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This dissertation attempts to demonstrate how Nathaniel Hawthorne's lifelong friendship with Franklin Pierce influenced the author's literary imagination, often prompting him to transform Pierce from his historical personage into a romanticized figure of notably Jacksonian qualities. It is also an assessment of how Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce profoundly influenced a wide range of his work, from his first novel, Fanshawe (1828), to the Life of Franklin Pierce (1852) and such later works as the unfinished Septimius romances and the dedicatory materials in Our Old Home (1863). This dissertation shows how Pierce became for Hawthorne a literary device--an icon of Jacksonian virtue, a token of the Democratic party, and an emblem of steadfastness, military heroism, and integrity, all three of which were often at odds with Pierce's historical character.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship. The chapter also assesses biographical reconstructions of Pierce's character and life.

Chapter 2 addresses Hawthorne's years at Bowdoin College, his introduction to Pierce, and his early socialization.
Chapter 3 demonstrates how Hawthorne transformed his Bowdoin experience into formulaic Gothic narrative in his first novel, *Fanshawe*.

Chapter 4 discusses the influence of the Hawthorne–Pierce friendship on the *Life of Franklin Pierce*, Hawthorne’s campaign biography of his friend. The friendship, the chapter concludes, was not only a context, or backdrop to the work, but it was also a factor that affected the text significantly.

Chapter 5 treats the influence of Hawthorne’s camaraderie with Pierce on the author’s later works, the *Septimius* romances and the dedicatory materials in *Our Old Home*.

Chapter 6 illustrates how Hawthorne’s continuing friendship with the controversial Pierce distanced him from many of the prominent and influential thinkers and writers of the day, including Ralph Waldo Emerson and Elizabeth Palmer Peabody.

Chapter 7 offers a final summation of the influence of Pierce on Hawthorne’s art and Hawthorne’s often tenuous role as political artist. Finally, the chapter shows how an understanding of Hawthorne’s relationship with Pierce enhances our perceptions of Hawthorne as writer.
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CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW OF THE HAWTHORNE-PIERCE FRIENDSHIP

"It is a pity that I am not in a situation to exercise my pen in your behalf."

--Hawthorne, in a letter to Pierce, June 28, 1832

A summary of the friendship that Nathaniel Hawthorne maintained with Franklin Pierce from 1821 to 1864 reveals how intertwined the lives of the two men were, in spite of the differences in their personalities and careers. From Hawthorne's arrival at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine, in 1821, to his death on May 19, 1864, at the Pemigewasset House inn in Plymouth, New Hampshire, the two men enjoyed an intimate friendship that was based on lengthy visits, candid conversations, sincere correspondence, and mutual support and admiration. Hawthorne's respect, love, and frequent idealization of Pierce remained unshaken throughout his life, distressing many among the liberal New England literati (including Ralph Waldo Emerson, Ellery Channing, James Russell Lowell, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, Charles Eliot Norton, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and even Hawthorne's publisher, James T. Fields) while impressing others (Annie Fields and Horatio Bridge, for instance). Hawthorne's adulation of Pierce is evident in his inclusion of Pierce on lists of persons whom he designated to receive copies of his works immediately after they were
printed. These lists also included the likes of Washington Irving, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Emerson, Herman Melville, and Oliver Wendell Holmes. Unlike Melville, whose friendship with Hawthorne cooled after 1852 and was never to achieve the same intensity, Pierce remained an influential person in Hawthorne’s life and career, serving as friend, fellow Democrat, and, often, subject for the author’s art.

Who, then, was Franklin Pierce, and what was it about his demeanor, character, and career that appealed to Hawthorne? To answer this question, a brief historical summary of Pierce’s life is necessary.

In a letter written to a friend in the summer of 1847, Pierce, a brigadier-general in the army newly arrived in Vera Cruz to participate in the controversial Mexican War, emphasized the physical and psychological stress associated with his predicament. “Although but a few months in the service,” the forty-two year old Pierce wrote, “I know what is fatigue, anxiety, and exposure” (Scott 140). The phrase—a casual, almost marginal expression in a letter that often candidly reflects the writer’s well-being and emotional bearing—indicates Pierce’s acknowledgment of the effects of tension on his situation. Pierce’s statement foregrounds the impact that tension, contradiction, and political sectionalism would have on his presidency and the formation of his political image.

Textual reconstructions of Pierce’s life and career exhibit variance, inconsistency, opposition, and, often, antagonistic
political perspectives, complicating historical reconstruction of Pierce's character for biographers, historians, and students of nineteenth-century American culture. Pierce's affable personality, his conversational and oratorical skills (he surprised his auditors by delivering his inauguration address on March 4, 1853, without notes or a manuscript), his striking looks, and the romantic association of him with his father, Revolutionary War hero and accomplished New Hampshire statesman Benjamin Pierce, impressed many politicians and journalists, as well as members of the general public. In addition, his lifelong devotion to the Constitution, Jacksonian idealism, and the foundational principles of the Democratic party prompted favorable responses from many of his contemporaries (including Hawthorne, Jefferson Davis, and Kansas territorial governor John Geary), biographers (Hawthorne, David Vandewater Golden Bartlett, and others), and voters. On the other hand, criticism of Pierce's character and administrative capability, especially after his nomination as the Democratic presidential candidate in early 1852, has frequently been incisive, harsh, and even devastating. Indeed, Pierce would throughout his life experience the troubling effects of "fatigue, anxiety, and exposure."

Analysis of the diversity, bias, romanticization, and conflict evident in historical accounts of Pierce's life, political and military careers, and presidency promotes the view that both personal and political tensions determined
Pierce's character. These tensions, and the inertia and inconsistency they often effected in Pierce's career, defined to a great extent Pierce's presidency and generated what biographer Roy Franklin Nichols sees as a lasting negative stereotype of Pierce. During his presidency, Pierce was a rigorous adherent to the tenets of Jacksonian democracy, a devout supporter of what he saw as the South's Constitutional right to maintain slavery, and a firm believer in limiting the role of the federal government in influencing states' affairs. This stance was reminiscent of his father's intense opposition to the Federalists. Unfortunately, Pierce, Nichols writes, was "inflexible and incapable of growth" in an era that "encouraged daring and ruthlessness" (FP 545). Pierce's unyielding adherence to the Democratic platform--and to what Larry Gara sees as his "lack of political common sense . . . and [his] simplistic view of sectional differences" (178)--precluded the possibility of his achieving political compromise between the North and the South, a productive relationship with Congress, and success as president.

As biographers and historians have pointed out, Pierce's years at Bowdoin College (1820-1824) illustrate many conflicting elements within his character, foreshadowing many of the tensions that would characterize his adult life. Pierce was sixteen years old when he entered Bowdoin, which, in 1820, notes Richard J. Purcell, "consisted of two box-shaped brick halls, an unpainted and unheated wooden chapel . . . and a limited
library which was opened an hour a day" (134). Like his friend and colleague Nathaniel Hawthorne, who was in the class that followed his, Pierce experienced socialization, competition, and male camaraderie for the first time at college. Pierce's friendship with Zenas Caldwell, with whom Pierce shared a room and at whose home he spent a summer teaching school, proved also influential, as Caldwell, who was a devout Methodist, exemplified to Pierce religious sincerity and integrity.

Historical accounts of Pierce's academic and extracurricular activities at Bowdoin suggest that he had a broad range of interests. He enjoyed fishing, hunting, various team sports, and activities in both the Athenaeum Society and the college military company. David V. Bartlett, who wrote a biography for Pierce's presidential campaign in 1852, writes that Pierce "was not, during his first two years [at Bowdoin], a brilliant scholar, owing to his fondness for society and his high spirits" (23). Pierce commanded the school's first cadet corps, patronized nearby Ward's Tavern (a practice, according to many historians, that was not uncommon among Bowdoin students, despite the school's restrictive codes of behavior), and, later, made great efforts to improve his academic standing. Bartlett's biased and often sentimental biography states that at Bowdoin Pierce established an "honesty of character" (24) and, as a result of his effective declamations before President William Allen and his Bowdoin classmates,
enhanced his ability to make "able and statesmanlike" (Bartlett 61) speeches, a skill he would exhibit throughout his political life. Following his decision to improve his grades (he graduated fifth in a class of fourteen), he displayed the stubbornness and determination in his character that would years later irritate congressmen and Free Soilers. Nehemiah Cleaveland and Alpheus Spring Packard, romanticizing Pierce in their extensive *History of Bowdoin College*, write:

> It is still remembered that [Pierce] was commander of the short-lived and only military company which has ever existed among the students of our college, and that the spirit with which he performed his part fully evinced those predilections and capacities which were afterwards developed on a broader field. (282)

Pierce's brief, energetic confrontation with President Allen concerning the marching of the company in what was for Allen too close a proximity to the president's residence—an event that is discussed in Chapter 3—demonstrates Pierce's inflexibility at a young age.

Pierce's service in the Mexican War (1846-1848) has also been treated by biographers and historians in diverse ways, each version shaped by the writer's purposes and, in some cases, political agenda. The tensions between romanticized, carefully designed accounts (like Hawthorne's, and, to a lesser extent, Bartlett's) that present Pierce as a dedicated and trustworthy soldier-commander and less biased, more accurate accounts are
noticeable. Again, the variety of historical reconstructions suggests the complexities and anxieties that defined Pierce's character. Hawthorne's Pierce, in his *Life of Franklin Pierce* (1852), is a creditable soldier and an effective leader, a product of Hawthorne's skillful and cautious intertwining of historical fact and romantic speculation. Lee H. Warner, noting that in Hawthorne's biography, "the soldier who emerged was an attractive one--if not exactly a hero" (213), writes:

Pierce had to have a sterling military record, especially since he was running against his former commanding officer, a first-rate military man, Winfield Scott. But as is well known (at least to later generations) Pierce's military record was not outstanding . . . Hawthorne faced a dilemma: he could not ignore the Mexican [War] service since Scott was the opposition candidate, and he could not tell the unvarnished truth or it would lose votes for Pierce. In these circumstances some compromises were necessary. (214)

This set of "circumstances" facing Hawthorne forced him to present Pierce, in Warner's view, as a "soldier-Cincinnatus" figure whose "creditable service" illustrates the candidate's "breadth" (220).

Other accounts of Pierce's involvement in the war that reveal a pro-Pierce bias display excessive romanticization and frequently stylized reconstructions of Pierce's actions. These
accounts contrast markedly with Hawthorne's more moderate renditions and, later, more objective views of Pierce's contributions to the war. Less cautious than Hawthorne regarding the war episodes, Bartlett borrows liberally from the conventions of sentimental and romantic literature to depict Pierce as a brave, sacrificing commander who exhibits awe-inspiring administrative skills during battles. Scott E. Casper, detecting in Bartlett's biography "sensational elements of popular fiction" (207), adds:

Examining Hawthorne's biography in relation to Bartlett's reveals that the lesser known author in fact portrayed Pierce more innovatively, connecting the candidate to the popular imagination in the language of popular literary culture and in the well-worn images of Jacksonian political culture. (204)

Clearly, Bartlett's Pierce differs from Hawthorne's Pierce. Bothered by the excessive, sensational quality of Bartlett's text, Pierce, illustrating his political acumen, preferred Hawthorne's less indulgent treatment of his life. Cleaveland and Packard likewise present a romanticized, heroic version of Pierce's service in the controversial war. In the History of Bowdoin College, they depict Pierce as possessing distinctly Jacksonian virtues. They state that he exhibited a "frank and gallant bearing, fascination of manner, genuine kindliness of nature, with entire absence of stateliness and reserve that repel" (283). Pierce, they add, was
actively engaged in the battles of Contreras, Churubusco, and Chapultepec, exhibiting bravery and conduct which were recognized and won respect from older generals of the army. (285)

The suspiciously vague aspect of the passage (Pierce's "bravery and conduct" notably lack specification) vividly contrasts with less subjective, more critical views of Pierce's military record.

Pierce's contradictory attitudes toward war, as recorded in his diaries and correspondence, mirror tensions and inconsistencies that contribute further to the formation of his character. At times, Pierce displays an adamant, heated dislike of war. "'I hate war in all its aspects,'" he writes in his journal at one point. "'I deem it unworthy of the age in which I live and of the Government in which I have borne some part'" (Purcell 136). Contrary to this sentiment is evidence in Pierce's Mexican War journal of a curious, almost morbid fascination with war, conquest, and destruction. Pierce writes during the war (the emphases are his):

"War has been declared, but with all our battles, all our brilliant victories, and the loss of all the valuable lives, War has not yet been prosecuted . . . but from the little I have observed I believe, that it must be before a peace can be 'conquered' . . . ."

(Nichols, FP 156)

Pierce goes on to offer a glamorized (and startlingly barbaric)
view of what type of war is needed to achieve peace in Mexico. He wishes for a war

"as it has actually been carried on, with its fruits and its results—War, that actually carries widespread [sic] woe and desolation [sic] to the conquered and tacitly at least allows pillage and plunder with accompaniments [sic] not to be named during a campaign like this even in a private journal." (Nichols, FP 156)

Pierce thus textualizes what Nichols calls his "confused reactions to his role as invading general" (156). The inconsistency evident in these two views—the tasteful disavowal of war, countered by the fervor for "widespread [sic] woe," "desolation [sic]," and "pillage and plunder" (156)—signifies opposing impulses in Pierce's character.

Pierce's presidential term (1853-1857) has likewise invited disparate treatments in biographies and historical accounts, a variegation that itself parallels the divisiveness and political sectionalism that characterized the nation in the ante-bellum era. Pierce, "caught in a great political reorganization which he did not understand" (Nichols, FP 545), encountered confounding problems during his term. The national political scene was characterized by fragmentation and unrest, as the Democrats, Whigs, Know-Nothings, Know-Somethings, Free Soilers, and Republicans vied for power. This multiple
party system generated sectionalism, rigid partisanship, and a general state of political instability. Pierce's administration seemed only to intensify this divisiveness by passing such legislation as the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. In addition, Northerners criticized Pierce for espousing what they believed to be pro-South policies. Although the Pierce term saw the opening of trade routes with Japan, improved relations with England, and the purchase of the so-called "guano islands," the administration, like the nation as a whole, was beset by internal strife, tense relations between the president and Congress, and an adherence to Jacksonian principles of government that in the mid-1850's were dangerously outdated and unrealistic. Perhaps most significantly, Pierce's presidency was defined by Pierce's attempts at political compromise that were doomed to failure by the forces of political sectionalism, regional paranoia, and Pierce's own mismanagement. Larry Gara writes,

Increasingly, Pierce was perceived as an inept administrator incapable of carrying out his own policies. Just as he had done years before in New Hampshire, he tried to use cabinet members to bring dissenters into line, but the tactic didn't work on the national scene. Many of his early supporters . . . began attacking the administration for
dictatorial tactics and ill-advised rewarding of party traitors. (51-52)

Administrative ineffectiveness, strained relations with Congress, deep suspicions concerning Pierce's abilities to lead, and increased North/South tensions, and not the peaceful compromise Pierce so greatly desired, faced the president who considered "Jacksonian policies of the 1830's a valid guide for the nation in the 1850's" (Gara 80).

Although most accounts of the Pierce presidency assert that Pierce was an unsuccessful president, criticism of him ranges from being sympathetic to indicting. Cleaveland and Packard, displaying a discernible amount of pride in their Bowdoin alumnus, show an awareness of anti-Pierce sentiments while maintaining his good character and sincerity:

However men may differ regarding the policy of his administration . . . there can be no hesitation in ascribing to him high integrity and honor, and in affirming that the dignity and properties of the station [of president] were never more strictly or more gracefully maintained. (286)

Nichols, in *The Democratic Machine: 1850-1854*, offers the view that Pierce, who appeared "pale, careworn, thin, and evidently very nervous" (165) on his arrival in Washington on February 21, 1853, exhibited his flawed capabilities by "consider[ing] simple and apparently real solutions sufficient for complex problems" (221) throughout his presidency. Purcell
cites Pierce's inability to unify the Democratic party (implicating that national political unity was clearly beyond the reach of his administration). He states that the President was seen as "a leader who had assisted in breaking" the Democratic party instead of as a "man whom chance and party rivalries had forced into a great office beyond his capacity" (141). Pierce, then, hampered by political tensions, a laissez-faire approach to administrative strategy, and a naive reliance on Jacksonian ideology, failed to achieve solidarity and a political truce among opposing factions. It is ironic, in hindsight, to note the optimism expressed by Edmund Burke (later a bitter opponent of Pierce's) in a letter he wrote to Pierce after the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore in 1852. On June 5, 1852, Burke wrote to Pierce:

> The scene in the convention was grand--sublime. The cannon has already heralded your success. Mighty destiny, be true to it. . . . The enthusiasm is tremendous. You unite all cliques. (Ray 113)

Pierce's character, as biographical and historical reconstructions suggest, was defined by personal and political tensions, oppositional forces that no doubt helped to create (both during his lifetime and afterwards) the stereotype of Pierce as a weak, hesitant, unrealistic, and, often, confused administrator. The conflicting and frequently discordant treatments of his life, military and political service, and personality illustrate the numerous tensions that promote this
image. Certainly, his administration, often paralyzed by a stubborn president, a fragmented cabinet, and an unrealistic perception of North/South dissension, was not a successful one. However, the forces that opposed him warrant consideration. During the 1850's, the nation became increasingly divided over political issues. The zeal for industrial growth and expansion, intensified by the persistent lobbying activities of such "Young Americans" as Stephen A. Douglas, grew. North/South hostilities increased. Finally, personal hardships—the loss of three young sons, the fragile mental health of his wife, a general dislike of Washington high society, and intemperance—made a profound impact on Pierce, who, writes Nichols, was a "suggestible" (FP 258) individual who "lacked a feeling of self-confidence and was desirous of approbation" (FP 257).

For Hawthorne's active romantic imagination, Pierce was emblematic of patriotism, virtue, and Jacksonian idealism. In a forthright letter to his sister-in-law, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, on July 20, 1863, Hawthorne revealingly summarizes the reasons for his lifelong loyalty to Pierce. (The letter is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.) Responding to Peabody's concerns that his dedication of Our Old Home (1863) to Pierce might subject him to charges of pro-South sentiments and even treason, Hawthorne writes:

Though I differ from him in many respects, I would rather that he should die than change. There is a
certain steadfastness and integrity with regard to a man's own nature (when it is such a peculiar nature as that of Pierce) which seems to me more sacred and valuable than the faculty of adapting one's self to new ideas, however true they may turn out to be.

(CE XVIII: 589-90)

A short history of the friendship between Hawthorne and Pierce illustrates the lasting and significant impression made by this alliance on Hawthorne's literary imagination. "I love him," Hawthorne wrote to Horatio Bridge in October of 1852, "and, oddly enough, there is a kind of pitying sentiment mixed up with my affection for him" (CE XVI: 607). The Hawthorne-Pierce relationship served as a context for many of Hawthorne's writings.

Hawthorne's years at Bowdoin College (1821-1825) were influential ones, for at Bowdoin Hawthorne established relationships with a small circle of individuals that would last well into adulthood and have an effect on his public and private life. Members of Hawthorne's class who would achieve success in their careers, as well as remain on close terms with Hawthorne, included Bridge, Jonathan Cilley (whose biographical sketch Hawthorne later wrote and published in the September, 1838 issue of the Democratic Review), and Longfellow. Pierce served a key role in introducing Hawthorne to politics and the military via membership in the Athenaean Society and the Bowdoin military company, Pierce being an officer in the
latter. Hawthorne's college friendship with Pierce, then, foreshadowed his lifelong involvement in the Democratic party, his association with such literary organizations as the Saturday Club and the Atlantic Club, his socialization in such groups as the Brook Farm commune, and his depiction of military matters and employment of a soldier paradigm in *Fanshawe*, the *Life of Franklin Pierce*, the unfinished romances *Septimius Felton* and *Septimius Norton*, and other works.\(^9\)

If, as Edwin Haviland Miller asserts, the "most meaningful part of Hawthorne's Bowdoin experience was his long-delayed socialization" (68), then Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce played a significant role in admitting him into social and political realms that would affect his thinking and his work for the remainder of his life.\(^10\) As Frank Preston Stearns notes, Pierce, as early as the Bowdoin days, became Hawthorne's "patron and protector" (63).

Pierce introduced Hawthorne to the Athenaean Society at Bowdoin, a literary society that also included Bridge and Cilley. Unlike the other principal literary organization on campus, the Peucinian Society, whose members (including Longfellow) were conservative Whigs who supported John Quincy Adams in the presidential election of 1824, the Athenaeans were progressive Democrats who supported Andrew Jackson. Hawthorne, who in 1833 walked to the outskirts of Salem to join a crowd of people welcoming the visiting Jackson, was a lifelong admirer of Jackson and often reconstructed Pierce as
a person with Jacksonian qualities. Probably because of Pierce's influence and encouragement, Hawthorne served on the standing committee of the Athenaean Society, thus experiencing a type of political service some thirty years before his writing of the Pierce campaign biography and his service as the United States consul at Liverpool.

Hawthorne's involvement in the Bowdoin military company under the direction of Pierce also proved to be a prophetic and influential event. Pierce, who would later serve as a brigadier-general under General Winfield Scott in the Mexican War, exhibited a military and commanding demeanor even in his late teens. Robert Cantwell, noting that Pierce at the time was "seventeen, of middle height, with a fair complexion, light hair, and a military bearing" (63), writes:

To the end of his life Hawthorne could remember Pierce's intense earnestness in drilling his lazy company, the contrast between his youthful appearance and his veteran's airs as he barked out the orders he had learned from his father. (99)

Hawthorne's memories of his brief stint in the Bowdoin cadets would later serve to shape his reconstruction of Pierce and Pierce's father, military hero Benjamin Pierce, in the campaign biography. The military drills, numerous walks in the woods near the college, strolls along the banks of the Androscoggin River, and the occasional revelry at Ward's Tavern on the edge of campus formed memories that Hawthorne would
later draw from in many of his writings.

