

The Demise of Romance under Patriarchy: Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*

SASAKI, Eitetsu

Introduction

I. Attempt to Restore the Shaken Patriarchy

II. Politics of Sexuality

III. Hawthorne Trapped in the Gender System

Conclusion

Introduction

In the denouement of *The Marble Faun* (1860), Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-64) marries Kenyon, the American sculptor temporarily living in Rome, to Hilda, the innocent American painter and copyist of maestros. Probably compelled by his own bent for patriarchy and stance for the binary gender system, the author expressly promises Kenyon the status of patriarch in the middle-class family,¹ a position that presumably assures the male of his normative heterosexually-based gender.² To make things doubly sure, Hawthorne forcibly and unmistakably hetero-sexualizes the two genders, male and female, by making Kenyon say, “I am a man, and, between man and man, there is always an insuperable gulf. They can never quite grasp each other’s hands; and therefore man never derives any intimate help, any heart sustenance, from his brother man, but from woman — his mother, his sister, or his wife” (285).³

From a feminist viewpoint, the ideologies of gender and identity, inseparably entwined, were the foundation stones shaping modern Euro-American society (Cohen 171). The gender difference between male and female helped reinforce the patriarchic ideology in capitalistic modern society, an ideology established by the Anglo-Saxon middle-class men who dominated mid-nineteenth-century America. The gender-related ideology of the day, as Charles E. Rosenberg postulates (131-53), could have been established on the assumption that one can

keep sexual continence, in other words, that one can keep one's libidinous nature inconspicuous. Conspicuous corporeality was (and still has been and will be) something to be hidden and something incompatible with the social code established by the gentrified middle class. As this paper will later show, the near-elderly author of *The Marble Faun*, a man who, according to Walter T. Herbert, already occupied the status of patriarch, both publicly as a canonical writer and Liverpool consul and domestically as a breadwinner for a wife and three children, incorporated too much corporeality within Kenyon, the protagonist of the romance, *The Marble Faun*. Interestingly, this, in turn, jeopardized the author's own apparently gentrified and normative (i. e., heterosexually oriented) patriarch identity. One suspects that this may partly explain why *The Marble Faun* had to be Hawthorne's last romance. By focusing on Hawthorne's approach in building up the identities of the (semi-)protagonists, this paper will elucidate a gender mechanism that is fortified by the author himself and the author's artistic view, yet victimizing to the author.

I. Attempt to Restore the Shaken Patriarchy

Hilda, the innocent American girl in self-apprenticeship to the painting maestros, is drawn to a work possibly painted by Guido Reni (1575–1642), a portrait of the scandal-ridden Beatrice Cenci (1577–99), an Italian noblewoman who was beheaded for killing her father (putatively a sexually abusive one). On showing the copy of Beatrice Cenci to Miriam, the young half-Jewish Italian painter, Hilda is “startled to observe that her friend's expression had become almost exactly that of the portrait” (67). Hilda senses that Miriam, whose features are reminiscent of Beatrice's, may intend to do the exactly the same thing as Beatrice. As it turns out, Miriam kills a mysterious stalker, Brother Antonio, a monk who, despite his old age and holy orders, is actually engaged to become her husband. In a word, she kills a man with qualification as a patriarch, with the status of either father (though suspicious) or husband to-be. Interestingly, Brother Antonio is also the man who poses for Miriam's paintings, the simply monikered “Model” in the story. Hilda holds a conceit that “Beatrice's expression, seen aside and vanishing in a moment, had been depicted in *her own face* [italics added],” and here the narrator quickly interpolates, “nor was it without horror” (205).

Through the alter ego symbolized by (Gido's picture of) Beatrice Cenci, Hilda merges and becomes identical with Miriam, in spite of the decided differences between the two. Though raised in Puritan America, the innocent Hilda worships the Virgin Mary, and becomes true to her name, Hilda evoking St. Hilda, the founding abbess of the monastery at Whitby. What's more, she shows loyalty to the great (male) masters of Italian art as a filial disciple, thus proving herself to be a supporter of the existent patriarchy. Contrariwise, the sexually mature Miriam, offensive in her arrogant words and deeds, is emboldened enough to commit parricide. Two who begin as complete opposites reverse themselves into entities similar to each other.

