout not only Miriam's thoughts on the Faun but through all of their comments.

Hawthorne's clearest statement of Donatello's uniqueness and comment on the natural man is when he has Kenyon say these words which could have come straight out of Rousseau:

'... and now comes Donatello, with natural sunshine enough for himself and her, and offers her the opportunity of making her heart and life all new and cheery again. People of high intellectual endowments do not require similar ones in those they love. They are just the persons to appreciate the wholesome gush of natural feeling, the honest affection, the simple joy, the fulness of contentment with what he loves, which Miriam sees in Donatello. True; she may call him a simpleton. It is a necessity of the case; for a man loses the capacity for this kind of affection, in proportion as he cultivates and refines himself' (650).

Notice especially in this passage the concluding statement that something is lost in the transition out of the state of nature into the state of society or civilization.
One way Hawthorne establishes and reinforces the relation between Donatello and the ancient faun and primitive world is by relating him to animals. Sand also used this technique to establish Bernard Mauprat's affinity to the brute world, but Sand equated the brute world directly to the social state whereas Hawthorne with Donatello seems more interested in the state of nature and primitivism, in a pre-social condition as the place of Donatello's origins.

Miriam smiles at and caresses Donatello as she would "a pet dog" (598). Although she nastily calls him "underwitted" at one point (598) and in another says, "... if you consider him well, you will observe an odd mixture of the bulldog, or some other equally fierce brute, in our friend's composition," she also can laugh and say, "'He perplexes me,—yes, and bewitches me,—wild, gentle, beautiful creature that he is! It is like playing with a young greyhound!'" (636) When Donatello becomes angry with Miriam's model, Hawthorne says his anger "resembled not so much a human dislike or hatred, as one of those instinctive, unreasoning antipathies which the lower animals sometimes display, and which generally prove more trustworthy than the acutest insight into character" (610). Another time Donatello glares at the dark model and "His lips were drawn apart so as to disclose his set teeth, thus giving him a look of animal rage, which we seldom see except in persons of the simplest and rudest natures" (641).

Donatello's role as pre-civilized man, as partaker of the innocence and spontaneity of natural life is also established by
Hawthorne in these early chapters. Early Hawthorne speaks of the marble Faun as conveying the "idea of an amiable and sensual creature, easy, mirthful, apt for jollity . . . , it is impossible to gaze long at this stone image without conceiving a kindly sentiment towards it. . . . It comes very close to some of our pleasantest sympathies" (595). He says such a creature would not be endowed with a "principle of virtue and would be incapable of comprehending such; but would be true and honest by dint of his simplicity" (595). Concluding chapter one, Hawthorne says the Faun is probably of a period which exists only in the poetic imagination "when man's affinity with nature was more strict, and his fellowship with every living thing more intimate and dear" (596). Miriam longs for the faun's life, since he lived as "'mankind did in its innocent childhood; before sin, sorrow or morality. . . .'" (597). We recall that Hawthorne also spoke of this pre-moral aspect of the faun's existence and realize with Miriam's comment that all of the virtues and benefits of the pre-civilized life are pure, untainted by either sin or morality, and of the state of nature as it has been defined earlier.

Hawthorne overtly links Donatello to this state of nature or pre-civilized and pre-moral natural life, and his most Rousseauan statements are in chapters 8, 9, and 10 when Donatello and Miriam meet in a suburban garden and as "The Faun and Nymph" dance the wild dances of nature. Of Donatello in this natural setting, Hawthorne says:

How mirthful a discovery would it be (and yet with a touch of pathos in it), if the breeze which sported fondly with his clustering locks were to waft them suddenly aside, and show
a pair of leaf-shaped furry ears! What an honest strain of wildness would it indicate! and into what regions of rich mystery would it extend Donatello's sympathies, to be thus linked (and by no monstrous chain) with what we call the inferior tribes of being, whose simplicity, mingled with his human intelligence, might partly restore what man has lost of the divine! (630)

In several of his comments Hawthorne is careful to say that Donatello is linked to the pre-moral life "by no monstrous chain" as if to accentuate the positive feelings he wants associated with Donatello. Again in this last quotation we see Hawthorne's belief that innocent man in nature partook of the "divine" in a way civilized man no longer does. Civilization seems to bring a decline not a gain in man's capacity for virtue.

During this dance in the suburban garden, Donatello drinks "in the natural influences of the scene" and in all nature finds "something akin," as we all do to an extent, Hawthorne adds, when we leave the city and feel "the blood gush joyously through our veins with the first breath of rural air" (632). "How close he stands to nature," Miriam observes (637). In words rich with Edenic imagery, Hawthorne speaks of this garden "as beautiful as a fairy palace, and seemed an abode in which the lord and lady of this fair domain might fitly dwell, and come forth each morning to enjoy as sweet a life as their happiest dreams of the past could have predicted" (633). This leads into Hawthorne's most Rousseauist chapter, number 9, "The Faun and Nymph." Donatello speaks "the natural language of gesture," (633) "the language of the natural man. . . . He gave Miriam the idea of a being not precisely man, nor yet a child, but, in a high and beautiful sense, an animal,—a creature in a state of development
less than what mankind has attained, yet the more perfect within
itself for that very deficiency" (634). He has an "unsophisticated
heart" which is to Miriam as a fresh fountain (635).

As Donatello and Miriam dance together and throw flowers and
leaves at each other, Hawthorne makes this important comment:

They played together like children, or creatures of immortal
youth. So much had they flung aside the sombre habitudes of
daily life, that they seemed born to be sportive forever, and
endowed with eternal mirthfulness instead of any deeper joy. It
was a glimpse far backward into Arcadian life, or, further still,
into the Golden Age, before mankind was burdened with sin and
sorrow, and before pleasure had been darkened with those shadows
that bring it into high relief, and make it happiness (637).