After graduating from Bowdoin in 1825, Hawthorne did not see Pierce as often, but the two men did maintain their friendship despite the divergence of their career paths. From 1825 until the late 1830's, Hawthorne devoted himself to developing his talents as a writer, completing his derivative first novel, Fanshawe, and numerous tales and sketches. In addition, Hawthorne wrote enthusiastically and prolifically in his journals. Randall Stewart writes that, during this time, Hawthorne saw Pierce infrequently, meeting him in Boston or at Fresh Pond, where on one recorded occasion there was "good cheer." Although, as Hawthorne put it later, their "modes of life had been as different as could be imagined," they always met "on the old ground of friendly confidence." Hawthorne watched with interest and admiration his friend's rapid advancement in public life. (38)

Pierce had indeed obtained great and "rapid" success in politics. Before 1837, he had served as justice of the peace, town moderator of his native Hillsborough, New Hampshire, state representative, speaker of the house, and congressman. In 1837, he was elected to the United States Senate, serving until 1842.

In a letter to Pierce on June 28, 1832, Hawthorne offers an almost prophetic view of the young speaker of the house's future. The letter also testifies to the closeness of the friendship between the two Bowdoin alumni. Congratulating
Pierce on "all [of his] public honours, in possession or in prospect," Hawthorne writes:

I suppose there is hardly a limit to your expectations at this moment; and I really cannot see why there should be any. If I were in your place, I should like to proceed by the following steps,—after a few years in Congress, to be chosen Governor, say at thirty years old,—next a Senator to Congress,—then minister to England,—then to be put at the head of one of the Departments (that of War would suit you, I should think)—and lastly—but it will be time enough to think of the next step, some years hence. You cannot imagine how proud I feel, when I recollect that I myself was once in office with you, on the standing committee of the Athenaeum Society. That was my first and last appearance in public life.

(CE XV: 223)

Of course, the "prospect" that Hawthorne coyly emphasizes by dodging it in an obvious manner (the "next step" referring to the presidency) was achieved by Pierce years later—with the help of Hawthorne, his campaign biographer.

Hawthorne's letter, an early example of Hawthorne's textualization of his friendship with Pierce, reveals traits that would later appear in many texts relating to Pierce: Hawthorne's mock-humility and self-deprecation ("when I recollect that I myself was once in office with you"), his
feigned dislike of politics ("That was my first and last appearance in public life"), and a genuine respect for Pierce. He opens the letter with the salutation, "Dear Mr. Speaker," and in later life would refer to Pierce as "the President" or "the General," using titles rather than Pierce's name to signify admiration and respect. \^{12} Later in the letter, Hawthorne offers a preview of his willingness to use his skills as a writer to assist Pierce's political career. Realizing that Pierce would face "opposition" in his upcoming race for a seat in the New Hampshire legislature, Hawthorne adds:

> It is a pity that I am not in a situation to exercise my pen in your behalf; though you seem not to need the assistance of newspaper scribblers. (CE XV: 224)

Again, self-deprecation (probably inauthentic), a readiness to help Pierce with his writing, and admiration for Pierce are principal elements of the piece, signifiers of Hawthorne's high regard for the future president.

During his residence at the Old Manse in Concord, Massachusetts, from 1842 to 1845, following his marriage on July 9, 1842, Hawthorne invited Pierce to visit with him and Sophia. Pierce, who had not met Sophia Hawthorne, visited the Old Manse for the first time in May of 1845. Pierce was accompanied by Horatio Bridge. Sophia's recollection of the arrival of Pierce and Bridge and her first impression of the friendship between her husband and Pierce reflect the intimacy of the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship. Sophia, as
impressed by Pierce's demeanor as Hawthorne had been at Bowdoin, remembered the day in a letter to her mother:

Mr. Hawthorne was in the shed, hewing wood—Mr. B caught a glimpse [sic] of him, & began a sort of waltz towards him—Mr. P followed, & when they reappeared, Mr. Pierce's arm was encircling my husband's old blue frock—How his friends do love him! . . . [Pierce] called him "Nathaniel," & spoke to him & looked at him with peculiar tenderness.

(Miller 240)

Sophia's insightful observation of the "peculiar tenderness" between Hawthorne and Pierce complements Miller's comment that "Hawthorne commanded incredible loyalty [from lifelong friends like Pierce and Bridge]--and returned it" (2). Correspondence, then, for Hawthorne as well as Sophia, is the primary medium in which their idealization of Pierce is voiced, an idealization that at times approaches infatuation. Oddly enough, in a letter to Bridge on May 3, 1843, two years before Sophia's celebratory treatment of this "peculiar tenderness," Hawthorne exhibits a rare lapse in his fondness for Pierce. He writes to Bridge:

Except yourself, Longfellow is my only college acquaintance about whom I now really care much. Pierce, somehow or other, has faded out of my affections. (CE XV: 688)

This blunt, mysterious passage (one cannot help wondering,
apparently along with Hawthorne, what caused this momentary pause in the friendship) further reflects the nuances of this relationship.

Hawthorne's appointment to the Salem Custom House in April of 1846 was the result of Pierce's interaction in his behalf. Pierce's gesture was further evidence of the loyalty between the two friends, a loyalty that Hawthorne would later express in various prefaces, dedications, and letters. Pierce, a United States senator from New Hampshire at the time, along with Bridge, an officer in the U. S. Navy, and John O'Sullivan, the editor of the Democratic Review, the chief magazine of the Democratic party, worked for almost two years to achieve a governmental position for Hawthorne. Pierce's letters in Hawthorne's behalf to George Bancroft, President James Polk's Secretary of the Navy and "arbiter of patronage in New England" (Stewart 75), are often forceful and impassioned. Seeking the removal of Tyler appointee Benjamin F. Browne from the Salem postmastership to allow Hawthorne to take the post, Pierce wrote to Bancroft:

If Hawthorne is not provided for in some way, it will fill me with regret and I shall never cease to feel that a thing has been omitted that was due from this Administration. (Stewart 76)

As Stewart points out, the "snowball of political influence" (75) that Pierce, Bridge, and O'Sullivan instigated was successful, and again the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship had a
considerable impact on the author's career.

The careers of Hawthorne and Pierce again intersected after Pierce was nominated on the 49th ballot as the Democratic candidate for the presidency by the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore on June 5, 1852. Stewart calls the nomination "a public event . . . which was to affect their future profoundly" (126). Hawthorne received the news of the nomination on June 8, and on June 9 wrote a letter to Pierce in which he offers his services as a campaign biographer. Pierce accepted Hawthorne's offer, and that summer Hawthorne wrote the brief *Life of Franklin Pierce*, a work which presents the most explicit textualization of Hawthorne's idealization of Pierce. Noting Hawthorne's general support of Pierce's political views, Arlin Turner states:

> In writing the campaign biography of his friend Franklin Pierce, [Hawthorne] found it easy to defend Pierce's position of moderation on the issue associated with slavery at the time; he applauded Pierce for recognizing the pledges which the South found in the Constitution and for, in consequence, placing devotion to the Union above "the mistiness of a philanthropic theory." (46)

In the June 9, 1852, letter, Hawthorne's congratulatory tone is clouded by a concern for his friend's welfare. It almost seems that Hawthorne foresees the strife, party divisiveness, and national tensions that would weaken Pierce's administration.
Hawthorne writes:

I hardly know whether to congratulate you; for it would be absurd to suppose that the great office to which you are destined will ever afford you one happy or comfortable moment— and yet it is an end worthy of all ambition, as the highest success that the whole world offers to a statesman. (CE XVI: 545)

In the same letter, Hawthorne balances the sense of dread and awareness of great responsibility with slight humor, adding: "By the by, I suppose we shall soon see numberless engravings of your face" (CE XVI: 546).

Not long after Pierce's election to the presidency in November, 1852, Hawthorne was appointed United States consul to Liverpool and soon began his lengthy stay in England and Italy. Pierce rewarded his friend's loyalty with the most lucrative appointment at his dispensation. The appointment, confirmed by the Senate on March 26, 1853, satisfied two of Hawthorne's pressing needs: the need for financial security for his wife and three children (as well as provide support for his older sister Elizabeth), and the desire to travel abroad. As Stewart writes, Hawthorne "felt his ancestral ties deeply," and the appointment would allow him to "vivify his impressions and make them concrete through the physical senses" (141). Hawthorne's interest in politics and political machinations, despite his frequent efforts to appear as a person removed from politics and political motivations, is
evident in a letter written to his publisher, William D. Ticknor, on March 28, 1853. In the letter, Hawthorne, preparing to go to Washington for the first time to meet with the new president, is greatly concerned with his clothes and expresses his desire to appear as "a man of consular rank." He thus makes it clear (although the jocundity of the letter is notable) that he wishes to appear in Washington as a political person, as an officeholder, and not as a writer. He writes to Ticknor:

> My best dress-coat is rather shabby (befitting an author much more than a man of consular rank); so, when you next smoke a cigar with our friend [Cornelius] Driscoll, I wish you would tell him to put another suit on the stocks for me. (CE XVI: 658)

Pierce's influence on Hawthorne is again evident, as Hawthorne expresses a desire to present himself as a proper governmental officer or politician to meet with Pierce in Washington.

Often in Hawthorne's life, Pierce seemed to play the role of a type of savior-friend, a rescuer of sorts whose influence and actions often provided Hawthorne with passage over difficult, financially strained, or emotionally devastating circumstances. In the spring of 1859, during the Hawthorne family's stay in Rome, Una Hawthorne's severe illness caused Hawthorne intense grief and anxiety. James R. Mellow writes that this illness became "the worst ordeal of [Hawthorne's] life" (512). Pierce, on vacation in Italy with his wife Jane
Appleton Pierce, visited Hawthorne during this time and offered much-needed comfort and camaraderie. Hawthorne, Mellow writes, was gladdened by the visit of the former president, for Hawthorne "was still reluctant to give up his notion that Pierce was a gifted executive, a mover of men" (513). Mellow writes that Pierce

remained in Rome longer than he had planned, offering what consolation he could. In his worried mood, Hawthorne had been saddened to see "the marks of care and coming age" on his old friend. Pierce—with a slight air of melancholy, perhaps remembering his own dead son—had remarked on what a stout boy Julian had become. "Poor fellow," Hawthorne noted. "He has neither son nor daughter to keep his heart warm."

(512-13)

Pierce's presence clearly relieved some of Hawthorne's distress. Pierce visited the Hawthornes' residence at 68 Piazza Poli three times a day, taking walks with Hawthorne and discussing politics to provide his worried friend with diversion. Hawthorne's notes record the consolation these visits provided and the closeness that defined his long association with Pierce. Hawthorne writes:

Never having had any trouble, before, that pierced into my very vitals, I did not know what comfort there might be in the manly sympathy of a friend; but Pierce has undergone so great a sorrow of his own [in the deaths of his sons], and has so large and kindly a
heart, and is so tender and strong, that he really did us good, and I shall always love him the better for the recollection of those dark days. . . . We have passed all the turning-off places, and may hope to go on together, still the same dear friends, as long as we live. (CE XIV: 518-19)

The visits, which displayed a "quiet, forlorn dignity" (Cantwell 515), emphasized the closeness of the two men, and Hawthorne's note reflects a heartfelt gratitude for Pierce's "manly sympathy" and his role as a beloved rescuer from "dark days."

Several events in 1863 further demonstrated the intimacy of the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship and drew intense criticism from Pierce's opponents. On July 4, 1863, Hawthorne's fifty-ninth birthday, the author attended a speech given by Pierce in Concord, New Hampshire, that caused many to question Hawthorne's political (and even patriotic) sensibilities. In the speech, Pierce harshly criticized the Civil War and the aggressiveness of Lincoln's military strategy. During the speech, Hawthorne sat on the platform from which Pierce spoke, making it clear that he agreed with Pierce's politics. According to Stewart, the former president declared that "aggression by arms" was not "a suitable or possible remedy for existing evils" and that "the great objects" for which the Constitution had been
formed could be achieved "through peaceful agencies alone." (230)

Miller adds that the speech was "fiery," in which Pierce maintained that the war could have been avoided through compromise and accused Lincoln of unconstitutional assumption of powers in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation. (502)

Mellow offers a more informative report of the controversial speech. He writes:

[Pierce] was one of the few public men who spoke out courageously against the suppression of free speech and the rights of *habeas corpus* under Lincoln's administration. In his speech, Pierce particularly remarked on the fate of Clement Vallandigham, a harsh and opportunistic critic of Lincoln's policies, who had been summarily arrested, given a military trial without benefit of *habeas corpus*, and, on the personal orders of Lincoln himself, banished to the Confederacy. (565)

Mellow adds that "[Hawthorne's] appearance on the platform with the former President . . . brought his patriotism into question" (565). In December of the same year, Hawthorne made another public gesture to show his support of Pierce by attending the funeral of Pierce's wife. Hawthorne, "finding his friend overwhelmed with sadness" (Stewart 235), later accompanied Pierce to his home in Concord, New Hampshire,
despite miserable weather and his own failing health.

The two friends were together even at Hawthorne's death in Plymouth, New Hampshire, on May 19, 1864. It was an appropriate conclusion to a friendship that had lasted over forty years. Even at the end of his life, as his declining health made walking and writing excruciatingly difficult, Hawthorne looked to Pierce as a comforter and comrade. In the last letter he wrote, dated May 7, 1864, Hawthorne informed Pierce that he was looking forward to their trip by carriage to the White Mountains of New Hampshire. He writes: "My own health continues rather poor, but I shall hope to revive rapidly when once we are on the road" (CE XVIII: 655). Sophia Hawthorne expresses the hope that Pierce's company would somehow improve her husband's health in a letter to Annie Fields. Intimating that she "should be afraid to have [Hawthorne] go away without me, if I did not trust to the tender watchfulness of General Pierce" (Stewart 237), Sophia writes:

I think the serene jog trot into country places, by trout streams and old farm houses away from care and news, will be very restorative. They will fish and muse and rest and saunter upon horses' feet and be in the air all the time in fine weather. . . . General Pierce has been a most tender constant nurse for many years and knows how to take care. And his love for Mr. Hawthorne is the strongest
passion of his soul, now his wife is departed. (Stewart 237)

Pierce's later account of the morning he found Hawthorne dead reflects the tenderness and admiration shared by the two men. Pierce's actions as recorded in the passage do complement Sophia's references to the former President as a "tender," "nurse"-like companion to her husband. Pierce, writing to Sarah Webster on March 18, 1868, recalls the morning of Hawthorne's death:

I seized [Hawthorne's] wrist but found no pulse—run [sic] my hand down upon his bare side, but the great, generous, brave heart beat no more . . . He had passed from natural sleep to that from which there is no earthly waking—without the slightest struggle—evidently without moving a muscle.

(Miller 518)

Pierce's remarks are a fitting closing to the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship and the treatment of that relationship in various texts.

Throughout his career, Hawthorne would present in his works sympathetic and idealized reconstructions of Pierce. His friendship with Pierce thus influenced several of his works, including Fanshawe, the Life of Franklin Pierce, the unfinished Septimius romances, and the dedication and prefatory letter "To a Friend" in Our Old Home (1863). Often, Hawthorne combines historical reconstruction, indulgent (and often speculative)
romanticism, and Democratic partisanship in expressing his views of Pierce and the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship. This lifelong friendship with "the General," then, served Hawthorne as an apparatus by means of which he could synthesize historical reconstruction, political expression, and romantic art.
Notes

1. All references to Hawthorne's writings, with the exception of the *Life of Franklin Pierce*, are to *The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne* and will be cited parenthetically by CE and the appropriate volume number. All references to Roy Franklin Nichols' *Franklin Pierce: Young Hickory of the Granite Hills* will be cited parenthetically by FP and the appropriate page number.

2. Benjamin Pierce's distrust of the Federalists was a constant feature of his personality. Purcell writes: "While a brigadier general of militia, he declined a colonelcy in President [John] Adams' army of 1798 as he condemned the Federalist administration as recreant to the liberal principles for which the Revolution had been fought" (134). In his *Life of Franklin Pierce*, Hawthorne romanticizes Benjamin Pierce and associates Franklin Pierce with his heroic attributes.

3. In his preface to *The Snow-Image and Other Twice-told Tales* (1851), which is discussed at length in Chapter 5, Hawthorne offers a quaint, pastoral sketch of a college campus that is unmistakably Bowdoin-like. George Thomas Packard states that in the preface, Hawthorne "recalls the days at a 'country college,' when the 'two idle lads' fished in the 'shadowy little stream wandering riverward through the forest,' 'shot gray squirrels,' 'picked blueberries in
study hours,' or 'watched the logs tumbling in the
Androscoggin'" (52).

4. In the study of Locke, Nichols writes, Pierce
"gained a lasting reverence for, and belief in, the rational,
which was to prove quite at variance with his own emotional
and illogical methods of action" (FP 21).

5. Pierce's oratorical skill contrasted with Hawthorne's
reticence in public speaking. The phrase that Bowdoin students
used in referring to performing poorly in declamation was
"taking a dead." Packard notes that unlike Pierce, Hawthorne
"was a shy, morbidly sensitive young man, who often 'took a
dead' in his recitations, but stood first in the class as a
writer" (52).

6. In a letter to Pierce on July 5, 1852, Hawthorne writes:
"There will be ample stuff, I think, for [the military section]
of the [campaign biography]--which, though it should be made
prominent, ought not to be so much as to overshadow you as a man
of peaceful pursuits. . . . A statesman in your proper life--
a gallant soldier in the hour of your country's need--such, in
the circumstances, is the best mode of presenting you" (CE XVI:
560-561). Forty of the biography's 144 pages are devoted to
Pierce's military career.

7. Hawthorne's claim in the preface to the Pierce biography
that he is "so little of a politician that he scarcely feels
entitled to call himself a member of any party" is dubious.
Hawthorne, it appears, is a clever, politically-motivated
manipulator of historical fact, romantic projection, and popular Jacksonian ideology in his treatment of Pierce's life. "As his letters to Pierce reveal," adds Scott E. Casper, "Hawthorne knew exactly how to write a campaign biography, even if Pierce's total lack of distinction presented certain problems" (224).

8. Pierce's friendship with Jefferson Davis, who served as Pierce's Secretary of War, remained intact throughout the Pierce presidency. Larry Gara notes: "President Pierce was often seen walking or riding horseback around the capital city, sometimes to visit friends. . . . [Jefferson] Davis's youthful wife was a leader of Washington social life, which was dominated by southern groups. Jane Pierce was also very fond of their son, Samuel, virtually adopting him as a substitute for her own lost son. . . . The next Davis baby [after Samuel's death] was born during one of the worst snowstorms in Washington history, and the difficult birth brought Varina Davis near death. Pierce, determined to comfort the family, fought the weather for nearly an hour to arrive exhausted at the Davis home" (49).

9. Another organization that Hawthorne joined at Bowdoin was the Pot-8-0 Club, whose "Constitution" was signed by Hawthorne, Jonathan Cilley, Alfred Mason, Jeremiah Dummer, George W. Pierce, and David Shipley. The group arrived at its name because of the fondness of its members for roasted potatoes and cider.
10. Stewart adds: "So strict were the rules of Bowdoin and so efficient was their enforcement that only a paragon of propriety could have avoided fines altogether. On one occasion Franklin Pierce was fined fifty cents for 'sitting in an improper posture in Chapel.' On another Hawthorne and three companions were fined twenty-five cents each 'for walking unnecessarily on the Sabbath'" (22).

11. Stewart writes that "Elizabeth Hawthorne . . . described her brother as a 'partizan' of General Jackson, whose victory over the British at New Orleans had doubtless appealed particularly to the boy's imagination and patriotism. Hawthorne's lifelong connection with the Democratic party was owing partly to principle and partly to the influence of his friends and associates in the Athenaean literary society" (20).

12. Other names that Hawthorne, in casual moments, used in referring to Pierce, were "Princelie Frank" and "Emperor Frank."

13. Wagenknecht notes: "Hawthorne liked to take up the pose of having written Pierce's life unwillingly, out of pure disinterested friendship and with no thought of reward. But the evidence shows clearly that he broached the idea to Pierce, though in a characteristically tentative and half-hearted fashion" (113).

14. In the letter to Bridge, Hawthorne adds that Pierce "is now in the intensest blaze of celebrity--his portrait is everywhere, in all the shop-windows, and in all sorts of styles--on wood, steel, and copper, on horseback, on foot,
in uniform, in citizen's dress, in iron medallions, in little brass medals, and on handkerchiefs; and it seems as if the world were full of his not very striking physiognomy. If he loses the election, in one little month, he will fade utterly out of sight, and never come up again" (CE XVI: 606).

15. In his journals, Henry David Thoreau recorded his private censure of Hawthorne's acceptance of the Liverpool consulship. He writes: "Better for me, says my genius, to go cranberrying this afternoon for the Vaccinium Oxycoccus in Gowing's Swamp, to get but a pocketful and learn its peculiar flavor, aye, and the flavor of Gowing's Swamp and of Life in New England, than to go consul to Liverpool and get I don't know how many thousand dollars for it, with no such flavor" (Stewart 142).

CHAPTER 2

HAWTHORNE AND PIERCE AT BOWDOIN COLLEGE

"A college friendship, prolonged through manhood."

--Hawthorne, in the inscription of Our Old Home (1863)

Hawthorne's years at Bowdoin College (1821-1825) were significant ones, not only because it was at Bowdoin that Hawthorne met Franklin Pierce, but also because the Bowdoin experience provided the young writer-to-be with a rich source of elements from which he would borrow in writing his first novel, Fanshawe, and other works. The stay at Bowdoin College, Hawthorne's first lengthy separation from his mother and sisters, offered him many images, sensations, associations, and conflicts that would resurface in his writings. Hawthorne's friendships with Horatio Bridge, Stephen Longfellow (Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's older brother), Alfred Mason (Hawthorne's first roommate at Bowdoin whose cousin, Jane Appleton, the daughter of former Bowdoin president Jesse Appleton, would later marry Franklin Pierce), and Jonathan Cilley, among others, played a significant role in his socialization. Other aspects of the Bowdoin years that made an impact on Hawthorne's character and writings included: the faculty members, the rigorous daily academic activities, classes, church services, declamations, the Athenaean Society, the leisurely walks along the
banks of the Androscoggin River and into the town of Brunswick, the pranks and antics of his schoolmates, and the punishment enforced by the Bowdoin administrators as a result of various infractions of the school's rules by students. Crucial to Hawthorne's Bowdoin experience was his friendship with Pierce and the indelible impression Pierce made upon Hawthorne's thinking. As Edward Mather notes, "What Emerson was many years later to call the 'disastrous' friendship of Hawthorne and Pierce had begun" (37-38).