What confounds the problem is the omnipresence of Beatrice's portraits: "Everywhere we see oil-paintings, crayon-sketches, cameos, engravings, lithographs, pretending to be Beatrice" (65). *Beatrice* exponentially duplicates itself/herself in the form of copies or crones. In doing so, she overwhelms the market with kitsch, and by extension the world of fine art, the patriarchic world dominated by a limited number of male authorities. *Beatrice* replaces the original work, dethroning the authority of the father/creator (the painting maestro, Guido Reni). Moreover, the doppelganger phenomenon invalidates the concept of identity and disintegrates the binary hierarchic system, including the hierarchy of gender. Once the hierarchy topples down, the clones begin to compete for hegemony, reaping an endless cycle of reciprocal violence and chaos. The order established under the patriarchy might indeed have been a distorted one, yet even this distorted order is better than chaos, in a way. Julia Kristeva (67-95), the feminist-minded psychoanalyst, is right in saying that a diabolical chaos comes into being after the patriarchic order is displaced.

Hawthorne wrote *The Marble Faun* in mid-nineteenth-century America, a setting where white-collar Anglo-Saxons managed to accommodate themselves to capitalistic society. In coping with their capitalistic society, Americans built up the modern nuclear family, the family as a microcosm of the hierarchy based on the gender binary system, where men worked outside of the home and women stayed indoors to take care of their husbands and children. Hawthorne, it seems, was so deeply obsessed with the myth of Beatrice Cenci, he may even have feared the possibility of patricide and its consequence, the annihilation of the whole gender-based social system. To cope with the possible disaster to come,

the author/father attempts, from his position as a maneuverer of text, to introduce into the fictional world what the anthropologist René Girard refers to as the “ritual.” The ritual sacrifice concentrates all the defilements on the particular individual, momentarily erasing the possibility of chaos in the community/text, and thus helping maintain the communal/textual order. Girard points out that a lynching by a unanimous crowd of a community is a concrete example of a ritual. As a matter of fact, several passages of *The Marble Faun* depict cinder-box scenarios: gathering mobs are heated by mounting internal pressures to almost the explosion point, the point of actual lynching. The government recognized that the carnival spree might escalate into commotion, and commotion, into lynching: “the government seemed to imagine that there might be excitement enough, (wild mirth, perchance, following its antics beyond law, and frisking from frolic into earnest,) to render it expedient to guard the Corso with an imposing show of military power” (441). Girard argues that a lynching by a primitive community always involves an oedipally related issue with the potential to trigger chaos, such as infanticide, incest, and patricide. Oedipal fear drives the mob to unanimously consent to the sacrifice of a scapegoat. Intriguingly, an oedipal problem is also at work in *The Marble Faun*. This is the problem of Miriam (contrasted with the incest-committing parricidal Beatrice Cenci) and Donatello, the perpetrator who acts out Miriam’s criminal intent to kill a sacred being—a monk, Brother Antonio, Miriam’s model, the so-called “Model,” ambiguously identifiable as either Miriam’s fiancé or her father. Girard goes on to demonstrate that the scapegoat chosen is to be one who stands at the fringes of the community, who stays both inside and outside the community, who appears both similar to and different from the normal community members because he is assigned sacred and/or unsacred attributes—the being distant from the other community members in terms of his (un)sacredness, aloofness, untouchability, monstrosity, and deformity. Two characters qualify as candidates for scapegoat in *The Marble Faun*; namely, Brother Antonio and Donatello. Here I will focus on the latter.

Kenyon, Miriam, and Hilda suspect that “two ears. . .” “leaf shaped, terminating in little peaks, like those of some species of animals” (10), are probably hidden in Donatello’s curly hair. These pointed ears, bestial reversion (Dijkstra 210–34), make Donatello the most suitable candidate as victim to the unanimous lynching. Donatello, it must be recalled, is compared to the *Faun* carved by

the 4th Century BC sculptor Praxiteles, the marble image with “a fuller and more rounded outline, more flesh, and less of heroic muscle, than the old sculptors were wont to assign to their types of masculine beauty” (8-9). The hermaphroditism in the statue and in Donatello deviates and disturbs the gender category of the patriarchic paradigm, making it easier to victimize Donatello in the lynching ritual.