In almost the same words Hawthorne says again, "Here, as it seemed,
had the Golden Age come back again within the precincts of this sunny
glade, thawing mankind out of their cold formalities, releasing them
from irksome restraint, mingling them together in such childlike
gayety that new flowers (of which the old bosom of the earth is full)
sprang up beneath their footsteps" (640).

In these opening pages of the book Hawthorne has established
a correlation between Donatello and the Faun of Praxiteles. Whether
Donatello is literally this "natural" Faun is beside the point. For
Hawthorne, Donatello's soul is analogous to the soul of the innocent
Faun and his natural setting is a golden world of Edenic joy before
morality and sin. This is the first stage in Donatello's history and
moral growth.

The second stage of this moral advancement comes in the second
movement of the novel when the four principal characters join their
artist friends for a "Moonlight Ramble" through the ruins of Rome,
which leads to the moment of death for the model.

Donatello's personality is like that of a primitive faun in its simplicity and happiness, but we have also seen how his personality can become savage and animal-like when Miriam's model comes near. Miriam, therefore, by scorning his overt attempts to love her and by placing between them this dusky figure of evil (albeit without her seeming control or will), is placing Donatello in a situation where he must either leave her or have his innocence and care-free happiness destroyed. He will not leave her; so he is brought to the "precipice" where the model falls to his death and Donatello "falls" into civilization.

As the model appears on the scene of the evening stroll, Donatello reacts with a "tiger-like fury gleaming from his wild eyes" (674), and Miriam soothes his "animal rage" with techniques she "might have used in taming down the wrath of a faithful hound" (675). Then, realizing that something is happening to himself, Donatello says to Miriam:

'Signorina, do I look as when you first knew me? Methinks there has been a change upon me, these many months; and more and more, these last few days. The joy is gone out of my life; all gone! all gone!' (675)

His uncharacteristic moodiness is increased to despair when he comes unnoticed upon Miriam who, thinking she is alone, vents her frustrations by flailing her arms and gnashing her teeth (680). She is "possessed" by the influence of the model. Donatello responds in horror: "'... this is too terrible!'" (680). She warns him for the last time to cast her off or be lost, but he will not and she
realizes that he must go on to his fate. "'Ah! what a sin to stain his joyous nature with the blackness of a woe like mine!'" (681)

In the next chapter, "On the Edge of a Precipice," Miriam, Donatello, and the model meet alone on the edge of a crevasse or chasm on one side of Tarpeian Rock which falls off at a sheer angle for many feet. With a fierce and swift movement, Donatello grabs the man and throws him off the precipice. Miriam's influence over him has led him to murder and he stresses her influence on his act: "'I did what your eyes bade me do, when I asked them with mine . . . , but he had his trial in that breath or two while I held him off the cliff, and his sentence in that one glance, when your eyes responded to mine!'

(689)

Through her influence, Donatello is now a different man. This next chapter is appropriately entitled "The Faun's Transformation" and Hawthorne summarizes the keypoint when he says of this new Donatello:

... the young man, whose form seemed to have dilated, and whose eyes blazed with the fiery energy that had suddenly inspired him. It had kindled him into a man; it had developed within him an intelligence which was no native characteristic of the Donatello whom we have heretofore known. But that simple and joyous creature was gone forever (689, underscore mine).

After some first moments of love and union between Donatello and Miriam, which to them seems a kind of "new sphere, a special law" where "they were safe" (690), they realize that they have sinned and guilt and gloom enter Donatello's soul. "And thus Miriam and her lover were not an insulated pair, but members of an innumerable confraternity of guilty ones, all shuddering at each other" (692).
Thus does Donatello "fall" from innocence into the world. Like Young Goodman Brown and others of Hawthorne's innocents who fall, gloom settles on Donatello's soul; unlike Goodman Brown and almost all of the others, however, Donatello's story does not end here.

There now takes place an interim stage in Donatello's moral development which could be described as life at the bottom of the pit. He loses all of his spirit, his "'Heart shivers'" (702) and he loses interest in Miriam and her love. "'Nothing will ever comfort me,'" he says (703). "'Happy? . . . Ah, never again; never again!'" "A stupor was upon him, which he mistook for such drowsiness as he had known in his innocent past life" (704).

He flees from Rome and Miriam and goes into the mountains to Monte Beni to brood. He will not leave his tower because even "'nature shrinks from me, and shudders at me. I live in the midst of a curse, that hems me round with a circle of fire; no innocent thing can come near me'" (733). And finally, in terms very similar to those of Rousseau when he, too, describes life in the world, Hawthorne says, "It is a very miserable epoch, when the evil necessities of life, in our tortuous world, first get the better of us so far as to compel us to attempt throwing a cloud over our transparency" (734). Opacity and dullness characterize the state of the world where man seems forced to wear what Kenyon calls "'the abominable mask'" (737) and hide his transparency.

354
The third stage in Donatello's moral growth begins when Kenyon begins to share his tower and to affect Donatello's perspective. When Donatello first allows Kenyon up into his tower, Kenyon, who has been reading Dante, says, "... your tower resembles the spiritual experience of many a sinful soul, which, nevertheless, may struggle upward into the pure air and light of Heaven at last!!" (737) They continue to share conversation and perspective and in an important description of what is happening now to our "Faun," Hawthorne says:

The effect of this lesson [the murder and guilt], upon Donatello's intellect and disposition, was very striking. It was perceptible that he had already had glimpses of strange and subtle matters in those dark caverns, into which all men must descend, if they would know anything beneath the surface and illusive pleasures of existence. And when they emerge, though dazzled and blinded by the first glare of daylight, they take truer and sadder views of life forever afterwards... He now showed a far deeper sense, and an intelligence that began to deal with high subjects, ... He evinced, too, a more definite and nobler individuality ... (741, underscore mine).