At the time of Hawthorne's arrival in the fall of 1821, Bowdoin College was a small college in the new state of Maine, modelled after Harvard but characterized by distinct differences from that more eminent institution. Founded in 1803, Bowdoin, situated in the small logging town of Brunswick (about thirty miles from Portland), doubtless seemed to Hawthorne the quintessential country college. Henry James characterized it as "a highly honourable, but not a very elaborately organized, nor a particularly impressive, seat of learning" (28). In the 1820's, the Bowdoin campus consisted of two dormitory buildings, Maine Hall and Massachusetts Hall, a recreational building, and a small chapel, "wooden, unpainted . . . with its domed steeple" (Cantwell 68). Surrounding the college campus was a natural environment that must have reminded Hawthorne of the area around his Uncle Richard Manning's home near Lake Sebago in Raymond, Maine, where Hawthorne had visited regularly and lived for a year before attending Bowdoin. Close to campus
were dense woods, numerous streams, and the ever-busy Androscoggin River. Cantwell writes:

The college grounds were wild and interesting, with paths winding under the pines and along the shadowy little stream that wandered riverward through the forest. (75-76)

Beyond the campus and its immediate surroundings were other elements that would make impressions upon Hawthorne's romantic sensibility and contribute to his experience at Bowdoin. On the edge of campus, located conveniently between the college and the town of Brunswick, was Ward's Tavern, which attracted many Bowdoin students to its smoky, distinctly non-academic interior. There Hawthorne and his colleagues engaged in revelry, playing cards, drinking wine, and smoking cigars. Occasionally, revelry led to fighting among the students, most of whom in later life would pursue respectable professions in law, the ministry, medicine, politics, the military, and literature. Cantwell notes:

Sometimes the nights ended in a riot. Once [the students] wrecked the tavern--or so Hawthorne pictured it, one of the students drinking huge stupefying draughts, one after another, and breaking chairs, windows, and mirrors, while outside the storm raged. (85)

This scene is remindful of the episode in *Fanshawe* in which Edward Walcott, in many ways a representative of Pierce in the
novel, becomes intoxicated and gets involved in a fight on the evening before his scheduled duel with the villainous Butler. Hawthorne's fondness for gambling (often in a card game called lanterloo) with such individuals as William Pitt Fessenden, Josiah Hook, and Hiram Hobbs, often led to his being fined by Bowdoin administrators. In contrast to the excitement and boyish recklessness that often characterized evenings at Ward's Tavern, Maquoit Bay, three miles from the Bowdoin campus, was frequently the site of a pleasant stroll or contemplation for many Bowdoin students. Hawthorne and Bridge took many walks to the bay, where, writes Lloyd R. Morris,

the air held a faintly perceptible tang of salt and a dilapidated wharf and an occasional desolate lumber-sloop reminded Nathaniel of the seacoast. (41)

On other occasions, Hawthorne, Bridge, and others would visit a fortuneteller at a house on an old, empty street in town, or they would walk to a carpenter's house on the outskirts of Brunswick where they would visit with John Russwum, the first Negro student at Bowdoin.

Historians and biographers agree that Bowdoin was far different from the Harvard that Emerson, Thoreau, and, later, James Russell Lowell attended. Mark Van Doren writes that the principal aspect of Bowdoin was its "frontier frugality" (17). Mather, noting that the campus was "set in surroundings of great beauty and charm," adds that Bowdoin was "a little country college of the plainest description" in which "[the]
general tenor [was] old-fashioned and Calvinistic" (37). Cantwell gives as his assessment the view that the Bowdoin of the 1820's was "a remote college in a new state, with inadequate facilities . . . [and] a small staff" (70). Henry James suggests that, ultimately, Bowdoin was "a homely, simple, frugal, 'country college,' of the old-fashioned American stamp" (28-29). Despite, or perhaps because of, its size, simplicity, and homely aspect, Bowdoin, as discussion of Fanshawe in Chapter 3 will show, made a significant impression on Hawthorne's imagination.

Significant to a study of the role of Hawthorne's Bowdoin experience as an influential factor in many of his writings is a discussion of the Bowdoin faculty. Of the twelve faculty members at Bowdoin during Hawthorne's stay, many had the reputation of being renowned scholars. They were, writes George E. Woodberry, "kindly and cultivated men" (18). The Reverend William Allen, the second president of Bowdoin and president during Hawthorne's and Pierce's years at the college, had published The American Biographical and Historical Dictionary (1809) and, during Hawthorne's second and Pierce's third year at Bowdoin, published Accounts of Shipwrecks and Other Disasters at Sea, Designed to Be Interesting and Useful to Mariners (1822). Allen, in sharp contrast to the benign, idealized, and fatherly President Melmoth of Harley College in Fanshawe, was not popular among many of the Bowdoin students, including Hawthorne. A
Unitarian minister and former president of Dartmouth College, Allen, writes Cantwell, was "short, round-faced, with a slow, methodical walk and speech" (71). In addition, Cantwell writes that Allen's sermons and thinking were "relentlessly orthodox" (65). Hawthorne, in creating Melmoth as a distinctly personable, chivalrous figure whose dialogue with Edward Walcott is often candid, casual, and humorous, appears to be deliberately constructing a character in contrast to his real-life analogue.

Hawthorne's other instructors were impressive academicians. Parker Cleaveland, considered to be the "most celebrated instructor" (Cantwell 63) at the college, taught mathematics, natural philosophy, and chemistry. He had previously turned down offers to teach at Harvard and the College of William and Mary. Alpheus Spring Packard, a long-time professor of Latin at Bowdoin, expressed admiration for Hawthorne's Latin compositions and translations. Likewise, Samuel Phillips Newman, professor of ancient languages, rhetoric, and oratory, admired Hawthorne's essays and compositions. A very prolific member of the Bowdoin faculty was Thomas C. Upham, professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy. His published works would later include Elements of Moral Philosophy (1831), Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life (1843), and A Treatise on Divine Union (1857). The professors at Bowdoin were scholarly, influential, and, often, authoritative figures. Miller writes that "publicly, at least, members of the faculty took their roles as substitute parents
seriously, discipline being a preoccupation of the college community" (65). As will be seen, it was this disciplinary authority that often led the young Hawthorne to associate authority with respectability, conformity, and hypocrisy. As a result of this association, he, along with other members of the Athenaean Society, would support a Jacksonian political perspective and transform Pierce into an exemplar of Jacksonian individualism.

Hawthorne's arrival at Bowdoin and the ensuing friendships he would form with other Bowdoin students made significant contributions to his experience at the college. In October of 1821, Hawthorne, seventeen years old, arrived at Bowdoin on the Boston-Portland stagecoach. At a station in Portsmouth, on the New Hampshire seaboard, three young men, also Bowdoin-bound, boarded the coach. The young men were Franklin Pierce, who was returning to begin his second year at the college, Jonathan Cilley, and Alfred Mason.

Although Hawthorne would share a room with Mason, it was his bond with Cilley, and particularly his friendship with Pierce, that would influence his political views and socialization. Pierce and Cilley would later invite Hawthorne to join the Athenaean Society, a literary society whose members shared a Democratic perspective. Cilley was a popular student at Bowdoin whose skills at oratory and debate were renowned (and would later enhance his short-lived political career). Cilley, who "never professed to understand
Hawthorne" (Mather 41), once remarked, suggesting the solitary, reflective quality that for many would characterize Hawthorne's persona at Bowdoin:

"I love Hawthorne; I admire him; but I do not know him. He lives in a mysterious world of thought and imagination which he never permits me to enter."

(Van Doren 20)

Another significant alliance that Hawthorne established at Bowdoin was his friendship with Horatio Bridge. In his correspondence with Hawthorne, Bridge would often use the pseudonym "Arthur" while Hawthorne, in stark contrast, would use the more poetic pen name "Oberon." Bridge frequently accompanied Hawthorne in walks to Maquoit Bay, gambling episodes at Ward's Tavern, journeys into Brunswick, and walks along the banks of the Androscoggin River. Curiously, it was only with Bridge, whose hometown was Augusta, Maine, that Hawthorne stayed in touch immediately after leaving Bowdoin.

Although Hawthorne's experience at Bowdoin allowed him to come into contact with a fairly wide circle of boys, from a diversity of backgrounds, he seemed to prefer having close relationships with very few and remaining somewhat obscure to the rest. Of this small circle of intimate friends, Pierce assumed particular importance and would serve several roles in Hawthorne's career and writings.

From the outset, Pierce appealed to Hawthorne. The reasons for this attraction are complex and multifold. Pierce
was, first of all, a very popular student at Bowdoin. Friends and fellow members of the cadet corps and Athenaean Society admired his friendliness, directness, and ability to lead others. Noting that Pierce exuded a "charm [and] gaiety" (100) to his schoolmates and professors, Cantwell writes that Pierce was seen as being "impulsive, generous, courteous, manly, and warmhearted" (99). Cantwell adds that "[a] kind of willfull recklessness, however, underlay his ease and his friendliness" (99). It is perhaps this very "recklessness" in Pierce's character that Hawthorne simultaneously admired and envied, giving his gallant and soldierly Walcott this trait in *Fanshawe*. Miller suggests that Pierce performed the role of "supportive older brother" (69) to Hawthorne. This role was further signified by the ranks the two men held in the Bowdoin cadet corps; Pierce was the commander, while Hawthorne was a mere private. Pierce's abilities to lead appealed to the less outgoing Hawthorne, and Hawthorne would voice his association of Pierce with the role of "leader" in texts throughout his life to achieve various ends. Mather writes that Pierce was

a plodder, a hard worker, an organizer and eventually chairman of the committee of the Athenaean Society. . . . A slender boy of medium height, he was popular, warm-hearted, courteous and affable to his fellow undergraduates. (41)

Pierce, then, became an integral part of the Bowdoin experience
for Hawthorne, exemplifying for Hawthorne Jacksonian virtues, military leadership, and political idealism.

Students at Bowdoin experienced a rather rigorous academic schedule of classes, church services, declamations, and other activities for which they paid $14.49 in tuition per term. A typical day for Hawthorne, Pierce, and their colleagues went as follows: At 7:00, the students attended their first class of the day (for Hawthorne, this often meant studying Xenophon, Livy, or arithmetic). At 8:00, the students ate breakfast. After breakfast, the students devoted two hours to studying in their rooms. At 11:00, they attended their next class. From 1:00 to 2:00, the students ate their midday meal. Another study period lasted from 2:00 to 4:30, followed by the last recitation for the day. At 5:30, the students attended evening prayers, after which they had an evening study period from 7:30 to 9:00. Students went to bed at about 9:00 (Cantwell 72).

Other aspects of life at Bowdoin with which Hawthorne would have been familiar included buying firewood to keep the dorm rooms warm in winter (firewood cost a dollar per cord), getting mail from home (Hawthorne was distressed by the lack of word or money from Robert Manning for the entire month of October, 1821), having supper at a professor's house (Hawthorne frequently dined at Professor Newman's home), and reading in the school library (which was open for only two hours a day). Students took courses in Latin, Greek, Roman history, mathematics, moral philosophy, rhetoric, and natural philosophy.
Particularly troublesome to Hawthorne was declamation, a required activity at Bowdoin. Critics and biographers have analyzed Hawthorne's reticence regarding public speaking, an inability that contrasted greatly with the oratorical skills of Pierce or Cilley. Cantwell states that a "profound significance" is evident in Hawthorne's failure "to stand before a group of his classmates and declaim" (91). To offer an explanation for this disinclination, Cantwell writes:

It was partly his indifference to the motives, in the desire for honors, as pre-eminence in school, of his classmates, and partly his natural shyness. But it was also his recognition of the essential falseness and foolishness of these high-flown exercises in eloquence, and most deeply his instinctive recognition that the part of the country's intellectual life which they represented was finished. (91)

Thus, Hawthorne's refusal to declaim was rooted, to a great degree, in his deliberate rejection of respectability, sophism, and artifice. By avoiding or refusing to speak in oratorical exercises, he was criticizing the "old sonorous orations, the quotations, [and] the studied gestures" (Cantwell 91) that he saw as being inauthentic, self-aggrandizing modes of communication.

An important factor in Hawthorne's socialization at Bowdoin was his membership in the Athenaean Society, a literary group that included his friends Pierce, Bridge, Cilley, and William
Pitt Fessenden. The Bowdoin of Hawthorne's day had two principal literary societies, both of which espoused opposing political perspectives. The Peucinian Society, which included in its ranks such individuals as Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Alfred Mason, Calvin Stowe, and Seargent Prentiss, was characterized by its members' conservative political outlook. Its members were the sons of prominent bankers, lawyers, merchants, and statesmen who generally held pro-Federalist, pro-Whig sympathies. The Athenaean Society, the "newer and more radical" (Cantwell 96) of the two societies, supported a more liberal political agenda. Its members were often the sons of middle-class families with pro-Jackson loyalties. Cilley was a very popular and effective leader of the organization. Jean Normand states that, in general, the Athenaean Society was "a more free and boisterous group" whose members were "the more democratic in their feelings" (18).

In the Athenaean Society, Hawthorne experienced socialization and, for the first time, political partisanship. While at Bowdoin, he joined Pierce and the others of the society in vigorously supporting Andrew Jackson's 1824 campaign for president. They discussed political issues of the day and read books from among the eight hundred volumes in the society's library. Hawthorne fit in with the Athenaean Society well. Unlike Longfellow and many of the other members of the Peucinian Society, whose families were often
wealthy and renowned, Hawthorne was a representative of the middle class, the son of a sea captain's widow from Salem. He was, Mather notes, "always short of cash and always short of presentable or suitable clothes" (40). The sympathy for the tenets of the Democratic party that led Hawthorne to join the Athenaeans in 1822 remained as an influential factor in his life and writings, operating as a shaping force in such works as the *Life of Franklin Pierce* and "Chiefly about War Matters by a Peaceable Man" (1862). This Jacksonian political consciousness explained Hawthorne's early admiration of Pierce and his lifelong association of Pierce with the platform of the Democratic party, Jacksonian values, and heroic individualism.

Other less formal organizations also attracted the attention of students at Bowdoin. Numerous loosely organized, sometimes short-lived, clubs sprang up, offering like-minded members fellowship, venues for discussion, and sportive fun. Clubs included the Navy Club, a supper club, the Androscoggin Club, which, according to Mather, "existed for the purpose of playing five-card and loo" (40), and others. Hawthorne cofounded the Pot-8-0 Club, an organization whose name came from the members' fondness for eating roasted potatoes (and drinking brandy cider) during its weekly meetings. In a comical tone, the club's constitution, which Hawthorne wrote, subtly satirizes the heavy-handed legality of Bowdoin documents that listed the college's rules and catalogued
types of punishment. At one point, the constitution reads:

Some one of the members of each meeting shall read an original dissertation or poem, and if he omit to perform the same, after receiving notice, he shall pay a fine of a peck of Potatoes. (Miller 73)

The elaborate, deliberately ornate language of the constitution further signifies, by means of parody, Hawthorne's mild criticism of the Bowdoin system of laws regulating student behavior. At another point, the document reads:

Being convinced that it is beneficial both to the health and understanding of Man, to use a vegetable diet, and considering that the Potato is nutritious, easy of digestion, and procured with less difficulty and expense than most other vegetables, [we] do hereby agree to form ourselves into an association under the name of the Pot-8-0 Club. (Cantwell 81)

The document is playful but not completely innocuous. Beneath the mask of mock-legalistic phrasing and excessively elaborate syntax lies a democratic rebuke of pretense, sophistication, authority.  

Aside from the Pot-8-0 Club, Hawthorne took part in numerous extra-curricular activities (which he refers to in his preface to The Snow-Image and Other Twice-told Tales in 1851). Like many Bowdoin students, Hawthorne enjoyed gambling, a habit that led President Allen to write a letter to Hawthorne's mother voicing concern. Hawthorne also joined his
colleagues in drinking, smoking cigars, and roaming the shore of the Androscoggin River or the tree-lined paths near campus. Often, he and Bridge would explore little streams and byways, stroll on the hill near Professor Cleaveland's house, or stop on the bridge over the Androscoggin River and talk. He frequently cut classes, missed church services, skipped mandatory study hours, and, at one point, took up chewing tobacco, which, writes Arlin Turner, Hawthorne "thought . . . elevated his spirits" (6). His resistance to the regimentation of the Bowdoin academic routine, along with an already emergent restlessness, is evident in a letter Hawthorne wrote to his sister Elizabeth on October 28, 1821. He writes:

I have not been under the necessity of studying more than 3 hours a Day, though by the Laws of the College I should study 7. . . . Yet I generally make the time pass very tolerably, by dint of playing Cards, at which all the students are great adepts, and other unlawful occupations, which are made the more pleasant by the fines attached to them if discovered. (CE XV: 159)

Hawthorne's apparent zeal in violating the "Laws of the College," albeit via the fairly inoffensive means of card-playing, complements his growing Jacksonian sensibility, a resistance to centralized authority and respectability that would influence many of his texts. Card-playing, smoking,
walking on the Sabbath, and missing mandatory church services, like Pierce's brief conflict with President Allen regarding the route his cadets would take in their marching drills on campus, appealed to Hawthorne's democratic sensibility and formed lasting images of his Bowdoin years in his mind. In many ways, Allen and the Bowdoin administrators represented an authority, respectability, and perhaps even condescension that Hawthorne would later find (and criticize) in Emerson, Lincoln, and George Bancroft. Perhaps, even at this early stage of their friendship, Pierce, to Hawthorne, represented the "democratic" alternative to this self-aggrandizing, self-empowering, and impersonal kind of authority. Certainly, Hawthorne's later works would present Pierce as a "common man" and an admirable deviation from the pretentious and remote authority that many associated with Washington politics.

Biographers have presented varying reconstructions of Hawthorne's personality while at Bowdoin. By most accounts, Hawthorne presented a demeanor that can best be characterized as being paradoxical. Although he was considerably shy, withdrawn, and reticent (particularly in crowds or speaking before groups), he also enjoyed youthful fellowship with members of the Athenaean Society and the Pot-8-0 Club. Cilley recalled that he never "knew" Hawthorne, while Bridge remembers Hawthorne's active engagement in walks, hunts, and fishing expeditions. Hawthorne, writes Arlin Turner, revealed at Bowdoin "a natural propensity for seclusion" (8), and the "key trait" of his
character was, ultimately, "detachment, either genuine or feigned" (7). Normand's reconstruction complements Turner's account, noting that the athletic Hawthorne, who took long walks without tiring, loved climbing trees, and could jump from a standing position as high as his shoulders, was also an introspective figure around whom a "mystery . . . seemed always to hover" (27). Pointing out the paradoxical aspects of this personality, Lloyd Morris notes that the primary tension in Hawthorne's character was the conflict between "inward excitement and outward placidity" (35).

Despite his involvement in, and apparent (though, perhaps, temporary) enjoyment of the evenings of card-playing at Ward's Tavern, the poetry readings at meetings of the Pot-8-0 Club, and the drills of the cadet corps, Hawthorne remained in many ways a detached observer, a figure similar to such literary creations as Fanshawe, Arthur Dimmesdale, and Miles Coverdale. What for Henry James is Hawthorne's "innocent reserve" and "by no means cynical . . . relish for solitude" (36) is, in the perspectives of others, a deliberate self-marginalization that complements Hawthorne's role as observer and romantic interpreter of events. Cantwell suggests that Hawthorne's distancing of himself from others (though not from Pierce and Bridge, for significant reasons) was the consequence of his "queer kind of half-conscious purpose" (93). This "purpose" was his goal, perhaps only partly known to Hawthorne himself, to later transform the events and people
at Bowdoin into literary art. Milton R. Stern, assessing Hawthorne's persona of observer at Bowdoin, writes:

Certainly, as a youngster Hawthorne had seemed social enough in the bosom of his mother's family, the Mannings, and at Bowdoin College. . . . [Yet] within himself, temperamentally, Hawthorne remained the outsider, looking on. (149)

Cantwell adds that Hawthorne had an uncanny facility for imprinting upon his memory the exact details of apparently undistinguished scenes—a stretch of nondescript riverbank, an overgrown woodland path, a ruined dam across a brook, a hidden valley or a cavelike opening in a cliff—except that, with him, the stretch of riverbank might be one over which a flood would wash, and the path one by which a fugitive could escape, the height one an army could fortify, and the cave one where supplies could be stored. (76)

Although the Bowdoin experience did provide Hawthorne with a backdrop he would employ in writing Fanshawe, the preface to The Snow-Image and Other Twice-told Tales, and other works, Hawthorne ultimately saw its usefulness to him as being limited and only temporarily satisfactory. Hawthorne's fatigue with college, evident in many of the letters he wrote to his mother and sisters back in Salem, might spring from a realization that as historical backdrop for future romances Bowdoin was
limited. It was as if his observatory powers and his artistic sensibility, even at this early period in his career, demanded more than the environs and people of Bowdoin, demanded a more significant and more useful historical "moment" to transform into romance. On February 20, 1822, not six months since his arrival on campus, Hawthorne denoted his recognition of Bowdoin's limitations in this vein in a letter to his uncle, Robert Manning. He tells Manning:

You complained very much of the shortness of my Letters; but I hope that you will believe [sic] that the occasion of it is not the want of will, but the want of subject. I would willingly write more if I could find anything to write about. (CE XV: 167)

On another occasion, in a letter to his sister Elizabeth on August 5, 1822, a similar complaint is voiced. Bluntly, Hawthorne writes: "My only reason for not writing has been that I have had nothing to write" (CE XV: 174). By the fall of 1824, at which time Hawthorne returned to Bowdoin as a senior in "dandy" apparel, this fatigue and boredom bordered on anger and self-loathing. On October 1, 1824, Hawthorne wrote to Elizabeth:

Since my arrival I have put on my gold watch-chain, and purchased a cane; so that, with the aid of my new white gloves, I flatter myself that I make a most splendid appearance in the eyes of the pestilent little freshmen. . . . I am very low-spirited, and I
verily believe [sic] that all the blue devils in
Hell, or wherever else they reside, have been let
loose upon me. I am tired of college, and all its
amusements and occupations. I am tired of my friends
and acquaintances, and finally I am heartily tired
of myself. I would not live over my college life
again, "though 'twere to buy a world of happy
days." (CE XV: 184)

Along with the mock self-deprecation and deliberately romantic
angst of the passage exists a literary sensibility that is
apparently anxious to encounter new materials and new subjects.
As Miller notes,

The sentiments were melodramatic and self-pitying but
not wholly false. The weariness and the depressed
periods began in youth and were shortly to be recorded
in the pages of his first romance *Fanshawe*. (73)

Clearly, it was time for Hawthorne to leave Bowdoin
College. As the source of biographical elements from which he
would draw in writing *Fanshawe*, it had offered him many things:
the Bowdoin campus and the surrounding woodlands, streams, the
Androscoggin River, and the town of Brunswick provided images
that would fit effectively into the romantic framework of his
first novel; Pierce, Bridge, and Cilley, along with other
Bowdoin colleagues, gave him early insight into character
types, providing him with real-life examples of the active,
heroic, and outgoing characters he would later create as
antagonists to his contemplative, more introspective characters; and the Athenaean Society introduced him to fellowship and Democratic partisanship, as its foremost members, Pierce and Cilley, appeared to him as icons of Jacksonian values and political zeal. A significant contributor to Hawthorne's Bowdoin experience was, of course, Pierce, who, as friend, upperclassman, cadet corps commander, and Athenaean officer, presented to Hawthorne an image of political leader, heroic soldier, and popular extrovert. In many ways, Hawthorne saw in Pierce's character a counterpart to his own inclinations to be introspective, moody, and solitary. This difference stimulated Hawthorne's romantic imagination. Newton Arvin writes:

> Perhaps to be with Frank Pierce or Horatio Bridge gave [Hawthorne] a warm sense of the tough objective fact, the fact untouched by fancy, the letter without the spirit. (24)

In *Fanshawe*, published anonymously a few years after he graduated from Bowdoin, Hawthorne would attempt to bridge fact and fancy, transforming Pierce and the Bowdoin experience into the stuff of Gothic romance.
Notes

1. Mather notes: "Had Emerson been the sort of man to understand lifelong loyalties, he would have realized that for Hawthorne to give up Pierce because his presidential campaign [in 1852] was anathema to the intellectuals would have been as improbable and unnatural as for Bronson Alcott to make a fortune" (41).