After fully prearranging the lynching ritual for the very purpose of restoring the patriarchic order, the author inadvertently shatters this initial arrangement. He opens the door to this catastrophe chiefly by forcing the ritual to thrust out into the world of text just when the crowds are reveling in the carnival. Lynching, an act performed to reinstate the patriarchic/hierarchic order, is out of harmony with the carnival and its function (according to Mikhail Bakhtin) of de-hierarchizing the existent order, including gender. With its excessive, and therefore vulgar, sexual power, the carnival embarrasses the gentrified author and nullifies his sexuality-regulating authorial/patriarchic power. “Five strapping damsels . . . so, at least, their petticoats bespoke them” (445), appear to instigate the mock-lynching. Shamelessly, they display “an awful freedom in the flourish of their legs,” and push their sexuality into the public view. Needless to say, sexuality was something to be concealed in accordance with the middle-class gender-norms of the nineteenth century. Taking advantage of this carnivalesque atmosphere, one of the monstrous transvestites approaches Kenyon along the street: “a gigantic female figure, seven feet high, at least, and taking up a third of the street’s breadth with the preposterously swelling sphere of her crinoline skirts” (445-46). “[D]rawing” a phallic “huge pistol,” [s]he [the transvestite] “took aim right at the obdurate sculptor’s [Kenyon’s] breast, and pulled the trigger” (446). Thus, the symbolic homosexual rape is perpetrated. In this hilarious merrymaking fraught with grotesque sexuality, it is not Donatello, but Kenyon, who is chosen as the victim of the lynching ritual. Kenyon, the victimizer, is victimized.

II. Politics of Sexuality

By the time he published *The Marble Faun*, the author was established as a male canonical writer in the androcentric society of the Anglo-Saxon middle class. It would not be off the mark to suggest that he invested the qualification

of patriarchic status in the American sculptor Kenyon. To secure this qualification, the author paradoxically threw Kenyon into an insecure condition. Hawthorne adopted a roundabout way: inserting the “*other*” being, the being threatening to Kenyon (as well as to Hawthorne himself). This is effective because if the author could endow the “*other*” being with a power comparable or even superior to that of the male artist, either Hawthorne or Kenyon, then the male artist could be expected to defensively react to the emergent *other* and paradoxically make himself more dynamic, flexible, and even resilient. In the minds of Hawthorne and Kenyon, the *other being* in question is Miriam, the female painter who draws “[o]ver and over again . . . the idea of woman [Judith, Salome, and Jael], acting the part of a revengeful mischief towards man”; or draws “these stories of bloodshed, in which woman’s hand was crimsoned by the stain” (44). Hawthorne pits himself and Kenyon against Miriam to arrange homosocial alliance and makes Kenyon choose, of all men, Donatello, the handsome and yet monstrous androgynous, and therefore the possible prey to the ritual sacrifice. The two male artists, Hawthorne and Kenyon, expect Donatello to play a role other than victim, i. e., the role of a partner in homosocial alliance. Here lies the reason, it seems, for the failures of Hawthorne and Kenyon to reinstate the patriarchic order.

The Darwinism-influenced intelligentsias and painters of the nineteenth century quibbled that they could join hands with “musclemen of physical action so that they could scale the heights of evolution” (Dijkstra 204), because “the young, fully grown male, the ‘blond god,’ his lingering freshness enhanced by muscular development and physical strength . . . seemed . . . the personification of the magnificent, aggressively evolving mind of men” (Dijkstra 200). In three respects, Hawthorne’s depiction of Donatello suggests that Hawthorne approved of this logic. First and foremost, “[s]o full of animal life as he was, so joyous in his deportment, so handsome, so physically well-developed, [Donatello] made no impression of incompleteness, of maimed or stunted nature” (14). Setting aside the question of his seemingly underdeveloped intellect, Donatello is depicted as a flawless, handsome young man. Secondly, the emotionally and intellectually immature half-god and half-beast Donatello gains, by committing homicide, the promise of metamorphosis into an intellectually grown man [adult male] through *felix culpa* (happy fault), just as Cain, the ancestor of men in the

Old Bible, becomes a killer ironically qualified, in Dijkstra's words (200), for "the personification of the magnificent, aggressively evolving mind of men." Finally, Donatello is the most suitable partner for Kenyon in the male-to-male alliance.