Later, as Kenyon and Donatello stand in the tower, gazing at the evening stars, Donatello tells Kenyon of his wish to do penance and perhaps become a monk. Kenyon advises him to do his repenting out in the open world where he can do good to his fellow men. The Kenyon looks at Donatello's face and he can see that it "brightened beneath the stars" (744). Kenyon observes that there is still a resemblance between this man before him and the Faun of Praxiteles but that now Donatello is of a different quality:

... when first the idea was suggested of living for the welfare of his fellow-creatures, the original beauty, which sorrow had partly effaced, came back elevated and spiritualized. In the black depths, the Faun had found a soul, and was struggling with it towards the light of heaven (744).
At this exact moment as Kenyon thus observes and contemplates Donatello in the tower, a song breaks out below them in an unknown tongue. Its strains are rich and soft and yet seemed "the murmur of a soul bewildered amid the sinful gloom of earth. . ." (745). It is Miriam singing and her music reduces both men to sobs. She makes it clear that Donatello still cannot get out of his dark valley, and, because he cannot, both he and Miriam must remain in this hell. Kenyon realizes that if Donatello does not leave the tower and overcome his despondency that no good will come to him. So, in words reminiscent of Dante, Kenyon tells Donatello:

'. . . you know not what is requisite for your spiritual growth, seeking, as you do, to keep your soul perpetually in the unwholesome region of remorse. It was needful for you to pass through that dark valley, but it is infinitely dangerous to linger there too long; there is poison in the atmosphere, when we sit down and brood in it, instead of girding up our loins to press onward. Not despondency, not slothful anguish, is what you now require,—but effort! Has there been an unalterable evil in your young life? Then crowd it out with good, or it will lie corrupting there forever, and cause your capacity for better things to partake its noisome corruption!' (747)

Then, as Kenyon models Donatello's visage in a clay bust he is preparing, his hands put "a higher and sweeter expression" on the bust and as he leaves the clay image it is "illuminated with a higher meaning, such as the old marble never bore" (748).

Kenyon then meets with Miriam in the hidden chapel and learns of her love for Donatello and of her need to sacrifice herself for him. Kenyon reassures her that Donatello's faculties, "in their new development" (752) are now stronger and full of a deeper love for her than before.
'A wonderful process is going forward in Donatello's mind. . . . The germs of faculties that have heretofore slept are fast springing into activity. The world of thought is disclosing itself to his inward sight. He startling me, at times, with his perception of deep truths . . . , he compels me to smile by the inter-mixture of his former simplicity with a new intelligence. Out of his bitter agony, a soul and intellect . . . have been inspired into him' (753).

Miriam's femininity and love need an object to expend themselves on, a man to need them in his own growth. So, when Kenyon suggests his taking Donatello away from the tower, she adds to his scheme a pre-arranged meeting between herself and Donatello in Perugia before the bronze statue of Pope Julius.

Therefore, this third stage in his development where he begins to think deep thoughts and of others is when his intellect and soul come into existence. Now Kenyon leads him away from Monte Beni to travel and thereby "'Escape . . . out of a morbid life, and find his way into a healthy one'" (754).

Stage four is one which begins with Kenyon and Donatello setting off like Emile and his tutor or Saint-Preux into the wide world and does not finish even at the end of the novel. This stage in Donatello's moral growth involves two tutors, Kenyon and Miriam, and when Donatello and Miriam meet in Perugia, the whole theme of Donatello's fortunate fall recedes into the background until the end of the story.

As Donatello and Kenyon set out, Donatello immediately begins to change. "His perceptive faculties . . . became keen." "He delighted" in the scenery and the rustic characters and manners they encounter. They see the squalor of towns and the light and ideal
beauty of nature. Donatello kneels at all of the crosses they encounter which seem to help "him towards a higher penitence" (763). They visit shrines and churches and speak of Dante, Milton, and of religious faith. Thus their journey goes until Kenyon announces his desire for them to be in front of the statue of Pope Julius "'To-morrow noon'" (768).

Miriam tells Kenyon that her beauty and femininity shall be "the instruments by which I will try to educate and elevate him, to whose good I solely dedicate myself" (755). Now, as a meeting between them nears, Hawthorne describes the day in particularly feminine terms, where rain has refreshed the land and made it a scene of "verdure and fertility" (768). Donatello sees the statue of "benevolent" bronze Pope and says of the Pope's act of bestowing a benediction, "there is a feeling in my heart that I may be permitted to share it" (771). He does share in that benediction, as Kenyon notices: "'The Pope's blessing methinks, has fallen upon you. . .'" (771). Then Hawthorne summarizes what is happening to Donatello:

In truth, Donatello's countenance indicated a healthier spirit than while he was brooding in his melancholy tower. The change of scene, the breaking up of custom, the fresh flow of incidents, the sense of being homeless, and therefore free, had done something for our poor Faun. . . (772).

Donatello stands before the beneficent Pope, healthy and full of hope and faith. Appropriately, Hawthorne has Kenyon say at this noon-time and climactic moment, "It is Miriam's hour" (772), since it is the moment of the acceptance of the woman and the acceptance of love.
family, and hearth, which acceptance can lead man out of the world and into the higher moral state.