2. After the War of 1812 ended, land sales in the state of Maine increased dramatically. Hawthorne's uncle, Richard Manning, settled in Raymond, Maine, building a house that his neighbors would nickname "Manning's Folly" because of its being much larger than neighboring houses.

3. Newton Arvin characterizes the majority of the Bowdoin students of Hawthorne's day as being "unimaginative youths, with their cards, and their light wines, and their campus games, their easily achieved high spirits and easily defined practical purposes" (24).

4. Arvin notes that Hawthorne's closest friends at college did not provide "imaginative companionship or common literary tastes." In fact, Arvin points out, Hawthorne admired traits in Pierce, Bridge, and Cilley that were "at a polar distance from just that, something coarse, prosaic, matter-of-fact, muscular; something set inertly on the common earth and as little volatile as possible" (24).

5. Remarking on the "curious compensatory principle" that
seemed to determine Hawthorne's allying himself with certain Bowdoin students, Arvin writes that "it was men like Pierce and Bridge and Cilley whom [Hawthorne] clove to most tenaciously; it was their hilarities that he enjoyed partaking in, and their confidences that he enjoyed hearing. Undoubtedly, too, there was something about him that exercised a strong sway over them" (24).

6. Cantwell writes that entrance requirements at Bowdoin during Hawthorne's day included "[the] ability to write Latin correctly, an understanding of the fundamental rules of arithmetic, an acquaintance with Cummings' Geography, Cicero's Select Orations, Virgil's Bucolics, Georgics and Aeneid, Sallust, the Greek Testament, and the Collectanea Graeco Minora" (55).

7. Mather adds that "the Athenaean Society provided [Hawthorne] with leaders . . . [and] with heroes" (41). The two members of the society who would appear in this light to Hawthorne would be Pierce and Cilley.

8. Cantwell states that the constitution is "characteristic of [Hawthorne's] games with words . . . [and] hidden puns and ciphers" (80).
CHAPTER 3

ROMANTIC TRANSFORMATION IN FANSHAWE

"I suppose there is hardly a limit to your expectations at this moment."

--Hawthorne, in a letter to Pierce, June 28, 1832

In a letter to Horatio Bridge on November 7, 1865, Sophia Hawthorne expressed an eagerness to acquire from Bridge "any memories or incidents of Mr. Hawthorne's college life" (Bridge 192-93). Busy preparing Hawthorne's journals and notes for publication in the Atlantic Monthly, Sophia intimated to Bridge that copying her husband's journal entries had impressed upon her the perspective that the passages are, to use her words,

very rich as studies of nature and man, and now and then a glimpse of [Hawthorne's] personal character gleams through in a radiant way, though he puts himself aside as much as possible, as always.

(Bridge 192-93)

Sophia's interest in her husband's years at Bowdoin College illustrates her critical acumen, for Hawthorne's Bowdoin experience, romanticized in his first novel, Fanshawe (published shortly after the author's return to Salem), provided him with socialization and a recognition of a tension between personality types that never left his
fiction. This tension was in part the product of his relationship with Franklin Pierce.

*Fanshawe* presents a textualization of the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship, thus establishing a motif of interpersonal dichotomy that would resurface throughout Hawthorne's career. Hawthorne's narrator demonstrates the polarity between the shy, introspective, self-absorbed protagonist (the isolated artist) and the athletic, exuberant, sociable foil. The opposition, then, between the characters of Fanshawe (in many ways a textualized Hawthorne) and Edward Walcott (a textualized Pierce) not only serves to advance the central plot of the novel, but, more significantly, it reveals an early manifestation of the impression that the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship made upon Hawthorne's imagination.

Hawthorne's skills as a writer of romance while composing *Fanshawe* were insufficient to support Leo B. Levy's claim that the author "gains for his story the point of view of romance and removes it from the intimacy of autobiographical disclosure" (441). Instead, Hawthorne's narrator is a hyperbolic and unpolished storyteller whose narrative combines Gothic mystery, machinations, romance, and autobiographical impulses. The work is, to use Carl Bode's phrase, a novel "of character and adjustment" (239). The narrator, clearly a former student of Harley College, distills, like Hawthorne, from his personal experience an antagonism and an accord between two personality types that lend a telling, almost
confessional aspect to the work.

The illustration of the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship in *Fanshawe* has been either overlooked or minimalized by reviewers and biographers. The work, in general, has been marginalized by critics, who, perhaps, are following Hawthorne's own example, in view of his destruction of the majority of the copies of the book in the late 1820's. The romance has also been stigmatized as a flawed though admirably ambitious first novel. Such oversight and simplification preclude significant analysis of two significant issues that are related to the novel: Hawthorne's inclination to romanticize his first experience in socialization at Bowdoin and his imaginative reconstruction of the anxiety created by his relationship with Pierce. Roy Harvey Pearce sees the work as presenting a conventional Gothic narrative, derivative of the romances of Sir Walter Scott. Arlin Turner, in *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography*, demonstrates the similarities between Bowdoin College and the fictitious Harley College, but he does not explore ways in which the text of the novel mirrors the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship. In *Hawthorne's View of the Artist*, Millicent Bell suggests that Hawthorne espouses a dispassionate view of the character Fanshawe, distancing author from character to allow for objective criticism, and, ultimately, condemnation of isolation and solipsism. Others, including George E. Woodberry, Mark Van Doren, and Frank Preston Stearns, have relegated the work to a minor status, hastily categorizing it as a youthful
experiment beset by stylistic weaknesses, conventional (and often unnecessarily elaborate) plotting, and embarrassingly excessive romanticism. Bode's significant article, published in 1950, hinges on the worthy premise that Hawthorne's narrator is exhibiting primarily a "devotion to character" and a "study of personality" (241). Yet he too overlooks the historical analogue of the Fanshawe-Walcott polarity—the relationship between Hawthorne and Pierce at Bowdoin College.

To begin with, the setting of the story is significant, as Hawthorne presents Harley College, the fictionalization of Bowdoin, as the background for his textualization of his friendship with Pierce. Descriptions of Harley College reveal Hawthorne's reading of Scott's popular romances and Charles Robert Maturin's Gothic novel, *Melmoth the Wanderer*. Hawthorne's narrator begins:

> In an ancient, though not very populous settlement, in a retired corner of one of the New-England states, arise the walls of a seminary of learning, which, for the convenience of a name, shall be entitled "Harley College." *(CE III: 333)*

The key remark in this highly stylized opening sentence is the prepositional phrase "for the convenience of a name." This phrase, buried in the sentence by its position as an interruptor in the concluding clause of the passage, implies that Hawthorne's narrator is disguising history by romanticizing it. He thus gives his institution a fictional name "for the
convenience" of avoiding what he saw as the complications and embarrassment of confession or autobiography. The narrator, then, in the first sentence of the book, hints to the reader that the excessive, romantic language of the narrative is employed "for the convenience" of fictionalization.

Hawthorne's apparent inability at this point in his career to skillfully disguise historical sources invites critical investigation into the real-life counterparts of Fanshawe's settings and characters. This inability, no doubt, later prompted a more mature, censorious Hawthorne to disconnect himself from the book altogether. The small, secluded college--its "humble edifices [which] rear themselves almost at the farthest extremity of a narrow vale" (CE III: 334), its little stream, which "affords, along its wood-fringed banks, many shady retreats, where even study is pleasant, and idleness delicious" (CE III: 334), and the neighboring village, an obviously romanticized reconstruction of the Brunswick that Hawthorne encountered in the 1820's--is a romantic locale, suspiciously over-idealized by the exuberant narrator. Hawthorne's prohibitions against explicit autobiographical allowances, it appears, result in dubious romanticization, with which the author hopes, Allene Cooper suggests, to intentionally avoid "reconcil[ing] reality and imagination" (457).

The narrator's description of Fanshawe undermines Hawthorne's attempt to conceal fact or autobiographical
disclosure with romance, for the signifiers are too obvious, the self-portrayal too conspicuous. Hawthorne's inability to complicate the description of Fanshawe with ambiguity or subtlety is evident in his depiction of the character's first appearance in the narrative:

The stranger could scarcely have attained his twentieth year, and was possessed of a face and form, such as Nature bestows on none but her favorites. There was a nobleness on his high forehead, which time would have deepened into majesty; and all his features were formed with a strength and boldness, of which the paleness produced by study and confinement, could not deprive them. (CE III: 346)

Clearly, Fanshawe is at this moment a textualized Hawthorne, perhaps the closest Hawthorne arrives, in the early phase of his career, at self-portraiture. Fanshawe's attributes and character mirror qualities Hawthorne displayed at Bowdoin: the "proud and high" expression, "like one who was a ruler in a world of his own, and independent of the beings that surrounded him" (CE III: 346), the smiles that "had a beautiful effect upon his countenance" (CE III: 347), the shyness, and, perhaps most significantly, his tendency to engage in "solitary study" and, through the many volumes in his library, indulge in "conversations with the dead" (CE III: 350). Bode adds that
if the character of Fanshawe is not Hawthorne at college, it is surely Hawthorne after college—Hawthorne writing by himself, taking his meals alone, studying and composing almost completely without encouragement. (238)

Rather than voice what Levy terms a "tone of dispassion" (442) in depicting Fanshawe, Hawthorne offers a bold and, considering the ambiguity that would later characterize his works, surprisingly candid depiction of the flaws and self-isolating tendencies that he found in his own character. Describing Fanshawe, he writes:

But a blight, of which his thin, pale cheek and the brightness of his eye were alike proofs, seemed to have come over him ere his maturity. (CE III: 346)

Edward Walcott, the representative of Pierce in the novel, serves as a foil to the self-absorbed Fanshawe. In the passages that focus on Walcott, Hawthorne employs numerous signifiers that suggest a Pierce-Walcott parallel. Early in the story, the narrator presents evidence of this connection:

[Walcott] was tall, as the natural grace of his manners had been improved (an advantage which few of his associates could boast) by early intercourse with polished society. His features, also, were handsome, and promised to be manly and dignified, when they should cease to be youthful. (CE III: 343)
Walcott, representative of the upper class (he "possessed a considerable amount of money") ([CE III: 343] and characterized as having "superior" manners, is remindful of Pierce, whom Julian Hawthorne described in his *Memoirs* as being "strong-willed" and "magnetic" (160). Julian, in fact, who spent a considerable amount of time with Pierce after his father's death, described Pierce with language that remarkably echoes Hawthorne's descriptions of Walcott. In his *Memoirs*, Julian Hawthorne writes of Pierce:

> His chest was impressive, and the great muscles of his arms and legs; his bearing was always erect and soldierly, and his coats buttoned up to the throat in military fashion. (190)

A point of similarity that further supports the Walcott-Pierce association is the taste for alcohol. Walcott, Hawthorne's narrator notes, "though naturally temperate, had been not an unfrequent offender in this respect; for which a superfluity both of time and money might plead some excuse" ([CE III: 382]). Walcott's frequent lapses into "tavern-haunting" ([CE III: 307]) at Hugh Crombie's The Hand and the Bottle Inn offer further elaboration of the Walcott-Pierce connection if one recalls Julian's note in the *Memoirs* that Pierce had "a taste for strong liquor" (160) and "had never finally discontinued drink" (190).

The dichotomy between Fanshawe and Walcott, signifying what Hawthorne no doubt perceived as a competitive though
rewarding relationship with Pierce at Bowdoin, is emphasized in the scene in which the two characters pursue the villainous Butler on horseback. Hawthorne employs the race as a symbol of the antagonism between the two halves of this duality. Again, the Hawthorne-Pierce camaraderie is romanticized and magnified in the narrative, as the qualities of each personage, as interpreted by Hawthorne, are illustrated and critiqued. Fanshawe's talents are more suited to scholarly meditation and discussion (the reader is told at one point that he seems to have been "endowed by a fairy with the gift of speech") (CE III: 386). In addition, Fanshawe is seen by Walcott as "a rival not to be despised" (CE III: 414) in the effort to save Ellen. The fact that Hawthorne uses the word "rival" asserts that the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship provoked in him an anxiety and a complex mixture of attraction and repulsion regarding Pierce.

As will be discussed later, Edward, more adventurous than the studious Fanshawe, conveys a soldierly persona that contributes to the Pierce-Walcott parallel. Walcott, who, in Frederick C. Crews' view, is "Fanshawe's manly alter ego" (161), is excited by the race with Fanshawe to rescue Ellen from Butler. He is intrigued by "the uncertainty itself, and the probable danger of the expedition" (CE III: 413). Walcott's rhetoric is likewise militaristic and heroic, textual evidence of Hawthorne's fascination with soldiery and war (a fascination that is particularly
apparent in his construction of Pierce as a war hero in the campaign biography). Brandishing a pair of pistols, Edward tells Dr. Melmoth at one point in the story: "'One of these, if you will accept it . . . will serve to begin the conflict, before you join the battle hand to hand'" (CE III: 417). The enthusiastic boy-soldier refers to Dr. Melmoth as "reverend knight," and the narrator in turn calls Walcott a "squire" (CE III: 417). Melmoth thus maintains the mock-heroic language of the passage while further demonstrating the Pierce-like traits of Fanshawe's rival.

The antagonism between Walcott and Fanshawe is not settled or vanquished by the narrator, as Walcott maintains a competitive relationship with his studious opposite. Hawthorne writes that

all [of Walcott's] speed could not divest him of the idea, that Fanshawe would finally overtake him, and attain the object of their mutual pursuit.

(CE III: 414)

Hawthorne, then, suggests that the Fanshawe-Walcott/Hawthorne-Pierce duality is an ongoing phenomenon, symbolic of the dichotomy between inertia and aggression within the individual. Significantly, Fanshawe's passion, the text states, is "founded on the principle of contrariety, rather than of sympathy" (CE III: 443). Indeed, it is this "contrariety" that Hawthorne saw as defining in part his relationship with Pierce. Hawthorne responds to this binary opposition by fictionalizing it. The
Hawthorne-Pierce antagonism, transformed into the Fanshawe-Walcott rivalry, causes Hawthorne to investigate the relationship of the "self" with the "other," a relationship that Hawthorne's arrival at Bowdoin in 1821 forced him to confront for the first time.

Hawthorne's early attempt at writing a novel-length romance, although considered by most critics to be flawed, self-indulgent, and derivative of popular sentimental fiction which the author himself intently disliked (yet read), demonstrates a significant textualization of his friendship with Pierce. The anxiety created by the intimate friendship --the tensions between Hawthorne, the withdrawn, introspective "self," and Pierce, the outgoing, dynamic "other"--markedly influences Hawthorne's writings. This relationship can be seen as the historical source for the numerous themes and motifs related to this anxiety that Hawthorne's later fiction would explore with greater artistic success. By textualizing his friendship with Pierce in Fanshawe, Hawthorne records the dynamics of and tensions associated with a relationship that would last throughout his life.

The characterization of Edward Walcott, the dashing claimant for Ellen's affections, deserves close analysis, for it reveals the influence of Pierce on Hawthorne's art. With the creation of Walcott, Hawthorne synthesizes an exaggerated assessment of Pierce's soldierly qualities with the
attributes of a stock, antagonistic, cavalier character. Clearly, Walcott is derivative of such characters in Gothic melodrama and the historical romances of Scott. Pierce, a year older than Hawthorne and a member of the class preceding Hawthorne's, served as a captain of the Bowdoin military company, an organization that, oddly enough, included Hawthorne in its ranks as a private. The youthful Pierce, whom Nichols describes as having "a military bent" and expressing "the full glow of military enthusiasm" (FP 23) during his college years, provided Hawthorne with a real-life source for the soldier archetype that he would adapt to his fiction. Hawthorne would employ this soldier paradigm in works ranging from Fanshawe to the abortive romances Septimius Felton and Septimius Norton. Although Walcott is not specifically labeled a soldier by the narrator, he does exhibit actions, dialogue, and gestures that vividly suggest a soldierly, as well as chivalrous and cavalier-like, personage.

With Fanshawe, Hawthorne, experimenting with the Gothic formula that achieved popular success in his day (a formula that is evident in the aforementioned Melmoth the Wanderer by Maturin and Ann Radcliffe's The Italian, both of which Hawthorne read), looked to his experiences and small circle of friends at Bowdoin as the contextual basis for his romance. In the book he merges romantic fancy and New England history. With this methodology, he would achieve artistic success
throughout his career, most notably, perhaps, in the tales and
sketches that he would publish in such journals as The Token and
in such collections as Twice-told Tales (1837). If, as most
critics and biographers suggest, Harley College is a
reconstructed Bowdoin College, then the primary characters of
Hawthorne's "college novel" appear to have historical parallels
in the author's friends at Bowdoin. The fact that the young
author turned to his recollections of college friendships as
the source materials for the creation of characters in the
novel yields, as Henry James notes, "proof of how little the
world of observation lay open to Hawthorne at this time" (32).
Woodberry echoes James's view, writing that, in composing
Fanshawe, Hawthorne

had recourse to his academic experience in lieu of
anything else, and in the setting of the story
and some of its delineation of character,

[Henry Wadsworth] Longfellow recognized the
strong suggestion of Bowdoin days. (31)

Longfellow's observation warrants critical analysis of the
historical contexts of the novel's prominent characters,
Fanshawe and Walcott. A contextualist approach to
understanding the characterization of Walcott reveals the
early impact of Pierce on Hawthorne's literary imagination.
Hawthorne endows Walcott, who, admittedly, often appears as
little more than a conventional Gothic rival in the story,
with the traits that the young Hawthorne admired,
romanticized, and even envied in Pierce. Walcott's soldierly
qualities distinguish him as the first example of Hawthorne's
treatment of the soldier archetype, a device to which the
author would return throughout his career. This soldier type
evident in Fanshawe is an example of what Philip E. Burnham
calls "[the] harbingers of Hawthorne at the height of his
power" (138). Hawthorne owes a significant part of its
inspiration and formulation to his lifelong idealization of
Pierce as a chivalrous gentleman-soldier cast in a
Jacksonian mold.

During his years at Bowdoin, Pierce displayed a soldierly
persona that would attract Hawthorne's notice and appeal to
the future writer's romantic imagination. Hawthorne referred
frequently to Pierce as "the General" in correspondence and
journals throughout his life. At Bowdoin, Pierce displayed a
military presence with which Hawthorne would always associate
him. Nichols notes that the seventeen year old captain "plunged"
into his role as leader of the Bowdoin cadets with "all his
energy" and a "drilling zeal" that was "infectious" (23). To
demonstrate this, Nichols discusses an incident involving
Pierce's company and the president of the college that would
later contribute to Hawthorne's creation of Edward Walcott.
Nichols writes:

Up and down the bare flat campus the cadets marched
and one of their favorite parades was quite near
President Allen's [residence]. The "Praeses" stood
this awhile [sic] but evidently the drill bothered him and finally he ordered the cadets to detour around his grounds. But it was an unruly spring and the cadets and their captain resented this order. Consequently the very next day they filed by in usual formation. This defiance brought [the] irate authority out of his house with a demand upon the debonair cadet for the meaning of this insubordination. The leader replied that the order was unjust inasmuch as their march put the president to no inconvenience while a change of route would injure the method of their evolutions. The president retired threatening punishment . . . [later attempting] unsuccessfully to discipline the captain. The company marched on with Captain Pierce at the head and in the rear rank a curiously unwarlike high private, Hawthorne. (FP 23)

The event Nichols describes foregrounds Hawthorne's use of the soldier paradigm. In the passage, Pierce is a direct, steadfast soldier, a "debonair cadet" who displays "defiance" to an "unjust" "order." He is also shown as being a practical "captain" who is ennobled by an innate sense of duty. Pierce's claim to Allen that the order not to march near the president's house "was unjust inasmuch as their march put the president to no inconvenience while a change of
route would injure the method of [the company's] evolutions" illustrates his selfless actions in behalf of his troops. In addition, Pierce is characterized in this episode as a rebel revolting against unfair authority. Pierce would later voice opposition to the policies of the Lincoln administration that would seem remarkably similar to his youthful resistance to President Allen. Perhaps most significantly, the confrontation with Allen shows Pierce as a Jacksonian leader who prefers the pragmatic to the unnecessarily elaborate. Pierce's defiance is after all rooted in his concern that his company's "evolutions" be as efficient as possible.