In fact, the safe haven into which Donatello secludes himself from the overwhelming sexuality shedding from Miriam is a phallic tower. His tower, "evidently a stronghold of times long-past," is endowed with a "battlemented and machicolated summit" (215). Here I should add, incidentally, that the author unnaturally stresses the unaffordability of the emotional support from the male-to-male companionship. This should be construed as a deliberate defensive strategy by which Kenyon (and Hawthorn) evade(s) being chosen as a prey to the lynching ritual in the *apparently* hetero-sexual and homophobic patriarchic society. Hawthorne's strategy stands to reason, as what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick specifies as homosocialism, or the male-to-male alliance, is arranged exclusively for reinstating patriarchy and assuring profit for privileged men. Afraid that women would claim the same rights enjoyed by propertied men, the nineteenth-century male intelligentsia expected the golden-haired, and blue-eyed male god from the long bygone days of ancient Greece (Praz 235), to push women back into their own exclusively allotted realm, their homes. In *The Marble Faun*, Hawthorne expects Donatello to meditate upon Miriam, the artist who renders, in her own sketches of "domestic and common scenes" (45), a figure whose face and form have "the traits of Miriam's own," a figure who "peeped between the branches of a shrubbery, amid which two lovers sat . . . look[ed] through a frosted window, from the outside, while a young wedded pair sat at their new fireside within . . . and gazed at a scene of humble enjoyment by a cottage door" (46) — a figure excluded from the domestic realm. Hawthorne expects Donatello to punish, if necessary, the undomestic Amazonian woman [Miriam] for killing the father figure and unleashing chaos in the patriarchic society. Hawthorne entrusts this indispensable mission to Donatello, the half-god and half-beast, or the Faun-like young man falsely similar to and easily (mis)taken for the handsome Greco-Roman god Apollo, the god of reason, the dominator of patriarchic Western Civilization. This young Faun "consorted so familiarly of old" with "Bacchus" (78), who unashamedly throws everything into a state of utter confusion. Bacchus, the Roman god of wine and intoxication, one and the same as Dionysus, the Greek

deity, who appears in Euripides's tragedy, *The Bacchae*. In this story, Pentheus tries to capture Dionysus, but the latter orders his ardent female worshippers (the Bacchantes) to tear the former from limb to limb. This suggests that Miriam, as Donatello's putative lover, an analog of the female Dionysus-worshippers, has the capacity to do to Kenyon just what the Greek women do to Kenyon's counterpart, Pentheus. In fact, Donatello leaves Kenyon to successfully reunite with Miriam and reconfirm their love, though it be a love impermissible in the homosocial community or male-centric interest group.

Donatello has committed a taboo in society, a society with which the author has become so obsessed, he harshly condemns the aloof artists for alienating themselves from the common run of the people. To be precise, the society in question is androcentric or homosocial. In the homosocial society, the society with pretended heterosexuality, where men are supposed to restrain women from upgrading their social status beyond that of a consolidating medium between men and men, Donatello breaks the tacit agreement by giving Miriam unrestricted love, allowing her to act without reservation, i. e., to freely draw pictures of revenging female biblical figures, subjects only male artists are allowed to choose. Donatello also grants Miriam the power to emotionally and spiritually educate him.

Now that we have attributed the cause of Kenyon's/Hawthorne's failures in reinstating the homosocial patriarchy to Donatello's desertion of the male side [Kenyon] to the female side [Miriam], we will closely observe how Miriam brings Donatello over to her side and inspect the extent to which Miriam's artistic stance is politically imbued. When the statue of Venus is dug out from the excavation site of the old tomb, Miriam decisively evaluates the statue as "a far truer image of immortal womanhood than the poor little damsel at Florence, world-famous though she may be" (427). Miriam asks Kenyon, pressingly, "Does it frighten you a little" (427)? With this excavated Venus, a statue made by an anonymous artisan, Miriam manages to replace Medici's world-famous Venus in marble. With the very lifelike physicality of the excavated Venus, Miriam searches for the possibility of eroding and overturning the hierarchically ordered realm that men have established as a prerogative, the inorganic realm that the writer Hawthorne lets the sculptor Kenyon represent and protect.

Though full of crumbling clogs, the "soft" and "polymorphous" Venus—to

paraphrase in the imitation of Jane Gallop—demonstrates the organic and viable female corporeality, erodes the masculine order, the order defined as inorganic, stable, unchanging, and therefore inflexible. “Soft” and “polymorphous” mean an unstable (unfixable) identity, disloyal to the identity/name imposed by the father/male. It is this ambiguous identity that threatens to resist the patriarchy. To put it crudely, Miriam opens a vulva-like cleft (“lovely crevice of the lips” (424) if you will) in the erect phallus and makes a beginning for a collapse of the rigid patriarchy. She proves female sexuality to be scary, wresting Donatello from Kenyon with her female affection and sexuality, opening up a crack in the apparently monolithic homosocial alliance between the two men—the alliance, strong and *marblelike* as it may first appear. In her own picture, Miriam tries to express threatening female sexuality or what is *lacking* in the archangel [St. Michael] from the picture drawn by the canonical male artist Guido Reni.