When, a few moments later, Donatello calls out Miriam's name, his tone of voice "bespoke an altered and deeped character; it told of a vivified intellect; and of spiritual instruction that had come through sorrow and remorse; so that instead of the wild boy, the thing of sportive, animal nature, the sylvan Faun, here was now the man of feeling and intelligence" (775). Kenyon speaks to them both on what has happened to them as a result of sin and as he speaks Donatello "ennobles" the ideas and assumes a "dignity" and elevated "beauty." Finally, in one of the happy and moving passages in the novel, Hawthorne himself, like the bronze Pope, pronounces a benediction and marriage blessing upon this couple:

He still held Miriam's hand; and there they stood, the beautiful man, the beautiful woman, united forever, as they felt, in the presence of these thousand eye-witnesses ..., all three imagined that they beheld the bronze pontiff endowed with spiritual life. A blessing was felt descending upon them from his outstretched hand; he approved by look and gesture the pledge of a deep union that had passed under his auspices (776-777).

A basic love unit is hereby established and it has been hard won out of the world of men. This union in the higher moral state is one that blesses the life of the man and allows the woman fulfillment and promises both family and hearth.

These words quoted above are the last words in chapter 35 and immediately, with the opening of chapter 36, the scene shifts back to Hilda in Rome and Donatello and Miriam are set aside. Donatello, through the analogy of the marble Faun, has grown morally through
four stages from a boy to a man. He is now capable of and ready for life in the higher moral state with Miriam.

Hilda

This immediate return in chapter 36 to Hilda's story which takes place during the same time period as Donatello's story is of structural and thematic importance. Both Donatello and Hilda as innocents participated in the murder of the monk, one by physical action and the other by witnessing the deed. First Hawthorne shows the affects of the act on Donatello and then he returns to show the affects on Hilda. Thus the chapters from 36 to 41 are devoted to her; these seventeen chapters (24 to 41) form the heart of the novel.

The key to an understanding of Hilda and of her reaction to the sin she witnesses is a comment Hawthorne makes on Donatello which expanded includes Hilda:

Every human life, if it ascends to truth or delves down to reality, must undergo a similar [like Donatello's] change; but sometimes, perhaps, the instruction comes without sorrow; and oftener the sorrow teaches no lesson that abides with us (741).

Donatello's natural innocence had to come to virtue through the experience of sin; this, however, is not the case with Hilda. Her religious innocence is already a source of spiritual and intellectual wisdom which is not elevated but muffled by sorrow. Her "instruction" brings her knowledge and maturity, but it is only when she shakes the sorrow off that the knowledge means anything to her. When Donatello must suffer to know, she can know only by not suffering: sorrow is destructive in her case.
The nature and quality of Hilda's religious innocence is shown in several ways. It is essential to show the nature and quality of her innocence first because then our discussion of her reaction to the murder will be understandable. I will speak of Hawthorne's use of clothes, physical setting, and character traits; of Hilda's relations with Miriam and Kenyon; and of Hilda's rejection of the whole idea of *felix culpa* to reveal the nature and quality of her virtue.

Chapter 6, "The Virgin's Shrine," is the only one in the first and second movements (to chapter 23) devoted to Hilda. She lives in a small room in one battlement of a "medieval tower which is square, massive, lofty, and battlemented and machicolated at the summit" (619). Near her room which is high up in the top of the tower is a shrine to the Virgin Mary and around this shrine fly many "white doves, their silver wings flashing in the pure transparency of the air" (619). Miriam and Hawthorne both remark on her "sisterhood" and similarity to these virginal doves and to the Virgin Mary. He says, because of her white robes, she

... bore such analogy to their snowy plumage that the confraternity of artists called Hilda the Dove, and recognized her aerial apartment as the Dove-cote. And while the other doves flew far and wide in quest of what was good for them, Hilda likewise spread her wings, and sought such ethereal and imaginative sustenance as God ordains creatures of her kind (622).

Hilda's tower room and the shrine are bathed in broad sunlight and Hilda, "A fair young girl, dressed in white" (619) tends the shrine and cares for the doves. Miriam observes how like her doves Hilda is, how much a "fair, pure creature" (620), and Hawthorne speaks of the
protection "the snowy whiteness of her fame" gives her (621).

Because of her fellings of reverence for the beautiful paintings of the masters, Hilda gives up original painting and is a copyist. Hawthorne speaks with obvious reverence of her "depth of sympathy," "that flitting fragrance," and the "finer instrument" of her spirit as she copies the great paintings. She is a "gentle and pure . . . worshipper of . . . genius" (623), "a more exquisitely effective piece of mechanism" (623). The key to her artistic power and to the power of her soul is that in art as in life "she wrought religiously, and therefore wrought a miracle" (624). Like the Virgin Mary or one of the ten virgins in the Bible parable who await Christ the bridegroom, and with obvious allusion to the Holy Ghost as a dove, this pure maiden awaits a knowledge and maturity from above, not from below.

In addition to her pure white clothes and her "aerial apartment" which reveal her pure and religious nature, her relations with Miriam and Kenyon also show the quality of her innocence.

There is a degree of Hilda's innocence which seems cold and forbidding and which paradoxically, keeps her from harm and from human happiness. As Miriam and Hilda discuss Hilda's marvelous reproduction of Guido's "Beatrice Cenci," they speak of sin and sorrow and when Hilda says Beatrice's "doom is just," Miriam responds, "'Oh Hilda, your innocence is like a sharp steel sword!'" (627) Later Miriam says that she is "merciless" and "'so terribly severe!'" (710) "'As an angel, you are not amiss,'" Miriam tells her, "'but, as a human
creature, and a woman among earthly men and women, you need a sin to soften you" (710). Hawthorne proves Miriam wrong here since Hilda is not finally matured by the sin of Donatello. She does not need a sin to soften her. Hilda's severe purity is highlighted here to show that her innocence is not compatible with the state of society which has so caught Miriam in its clutches; she is not of Miriam's world.