Following along in the ranks, Hawthorne was doubtless impressed by these traits in his friend, admiring these early signs of Pierce's "steadfastness and integrity" (Nichols FP 545).

Julian Hawthorne later recorded memories of Pierce's militaristic demeanor that complement Nichols' rendering. Julian echoes his father's admiration of Pierce's soldierly aspects. This admiration would influence the creation of the soldier paradigm in Fanshawe. In Hawthorne and His Circle (1903), Julian writes that Pierce had a "physical frame [that] was immensely powerful and athletic" (359). In addition, Julian writes that his father's friend was a good, conscientious, patriotic [and] strong man, and gentle and tender as a woman. He had the old-fashioned ways, the courtesy, and the personal dignity which are not often seen nowadays. (359)
Julian's description of Pierce's "voice, his look, his gestures, his gait" as being "delightful" (359) adds to an understanding of his father's admiration of Pierce at Bowdoin. Pierce, like Edward Walcott, the "tall" and "superior" cavalier-like character in Fanshawe, is remembered as having the attributes of an idealized soldier. At one point, Nichols writes that Pierce was "sturdily built and seemingly robust, capable of great exertion and elastic recovery from fatigue" (FP 534).

As Hawthorne's earliest manifestation of the soldier archetype, Walcott is a synthesis of historical context (Hawthorne's impression of Pierce), Gothic apparatus, and the author's busy imagination. Fanshawe's rival is not labeled a soldier by the narrator, but he displays many soldierly qualities that distinguish him as being Hawthorne's soldier prototype. As a pursuer of Ellen's romantic attention, Walcott serves the dual role of being Fanshawe's friend and opponent. Hawthorne describes Walcott by alluding to his background. The narrator tells us that Walcott comes from a family of wealth and respectability. He states:

[T]he natural grace of his manners had been improved (an advantage which few of his associates could boast) by early intercourse with polished society. His features, also, were handsome, and promised to be manly and dignified, when they should cease to be youthful. His character as a scholar was more than
respectable, though many youthful follies, sometimes perhaps approaching nearer to vices, were laid to his charge. But his occasional derelictions from discipline were not such as to create any very serious apprehensions respecting his future welfare; nor were they greater than perhaps might be expected from a young man who possessed a considerable command of money, and who was, besides, the fine gentleman of the little community of which he was a member-- (CE III: 343)

Popular and magnetic, Pierce was considered a "fine gentleman" by many members (Hawthorne, Bridge, and others) of the "little community" of his friends at Bowdoin.

Walcott is in many ways a formulaic character. He is an antagonist whose opposition to and rivalry with the hero are manipulated to advance the plot of the narrative and emphasize the admirable traits of the hero. Fanshawe, like Percy Bysshe Shelley's Zastrozzi and other novels in the Romantic/Gothic tradition, focuses more on the antagonist than the protagonist. Walcott receives more attention from Hawthorne's narrator than the reclusive hero, Fanshawe, and Walcott's actions often dominate the narrative. Signifying this privileging of Walcott over Fanshawe, the narrator describes Walcott as being "certainly much superior" to "his fellow students." As a result of this superiority, Walcott draws "the envy of the college" (CE III: 343). Anything but a peripheral or
insignificant character, Walcott is the enigmatic, active, and soldierly presence in the book whose heroic gestures ironically emphasize Fanshawe's passivity.

The association of Walcott with Pierce is convincing, as Hawthorne merges romantic creation with New England history (in this case, Pierce) that his limited Bowdoin environs offered to him in the 1820's. Applying, as Edward Wagenknecht states, "Scott's methods and point of view to native New England materials" (33), Hawthorne transforms Pierce into Walcott by means of a creative synthesis of the actual and the imaginary. Although Walcott's exaggerated, notably Gothic qualities provide Hawthorne with what Hyatt Waggoner terms "aesthetic distance from his personal situation" (9), the narrator of Fanshawe is not adroit enough to successfully transform Pierce without suggesting that Pierce is Walcott's historical parallel. The Pierce parallels are too obvious, Hawthorne's boyish adoration of Pierce too transparent. Walcott becomes an idealized soldier-friend whose "early intercourse with polished society" (CE III: 343) suggests Pierce's respectable family and his successful father, who was a beloved statesman. The "society" of the phrase might also refer to the Athenaeon Society at Bowdoin. The "handsome" features that the narrator predicts will be "manly" and "dignified" in the future contribute to the soldier paradigm while recalling Nichols' calling Pierce "sturdily built" and "robust" and Julian Hawthorne's nostalgic recollection of Pierce as an
"immensely powerful and athletic" man who exuded "irresistible magnetism" (39).

The narrator's comment that Walcott is a "more than respectable" scholar prone to "youthful follies" and "occasional derelictions from discipline" (CE III: 343) brings to mind a specific moment in Pierce's academic career. After beginning his third year at Bowdoin, Pierce was dismayed to learn that he was ranked last in his class. Driven by a desire to improve his academic standing, Pierce began at that moment what Nichols calls a "campaign for reconstruction" (FP 21). He studied intensively such works as Horace's Graeca, Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, and Paley's Evidences of Christianity (Nichols FP 21). Walcott's primary "dereliction" in the story was Pierce's in real life, that being a fondness for alcohol. In introducing Walcott to the reader, Hawthorne delicately intimates the susceptibility to drink that would persist in his friend's character. Suggesting this vulnerability, Hawthorne writes of Walcott:

But his occasional derelictions from discipline were not such as to create any very serious apprehensions respecting his future welfare; nor were they greater than perhaps might be expected from a young man who possessed a considerable command of money . . .

(CE III: 343)

As early as his first novel, Hawthorne sets the precedent for voicing a rationale for Pierce's behavior. He does this here by
having his narrator implicitly refer to Pierce's weakness for alcohol by addressing Walcott's "derelictions." As will be seen, Hawthorne would later make similar apologetic gestures in Pierce's behalf in letters to Bridge, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, Fields, and others.

Throughout Fanshawe, Walcott serves as an aggressive, purposeful character whose romantic angst and impulsiveness propel him into a series of adventures. While enhancing the suspense of the novel and advancing the formulaic and often implausible plot, his actions further reveal him as an idealized soldier based in many ways on Pierce. Millicent Bell argues in Hawthorne's View of the Artist that the book's "contribution" resides not in its plot or its imitative, Gothic formula, but in Hawthorne's intriguing "study of personality" (241). However, Walcott's gestures demonstrate Hawthorne's interest in presenting a soldier type by means of depicting events. One of Walcott's first actions in the work reflects his role as a courageous and even rash example of this soldier paradigm. Walcott is angered when Butler speaks to Ellen bluntly at the bank of the stream. He noticed also that she shared "a glance with the stranger, the meaning of which [Butler] appeared perfectly to understand" (CE III: 358). After gallantly escorting Ellen to the home of her guardian, Dr. Melmoth, Walcott angrily hurries back to the stream, hoping to duel with Butler.
Later, the narrator emphasizes Walcott's role as a soldierly, aggressive character by commenting on his "rather hasty temper" and the ever-present potential of his temper to be "violently" manifested (CE III: 383). Often, Walcott is so bothered by his anxieties regarding the relationship between Ellen and Butler that his features are altered by the "blood that rushed to his brow" (CE III: 384) in the heat of his distress. At Hugh Crombie's inn, following an episode of alcoholic indulgence, Walcott reveals more potential for aggression: "[Walcott's] passions, thoroughly excited, would willingly have wreaked themselves on any one" (CE III: 393). Walcott's aggressiveness and "reckless gaiety" (CE III: 394) eventually lead him to violence. In one episode, a drunken Walcott hurls chairs toward Hugh Crombie "with prodigious force" (CE III: 395), shattering a costly mirror. The violence of the scene is balanced by a farcical quality, as Walcott and Crombie (the latter man accompanied by an unnamed guest of the inn) become warring enemies. In their miniature battle, they throw furniture and even an andiron at each other. The comments of Crombie's associate emphasize Walcott's role as a rambunctious, volatile soldier. After Walcott heaves an andiron "with round brazen head" (CE III: 396) towards his enemies, Crombie's partner says:
"Let us return his fire, Hugh . . . He is in want of ammunition; let us send him back his own." (CE III: 396)

Here the unruly Walcott illustrates an extreme militaristic tendency, yielding to "an impulse to break and destroy whatever chanced to be within his reach" (CE III: 395). Though a marginal scene of low comedy, the episode stresses Walcott's role as a soldier-like character in the romance.

When Walcott is chasing after Ellen and Butler on a horse he borrowed from Crombie, the soldierly aspect of his character is again evident. Hawthorne employs several modifying phrases to strengthen the Walcott-soldier association and, by extension, the Walcott-Pierce linkage. Unrelenting, driven, impulsive, and heroic, Walcott is depicted vividly as being, in Cantwell's view, "a headstrong, reckless youth, who seems plainly modeled on Franklin Pierce" (122). As the narrative reaches its climax, Walcott becomes a hero-in-pursuit, a romanticized soldier-hero-lover whose soldierly stamina and bravery reveal Hawthorne's impressions of Pierce as the bold and defiant captain of the Bowdoin military company. Walcott, Edwin Haviland Miller writes, is the dynamic counterpart to Fanshawe's static persona. Miller adds that he is a "practical" and "life-affirming" (81) figure who, in soldierly fashion, both acts and demands actions from others. Hawthorne's narrator freely catalogues the soldierly aspects of Walcott's gestures. Walcott mounts his horse "with all expedition"
(CE III: 412), finding a certain "charm" in the "uncertainty" and the "probable dangers of the expedition" (CE III: 413). In the diary he kept during his Mexican War campaign, Pierce often expressed a similarly aggressive stance. At one point, Pierce writes in the diary: "If you must have war the answer of Palifax--'War to the knife and the knife to the hilt' is the true sentiment--" (Nichols FP 156-57).

Indicating Walcott's soldierly inclinations, Hawthorne adds:

In fact, Edward would not have been altogether satisfied to recover the errant damsel, without first doing battle in her behalf. (CE III: 413)

Walcott, whose horse is faster than Fanshawe's (a semiotic indication that the narrator privileges Walcott over Fanshawe in many ways), rides with "increased ardour" (CE III: 414). Later, as an illustration of his military preparedness, Walcott, wearing a sword at his side, presents pistols to Dr. Melmoth. Walcott hopes to relieve Melmoth's worries that they have no weapons with which to encounter Butler. Walcott's gallant statements are intentionally soldier-like, complementing his soldierly "ardour":

"One of these, if you will accept it," answered Edward, exhibiting a brace of pistols, "will serve to begin the conflict, before you join the battle hand to hand." (CE III: 417)

Walcott, in serving the role of exaggerated soldier-rescuer, reveals a practical perspective that characterizes him
as a tactician. Concerned only with employing the "most direct method" (CE III: 423) of rescuing Ellen from Butler, Walcott (labeled by the narrator as a "squire") outlines to Dr. Melmoth his plan for saving Ellen. Again, Hawthorne's admiration of Captain Pierce of the Bowdoin military company comes to mind. (In a letter to Pierce in 1832, Hawthorne playfully offers a prophecy of his friend's future accomplishments. He states that the rank of head of Department of War would best "suit" Pierce.)

Walcott's commanding personality suggests Pierce.

"If I may presume to advise," said [Walcott to Dr. Melmoth], "you, as being most valiant and experienced, should ride forward, lance in hand, (your long staff serving for a lance,) while I annoy the enemy from afar." (CE III: 417)

Just as, to quote Philip E. Burnham, "one feels the author very strongly" in "descriptions of the moods and emotions of Fanshawe" (135), one also senses Hawthorne's adulation of Pierce in the romantic actions of Walcott. One might also argue that Fanshawe's envy of Walcott (an envy, according to the logic of the narrative, that is shared by all the students at Harley College) reflects, to some degree, a subconscious envy of Pierce on Hawthorne's part. Hawthorne thus expresses, behind the supposedly safe shield of romance, an envy of the soldierly and popular friend with whom, according to Hubert H. Hoeltje, he would frequently stroll "down the campus arm in arm" (214).

Walcott's dialogue, often heroic (and even mock-heroic in
places) and indicative of his proneness to action, reveals more
evidence that, as a manifestation of the soldier type, he is a
projection of Hawthorne's impression of Pierce. George Parsons
Lathrop presented the thesis in 1876 that Hawthorne "constantly
and closely scanned . . . [Pierce's] character with his
impartial and searching eye for human character" (CE III: 115).
If Lathrop's thesis is valid, then Walcott's speech acts
illustrate Hawthorne's interest in Pierce's character as a
source for romantic interpretation. Walcott's statements are
often stylized, exaggeratedly heroic (though not ironic or
deprecating), and soldierly. In creating Walcott, Hawthorne
was influenced by his reading of Scott, Radcliffe, Maturin,
and Byron. In addition, Walcott's dialogue reveals
Hawthorne's enthusiasm for the military demeanor of his boyhood
hero, Andrew Jackson, whom he associates with Pierce. Like
Hawthorne, Pierce was a lifelong Democrat and Jackson supporter.
Walcott's statements frequently suggest a Jacksonian
preference for the efficient and the practical. Early in the
novel, Walcott speaks to Ellen using phrases that one would
expect from a soldier and horseman. Encouraging Ellen to
journey with him despite the late hour ("'Shall we try the
adventure now, Ellen?'") (CE III: 345), Walcott employs
language that also demonstrates his role as a romantic
cavalier: "'Come, Ellen--one light touch of the whip:--
your pony is as fresh as when we started'" (CE III: 345).
Later, he illustrates his soldierly and aggressive
inclinations at the bank of the stream. Jesting with Fanshawe, he states:

"Now would I give the world," [Walcott] exclaimed, with great interest, "for a hook and line--a fish spear, or any piscatorial instrument of death!"

(CE III: 354)

At The Hand and The Bottle Inn, an inebriated Walcott provokes Butler to a duel. Walcott demands "'a man's satisfaction'" ("'and that speedily'") with conventional, Gothic posing. "'Choose your distance,'" he tells Butler (CE III: 397). Hugh Crombie, intervening to postpone the duel until the following morning, also uses soldierly rhetoric, perhaps impressed by Walcott's bravado. Crombie cheerily tells the drunken Walcott:

"Come, Master Walcott, the enemy has retreated. Victoria! And now, I see, the sooner I get you to your chamber, the better." (CE III: 397)

Walcott is an active, determined character whose imperative rhetoric suggests the abilities of a natural leader. When an ally of Butler's refuses to tell him where Butler is at one point, Walcott tells the man: "'You must change this tone, fellow . . . I order you to lower your hand, and answer the questions that I shall put to you'" (CE III: 424). Throughout the narrative, Walcott's use of stately, soldierly, and commanding language supports categorization of him as a manifestation of the Pierce-influenced soldier archetype.
Finally, the narrator expands Walcott beyond the status of soldier type and depicts him as a romanticized cavalier. He becomes a gentleman-soldier who is reminiscent of Scott's Edward Waverley, Quentin Durward, and Ivanhoe. No mere soldier, Walcott is a paradigm of the chivalrous courtier and knight-errant, a near-mythological combination of Pierce's soldierly persona and Hawthorne's inspired fantasy. Early in the story, Walcott's role as knight-errant and protector of Ellen Langdon is evident. At the bank of a stream, Walcott, Ellen (often referred to as a "damsel"), and Fanshawe meet Butler. The conniving, villainous Butler appears as a threat to Ellen, expressing his antagonism in a fashion that is typical of Gothic romance.

"But will not the young lady try her skill?"
[Butler] continued, casting a bold eye on Ellen.
"The fish will love to be drawn out by such white hands as those." (CE III: 356)

Angered by this gesture, Walcott responds with ferocity. His "crimson cheek and flashing eye," we are told, "endangered" civility (CE III: 357).

"The young lady will not put the gallantry of the fish to the proof, Sir," [Walcott] said, "and she will therefore have no occasion for your own."

(CE III: 356)

Later, Hawthorne emphasizes Walcott's chivalric nature by stating that he is an example of "quixotism" who seeks to
provide "protection" (CE III: 382) for the beautiful Ellen. At one point, Ellen's devoted champion proclaims his steadfastness and dedication to romantic duty in a melodramatic manner: "'Forget her? Never, never! . . . I will follow her to the ends of the earth'" (CE III: 411).

The narrator of Fanshawe further qualifies Walcott's character by depicting him often as a romanticized cavalier. He is often seen as a chivalric knight whose exaggerated virtues signify, at times, Hawthorne's youthful admiration of Pierce. Merging a naive, enthusiastic interest in Pierce's soldierly demeanor with the soldier paradigm, Hawthorne manipulates language to shape Walcott as a courtier-knight figure. Hawthorne's preoccupation with the soldier archetype is here most obvious and most clearly articulated. Walcott becomes a Jacksonian soldier, a practical tactician, an athletic and Pierce-like commander of action, and a knight whose "quixotism" the narrator clearly finds engaging. Labeled Ellen's "cavalier" (CE III: 344), Walcott bravely defends her against the dark and threatening Butler. This protective impulse is often voiced by Walcott in the language of romance and melodrama: "'The young lady will not put the gallantry of the fish to the proof, Sir . . . and she will therefore have no occasion for your own'" (CE III: 356). Walcott's role of protector is evident in such gestures as his "biting his lip with vexation" (CE III: 357) at Butler's aggressive behavior.
Walcott's skills as a horseman while pursuing Ellen and Butler also complement his knightly status. Before leaving Crombie's inn to attempt a rescue of Ellen, Walcott drinks a mug of apple cider and brandy that is offered to him by Crombie. Walcott's response to Crombie's gesture is a stylized phrase one would expect to find in a Scott romance or an Arthurian legend. The youth tells Crombie: "It is powerful stuff, mine host, and I feel like a new man already" (CE III: 412). Crombie's comment after Walcott races after his damsel-in-distress reflects the narrator's depiction of Walcott as a knight. Watching Walcott ride away, Crombie murmurs: "He is a fine lad, and sits his horse most gallantly" (CE III: 412). This charming and goal-oriented knight, possessing "unwavering faith and pure and fervent love for Ellen Langdon" (CE III: 413), becomes an almost mythological representative of the soldier paradigm, an exaggeratedly chivalric hero.

In the scene in which Walcott catches up with Dr. Melmoth en route to saving Ellen, Hawthorne offers a treatment of knightly camaraderie that, almost mockingly, at times, illustrates Walcott's role as glorified knight. Again, the presence of Pierce, whom Frank Preston Stearns describes as "a man of mercurial mood and quick-changing emotion" (242), is evident in Hawthorne's descriptions of Walcott. If, in imitating the Gothic formula, the young author is presenting characters with overstated, as well as stock, qualities, then
Walcott represents a romanticization of Pierce's soldierly qualities while at Bowdoin. Dr. Melmoth's admiration of Walcott shows a significant inversion of the typical master-student, knight-squire relationship. To enhance Walcott's charismatic character, the narrator states that, in a "rather ludicrous" (CE III: 418) manner, Melmoth subordinates himself to the young Walcott. At first, Melmoth wishes that his wife was accompanying him during the pursuit of Butler and Ellen. The narrator tells us that the wife is a woman of "firmness, decision, and confident sagacity" (CE III: 415). Next, Dr. Melmoth looks to Walcott as a worthy companion.

Hawthorne writes:

In the absence of such a counsellor [as his wife],
even Edward Walcott--young as he was, and indiscreet
as the Doctor thought him--was a substitute not to
be despised; and it was singular and rather ludicrous
to observe how the gray-haired man unconsciously
came as a child to the beardless youth.

(CE III: 418)

This reversal suggests Hawthorne's romantic transformation of the traits he saw in Pierce while at Bowdoin College. Melmoth speaks to Walcott "with an assumption of dignity" (CE III: 416), and he subordinates himself to Walcott. He appears to be aware of the youth's natural superiority. This inversion may have as its historical source Pierce's successful defiance of President Allen's command regarding the marching route of the Bowdoin
military company, a defiance that apparently went without punishment from Allen. Hawthorne, present in the ranks of the company of cadets at the time of Pierce's rebellion, would have been impressed by his captain's stance. It is also important here to remember that Hawthorne approved of Benjamin Pierce's opposition to the British in the Revolutionary War and his rigid opposition to the Federalists in New Hampshire politics. Nichols' comment that at college Pierce reflected "the full glow of military enthusiasm" (FP 23), in conjunction with Horatio Bridge's recollection of Pierce as a student who was "erect, with a military bearing" (27), complements Dr. Melmoth's recognition of natural leadership abilities and soldierly features in Walcott.

Walcott's superiority to the Harley College president is multifold: he is younger (a Romantic advantage), more active and agile, and his horse is faster (a semiotic marker denoting superiority). Melmoth's statements reveal Hawthorne's fondness for romance and his consistent coloring of Walcott as a romantic hero. Noting the reversal of the master-student relationship, Melmoth says at one point:

"Alas, youth! These are strange times . . . when a Doctor of Divinity and an under graduate [sic] set forth, like a knight-errant and his squire, in search of a stray damsel. (CE III: 416)

Thus, in a moment of immature literary expression, Hawthorne demonstrates his inability to transform his historical sources
(Bowdoin College, Pierce, the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship) into complex art. At the writing of *Fanshawe*, Hawthorne lacks the skill necessary to disguise his historic contexts. Walcott's "imagination," the narrator adds, "was highly tickled by Doctor Melmoth's chivalrous comparison" (*CE III*: 417).