In Reni’s drawing of St. Michael fighting Satan, Satan’s face happens to be reminiscent of Miriam’s demoniac father/husband to-be. Herein lies the possibility of two mergers: Miriam with Michael, and her father/Model with the Devil. With “wild energy” that “astonish[es]” Kenyon (184), Miriam asserts that she would draw St. Michael in a way completely different from Guido Reni’s. She would sexualize St. Michael’s neuter feature, the feature with “a dainty air of a celestial society” (184), into the frightening Amazonian: “His sword should be streaming with blood, and perhaps broken half-way to the hilt; his armor crushed, his robes rent, his breast gory; a bleeding gash on his brow, cutting right across the stern scowl of battle!” (184). In making this statement, Miriam seems to be provoking and declaring war on Kenyon. In the face of the man [Kenyon] suffering from the narcissistic castration complex, Miriam boldly thrusts the very objects of his terror, namely, the cleft of Venus [literally the female genitalia], the scar of castration, and the blood associated with menstruation, rape, and violence.⁴ Without saying, Miriam’s tactics of re-drawing/re-sexualizing the classic art work might be instantly used by men for a purpose contrary to what she has intended, and cycled into pornography. According to Susan Griffin (1), pornography here can be understood not so much as an expression of eros or love of the living person with his or her entire body and spirit; but as an expression of the covert criminal intent, denying female wholesome sexuality, silencing its voice, mutilating the female corporeity, and zooming

onto specific parts such as breast, thighs, buttocks, and labia.

III. Hawthorne Trapped in the Gender System

Miriam's declaration of war against patriarchy might foretell a severe gender war forthcoming. The author, however, does not dare to allow Kenyon to face, as male warrior, the female warrior Miriam in hand-to-hand battle, in a close contest between two parties endowed with subjectivities and sexualities. Virtually, the battle is as good as settled, given the author's decision in favor of Kenyon. To a certain extent, Kenyon's victory is attributed to the dubious allure, the allure exuded from the androgynous Donatello. Until he betrays Kenyon by going over to Miriam, Donatello takes priority over Miriam in the eyes of Kenyon. As Kenyon sees it, Donatello's androgynous appeal is preferable to the passionate power of the sexually mature Miriam. This preference is so strong, there appears to be no room left in the patriarchic hierarchy for the vivifying female sexuality to break into.

In the nineteenth century, a woman's history was only attested to in connection to father, husband, and brothers. As such, women were to be sexually and corporeally defined as socially dead. To bury the troublesome woman alive, Hawthorne imposes a so-called Orientalism upon the half-Jewish Miriam, forcibly confining her into the categories of harlot, Virago, and the racially other being, Cleopatra. The author has Kenyon carve Cleopatra, a statue somehow suggestive of Miriam, with her (Cleopatra's/Miriam's) "fierce, voluptuous, passionate, tender, wicked, terrible [sexuality]" incarcerated in marble (127): "she [Cleopatra] might spring upon you like a tigress, and stop the very breath that you were now drawing, midway in your throat," but "[t]he repose, no doubt, was as complete as if she were never to stir hand or foot again" (126). Kenyon confines Miriam into the marble statue, and thus metaphorically degrades her to the status of a dead body without spirit. Kenyon denies the subjectivity of the assertive woman.

The mature female sexuality of which Miriam boasts is contrastive to the innocence, childishness, and fastidiousness—such banal features as Hilda represents. Hilda, bold enough not to conceal her Puritan identity, bluntly asserts to the face of the Catholic priest of St. Peter's Basilica, "I am of New England birth, and was bred as what you call heretic" (358). Interestingly, this Puritan girl

adores Virgin Mary and even insinuates an upcoming conversion to Catholicism. Alone in a tall tower whence she can look down at secular activities, Hilda has come to resemble an ethereal Maria in her own body. To the eyes of Kenyon and Hawthorne, there should never be anything suggestive of sensuousness in the slender girl Hilda, the girl whom Miriam teases: “What a hermitage you have found for yourself, dear Hilda! . . . You breathe sweet air, above all the evil scents of Rome; and even so, in your maiden elevation, you dwell above our vanities and passions, our moral dust and mud, with the doves and the angels for your nearest neighbors” (53). Hilda is changed into an angel-like being, or reduced into the “Angel in the domestic Eden” to be fetishized by the nineteenth-century middle-class ideology, the ideology complementary to the undisguised misogynous ideology where Miriam is petrified into the marble statue of Cleopatra, goddess-like, but punishable in the eyes of men in Western Civilization.