Kenyon, also, because he loves Hilda, realizes (as Sand tried to show with Edmee) that Hilda is not a human to be possessed in common passion and mundane love. This is shown dramatically in two places in the novel when Kenyons' love for Hilda is accentuated.

The first is in chapter 13 where Miriam is in Kenyon's studio, looking at his work. At one point he takes out of his desk a small and precious box and reveals inside of it a "small, beautifully shaped hand. . ." (659). It is a model of Hilda's hand which he has formed as "a reminiscence." When Miriam asks if he hopes to "'win the original one day,'" he answers:

'I have little ground to hope it. . . . Hilda does not dwell in our mortal atmosphere; and gentle and soft as she appears, it will be as difficult to win her heart as to entice down a white bird from its sunny freedom in the sky. It is strange, with all her delicacy and fragility, the impression she makes of being utterly sufficient to herself; no, I shall never win her. She is abundantly capable of sympathy, and delights to receive it, but she has no need of love' (659).

Kenyon is not correct when he says she has no need of love, but at least he feels clearly and correctly that her need is not physical or passionate. This marble hand in the ivory coffer is as a graven image of a divine being and, like a humble Galatea or disciple,
Kenyon "dared not even kiss the image that he himself had made: it had assumed its share of Hilda's remote and shy divinity" (660). He is stretching to reach the pure woman just as Bernard Mauprat had to stretch morally and spiritually for Edmée.

Later in the novel we again see Kenyon longing for Hilda but encountering marble. This is in chapter 46, "A Walk on the Campagna." While waiting in a small tunnel or excavation for Donatello and Miriam who have promised to give him word of the missing Hilda, Kenyon discovers a broken statue of Venus and is able to pull it out of the dirt enough to see its beauty. "'What a discovery is here,'" he thinks to himself. "'I seek for Hilda, and find a marble woman!'" (833). Some critics interpret this as a comment on Hilda and as we have seen in the beginning of the book Hawthorne has made her out to be like a statue of virtue. This idea that Hilda is a statue is not the only possible meaning to Kenyon's comment, as I will explain later in this discussion as I speak of Hilda's "transformation" in the ending movement of the novel (see p. 375).

The peculiar quality of her virginal whiteness is also shown in her disturbed rejections of the idea of felix culpa. Early and late in the novel, whenever the subject of Donatello's fortunate fall arises, she objects. At the beginning when Donatello is first likened to the Faun, Hilda agrees with the comparison, but calls it "'strange'" (594). Later she says, "'It perplexes me,' said Hilda thoughtfully, and shrinking a little; 'neither do I quite like to think about it'" (597). As they continue to discuss sculpture in general and then
return to the topic of the Faun, Hilda exclaims with impatience, "I have been looking at him too long; and now, instead of a beautiful statue, immortally young, I see only a corroded and discolored stone" (599). She has not interest in the idea of a transformation from below, her own innocence being so much from above.

Her most violent objection to the idea of felix culpa comes at the end of the novel. Kenyon repeats Miriam's idea that sin "elevated" Donatello and that Adam fell "that we might ultimately rise to a loftier paradise than his." She responds:

'Oh, hush!' cried Hilda, shrinking from him with an expression of horror which wounded the poor, speculative sculpture [sic] to the soul. 'This is terrible; and I could weep for you, if you indeed believe it. Do not you perceive what a mockery your creed makes, not only of all religious sentiments, but of moral law? and how it annuls and obliterates whatever precepts of Heaven are written deepest within us? You have shocked me beyond words!' (854-855)

Despite her rejection of felix culpa and sin, because she witnesses a murder, the feelings of guilt and sorrow do enter her life. In chapter 23, the final chapter in the second movement of the novel which closes with the murder scene, Miriam goes to Hilda's dove-cote and, knowing that Hilda knows of the crime, faces her angelic friend.

Miriam sees that Hilda's life has been totally upset. Hilda's pillow is soaked with tears "which the innocent heart pours forth at its first actual discovery that sin is in the world" (707). She sits near a glass opposite Miriam and looks over into it and sees her own copy of Guido's "Beatrice" reflected with her own and sees that Beatrice's expression "had been depicted in her own face likewise ...." Hilda asks, "Am I, too, stained with guilt?" Hawthorne
responds, "Not so, thank Heaven!" Her horror of sin makes her repulse Miriam when they meet. "... she put forth her hands with an involuntary repellent gesture, so expressive, that Miriam at once felt a great chasm opening itself between them two" (708). To Miriam's question, "'Are we not friends?" Hilda answers:

'Do not bewilder me thus, Miriam!' exclaimed Hilda, who had not forborne to express, by look and gesture, the anguish which this interview inflicted on her. 'If I were one of God's angels, with a nature incapable of stain, and garments that never could be spotted, I would keep ever at your side, and try to lead you upward. But I am a poor, lonely girl, whom God has set here in an evil world, and given her only a white robe, and bid her wear it back to Him, as white as when she put it on. Your powerful magnetism would be too much for me. The pure, white atmosphere, in which I try to discern what things are good and true, would be discolored. And, therefore, Miriam, before it is too late, I mean to put faith in this awful heart-quake, which warns me hence-forth to avoid you' (709).