Hawthorne describes Walcott as a justice-seeker, as a noble soldier-knight engaged in a quest to achieve justice and fame. Emphasizing Walcott's self-reliant, heroic spirit, the narrator notes that Walcott did not want Ellen's newly-arrived father to assist him in his rescue of Ellen. Walcott preferred instead "to be an independent ally, rather than a subordinate assistant" (*CE III*: 421). He reflects a heroic Jacksonian individualism that Hawthorne found in Pierce. Walcott is characterized as a singular hero who is unafraid of the perilous consequences of his actions. An old, unemployed seaman, who is in alliance with Butler, asks Walcott during the chase, "'Do you mean to take the law with you?—or will you right your wrongs, if you have any, with your own right hand'" (*CE III*: 426). Walcott's response to him is the direct response one would expect from a determined seeker of justice: "'It is my intention to take the latter method'" (*CE III*: 426). Walcott even tells the old man that he will "'deliver [him] up to justice'" (*CE III*: 424) if he does not cooperate with Walcott's demands. Walcott's intensity, to a degree, reflects what Nichols sees as Pierce's "mercurial mood" (242) as Walcott's "active intellect
alternately formed and relinquished a thousand plans for the recovery of Ellen" (CE III: 422). Later in the novel, Walcott admirably resigns from his schemes to win Ellen's love because he realizes that Fanshawe loves her. Hawthorne again uses the language of chivalry to describe Walcott's resignation. We are told that Walcott, "feeling the irresistible strength of his rival's claim," quietly and humbly "retired from the field" (CE III: 456).

Hawthorne gives to Walcott more qualities of a knight-errant from romantic legend by assigning to him the status of poet, and by presenting a scene at Hugh Crombie's inn in which Walcott's role as poet-soldier is demonstrated. To complete the picture of Walcott as a knight-like character, the narrator presents a song that Walcott composes in a moment of revelry and wine-induced frivolity. The song, an "extemporaneous production" that reveals "want of polish" (CE III: 386), reflects Walcott's role as knight. He is a typical soldier of romantic dimensions, a lover of wine, a maker of songs, an agent of justice, and a devoted protector of a young woman. The first of the song's two stanzas reads:

"The wine is bright, the wine is bright,
And gay the drinkers be;
Of all that drain the bowl to-night,
Most jollily drain we.
Oh, could one search the weary earth,
The earth from sea to sea,—
He'd turn and mingle in our mirth,

For we're the merriest three. (CE III: 386)

The song is a fitting reminder of Walcott's soldierly role and the Pierce parallels. Millicent Bell writes that, "like Scott, Hawthorne wishes to suggest that his story takes place in an age of song and ballad" (442). By celebrating manly camaraderie—the "merriest three" being Fanshawe, a friend named Glover, and himself—Walcott sings a song that is indeed reminiscent of the lifelong friendship between Bowdoin chums Pierce, Hawthorne, and Bridge.

In his preface to The Snow-Image and Other Twice-told Tales (1851), written in the form of a letter to his old friend Bridge and published some twenty-three years after the anonymous publication of Fanshawe, Hawthorne offers an apologia for his treatment of autobiographical matters in his first novel and various prefaces. The employment of prefaces was clearly on the author's mind. Recent prefaces to the Ticknor, Reed, and Fields edition of Twice-told Tales (1850) and The House of the Seven Gables (1851) had created great public interest in Hawthorne, an interest that was amplified by the success of The Scarlet Letter (1850). James T. Fields, in fact, consistently emphasized the necessity of keeping Hawthorne's name before the public to promote interest in Hawthorne's works and encourage sales.

An analysis of the preface to The Snow-Image and Hawthorne's use of the apologia form reveals the author's
hesitancy in expressing autobiographical facts explicitly in his works. This hesitancy, a shyness that for many critics and biographers has defined Hawthorne's persona, is complicated in the preface by his ambiguous response to his early literary efforts. In fact, the preface appears to be in many ways a "corrective" to the autobiographical allowances in *Fanshawe*. Written not long before he agreed to write the *Life of Franklin Pierce*, the preface displays the author's renewed interest in his years at Bowdoin. It appears that Hawthorne is reconsidering such friends as Bridge and Pierce, the various exploits of "lads together at a country college," the "prognostic" offered by friends and faculty of Hawthorne's "destiny," and the consequent first novel, *Fanshawe*. The subtext of the preface, then, is the Bowdoin experience. Hawthorne voices a rationale for his use of prefaces and introductions, with which he claims he has "pave[d] the reader's way into the interior edifice of a book." He also offers the preface as a "corrective" to the less ambiguous revelations of personal history in *Fanshawe*.

The preface exhibits ample linguistic evidence of Hawthorne's efforts to defend and explain his writing of prefaces and introductions. Writing within the format of a mock-letter, Hawthorne suggests that he wishes to discuss the place of autobiographical matters in his art. The preface is a medium in which "friend speaks to friend" (*CE XI*: 4) despite the fact that "strangers" (*CE XI*: 3) will also
have access to it. Hawthorne also notes that he is aware of the "dangers of being overheard by the public at large" (CE XI: 3). The author responds to claims that his interest in prefaces is generated by self-indulgent, self-promoting tendencies in a direct, forceful fashion. He also employs the strategy of allying himself with the reading public (from whom he strives to conceal personal matters elsewhere in the piece). Hawthorne writes:

Some of the more crabbed of my critics, I understand, have pronounced your friend egotistical, indiscreet, and even impertinent, on account of the Prefaces and Introductions. . . . In the justice of this censure I do not exactly concur. (CE XI: 3)

The angry tone of the first line of the passage, emphasized by the modifier "crabbed" (and the suggestion that all of Hawthorne's critics are "crabbed," and that those condemning his use of prefaces are "more crabbed" than others), contrasts with the regal, elegantly phrased, legalistic-sounding final line. Hawthorne's lack of finality, however, in stating that he does not "exactly concur" with the charges against him is curious. Perhaps he agrees, maybe even unconsciously, with some of the claims that he uses self-indulgent, autobiographical tactics in writing prefaces. As objective consideration shows, Hawthorne balances personal revelations in his prefaces with a masterly manipulation of concealment and silence.
To strengthen his defense of his employment of prefaces, Hawthorne makes note of the favorable responses of the public to the pieces. He states that

the public generally has negatived the idea of undue freedom on the author's part, by evincing, it seems to me, rather more interest in these aforesaid Introductions than in the stories which followed.

(CE XI: 3)

Hawthorne's suggestion that the prefaces to his collections and novels garner more public approval than the works themselves is yet another example of an expression of mock-humility. This self-disparaging, self-effacing tendency recurs frequently in Hawthorne's prefatory texts, correspondence, and journals. Later in the preface to The Snow-Image, Hawthorne asks, "But, was there ever such a weary delay in obtaining the slightest recognition from the public, as in my case" (CE XI: 5). The question reveals the author's exaggerated sense of anonymity. Also, in the context of his popularity in 1851, the sentiment seems misplaced. Sales of The Scarlet Letter and The House of the Seven Gables were substantial enough to throw doubt upon Hawthorne's statement that he is receiving "the slightest recognition from the public."

To conclude his defense against charges of indiscretion and indulgence, Hawthorne exhibits boldness while creating a driven, self-justified persona. The author claims that his treatment of "facts which relate to [him]self" (CE XI: 14) in prefaces and
introductions is not solely a self-directed, solipsistic act of expression. Such a "charge," Hawthorne states (admitting that he is "bold" at such moments), "is not a reasonable one" (CE XI: 4). Hawthorne's defense is complicated by his manipulation of mock-self-marginalization and a feigned underestimation of his popularity and status. With this apparent self-disparagement, Hawthorne creates mystery and interest. Hawthorne's veil is a linguistic one, as he devalues self on a textual, literal level to create interest in himself and his works. The author's preoccupation with acceptance, fame, financial gain, and artistic progress—he notes at one point the "blindness" of "the fraternity of booksellers" to his "wonderful merit" (CE XI: 5)—is evident throughout the preface, not in spite of but because of this self-deprecation. He writes:

I might further justify myself, on the plea that, ever since my youth, I have been addressing a very limited circle of friendly readers, without much danger of being overheard by the public at large.

(CE XI: 3)

This passage conveys an inauthentic air if one recalls the extensive popularity of such recent works as The Scarlet Letter and The House of the Seven Gables. The line also reveals Hawthorne's manipulation of self-marginalization to draw notice. Hawthorne's "very limited circle of friendly readers" is, at the time of the writing of the preface, anything but a very
limited circle.

After Hawthorne has established his defense for writing prefaces and introductions, he presents a brief, stylized, and idyllic description of his Bowdoin experience. This description, an almost marginal sketch that is "buried" in the middle of the preface (at the bottom of the third paragraph), is a logical consequence of the earlier section of the preface. Hawthorne's organization of the preface is logical and linear. First, he defends his textualization of personal history in prefatory texts (although this textualization is often ambiguous and romanticized, of course). Next, he presents an example of such textualization. Hawthorne reminds Bridge, as well as the "strangers" who have "mingled" with his "audience" (CE XI: 3), of the activities of "two lads together at a country college" (CE XI: 4). He remembers

gathering blue-berries, in study-hours, under those tall academic pines; or watching the great logs, as they tumbled along the current of the Androscoggin; or shooting pigeons and gray squirrels in the woods or bat-fowling in the summer twilight.

(CE XI: 4)

The passage is made emphatic by its brevity and Hawthorne's strategy to effect concealment. One cannot help wondering what "hundred things" he and Bridge did "that the Faculty never heard of" (CE XI: 4). It is an idealized sketch that avoids personal revelations or psychological disclosure. Unlike
Fanshawe, in which Hawthorne's Bowdoin days are to some degree less ambiguously depicted, the passage shows Hawthorne's inclination to present "some of the ordinary facts of life in a slightly idealized and artistic guise" (CE XI: 4).

The sketch offers a cautious, brief, and purposefully non-specific treatment of autobiographical elements that Hawthorne apparently prefers to the disclosure allowed in Fanshawe. Hawthorne's zeal for managing autobiographical materials to create mystery and intrigue via concealment, brevity, and romanticization is evident on a subtextual level throughout the preface. The following sentence, mentioned earlier, reveals telling linguistic signifiers concerning Hawthorne's ambiguous attitude toward autobiographical disclosure:

There is no harm, but, on the contrary, good, in arraying some of the ordinary facts of life in a slightly idealized and artistic guise. (CE XI: 4)

The modifiers in the passage, "some" and "slightly," reveal Hawthorne's anxiety and caution regarding self-revelation. The short description of Bowdoin life in the preface, then, serves as a "corrective" to the excessive, revelatory aspects of Fanshawe. His first novel does not present the ambiguous, disguised treatments of personal history that his mature works do. Of course, Fanshawe, as suggestive as it is of Hawthorne's Bowdoin experience, is not autobiography. That the novel only suggests autobiographical elements and was
published anonymously further illustrates Hawthorne's hypersensitivity to revealing self-portraiture to "strangers" (CE XI: 3), the "public at large" (CE XI: 3), and the "crabbed" proponents of "cold criticism" (CE XI: 5).
Notes

1. Critics and biographers have convincingly established the Harley College/Bowdoin College parallels in Fanshawe. Carl Bode writes that "librarian George T. Little of Bowdoin College, among them, pointed out as early as the turn of the century that Hawthorne's Harley College bore many specific resemblances to the Bowdoin Hawthorne knew" (236). After Little, scholars who have discussed these similarities include Bode, Randall Stewart, Philip E. Burnham, Robert Cantwell, Millicent Bell, Leo B. Levy, Nina Baym, Arlin Turner, James R. Mellow, and Edwin Haviland Miller, among others. The parallels are indeed many. Dr. Melmoth's garden suggests the garden near President William Allen's residence on campus, facing Maine Hall; the stream at which Fanshawe, Walcott, and Ellen meet Butler is remindful of Paradise Spring, which, remembered by Horatio Bridge for the "absolute purity of its waters" (11), emptied into the nearby Androscoggin River; the cave to which Butler takes Ellen suggests a popular haunt of Hawthorne's and Bridge's, a few miles east of Brunswick; Hugh Crombie's The Hand and the Bottle Inn recalls Ward's Tavern; and, as Burnham points out, Dr. Melmoth is reminiscent of President Allen in that, like Melmoth, Allen was, during Hawthorne's years at Bowdoin, at work on a weighty literary project, a dictionary of American biography.
2. Hyatt H. Waggoner responds to the Fanshawe-Hawthorne parallel by stating that, although "many found [Hawthorne] ordinarily quite cheerful and reasonably sociable" (9), he also seemed to share some qualities with the reclusive Fanshawe. Waggoner writes that the image of Hawthorne as a sociable person "begins to waver and blur as soon as we turn from the remarks of observers to the inner life as revealed in the writing. The well-adjusted Hawthorne, we begin to suspect, is the man he would have liked to be, and no doubt partly succeeded in being, but it is not the man he himself knew from within. The family letters, the Notebooks, and the more personal sketches all reveal a quite different man behind the social mask" (9).

3. Frank Preston Stearns, a colleague of Julian Hawthorne's at Harvard, gives a description of Pierce that counters Julian's idealized recollections of Pierce. Stearns writes that Pierce was "not much above the average in intellect, and, as Hawthorne afterward confessed, not particularly attractive in appearance, with a stiff military neck, features strong but small, and opaque gray eyes,—a rather unimpressive face, and one hardly capable of decided expression" (62-63).

4. Emphasizing the autobiographical aspect of the novel, Millicent Bell writes: "The main character in Fanshawe is Nathaniel Hawthorne. It is true that Gorham Deane may have furnished the suggestion for the figure of Fanshawe and that Hawthorne himself was at least lively and convivial enough to
be fined by the faculty for drinking at the old inn" (238).

5. On June 1, 1859, Pierce spoke at an anniversary banquet given in Faneuil Hall by the Ancient and Honourable Artillery Company. In his speech, Pierce expressed his adherence to the tenets of the Democratic party. Nichols writes that the theme of Pierce's address was that "the Constitution and the Union must be preserved, that latter word [having] more power for good to the human race than any other known in the English language" (FP 508).

6. As Robert Cantwell points out, an interesting Walcott-Pierce parallel (that, of course, Hawthorne could not have foreseen in writing Fanshawe) is evident in their marriages. In the novel, Walcott marries Ellen Langdon, the ward of the president of the college. Pierce, shortly after graduating from Bowdoin College, married Jane Appleton, the daughter of former Bowdoin president Jesse Appleton. In addition, Cantwell writes that Jane Appleton Pierce "had a certain oblique resemblance to Ellen," being "frail, beautiful, with a pensive, ethereal charm" (122).

7. Hawthorne's frequent devaluation of his earlier works in the preface to The Snow-Image presents numerous questions for critics to ponder. At one point, he labels his earlier writings "musty and mouse-nibbled leaves" (CE XI: 6). Is Hawthorne presenting an authentic voice in his disapproval of these texts? Or, as the preface implies, is this disparagement a device he employs to obtain the opposite of
what he appears to want to obtain (i.e., is he really looking for acceptance and approval despite his apparent desire to voice derision, disapproval, and deprecation of his older works?)? Is Hawthorne employing a strategy of mock-self-disparagement to elicit attention to these lesser known texts? A tension is evident between both viewpoints in the preface, raising doubts about the sincerity of Hawthorne's expressions of disappointment regarding the earlier writings. How did he really feel about them? Are these early texts "various trifles" and mere "indices of intellectual condition at far separated epochs" that cause the author a "singular complexity of regrets" *(CE XI: 6)*? Or are these pieces "memorial[s]" of a "long and unbroken connection" with the past, serving as emblems of a "wisdom . . . uttered long ago" *(CE XI: 6)*? Interestingly, Hawthorne's closing sentiments on the issue are phrased in what is arguably the preface's most poetic passage. Hawthorne's ambivalence regarding his earlier works remains evident. If these early texts are merely "musty and mouse-nibbled leaves," one wonders, do they deserve all of the attention that Hawthorne gives them in his preface? Hawthorne writes: "if a few [of these obscure, early works] still remain, they are either such as no paternal partiality could induce the author to think worth preserving, or else they have got into some very dark and dusty hiding-place, quite out of my own remembrance and whence no researches can avail to unearth them. So there let them rest" *(CE XI: 6)*.
CHAPTER 4

DUTY AND DILEMMA IN THE LIFE OF FRANKLIN PIERCE

"A statesman in your proper life—a gallant soldier in the hour of your country's need."

--Hawthorne, in a letter to Pierce, July 5, 1852

In the summer of 1852, Hawthorne hastily wrote the Life of Franklin Pierce. It was a brief campaign biography that would raise many significant questions regarding Hawthorne's political aspirations, his political alliances, and the influence of his friendship with Pierce on his art. Like his earlier eulogy of Jonathan Cilley published in the Democratic Review, the Pierce biography signified Hawthorne's political sympathies to a broad, national audience. It also demonstrated Hawthorne's willingness—despite his only partly authentic statements that his talents were unsuited for political biography—to apply his skills to political propagandizing and partisan rhetoric.

In writing the biography for Pierce's presidential campaign, Hawthorne found himself confronting a situation that was unlike any other in his career. It was a moment of artistic crisis and, in many ways, a pivotal moment in Hawthorne's political career.

To begin with, Hawthorne had difficulties acquiring information for the biography, often voicing complaints in letters to his publisher, William D. Ticknor, and to Pierce.
himself. Also, the material that Hawthorne did have to work with was limited, and Pierce's military, professional, and political records were, with a few exceptions, rather ordinary. In addition, Pierce was a very controversial candidate. He was heatedly opposed not only by Whigs (and many fellow Democrats as well) but also by Northern intellectuals, including Emerson and Horace Mann, by abolitionists, and by Free Soilers. Pierce's adversaries criticized his pro-South sympathies, his laissez-faire attitude regarding slavery, and his earlier support of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.1 Despite his own quiet disagreement with some of Pierce's views, Hawthorne aligned himself with his friend. Doing so, Hawthorne knew that he faced certain criticism, suspicion, and negative political consequences.2 Equipped with a certain political savvy, Hawthorne, writes Mellow, was "under no illusions about the results of his actions" (407). Hawthorne was cognizant of the delicacy of his situation as political biographer. In a letter to Pierce on July 5, 1852, Hawthorne expressed both gentle humor and a subtextual anxiety regarding the project. Hawthorne wrote:

I sometimes wish the convention had nominated old [Lewis] Cass! It would have saved you and me a great deal of trouble; but my share of it will terminate four years sooner than your own.

(CE XVI: 561)
The resultant text demonstrates the influence of Pierce on Hawthorne's writings by illustrating the author's Democratic partisanship, his romantic transformation of Pierce for political and artistic purposes, and, in presenting idealized reconstructions of Pierce and his father, his continued employment of a soldier paradigm.

A review of the history of the composition of the biography reveals the origins of the tensions and political dynamics evident in the book. On June 5, 1852, Pierce received news that he had been nominated on the 49th ballot at the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore. His nomination had been won after five days and nights of balloting. Other candidates who pursued the nomination included Stephen A. Douglas, James Buchanan, Lewis Cass, and an aging Daniel Webster. Hawthorne, having moved his family into the home he later called the Wayside (formerly owned by Bronson Alcott) on June 5, learned of Pierce's nomination on June 8. Although Hawthorne would not formally announce his decision to write the biography until June 17, his designs to combine personal friendship, political opportunity, and literary craftsmanship were already evident.

On June 9, Hawthorne wrote a congratulatory letter to Pierce that raises numerous issues. In the letter, Hawthorne's political eagerness and "political adroitness" (Mellow 406) are intimated beneath the guise of modesty and self-detachment from political engagement. The letter deserves close analysis,
for it presents the tensions and delicacy of Hawthorne's situation. Revealing a respectful and distinctly political tenor in his elegant prose, Hawthorne tells Pierce that he is unqualified to write political biography while at the same time implying his eagerness to do so. Stating that the nomination was "not unexpected" and that it symbolized the "tendency of all [of Pierce's] fortunes" (CE XVI: 545), Hawthorne first celebrates the nomination, expressing partisanship and a concern for Pierce's welfare:

I hardly know whether to congratulate you; for it would be absurd to suppose that the great office to which you are destined will ever afford you one happy or comfortable moment—-and yet it is an end worthy of all ambition, as the highest success that the whole world offers to a statesman. (CE XVI: 545)

Almost prophesying the divisiveness, debilitation, and factionalism that would characterize Pierce's administration (the presidency, Hawthorne tells his friend, will not provide him with "one happy or comfortable moment"), Hawthorne heartily applauds the nomination and establishes early in the letter his rigorous support of Pierce's campaign.

Following this prefatory celebration, Hawthorne addresses what appears to be the primary purpose of the letter--the issue of a "necessary" (CE XVI: 545) campaign biography for Pierce. Here, Hawthorne employs a coy strategy as he expresses
feigned self-deprecation to achieve the opposite of what he appears to want to achieve. Mellow states that despite Hawthorne's claims that he is uncomfortable with undertaking the project, he reveals in the letter to Pierce "both his availability for the task and his reluctance to perform it" (406). Hawthorne indicates his political deftness by employing a persona that demonstrates both political zeal and modest self-removal from politics. Interestingly enough, Pierce himself, as a dark horse candidate for the nomination, had successfully employed this strategy. Mellow adds that Hawthorne "acted like a man suspiciously eager for the job" (407). Hawthorne cleverly camouflages this eagerness with rhetoric that expresses both his unsuitability for the task and his desire that Pierce receive the best possible biography (which, Hawthorne intimates, he himself can offer). Yet Hawthorne's ambition shines through. He tells Pierce:

It has occurred to me that you might have some thoughts of getting me to write the necessary biography. Whatever service I can do you, I need not say, would be at your command; but I do not believe that I should succeed in this matter so well as many other men. It needs long thought with me, in order to produce anything good, and, after all, my style and qualities, as a writer, are
certainly not those of the broadest popularity, such as are requisite for a task of this kind.

(CE XVI: 545)

Hawthorne, perhaps accidentally, reveals his deliberateness regarding the project. He writes that "it has occurred" to him that Pierce "might" have "some thoughts" about his writing the biography. The seeming offhandedness and casual aspect of the phrasing are deceptive, for Pierce had, immediately after his nomination, mentioned that he would prefer that Hawthorne, a friend, write the book. Indeed, Pierce, Mellow writes, "was eager to have Hawthorne write his official campaign biography" (407). Hawthorne suggests in the passage that he too has been pondering his working on the project, even though "many other men" would achieve greater success with the task. The words of the passage indicate Hawthorne's subtextual eagerness: he will, he says, offer any "service" he can in Pierce's behalf, and he is at Pierce's "command" (using the word "command" to denote military associations with Pierce). Furthermore, Hawthorne's comment that his talents are not those of "the broadest popularity" is suspect, for the popular success of his recent novels, *The Scarlet Letter* and *The House of the Seven Gables*, suggests otherwise.