Thus, the author does not let Kenyon directly confront Miriam in the gender battle. Instead, he dispatches Hilda to the war front and stubbornly follows the trace of the imagined conflict between the two women, Hilda, the chaste wife to-be for Kenyon, and Miriam, the patricidal prostitute, in a strategy of “Divide and Rule.” Herein lies the reason why the author/the sculptor [Hawthorne/Kenyon] tries, by all means necessary, to stop Hilda from merging with Miriam through the mediation of the copy of Beatrice Cenci. Herein lies the reason why the male creator (Hawthorne/Kenyon) is embarrassed to see the copied portrait of Beatrice multiplied everywhere, undermining the authority of Guido Reni, and, by extension, the male canonical artists at large (Hawthorne and Kenyon). Even at the critical moment, when Hilda is abducted by Miriam’s underlings, Hawthorne allows Kenyon to remain an aloof spectator. Hawthorne assumes that, doing nothing at all, Kenyon can calmly stand in an absolutely advantageous position. By indirectly supporting Kenyon, Hawthorne puts the patriarchic discourse into practice.

Indeed, Hawthorne has so far failed in textually reinforcing the patriarchy. The fiascoes we have seen up to this point thwart his plan: Hawthorne abandons Kenyon to the hardship of losing Donatello through Donatello’s defection from the expected homosocial alliance. Hawthorne apparently deserts the sculptor at the hands of the monstrous, pistol-wielding, woman-like being at the carnival scene. There the sculptor could stay as one who belongs to the punishing group,

but contrarily he becomes the punished. Indeed, Hawthorne/Kenyon as patriarch — if called as such — is at the brink of metaphorical death. There remains, however, albeit barely, a last resort for Hawthorne's/Kenyon's survival: his unshakable belief in the binary gender system of the patriarchy.

Deprived of his homosocial partner Donatello by Miriam, Kenyon the sculptor has no choice but to live in the orderly and calm, yet bleak, *marble* world, the world without love, passion, and vivifying sexuality. The best he can do is to take warmth from the fire made by Hilda, his possible wife, the Angel in the domestic Eden to-be, the sexually, inflexible puritan girl who will foreseeably become a passionless or frigid housewife in the future. The author, who homosocially allies himself with Kenyon, and, through this union, (un)successfully redresses the chaos and puts the women under patriarchic control, will have to await and submit to his bleak fate as the price to be paid. To the eyes of the gullible outsiders who knew little about the author, Hawthorne must have appeared to be sailing smoothly. He had succeeded in establishing his status as a canonical writer. He was married to Sophia, a woman who, like Hilda in *The Marble Faun*, was nicknamed "Dove" and praised as a faithful follower of the patriarchy-supporting domestic ideology. By the time Hawthorne was writing his last long romance, *The Marble Faun*, he had come upon success as "the Poet as Patriarch," to borrow the phrase from Walter T. Herbert's *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthornes and the Making of the Middle-Class Family*, and apparently had realized the so-called American Dream. Peculiarly, and socially, he was successful, thanks to President Pierce's appointment of his old friend to the consul in Liverpool. Artistically, his status was confirmed as a canonical writer, and with the new opportunities he was afforded as a consul. During his stay in Europe, the author must have been able to cast off his previous image as the aloof artist, the artist severely faulted for his standoffish attitude. Hawthorne must have been encouraged to start "communicat[ing] with the world" (*Twice-Told Tales*, 58). Because "the world" with which he started "communicating" was a world defined as homosocial and exclusive of women, it follows that Hawthorne was still caged in an autistic sphere. He must have been disinclined to admit to this blunder: had he owned up to this fault, he would be proven inappropriate in the literary stance he had confirmed since his apprenticeship, the platform from which he sternly denounced egocentricity, misogyny, and misanthropy in his fictions, short or long,

early or late (e.g., “The Minister’s Black Veil” (1835), “Young Goodman Brown” (1835), “Ethan Brand” (1850), *The Scarlet Letter* (1850), and *The Blithedale Romance* (1852), to name a few). If he had admitted to this, he would have had to have confessed that he himself embodied the very culprit to be denounced. Refusing to accept defeat graciously, he dragged Kenyon to the postscript of the story and let him pretend not to know the facts concerning Donatello: “I . . . may not tell . . . [o]n that point” (467). He was adamant in avoiding any clarification on “that point”: whether or not Donatello’s ears resemble those of the Faun of Praxiteles; whether or not Donatello is a surviving descendant of the Faun, half-god and half-beast, chaos producing monster, possibly chosen as a victim for the order-reinforcing ritual; whether or not Donatello is different from Apollo, the god of sun/light, representing harmony, order, and reason; and whether or not Donatello is the degenerate being whose irrationality threatens to weaken the homosocial alliance.