Miriam is thus cast off by Hilda as she was by Donatello; she can go to him and effect a moral change for the better in his soul; she must simply leave Hilda alone. Far from being merely sterile or ice-cold, Hilda's spiritual goodness is of great spiritual richness which is not enhanced by sin but polluted by it. Donatello finally seeks Miriam because his natural innocence cannot elevate him into the higher moral life; Hilda must flee from Miriam so as to regain and maintain her higher moral quality. Her happiness is shattered by her knowledge of the deed and as she says, "'Your deed, Miriam, has darkened the whole sky!'" (712)

When we return to Hilda in chapter 36, after we have followed Donatello through the stages of his moral growth, we find Hilda so depressed that she has lost all power of joy or creation. 'A torpor, heretofore unknown to her vivacious though quiet temperament, had
possessed itself of the poor girl" (779). Her knowledge of the existence of evil in the world has divested her of interest in copying, in her doves, and in anything but praying at the Virgin's shrine. Her condition here parallels Donatello's gloominess and torpor as he sulks and hides in his tower at Monte Beni.

Now Hawthorne is ready to add some human wisdom to her spiritual purity. Her despondency has made her creative perceptions dry up, but it has "deepened them" in a human way. As she now looks at the works of some of her former "Master," she now sees a lack of truth in some of them. She is in need of and hungering "for a spiritual revelation" (783). Thus, while Donatello is brooding at this tower, Hilda is brooding in hers, but while his search will give him a soul, hers will restore her virtuous tranquility and spotless conscience while adding a touch of the human. Her search leads her into the Catholic chapels of Rome. Hawthorne's ambiguous feelings toward this religion are apparent throughout this section because he at once realizes its weaknesses and yet also sees its definite appeal to a soul laden with sin. Hilda sees the common people coming into the churches, heavy laden of soul but leaving relieved and hopeful, and in her present state of moral heaviness she longs for a similar unburdening.

Hilda enters St. Peter's cathedral and finds herself kneeling at the altars and dipping her fingers in holy water. Hawthorne suggests that because she is a "daughter of Puritan ancestors" (792) that her mother's spirit was probably looking down on her and weeping (792). But she is undergoing a deep religious experience
beyond denomination. Her meandering brings her to the confessionals which are set up for people who speak all of the major languages of the world. At the one labeled "Pro Anglica Lingua" (795) she "flung herself down in the penitent's place; and, tremulously, passionately, with sobs, tears, and the turbulent overflow of emotion too long repressed, she poured out the dark story which had infused its poison into her innocent life" (795). When she is finished, Hawthorne says, "It was all gone; her bosom was as pure now as in her childhood. She was a girl again; she was Hilda of the dove-cote" (796). Her spiritual innocence has been restored.

The Priest asks her about her religion and when he rebukes her for coming to Catholic confession as a Protestant she speaks to him of her right as a Christian to kneel and be absolved by Christ. She further tells him when he speaks of conversion and that she is "a daughter of the Puritans" and that she will not join his church. Then, in a gesture and action exactly parallel to that of the bronze Pontiff in the square at Perugia when Donatello and Miriam receive his benediction on their union, this priest "stretched out his hands . . . in the act of benediction [and] Hilda kneeled down and received the blessing with as devout a simplicity as any Catholic of them all" (798). Hawthorne thus bestows a blessing on both Donatello's moral rise and Hilda's moral restitution.

Immediately, with the words quoted above, chapter 39 ends. Chapter 40 has Kenyon witness her kneeling to the Priest and has the two reuniting again. Kenyon sees that Hilda is "a figure of peaceful
beatitude" and Hawthorne speaks of her "transfiguration!" (799) She tells Kenyon, "I am a new creature, since this morning, Heaven be praised for it. . . . I found infinite peace after infinite trouble." Then Hawthorne adds, "Her heart seemed so full, that it split its new gush of happiness, as it were, like rich and sunny wine out of an over-brimming goblet" (suggestive of the "Sunshine" wine of Donatello's ancestors with its heavenly properties). Almost a sacrament herself here, Hilda is so filled with spirituality that Kenyon in all sincerity calls her "Saint Hilda" (800). Hawthorne continues this religious tone to the end of the chapter when he says, "for peace had descended upon her like a dove" (804).

In addition to this restoration of her splendid and happy innocence there also comes to her a more human sympathy. She "returned to her customary occupations with a fresh love for them, and yet with a deeper look into the heart of things. . . ., her character had developed a sturdier quality. . . ." (806). Now, the conversation can return to subjects of the past like Donatello's moral growth and Miriam. Hilda and Kenyon speak of "the riddle of the soul's growth, taking its first impulse amid remorse and pain, and struggling through the incrustations of the senses" and we realize that Hawthorne is making a clear distinction between Donatello's kind of moral growth and Hilda's deepening humanity: he must come up from the primitive world into the material and sensual world and then to the higher moral state; she must come down a little from the moral state to humanity.
Her thoughts also turn to Miriam whom Hilda so totally rejected. Kenyon advises her that there may be a mixture of good and evil "through the clear crystal medium of her own integrity." "'But there is, I believe,'" she tells Kenyon, "'only one right and one wrong; and I do not understand, and may God keep me from ever understanding, how two things so totally unlike can be mistaken for one another. . ." (811). Hawthorne calls her view, which comes from "the pure air and white radiance of her soul," "unworldly and impracticable" and Kenyon calls her "'a terribly severe judge . . . with the remorselessness of a steel blade. You need no mercy, and therefore know not how to show any'" (811). Her thoughts turn to Miriam, and, although Hilda still cannot condone sin, she does care for Miriam as a human being. She returns home and immediately remembers a task she had told Miriam she would perform. She takes the packet and goes to deliver it. With this act of humanity and kindness, the story shifts into the final movement of the novel.