Next, Hawthorne concludes his persuasive ploy by recommending to Pierce one of those "many other men" who would write the biography more effectively than he would. Here, Hawthorne's self-marginalization and mock-modesty are
transparent. His willingness to write the biography becomes obvious. In an effort not to appear too ambitious or deliberate regarding the project, Hawthorne recommends Charles Creighton Hazewell for the job. Hawthorne tells Pierce:

   If you should think favorably of it, I would give [Hazewell] all the assistance in my power, and have no doubt that he would acquit himself ten times better than I should. I am not personally acquainted with Mr Hazewell, (or Haswell; for I don't know how he spells his name) but could easily become so, as he is a resident of this town. (CE XVI: 546)

As the editors of the Centenary Edition note, it is odd that Hawthorne was unacquainted with Hazewell. Hazewell was a one-time editor of the Concord Freeman and, at the time of this letter, the editor of the Middlesex Freeman. Although he "recommends" Hazewell, Hawthorne undercuts this recommendation by cleverly stating his (probably feigned) ignorance of how Hazewell spells his name. This gesture disempowers Hazewell and reveals Hawthorne's desire that he, and not Hazewell, take the assignment. By not knowing the correct spelling of Hazewell's name, Hawthorne implies that Hazewell is not as well known as he is, and, as a consequence, would not provide the campaign with a beneficial marketing tool—a well-known name (like Hawthorne's) to popularize a dark horse candidate. After this subtle statement, one that Hawthorne knows will remove Hazewell from Pierce's consideration and solidify Hawthorne as Pierce's
choice for the task, Hawthorne meekly states that he would "give [Hazewell] all the assistance in [his] power." The ploy may seem slight, but it conveys Hawthorne's eagerness to undertake the project and his effective manipulation of persuasive rhetorical strategies.

The closing of the letter to Pierce reveals further evidence of the tension between the eagerness and hesitancy that characterized Hawthorne's mindset during this "season of anxious expectations" (Mellow 416). At this point, Hawthorne's contradictory personae, his roles as both self-disparaging friend and political aggressor, are apparent. Offering a friendly, modest invitation to Pierce shortly before the closing of the letter, Hawthorne writes:

   My house is hardly fit for the reception of a future President; but Mrs. Hawthorne and myself, nevertheless, would be most happy to receive you here and we promise to treat you just as simply as if you were a mere country lawyer. (CE XVI: 546)

This gentle, jesting tone shifts abruptly into a more direct, deliberate tone in Hawthorne's brief postscript to Pierce. Countering the self-removal intimated earlier in the letter, the postscript demonstrates Hawthorne's readiness to write the biography. He tells Pierce: "You may hear of me, if in Boston, at Ticknor & Co.'s, or at the American House" (CE XVI: 546). Hawthorne thus gives Pierce specific information concerning where he can be found after Pierce receives the
letter, hinting at his desire to speak with Pierce about the biography and begin working on it.

After mailing the letter, Hawthorne revealed his partisanship and enthusiasm regarding the Pierce biography in various letters to Fields. The author also shares with Fields numerous frustrations, as will be seen. In his letters, Hawthorne appears as a politically aware, manipulative, and determined artist. On June 17, 1852, in a letter to Fields, who was in London at the time, Hawthorne announces his decision to write the biography. He tells Fields,

I meant to have written another Wonder Book, this Summer; but another task has unexpectedly intervened. General Pierce, of New Hampshire, the democratic nominee for the Presidency, was a college-friend of mine, and we have been intimate through life. He wishes me to write his biography, and I have consented to do so--somewhat reluctantly, however--for Pierce has now reached that altitude when a man, careful of his personal dignity, will begin to think of cutting his acquaintance. But I seek nothing from him, and therefore need not be ashamed to tell the truth of an old friend.

(CE XVI: 550-51)

Aware of Fields' liberal political perspective, Hawthorne labels the biography project as just "another task" that has "unexpectedly intervened" with his plans. Hawthorne appears to
be muffling his ardor for seizing a political opportunity. Attempting to downplay the project to Fields, Hawthorne writes that he merely "consented" to write the book, responding to the request of a "college-friend." The speculation that Pierce, having reached an "altitude" of public life that will require a concern for "personal dignity," will "begin to think of cutting his acquaintance" seems designed particularly for Fields, who was a (somewhat quiet) critic of Pierce. This view counters Hawthorne's numerous attestations elsewhere to Pierce's steadfastness, his democratic sensibilities, and his admirable maintenance of ties with old friends. Hawthorne appears to want to inform the doubtless wary Fields that his role in accepting the project is not that of politician, or even political biographer, but that of "an old friend" who is "not . . . ashamed to tell the truth."

Hawthorne's letters to William D. Ticknor convey a more explicit sense of purposefulness, zeal, and urgency. With Ticknor, Hawthorne is less concerned with defending his decision to write the biography. Instead, he displays his earnestness and his emotional investment in the venture. Ten days before the aforementioned letter to Fields, Hawthorne told Ticknor of his decision to take on the task:

General Pierce was here two evenings ago. I spoke to him about your publishing the biography; and I presume there will be no difficulty on that score.

(CE XVI: 564)
On July 24, Hawthorne exuded determination:

As for the biography, I have but just been supplied with the materials for commencing it. I shall set to work tomorrow in good earnest, and shall not show my face till it is finished. (CE XVI: 583)

After finishing the biography in August, Hawthorne gave Ticknor specific suggestions regarding ways in which to market the book. Again, Hawthorne's political understanding and his enthusiasm for political partisanship are evident. Hawthorne's persona in the letter is almost that of a political manager or marketer. The imperative tone of Hawthorne's diction signifies his excitement concerning the project and his unwavering support of Pierce. He advises Ticknor,

I think you must blaze away a little harder in your advertisement. Say, for instance, "The Life of FP by Nathaniel H--, drawn up from original sources with extracts from the General's Military Journal"—Emphasize largely with capital letters. Or, if you please—"HAWTHORNE'S Life of GENERAL PIERCE; SANCTIONED by the General, drawn up from original documents, and with the GENERAL'S OWN JOURNAL, AS WRITTEN IN THE FIELD. Together with a SUPERB ENGRAVING from the BEST PORTRAIT of the General.

... Go it strong, at any rate. We are politicians now; and you must not expect to conduct yourself like a gentlemanly publisher. (CE XVI: 588)
Hawthorne's enthusiastic concern for the wording of the advertisements for the biography, his employment of capital letters, and his calling attention to the frontispiece illustrate his fondness for political machinations. A boyish enthusiasm is evident in the lines: "Go it strong, at any rate. We are politicians now." His gestures demonstrate anything but reticence and hesitation. When he tells Fields, then, that he is "somewhat reluctantly" agreeing to write the biography, he is feigning detachment from political engagement.

Hawthorne's political understanding is particularly evident in a letter that he wrote to Pierce on July 5, as he was outlining the sections of the work. In the letter, Hawthorne informs Pierce of ways in which he will treat controversial issues. The most significant of these "knotty points" (CE XVI: 561) is the growing dissension between the North and the South. At this moment, Hawthorne's manner is most like that of a politician—he is cautious, aware of political risks and opposing views, and conscious of the importance of appearance and image creation. Telling Pierce that the topic of North/South tensions ought "not to be shirked nor blinked" (CE XVI: 561), he writes:

I am sensible of a very difficult and delicate part of my task, in your connection with the great subject of variance between the North and South. There is no way, however, open to my perception—no course either of true policy, or worthy either of you or your
biographer—save to meet the question with perfect
candor and frankness, and to state what has been your
action, and what your position; not pugnaciously,
and, by no manner of means, defensively, but so as to
put you on the broadest ground possible, as a man for
the whole country. (CE XVI: 561)

Hawthorne thus wants to construct in the biography a Pierce
whose Jacksonian sense of valor, heroism, and independence,
in conjunction with democratic ideals, will serve to unify a
fragmented nation. The future would not validate Hawthorne's
high assessment of Pierce's abilities to bridge polarities
and lead the nation. As Mellow notes, Hawthorne often expressed
"[a] thorough over-estimation of his friend, for Pierce, in
his administration, was to be continually at the mercy of
events rather than the master of them" (415).

In spite of his enthusiasm, Hawthorne encountered numerous
barriers in writing the biography. Various problems hindered
his progress in completing the book and caused him much
frustration. To begin with, Hawthorne did not fully agree
with all of Pierce's views, although he remained fairly quiet
about these differences in his writings. As Mellow points out,
in 1851, Hawthorne had signed a Free Soil petition, "not out of
wholehearted agreement with the abolitionists, but because of
his distaste for the Fugitive Slave Law" (409). Pierce had
clearly demonstrated his support of this legislation. On the
"great subject" of the tensions between the North and the
South, a "dramatic and unavoidable issue" (Mellow 409) for Hawthorne, other problems arose. Mellow notes that Hawthorne had "slightly different opinions" (409) about these tensions. This difference of opinion was "a fact that Hawthorne's detractors failed to recognize" (Mellow 409). Mellow adds:

It was clearly Pierce's view that the radical abolitionists were responsible for the climate of violence and agitation that was dividing the country and threatening the Union. It was not certain that Hawthorne, at that moment, felt the Union was endangered. Like Pierce, he found the abolitionists a meddlesome breed, but he was not in sympathy with the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law. (409)

Aside from his own qualms regarding the stipulations of the Fugitive Slave Law, Hawthorne faced other difficulties during the summer of 1852 as well. Especially stressful were his attempts to acquire information about Pierce's life and political and military careers from various sources. The individuals from whom Hawthorne sought such information included: Colonel Thomas Jefferson Whipple and General Solomon McNeill, military associates of Pierce's during the Mexican War; Colonel Isaac O. Barnes, a clerk of the United States Circuit Court in Boston and long-time friend of the Pierce family; Colonel Joseph Hall, a congressman from Maine when Pierce was elected to the Senate in 1837; and Samuel Hazen Ayer, a supporter of Pierce's nomination at the
Democratic National Convention who had studied law in Concord, New Hampshire, with Pierce and Asa Fowler. Hawthorne often urgently requested information about Pierce's family (frequently expressing specific interest in the career and character of Pierce's father), asking for speeches, committee reports, and any details he could acquire concerning Pierce's career in Washington. No doubt pressured by the lack of materials, Hawthorne used many extracts from Pierce's Mexican War journal. Many of Pierce's entries required slight stylistic revisions and grammatical corrections. The extracts, termed "[the] necessary padding to fill out a slender book" (382) by Miller, ultimately covered forty pages of the biography. In what might be taken as a defense for this act, Hawthorne writes that the extracts "will doubtless bring the reader closer to the man than any narrative which we could substitute" (400).

If, as Miller states, Hawthorne's "central problems" in writing the biography were "Pierce's obscurity and unexciting personality, the military record in a war that had become unpopular, and the slavery question" (381), then the author faced a tremendous challenge. Hawthorne hoped his sources would provide him with enough material to eradicate these problems and popularize his candidate. They did not. Hawthorne's sources were often slow (or completely negligent) in responding to his requests, and the material that did come in was, as Mellow notes, "not very promising" (409).

Most surprising was Pierce's own apparent reticence to give
information to Hawthorne or provide Hawthorne with an interview. In his letters to Pierce that summer, Hawthorne frequently requested that Pierce visit him and give him information for the book. Hawthorne's letters reflect the angst of a writer in dire need of material. As the writer of a campaign biography, Hawthorne felt the added pressure of timeliness. On June 24, Hawthorne indicated a growing anxiety regarding the difficulties he experienced getting much-needed information from his sources. He writes to Pierce:

Col. [Isaac O.] Barnes has sent me some materials respecting your family; but I have not yet obtained enough to enable me to write the first page. Pray suggest to your friends to be in haste.

Don't you mean to come & see me? (CE XVI: 559)

Hawthorne's urgency—hei awareness that the biography must be completed in time to be distributed to a wide audience in order to affect the November election—later turned to resignation. On July 5, Hawthorne informs Pierce that materials were arriving "slowly" and "scantily" (CE XVI: 560). He appears to be sadly aware of his destiny to work with limited resources on a project that might have a great impact on his career. He tells Pierce: "I had some hopes of seeing you to-day; but as there are no signs of your coming, I sit down to write" (CE XVI: 560). Despite his resignation, Hawthorne retains hope in his friend's "coming." Later in the letter, he writes that an interview with Pierce would greatly help him draft the book. Hawthorne's prose
assumes at times a demanding and near-desperate tone.

It will be highly desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that we hold a long and quiet discussion, before I cast the biography into its final shape.

No matter how soon; but any time within two or three weeks will probably do. (CE XVI: 560)

This passage from the letter shows Hawthorne's awareness that Pierce's hesitation in granting his biographer an interview may have political causes. Hawthorne considers the possibility that Pierce might be avoiding a "long discussion" with him because it would appear to Pierce's opponents and critics that Pierce was actively manipulating his own image and campaign. This was a taboo for candidates in the Jacksonian mold, to be sure. Aware of this, Hawthorne attempts to ease Pierce's anxieties. He tells Pierce that they need to have a "quiet" conversation, keeping Pierce's involvement in the composition of the biography hidden from political opponents. Despite Pierce's hesitation, Hawthorne presses on. He tells the candidate:

Now, I see no impropriety in yourself indicating to me the points, as to [your career in Washington], which it may be best to illustrate . . . (CE XVI: 550)

Hawthorne attests to Pierce's admirable self-removal from self-aggrandizement and politicking while a senator. He notes that Pierce's "conduct" in Washington
was so unlike that of most other political men that your biographer's task becomes the more difficult. Instead of thrusting yourself forward on all good or bad occasions, it always required a case of necessity, to bring you out; and having done the needful with as little noise as possible, you withdrew into the background. (*CE XVI: 560*)

Hawthorne transforms what might be considered a weakness of Pierce's, his reticence, into a virtue. Hawthorne's process of romanticizing Pierce, weeks before the book was completed, was thus underway.

In the resultant biography, Hawthorne's narrator exhibits textual evidence of uncertainty, hesitation, and misdirection. The work presents a complex and unbalanced synthesis of historical documentary and romantic narration. This apparent anxiety—the tension created by Hawthorne's complicating the genre of biography by combining history with subjective, romantic reconstruction—doubtless reflects both Hawthorne's enthusiasm and misgivings about writing the book. In the preface to the work, Hawthorne states that the "species" of political biography is

too remote from [the author's] customary occupations--and, he may add, from his tastes--to be very satisfactorily done, without more time and practice than he would be willing to expend for such a purpose. (349)
The finished text finds Hawthorne troubling the conventions of biography by employing romanticization, exaggeration, and dubious speculation. 

The indeterminate quality of the book—its tenuous status as neither reliable historical recounting nor romantic narrative—reflects the narrator's elastic persona. As a result, Hawthorne's attempt to advocate Pierce to a national audience by emphasizing the candidate's "marvellous and mystic influence of character" (435) reveals Hawthorne in a moment of indecision. Looking for a voice, the narrator shifts from the role of objective historian to the role of speculative, biased romance-writer. While attempting to establish a heroic persona for Pierce, the text displays Hawthorne's uncertainty in his role as political biographer. The work is a hesitant, uneven, and, ultimately, subversive response to the limitations of biography.

Critical responses to the Pierce biography have been regrettably limited in their consideration of Hawthorne's tendency to romanticize Pierce. One would think that moments such as Hawthorne's overstated description of the controversial Pierce as a "high and fearless spirit" (359) deserve commentary. Contemporary reviews of the book emphasized the work's status as political propaganda. Most reviewers recognized that the book was designed to enhance Pierce's image and detract attention from General Winfield Scott, Pierce's Whig opponent in the race and a popular hero of both the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. 

The September 14, 1852, edition of the
Washington *Union* stated that the biography is "as pleasant as the best of the author's romances, [a work in which] he narrates facts as charmingly as he does in fiction" (Boyd 339). The *New York Times*, on September 25, 1852, remarked that the book is essentially "a violent and extremely biased political tract intended solely for electioneering effect" (Gara 35). The few reviews of the biography in the twentieth century echo this marginalization of the work. In 1929, Newton Arvin relegated the book to a minor status, terming it "a mild and weakly colored little volume" that "could not have won many votes for its subject" (179).

More recent evaluations of the biography also slight or overlook altogether Hawthorne's elastic persona in the work. For some reason, the troubled narration has been ignored by many critics and scholars. William Jenkins states that despite Hawthorne's general dislike of politicians and political machinations, the biography is testament to the fact that the author acquired a great deal of skill in the political arena and played a relatively important role in the affairs of his chosen party during periods of his most intense political activity. (42)

Richard Boyd, who provides valuable insight into the work, correctly asserts that the Pierce biography served a "strategic function in a campaign that would be waged in large part through the printed word" (339). Boyd adds that Hawthorne, despite his
apparent modesty, esteemed the book a "unique opportunity to influence directly the political future of an America whose past had been so much a part of his work" (338). Boyd's later assertion, that Hawthorne "is not writing biography but something we might label as romance" (344), is significant. Unfortunately, Boyd does not support this assertion, and he ignores the tensions that are created by Hawthorne's wavering between the roles of historian and romance-teller. These tensions originate in the aforementioned misgivings Hawthorne had about the project. This distress is evident in a letter the author wrote to Ticknor on July 13, 1852. Hawthorne writes that he is

making no progress with the biography, on account of the sluggishness of the people who ought to furnish the materials. (3)

The finished version of the book suggests that, like his unnamed sources, Hawthorne too experienced "sluggishness" in achieving a distinct narrative voice.

The preface of the work presents numerous rather candid admissions of Hawthorne's discomfort with writing political biography. Because these admissions are very obvious, they often seem suspicious. Despite his subtextual eagerness about writing the book, Hawthorne appears to foresee the inconsistencies that the union of history and romance will effect in a political text. He offers, then, an apologia, of sorts, for such consequences. The preface reveals Hawthorne's
uneasiness. He tells the reader that he "would not voluntarily have undertaken the work" and that he cannot "flatter himself that he has been remarkably successful" with it (349). Such a text, he cautions readers, being "remote from his customary occupations" (349), will merely comprise "sentiments" and "the author's own speculations upon the facts before him, and may, or may not, be in accordance with the ideas of the individual whose life he writes" (350). Hawthorne's tone is self-disparaging and cautious. Furthermore, Hawthorne establishes with linguistic markers a lack of certainty ("may, or may not") and a realization of his own inclination to romanticize historical events. He writes that the finished biography is "a generally correct narrative" (380). The adjective "generally" is delicately placed to invite speculation concerning the extent to which Hawthorne idealizes history. In addition, Hawthorne at times appears to devalue the biography--and, perhaps, the entire "species" of political biography (349)--by using condescending rhetoric. "If this little biography have any value," he writes, "it is probably of another kind" (349). The word "little" suggests this condescension, while the purposefully mysterious language of the passage hints that the other "kind" of value exhibited by the Pierce biography is that of romance. After all, Hawthorne had achieved success with this method of combining history and romance in The Scarlet Letter and such tales as "The Maypole of Merrymount" and "Endicott and the Red Cross." Hawthorne deftly
employs a single, monosyllabic word ("kind") to suggest the complex difficulties of genre classification.

Hawthorne's infusion of romance into the biography is notable in the depiction of Pierce's boyhood. In this section of the book, the narrator serves a myth-building scheme by associating Pierce with General Benjamin Pierce and the heroes of the Revolutionary War. Hawthorne devotes much energy to reconstructing Pierce's father as an almost mythical patriot. Benjamin Pierce is described as being a venerable ideologue and an influence on the formation of Franklin Pierce's character. The Benjamin Pierce of the text is an idealized father-figure and war veteran whose active involvement in New Hampshire politics and beneficent character are exaggerated. Hawthorne early on gives a rationale for his lengthy depiction of General Pierce:

The history, character, and circumstances of General Benjamin Pierce, though here but briefly touched upon, are essential parts of the biography of his son, both as indicating some of the native traits which the latter has inherited, and as showing the influences amid which he grew up. (353)

Benjamin Pierce, the "most active and public-spirited man within his sphere" (354), is an idealized Jacksonian Democrat, made larger-than-life by the exuberant (and perhaps father-obsessed) narrator.

The romanticized Benjamin Pierce of the text represents not
only what Miller terms "the very ideal of fatherhood" (382), but he also represents Hawthorne's continued employment of the soldier paradigm that originated with the creation of Edward Walcott in *Fanshawe*. Like the depiction of Franklin Pierce later in the book, the treatment of Benjamin Pierce reflects Hawthorne's interest in the soldier character type. In Hawthorne's rendering, Benjamin Pierce's service during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 assumes national importance. Hawthorne admires what he sees as Pierce's democratic opposition to both centralized British and Federalist forces. Hawthorne tells us that, like other eminent figures from New Hampshire, including Daniel Webster, Levi Woodbury, Jeremiah Smith ("the eminent jurist, and governor of the state") (351), and General James Miller, Benjamin Pierce made significant contributions to local and national politics. Hawthorne states broadly that Pierce "contributed as much as any other man to the growth and prosperity of [Hillsborough county]" (351). Pierce, who left his family's farm to fight at the battle of Bunker Hill, becomes a hero whose exaggerated virtues and actions take on archetypal qualities. Hawthorne, providing what he hopes will be a "strong testimonial to [Benjamin Pierce's] character as a soldier" (352), writes that Pierce

after serving through the whole Revolutionary War, and fighting his way upward from the lowest grade,
returned, at last, a thorough soldier, and commander of a company. (352)

Hawthorne's numerous laudatory descriptions of Pierce's soldierly qualities reflect his enthusiastic manipulation of the soldier paradigm. In fact, it often appears that Benjamin Pierce will overshadow Franklin Pierce in the book. Benjamin Pierce, Hawthorne writes, implying that Franklin inherited the noble, soldierly qualities of his father, was the "model" (354) of the "practical" (354) and venerable "revolutionary soldier" (352). The elder Pierce is characterized by a stirring "fidelity to his principles" (353) and "a liberal hospitality" (354). Benjamin Pierce, as soldier, assumes emblematic dimensions. He is "one of the best specimens of sterling New England character, developed in a life of simple habits, yet of elevated action" (354). Pierce, Hawthorne continues, was a beloved "old general" whose adherence to "the principles and sentiments of democratic institutions" and alignment with the "popular mind" (355) characterize him as an ideal soldier-Democrat-leader. Like Edward Walcott, the Benjamin Pierce of the text is a pragmatic opposite to the more detached, more introspective characters in Hawthorne's works. It appears that Hawthorne's characterization of Benjamin Pierce is, at least in part, the product of Hawthorne's romantic projection of qualities that he admired in Franklin Pierce. In addition, Hawthorne saw these traits in himself, though he often repressed them. Perhaps Hawthorne, like the
Benjamin Pierce of the book, harbored the desire to "study men and their actual affairs, rather than books" (355). Although Hawthorne's rationale for his lengthy treatment of Benjamin Pierce's character and career is that this analysis serves "both as indicating some of the native traits which [Franklin Pierce] has inherited, and as showing the influences amid which he grew up" (353), his depiction is suspiciously more than that. In the Benjamin Pierce section of the work, he employs the soldier paradigm as a means to further popularize the tenets of the Democratic Party (Benjamin Pierce, he reminds us, was after all "a most dedicated Democrat") (354) and, consequently, popularize Franklin Pierce's campaign.