Conclusion

Comparing Romanticism with Realism in a treatment of artists ranging from the Romantics (Keats and Hawthorne) through (Neo-) Impressionists (Seurat) and Modernists (Joyce and Picasso) to Pop Artists (Warhol and Lichtenstein), Wendy Steiner defines an art genre of Romance from the perspectives of time and narrativity. Romance, according to Steiner (51), does not depend on self-sufficient narcissism, but on the existence of other beings, on the moment of negotiating with them, and on the possibility of loving them. Involvement in writing Romance allows one (or those around one including one’s partner(s)) to transform one’s (/their) subjectivity (/subjectivities). To a certain extent, the author encouraged Kenyon to accept Miriam’s sexuality, corporeality, and eroticism. Indeed, the author put emphasis on the importance of transforming process, the author deterred the sculptor Kenyon from putting a final touch on the bust of Donatello. Indeed, the author may appear to have obeyed the order of Romance while writing *The Marble Faun*. However, brandishing the gender-norm on his way, he repressed and silenced the love and sexuality in which Miriam takes pride. Hawthorne was terrified by the prospect of an uncontainable, uncontrollable expansion of Miriam’s female sexual power beyond his own textual power. In the text of his own writing, Hawthorne was daunted at what he

brought about: first, the possible chaos (e. g., the parricide committed jointly by Miriam and Kenyon), the chaos indistinguishable from love and fertility; and second, the identity meltdown or the diabolical doppelganger phenomenon (e. g., the merger of the two complete opposite extremes into one, i. e., Hilda and Miriam into Beatrice Cenci whose portraits are continually reproduced). For Hawthorne, an author (mis)led into thinking that he, as he really was, had established the qualification to take on the identity of patriarch of the middle-class family and canonical author, there was no recourse but to entrench himself in the binary gender system and defend it to the death. While so doing, he was unknowingly bound up. Self-destructively, he (de)composed this romance [*The Marble Faun*] to its extreme, putting up a strong resistance to what the sexuality of mature woman brought about, namely, eros, love, and their consequences of transformation and disorder (deconstruction). He found himself stranded and at a loss, with no energy left to enliven himself or to reactivate the potential to keep writing romance. This probably explains why *The Marble Faun* is the last romance Hawthorne could write.

Notes

1. Stuart M. Blumin explains the 18th-to 19th century history of the American white-collar middle class.
2. In European society, the nuclear family began to form from the 1750s, the first decade of rapid population growth, urbanization, and industrialization. In America, the middle class adopted the nuclear family lifestyle during the period of capitalism in the making, between 1815 and 1855.
3. All subsequent references to *The Marble Faun* will be parenthetically included in this thesis. Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Marble Faun*, ed. William Charvat et al., Vol. 4 of *The Centenary Edition* (1660; Columbus; Ohio State UP, 1971).
4. Neil Hertz explains the fear when men witness female genitalia from the Freudian theory.

Works Cited

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *François Rabelais no Sakuhin to Chusei Renaissance no Minshu Bunka*. Trans. Kawabata Kaori. Tokyo: Serika Shobo, 1973.
- Blumin, Stuart M. *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