In summary, Donatello and Hilda are both transformed and matured. Donatello is brought out of nature into civilization and then is loved by Miriam into a higher moral union. Hilda is saddened by the sin of another and thus enters into the world of society and sin for a short time. She is able to rid her garments of the stain through open "confession" and thus returns back into the higher moral condition of which she has always been a part.
At the end of the novel, Donatello is in prison somewhere and Miriam is doing public penance as she waits for him. This is reminiscent of the ending of Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* where Sonia waits for Raskolnikov, where regeneration takes place in a guilty and confused soul, and where there is a promise of family and hearth. 46 Also at the end Hilda returns with Kenyon to America; she comes down from her tower "to be herself enshrined and worshipped as a household saint, in the light of her husband's fireside" (855). Like Hawthorne and his Sophia and Holgrave and Phoebe, Kenyon and Hilda establish the higher human condition through marriage, a home, and a family. Neither had to sin but both had to suffer somewhat to achieve humanity and this union. Like Matthew and Hannah in "The Great Carbuncle", Kenyon and Hilda maintained transparence and open communication and thereby made their way through society to morality.

Miriam

The third transformation essential for the realization of Hawthorne's view of the higher moral transparency and openness is demonstrated in the life of Miriam. This change is not a question of innocence or virtue but is the shift from the harsh, masculine world of crime, guilt, and oppression to the tender feminine world of love and peace. It is in the characterization of Miriam that Hawthorne is most like George Sand.

Miriam is a dark-complexioned girl whose sorrow-laden and guilty past makes her a strong and tough woman of experience and complexity. Hawthorne likens her to great strong women of the past
like Beatrice Cenci, who killed her father; Jael who drove a nail through the temples of Sisera; Judith who cut off the head of Holofernes; and Cleopatra the dangerous queen. In her life and in her work, Miriam always takes the role of "woman, acting the part of a revengeful mischief towards man" (615). Thus, whenever she sees sorrow portrayed "her whole womanhood was at once awakened to love and endless remorse" (615). She is, of course, completely different from Hilda in all of these traits and we suspect it is the complete polarity of their characters that even makes them friends.

When the murder occurs, Donatello becomes the guilty one and Miriam's feminine needs and instincts begin to come to the fore and her radical feminism recedes. Her eyes told him to kill the monk and she, therefore is responsible for his act. In this time of his special need, she begins to soften, to love, and to become capable of a higher form of maternal sacrifice. Hawthorne says her face took "a higher, almost an heroic aspect, from the strength of passion" (691). This specific moment passes, but Miriam is now woman--maternal and passionate. Kenyon at one point marvels at the change which has come over her: "The sculptor... was startled to perceive how Miriam's rich, ill-regulated nature impelled her to fling herself, conscience and all, in one passion, the object of which intellectually seemed far beneath her" (752). And further, "Kenyon could not but marvel at the subjection into which this proud and self-dependent woman had wilfully flung herself, hanging her life upon the chance of an angry or favorable regard from a person who, a little while before, had
seemed the plaything of a moment" (754). This woman who felt herself a sister to Jael, Judith, Beatrice, and others who were eternally at war with men is now in willing subjection to the least of men. She had found love and sacrifice: "'Ah, I could help him here! . . . And how sweet a toil and bend and adapt my whole nature to do him good! To instruct, to elevate, to enrich his mind with the wealth that would flow in upon me, had I such a motive for acquiring it'" (753).

When Kenyon first meets her in secret in the marble chapel at Monte Beni, she is pale and feeble and seems in need of his physical assistance. When Kenyon asks what is the disorder, she replies, "'There is none that I know save too much life and strength, without a purpose for one or the other. It is my too redundant energy that is slowly--or perhaps rapidly--wearing me away, because I can apply it to no use'" (751). Like Hester Prynne in The Scarlet Letter who tucks her beautiful femininity and maternal power up under her bonnet and hides it deep from the gaze of public eyes, Miriam's womanhood withers and dries up when it is not needed and responded to. When Kenyon tells her that Donatello loves and needs her, "It was strange to observe the womanly softness that came over her. . . . The cold, unnatural indifference of her manner, a kind of frozen passionateness which had shocked and chilled the sculptor, disappeared. She blushed, and turned away her eyes, knowing that there was more surprise and joy in their dewy glances than any man save one ought to find there" (753). After they agree to meet with Donatello in Perugia and as they depart, Miriam's eyes meet Kenyon's and "he was surprised at the new, tender gladness that beamed out of them, and
at the appearance of health and bloom, which, in this little while, had overspread her face" (755). This new bloom leads Kenyon to say, "'... you are still as beautiful as ever..." (755).

When the meeting at Perugia does take place between Donatello and Miriam, she is "the beautiful woman" (776) and her feminine gifts are accepted. She is now capable of sacrifice and love, and thus she begins to create with Donatello the higher maternal and friendship-based love of the higher moral life.

Two Kinds of Higher Moral Love and Life

The last point to be made here on the higher moral condition portrayed in The Marble Faun is that Hawthorne, like Rousseau, saw more than one mode of life in the higher moral state. Donatello and Miriam will not be "happy" and carefree. As Kenyon tells them as they "wed" before the bronze pontiff, their union "is for mutual support; it is for one another's final good; it is for effort, for sacrifice, but not for earthly happiness... And if, out of toil, sacrifice, prayer, penitence, and earnest effort towards right things, there comes, at length, a sombre and thoughtful happiness, taste it, and thank Heaven!" (776) We see their love grow as we also watch their trouble increase until he is arrested and she left alone to pray and hope. But never do we feel that either would have been better off without the experience of that murder and gloom since neither even in their adversity when they are joined together lament their fate. Similar to Rousseau's Réveries du promeneur solitaire and Hawthorne's "Feathertop," this basic love unit of Donatello and
Miriam is one of isolation and alienation. Unlike the others, of course, this life in the higher state is blessed with the union of two and promises some hope of family and hearth in the future.