The Demise of Romance under Patriarchy

- Cohen, Ed. "Are We (Not) What We Are Becoming? 'Gay' 'Identity,' 'Gay Studies,' and the Disciplining of Knowledge." *Engendering Men: The Question of Male Feminist Criticism*. Eds. Boone, Joseph A. and Michael Cadden, New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Coontz, Stephanie. *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families, 1600-1900*. London; New York: Verso, 1988.
- Dijkstra, Bram. *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Gallop, Jane. *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: The Daughter's Seduction*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1982.
- Girard, René. *Boryoku to Seinarumono*. Trans. Yukio Furuta. Tokyo: Hosei UP, 1982.
- . *Mimesis no Bungaku to Jinruigaku: Hutatsu no Tachiba ni Shibararete*. Trans. Toshio Asano. Hosei UP, 1985.
- Griffin, Susan. *Pornography and Silence: Culture's Revenge against Nature*. New York: Harper, 1981.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Marble Faun*. 1860. Vol. 4 of *The Centenary Edition*. Eds. William Charvat et al. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1971.
- . *Twice-Told Tales*. 1837. Vol. 9 of *The Centenary Edition*. Ed. Donald Crowley. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1974.
- . *Mosses from an Old Manse*. 1846. Vol. 10 of *The Centenary Edition*. Eds. Bill Ellis and Claude M Simpson. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1974.
- . *The Snow-Image, and Other Twice-Told Tales*. 1852. Vol. 11 of *The Centenary Edition*. Eds. Bill Ellis and Claude M Simpson. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1974.
- Herbert, Walter T. *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthorns and the Making of the Middle-Class Family*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
- Hertz, Neil. "Medusa's Head: Male Hysteria upon Political Pressure." *Representations* 4 (1983): 27-54.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Kyohu no Kenryoku. Abjection Shiron*. Trans. Masao Edagawa. Tokyo: Hosei UP, 1984.
- Praz, Mario. *Nikutai to Shi to Akuma: Romantic Agony*. Trans. Tuneo Kurachi. Kokusho Kanko Kai, 1986.
- Rosenberg, Charles E. "Sexuality, Class, Role." *American Quarterly* 25 (1973): 131-53.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- Steiner, Wendy. *Pictures of Romance: Form against Context in Painting and Literature*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

The Demise of Romance under Patriarchy: Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*

SASAKI, Eitetsu

In his last romance, *The Marble Faun*, Nathaniel Hawthorne takes the trouble to force Kenyon to express his heterosexual male identity. Kenyon declares to Miriam thus: "I am a man, and between man and man there is always an insuperable gulf. They can never quite grasp each other's hands; and therefore man never derives any intimate help, any heart sustenance, from his brother man, but from woman—his mother, his sister, or his wife." The author seems, in an affected manner, to obediently follow and simultaneously stress the middle-class gender-norm by compulsively heterosexualizing the relation among the three, Kenyon, Donatello, and Miriam. Yet, Hawthorne unavoidably imports the excessive sexuality into the story and consequently destabilizes the gender system therein. In this thesis, I will clarify how the binary gender system affects Hawthorne's composition of *The Marble Faun* by focusing on how the author configures the gender identities of the characters in the story.

The patriarchic order and the authority have been symbolically undermined in *The Marble Faun* by the omnipresence of multiplicative copies of the parricidal Beatrice Cenci, whose features both the innocent American Puritan girl Hilda and the voluptuous Miriam resemble. By introducing the lynching ritual, the author hopes in vain to reinstate the order. Ironically, Kenyon, the patriarch to-be, is mock-victimized or mock-raped in the chaos of the carnival by the monstrous woman-like but probably male figure.

To offset this failure, Hawthorne squeezes Miriam into the category of the virago, represented by the biblical heroines such as Jael, Judith, and Salome. Theoretically, this manipulation enables Hawthorne to homosocially ally Kenyon (the author's double, in a way) with Donatello, the character whom Hawthorne /Kenyon hopes, in vain, to depict as not just a half-god and half-beast, but as an apollonian god. Yet Donatello's betrayal, his alliance with Miriam, thwarts this

homosocial scheme, as well. Next, Hawthorne pits the two contrastive women, Hilda and Miriam, against each other, to prove that the patriarchy, though under the attack of the Miriam-like woman, has still retained faithful supporters like Hilda, the submissive girl expected to dwell angelically in (the domestic) Eden.

In establishing his own masculinity and protecting his own position as a patriarch in the middle-class family and as canonical/authoritative male artist, Hawthorne has no recourse but to stick to the binary gender system. Ironically, Hawthorne's strategy reveals that his literary stance of "open[ing] an intercourse with the world" is fake and suspicious: "the world" with which Hawthorne and his male characters associate is not totally open, but is a mere homosocially constructed misogynic community. Woman's love, like that of Miriam's, has the potential to break open this homosocial dead end and revivify the artistic genre of romance—the romance that depends on the existence of and contact to the other being, or the romance that relies on the consequent transformation of the parties concerned. Yet Hawthorne does not admit the *other*, the *other* of female sexual maturity.

Obsessed with the seemingly unshakable binary gender system, with the penchant for homosocial alliance, and secretly fearful of female sexual maturity, Hawthorne adopts a defensive strategy for patriarchy. The result is completely opposite to what he intended. The strategy of concreting the patriarchy by fixing the identities ultimately undermines the very basis of *The Marble Faun*, the story to be categorized into romance, the genre that denies both fixation and marble-like concretion. This failure probably prevented the author from writing any more romances.