Kenyon and Hilda in their love and marriage demonstrate another mode of life in the higher moral state which is directly similar to George Sand's portrayal of Bernard and Edmee. Kenyon realizes the prize he is winning as Hilda's affection for him grows and as she becomes dependent on him. He is willing to sacrifice for her and when she denies the idea of Donatello's rise and the idea of evil mixed with good, he quickly and easily demurs to what she sees as righteousness. When he finds the statue of Venus and says, "I seek for Hilda, and find a marble woman!", the meaning is only made clear a few paragraphs later when Hawthorne says, "He could hardly, we fear, be reckoned a consummate artist, because there was something dearer to him than his art; and, by the greater strength of a human affection, the divine statue seemed to fall asunder again, and become only a heap of worthless fragments" (834). He came seeking precious Hilda and found merely a Venus. Hawthorne seems to agree with Kenyon's sacrifice of his art to his love. At the end of the novel Kenyon gives himself to her entirely and says to her, "...lonely as I live and work, I have neither pole-star nor light of cottage-windows here below, to bring me home. Were you my guide, my counsellor, my inmost friend, with that white wisdom which clothes you as a celestial garment, all would go well. O Hilda, guide me home!" (855). As "guide," "counsellor," and "friend" Hilda is cast in the role of mother and friend, thus establishing their love on the higher moral
level of the divine that George Sand so firmly desired.

All four characters, Kenyon included, undergo moral transformations which enable them to live a higher moral law. When these transformations are complete, the two couples, in bonds of love and/or marriage live in the higher state of nature. This is the meaning in The Marble Faun, in the Contrat Social and Réveries du promeneur solitaire, and in Mauprat.
CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and George Sand wrote novels and stories which demonstrate the moral innocence and transparency and open communication of life in the state of nature. Children like Petit-Pierre in Sand's La Mare au Diable and Little Annie in "Little Annie's Ramble" and old people like Gaffer Patience in Mauprat and Old Venner in The House of the Seven Gables live this innocent, a-moral condition. Even men and women can retain their innocence and crystal openness and live in this state. Germain and Marie in La Mare au Diable, Phoebe and Holgrave in The House of the Seven Gables, and Émile and Sophy in Émile are excellent examples of couples who can live alone, apart from others, yet together. It is possible in this world to be pure and innocent and to live a happy, simple, natural life as individuals or as couples.

Further, as synthesists and realists, Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand created stories which embodied the destructive influences of human deceit, materialism, and moral opacity in society or the social state. Characteristic of their portrayals of life in this state of war is an unstable and tension-filled triangle of men and women. We see these triangles and this destruction in novels such as La Nouvelle
Héloïse where M. d'Étanges and Wolmar struggle with Julie and Saint-Preux; The Scarlet Letter where Roger, Hester, and Arthur conflict and destroy; and Jacques with Jacques, Fernande, and Sylvia all in destructive competition with each other. In each instance the intrusion of the third person upsets the relations between the two people in the basic love couple, and the result is the destruction of family, of hearth or home, and of fulfilling human relations. Unlike many of the novelists of the Sentimental Tradition who use these triangles for plot and intrigue, these three authors used this tripartite configuration to focus on the human disaster that follows human denial and opacity. As Humanists, these three authors located the essential moral destruction of society in the male-female and family-home relations. When opacity and non-communication come between lover, husbands and wives, sons and daughters and parents, then tragedy occurs.

The completion of their moral synthesis and vision is contained in the third state of human relations and moral conditions: the higher moral state. Once men and women have become social or have fallen into the values and modes of the world of men, they must struggle to ascend about that world. As they do so and attain a higher moral capacity, they return to the transparency and open, honest communication which characterized the state of nature. Further, as the other two states are real and observable in this world, so also the higher moral state is possible now. With some characters like Rousseau's Solitary in the Réveries of promeneur solitaire,
Hawthorne's Feathertop, and Miriam and Donatello in *The Marble Faun* the struggle out of the trap created by the laws of men is painful and isolated; with other characters such as those citizens Rousseau envisioned in the *Contrat Social*, Sand's Bernard and Edmee Mauprat, and Hawthorne's Matthew and Hannah in "The Great Carbuncle" and Kenyon and Hilda in *The Marble Faun* there is moral transformation and regeneration and happiness. For all three authors the images of the statue which had been defaced and disfigured by time and the world is the embodiment of the central idea of this state of higher morality. Under the guidance of a wise tutor or woman or because of love and human friendship, the opaque statue of man can be cleansed, raised, and ennobled.

Thus we might say that whatever the direct influences may have been among Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand (and I have shown that such influences did exist), in their need to make a synthesis, to see from a moral perspective, and to focus on the humanity of men and women, these authors are surprisingly similar. In addition, when American scholars take Sand and Rousseau as seriously as they do Hawthorne and study the texts of all three carefully, they will see similarities of images (masks, veils, crystals, light), of character relations (basic love couples and the destructive triangles), and of attitudes (toward society, nature, love, friendship) that must be taken more seriously than has been the case in the past.

This dissertation was written to demonstrate the legitimacy of relating Rousseau, Hawthorne, and Sand. Future scholarship is
certainly needed to do more with why these similarities exist, why Rousseau has been ignored so in American culture scholarship, why Sand had such an impact on American intellectuals and writers in the 1840's, and why Hawthorne found Rousseau a subject of life-long interest. A careful study of George Sand's works in general is desperately needed as is a complete and balanced analysis of La Nouvelle Héloïse. These are the tasks ahead.
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