Following the discussion of Benjamin Pierce, which requires several pages (despite Hawthorne's claim that the venerable general would be "but briefly touched upon") (353), the narrator begins to employ the strategy of association. Hawthorne links this beloved father-Democrat-military hero with his son. Hawthorne's scheme of hero-formation by means of association and a stylized, speculative rendering of a father-son relationship invites doubt. The historical accuracy of Hawthorne's conclusions may be in question, but the biography reflects a delightfully romantic aspect. Franklin Pierce, the text tells us, inherited the noble traits and soldierly attributes of his father. Hawthorne idealizes Pierce as a
youth of Apollonian dimensions. He is described as being "a beautiful boy, with blue eyes, light curling hair, and a sweet expression of face" (356). In addition, his "bright and cheerful aspect made a kind of sunshine" (357). Hawthorne also constructs Pierce as a student of the Revolutionary War and an inheritor of quiet strength and virtue. He writes:

From infancy upward, the boy had before his eyes, as the model on which he might instinctively form himself, one of the best specimens of sterling New England character, developed in a life of simple habits, yet of elevated action. (354)

Hawthorne complements this romantic treatment with an association of Franklin Pierce with Jacksonian idealism. The text implies that, like his father, Pierce has lived "a life of simple habits, yet of elevated action." The narrator adds that "no mode of education could be conceived, better adapted to imbue a youth with the principles and sentiments of democratic institutions" (355) than Pierce's role as student under his father's instruction. Pierce, then, Hawthorne writes, learned from his virtuous father "patriotism" (354). The elder Pierce exuded [a] military spirit which the old soldier had retained from long service, and which was kept active by the constant alarms and war-like preparations of the first twelve years of the present century. (354)
This synthesis of myth, political ideology, and romance in the reconstruction of Pierce complicates the book's status as biography.\textsuperscript{11} Bode considers this method to be Hawthorne's manner of achieving "cultural preservation" (344). Hawthorne's narrator is explicitly prone to indulge in subjective reconstructions of historical events to promote an image of Pierce that will appeal to a national electorate. Hawthorne's Pierce is distilled from actuality and politically informed fantasy. Such instances as the narrator's comment that Pierce's inherited qualities "indicate a moral symmetry, kindliness, and a delicate texture of sentiment" (356) exemplify the work's awkward and often abstract synthesis of biography and romance.

Hawthorne briefly presents his interpretation of the image that Pierce projected while he was a student at Bowdoin College. As before, Hawthorne depicts Pierce in soldierly terms.\textsuperscript{12} Hawthorne remembers the youthful Pierce as being "vivacious," "resolved," and dedicated to "habits of attention and obedience" (358). At college, Hawthorne tells us, Pierce had an "ambition" that revealed a "military cast" (359). Showing the soldierly traits that would in later life undergo "a firm and manly growth" (356), Pierce gave "the impression of a high and fearless spirit" (359). Pierce's term as commander of the college cadet corps demonstrated that he was "destined to ascend" to the "dangerous atmosphere of elevated rank" (360). Pierce becomes, then, an idealized young soldier. His character comprises "courage," which, in the Mexican War, Hawthorne
states with exaggeration, would be "displayed so brilliantly in famous battles" (359). In addition, the young Pierce demonstrated a natural ability to lead others while also displaying a "liberal, generous, catholic sympathy" (360). Hawthorne recreates Pierce the student as an exemplar of traits that he too possessed (but did not reveal). Beneath the gloss of adulation, he intimates a distinct envy. Recalling Pierce's "slender and youthful figure," and the fact that he had "the air and step of a veteran," Hawthorne writes that the gallant soldier-student exhibited "an earnestness, with which I could not pretend to compete" (359). Hawthorne's Pierce, then, is an idealized soldier whose popularity, outgoing demeanor, and early success created in the writer admiration, a sense of competitiveness, and a certain amount of jealousy.

Hawthorne's treatment of Pierce's service in the Mexican War further complicates categorizing the book as conventional biography. The violence of this section of the work has surprised many critics unaccustomed to such elements in Hawthorne's prose. In this section, as before, Hawthorne employs such myth-building techniques as exaggeration, projection, and subjective interpretation to reconstruct Pierce and persuade readers of his viability as a presidential candidate. Hawthorne's efforts to overcompensate for what Boyd sees as Pierce's "lack of political accomplishment" (340) with depictions of military valor are obvious. The narrator pointedly remarks that the war imbibed Brigadier-General Pierce
with "a spirit of romantic adventure" (395). To emphasize the romance, and entertain as well as persuade his readers, Hawthorne describes the American soldiers on the Mexican battlefields as "untried warriors" and "gallant men" (411). The near-mythical description of Pierce is also evident. Noting the vitality of Pierce on the battlefield, Hawthorne writes:

Nature, indeed, has endowed him with a rare elasticity both of mind and body; he springs up from pressure like a well-tempered sword. After the severest toil, a single night's rest does as much for him, in the way of refreshment, as a week could do for most other men. (401)

Hawthorne's Pierce is a "well-tempered" combination of Apollonian and Herculean attributes, a synthesis of beauty and extraordinary stamina.

Pierce's involvement in the war is given additional mythical dimensions by the narrator's depiction of Pierce as a soldier protected from death by providence. Throughout the Mexican War section of the book, the narrator emphasizes the view that Pierce's luck signifies, in a mythic-romantic sense, his status as a favored son of fortune. The text implies that Pierce is protected by the gods or fate or some other force that is cognizant of his potential and the need for his survival. Fate itself, Hawthorne suggests, is protecting Pierce for his ultimate role as president and savior of a troubled Union. Hawthorne's instincts as storyteller are very evident.
He treats each major battle of the war in which Pierce was involved with a distinct bias, transforming Pierce's actions into romantically enhanced adventures.

At the battle of Contreras on August 19, 1847, Pierce experienced an injury when his horse stepped into a rocky crevice on the Pedregal and fell. The narrator writes that Pierce, with the help of an orderly, managed to crawl under a nearby ledge of rock and there acquire shelter. Manipulating his narrative to achieve suspense, Hawthorne writes:

'[A]nd as they made their way thither, a shell fell close beside them and exploded, covering them with earth.

"That was a lucky miss," said Pierce calmly. (403)

Pierce's heroically "calm" response to the explosion enhances Hawthorne's treatment of him as a recipient of divine protection and as a brave, humble soldier.

Presenting Pierce as a representative of the soldier archetype, Hawthorne attempts to overcompensate for Pierce's misfortunes on the field of battle. Hawthorne does this by emphasizing Pierce's courage while he was injured. The battle itself, Hawthorne reminds us, represented terrible odds. Pierce and his four thousand men

contended against seven thousand soldiers, [who were] protected by intrenchments, and showering round shot and shells against [Pierce's] assailing troops. (402)
Hawthorne intensifies the moment by giving the Pedregal an exotic, clearly dangerous quality. As the site of Pierce's injury, it becomes, in Hawthorne's rendering, no mere rocky terrain but instead

a broken tract . . . bristling with sharp pointed rocks, and which is represented as having been the crater of a now exhausted and extinct volcano. (402)

On this stage the narrator places his protagonist, a weary, wounded, and selfless Pierce. Hawthorne makes it clear that Pierce's heroism and practicality enable him to overcome obstacles. Illustrating Pierce's ability to persuade others, and underscoring Pierce's patriotism, Hawthorne writes:

In the midst of this fire, General Pierce, being the only officer mounted in the brigade, leaped his horse upon an abrupt eminence, and addressed the colonels and captains of the regiments, as they passed, in a few stirring words—reminding them of the honor of their country, of the victory their steady valor would contribute to achieve. (403)

When his horse stumbled on the Pedregal and fell, the pommel of the saddle injured Pierce's groin. The fallen horse rolled over on Pierce, spraining his knee. Yet Pierce remained determined to stay active in the battle. Rarely in Hawthorne's narratives does he manipulate pace as skillfully as he does in the biography, denoting action, urgency, and danger. Pierce shows a heroic willingness to fight on despite his injuries. He
bravely asks his comrades to tie his injured body on to
another horse so that he may continue in the charge. Pierce's
insistence that he fight is enhanced by Hawthorne's sudden
employment of understatement:

[I]n answer to a remark that he would be unable to
keep his seat [on the horse], "Then," said the
general, "You must tie me on." (404)

Pierce, the narrator tells us, stayed in the saddle until eleven
o'clock that evening, and he displayed the traits of a leader
throughout the remainder of the battle. Hawthorne's language
deftly points to Pierce's status as a leader: he was
consistently "in front" of his troops (405), he was "seen in the
saddle at the head of his brigade" (405), he was
"determined" (404) throughout the conflict, and he was
"the senior officer in the field" (404) who insisted on
"pressing forward to the head of the column" (403). Hawthorne
effectively uses repetition, exaggeration, and speculation
to transform the historical Pierce into an icon of
soldierly heroism.

Later, when American forces were confronting Santa Anna's
holdings at Churubusco and San Antonio, Pierce, gallantly
charging toward enemy lines in spite of his wounds, succumbed
to fatigue. Hawthorne writes that Pierce then "fell, faint and
almost insensible, within full range of the enemy's fire" (407).
There, the wounded Pierce lay "under the tremendous fire of
Churubusco, until the enemy, in total rout, was driven from the
field" (407). Hawthorne's text makes obvious efforts to de-emphasize Pierce's inactivity and construct a heroic image for him. Injured, Pierce somehow remains aware of his surroundings (he was "almost insensible") and remains bravely near the action, dangerously staying "within full range of the enemy's fire." Hawthorne's narrator attempts to show Pierce as a selfless leader who is ever near his troops and the exchange of hostilities. This construction of Pierce as a soldier who is somehow protected from harm is remindful of Hawthorne's comment to Horatio Bridge in a letter written shortly after the biography was finished. "'He is deep, deep, deep,'" Hawthorne wrote to Bridge. "'But what luck withal! Nothing can ruin him'" (Bridge 132).

To demonstrate Pierce's virtues and lend to the book what he hopes will be an objective assessment of the events at the battle of Churubusco and San Antonio, Hawthorne relies on the views of two respectable military authorities, Colonel Noah E. Smith and General Winfield Scott. Hawthorne knew that these two individuals would be recognizable to his readers. First, Hawthorne quotes Smith, a "patriotic American" (405), who first met Pierce near Coyacan. Hawthorne attributes to Smith the following observation of Pierce:

"He was exceedingly thin . . . worn down by the fatigue and pain of the day and night before, and then evidently suffering severely. Still there was
a glow in his eye, as the cannon boomed, that showed within him a spirit ready for the conflict."

(406)
Pierce's military readiness and ardor are also suggested by Hawthorne's reconstruction of a conversation between Pierce and General Scott. Hawthorne sets his two speakers at a clearing near the exchange of gunfire and creates a soldierly dialogue that is obviously romanticized.

"Pierce, my dear fellow," said Scott . . . "you are badly injured; you are not fit to be in your saddle." "Yes, general, I am," replied Pierce, "in a case like this." "You cannot touch your foot to the stirrup," said Scott. "One of them I can," answered Pierce. . . . "You are rash, General Pierce," said [Scott]; "we shall lose you, and we cannot spare you. It is my duty to order you back to St. Augustine." "For God's sake, general," exclaimed Pierce, "don't say that! This is the last great battle, and I must lead my brigade!" (406)

The dialogue seems more romantic than historical. The elaborate language, gentlemanly employment of addresses ("general," "General Pierce," "my dear fellow"), and courteous exclamations of dissent seem starkly out of place on a battlefield during the heat of a charge. Following the battle, Hawthorne tells us, because of his "determination" and "gallantry in the
field" (407), Pierce was asked by General Scott to attend the ceremony at which Santa Anna signed an armistice with the American officers. Hawthorne writes:

[Pierce] had not taken off his spurs, nor slept an hour, for two nights; but he immediately obeyed the summons, was assisted into the saddle, and rode to Tacubaya, where, at the house of the British consul-general, the American and Mexican commissions were assembled. (408)

After the armistice was broken by the Mexican forces, two major battles took place until peace was achieved. Both of these battles only partly involved Pierce. Pierce's lack of involvement caused more problems for Hawthorne in writing the biography. At the battle of Molino del Rey on September 8, 1848, Pierce's brigade was ordered to support General Worth's efforts. Hawthorne described this battle as "one of the fiercest and most destructive of the war" (409). Pierce's troops arrived at the scene after the battle had ended and were consequently ordered to remove the wounded and capture the enemy's ammunition. Hawthorne attempts to compensate for this less than glorious duty by stating that Pierce's troops were nevertheless "a long time under fire" (409). Try as he may, Hawthorne fails to successfully transform this moment into great romantic art. His defense of Pierce is weak and transparent:
Although the battle was won just as [Pierce] reached the field, he interposed his brigade between Worth and the retreating enemy, and thus drew upon himself the fire. . . . (408)

Even less glorious was Pierce's absence from the final major confrontation of the war, the battle of Chapultepec on September 13. For thirty-six hours, Pierce was bedridden with a severe case of diarrhea and did not contribute to the American invasion of the Castle of Chapultepec. Because he was "extremely ill" (409), Pierce was unable to assist Generals Pillow and Quitman in their charge, which led to Santa Anna's defeat. Pierce's debilitating illness, writes Mellow, was "a common and frequently fatal ailment during much of the Mexican campaign" (413).

Hawthorne includes numerous passages that romanticize war and the "daring and desperate valor" (410) that war engenders in its participants. In succession, Hawthorne glorifies the Revolutionary War (which, he writes, "was not a war of armies merely—it was the war of nearly a whole people, and such a people as the world had never before seen, in a death struggle for liberty") (375), the War of 1812, and the Mexican War. By associating Pierce with his father and other military heroes of the past, Hawthorne attempts to enhance Pierce's qualities and illustrate how the son has inherited the patriotic enthusiasm and talents of his father. As romantic speculation, this logic of the
text works, and Hawthorne's constructions of Pierce acquire a poetic, patriotic tenor that is often inspiring. As "logic" itself, however, this line of reasoning wilts, and Pierce's attributes, despite his biographer's efforts to state the contrary, do not measure up to his father's successes. Oddly enough, it is Hawthorne's own enthusiastic glorification of Benjamin Pierce that in many ways undermines the career of Franklin Pierce. The elder Pierce outshines the younger Pierce. Yet Hawthorne's romanticization of war remains as a consistent element in the text. Writing that there exists "a certain beauty in the devotion of the citizen soldier to his country's cause" (399), Hawthorne observes:

> There is nothing in any other country similar to what we see in our own, when the blast of a trumpet at once converts men of peaceful pursuits into warriors. Every war in which America has been engaged has done this; the valor that wins our battles is not the trained hardihood of veterans, but a native and spontaneous fire. (399)

Pierce, Hawthorne adds, as a partaker in this "spirit of romantic adventure" (399), was "evidently in his element" (400).

The anxiety between romantic speculation and historical documentation gives to the text of the *Life of Franklin Pierce* an indistinct, inconsistent quality. Hawthorne subverts conventional biographical enterprise with romantic intrusions and myth-building. Hawthorne's Pierce is a complex character,
made archetypal by overstated, over-compensatory descriptions of his service in the Mexican War. He is a romanticized Jacksonian leader who, along with his men, represents "the best blood of America" (411). Hawthorne adds:

There was not a man of [Pierce's] brigade but loved him, and would have followed him to death, or have sacrificed his own life in his general's defence. (411)

In promoting Pierce as "a new man, whom a life of energy and various activity has tested, but not worn out" (436), Hawthorne offers a problematic text in which political biography is complicated by romantic interference, subjectivism, and conjecture. Hawthorne employs numerous rhetorical schemes—romanticization, projection, myth-formation, and the employment of the soldier paradigm—to assist in advancing the political career of a fellow Democrat and a lifelong friend.
Notes

1. As Mellow notes, Hawthorne's support of Pierce met with rigid opposition from the Peabody family. Mellow states that Hawthorne's brother-in-law, Horace Mann, "in a rare moment of wit . . . remarked that if Hawthorne succeeded in making a hero out of such a lackluster figure as Pierce, it would be 'the greatest work of fiction he ever wrote'" (408). Louise DeSalvo adds that "[i]t irked Hawthorne that Sophia's mother much preferred Horace Mann [to him], and Mother Peabody inflamed the rivalry by sending Hawthorne Mann's speeches against Hawthorne's democratic allies, such as General Pierce and Noah Webster" (97).

2. According to Terence Martin, Pierce "had consistently advocated a cautious, moderate policy regarding slavery. To many he seemed far less a patriot than a temporizer" (25).

3. Hawthorne demonstrates evidence of his interest in Pierce's political career in a letter to Horatio Bridge on October 26, 1846. Writing to Bridge shortly after Pierce declined to accept President James K. Polk's offer of the position of attorney general, Hawthorne states:

Frank Pierce is said to have received the offer of the U.S. Attorney-generalship, but declined it . . .
I rather regret that Frank did not take it.

(CE XVI: 188)

4. Mellow writes that Hawthorne's letters to his publishers
at this time were "unusually enthusiastic and demanding."

They also revealed evidence that Hawthorne "had been giving
serious thought to very specific possibilities" (414) of
a political reward from Pierce.

5. During the summer in which Hawthorne was writing the
biography, his younger sister, Louisa, drowned in the Hudson
River after a fire erupted on her steamboat, the Henry Clay.
Julian Hawthorne remarks that Hawthorne responded to the
news of her death by secluding himself in his study and
working with more intense determination on the Pierce
biography.

6. In June of 1852, Hawthorne sought information about
Benjamin Pierce from John Hatch George, a member of Franklin
Pierce's law firm in Concord, New Hampshire, and the leader
of his campaign at the 1852 Democratic National Convention.
Hawthorne requested from George "files of the New Hampshire
Patriot, for the years 1812-1815, as containing much
interesting information respecting the course of General
Pierce's father in support of the administration,
during the war with England" (CE XVI: 557).

7. Expressing agitation, Hawthorne wrote to Ticknor on
August 22, 1852:

I shall send the rest as soon as they give me
materials; and if not finished before the end of
the week, I'll be d----d if I mean to finish it
at all" (CE XVI: 587).
8. Hawthorne's biography of Pierce was one of many published during the 1852 presidential campaign. All of Pierce's biographers employed different strategies in an attempt to counter the popularity of Whig candidate General Winfield Scott. Other Pierce biographers included David Vandewater Golden Bartlett, C. Edwards Lester (who used the pseudonym "Hermitage"), Charles C. Greene of the Boston Post, and B.B. French, who wrote for a New York agency.

9. Noting Pierce's limited national appeal, Larry Gara writes:

One New Englander was later said to have commented that in New Hampshire, "where everybody knows Franklin Pierce, and where Franklin Pierce knows everybody, he's a pretty considerable fellow, I'll tell you. But come to spread him all over this whole country, I'm afraid he'll be dreadful thin in some places." In truth, Pierce was virtually an unknown outside his native region, and it was important for the Democrats to respond quickly to Whig chants of "Who's Frank Pierce?" (35)

10. Hawthorne's biographers have generally reached agreement regarding the author's initial anxiety and hesitancy in writing the biography. Most also recognize the political aspects of Hawthorne's writing the book. However, commentary on Hawthorne's elastic persona in the work have been slight. Mark Van Doren states flatly that the biography is a
frequently "stilted" work that fails "to make Pierce clear" (195). Arlin Turner notes that the book makes Hawthorne's role as "a public man" evident and that it signifies the author's interest in national politics. Newton Arvin argues that Hawthorne's motives in writing the biography remain mysterious, for "not so easily can we explain away Hawthorne's devotion not only to the man but to the partisan" (177). Randall Stewart writes that "the task had not been entirely congenial" (179) to Hawthorne. More recent biographers concur. Mellow states that writing the book provided "a sad education" (412) for Hawthorne. It enlightened him on issues relating to American politics and revealed to him the divisiveness, partisanship, and rancor of the political scene in 1852. Hawthorne, responding to Whig charges that Pierce was an ineffective participant in the controversial Mexican War and intemperate, found himself in an awkward position. As Mellow notes, "attempts to explain and explicate seemed only further to compromise the candidate" (412). Miller writes that the Pierce biography is ultimately "a slender book" (382) in which Hawthorne, among other things, creates "a tale of a 'gentle boy' blessed with a father who was the very ideal of fatherhood" (381-82).

11. Richard Boyd suggests that Hawthorne's use of his own name in advertisements for the biography indicates the author's political enthusiasm. He writes:
Hawthorne seems finally to have embraced [the biography] with some enthusiasm [after it was finished], urging that his own name be made a part of the book's title—it would indeed be called *Hawthorne's Life of Pierce* in some early advertisements. (339)

12. Hawthorne's tendency to romanticize historical events is apparent in the reconstruction of a scene from Benjamin Pierce's journals. Pierce's account of his departure to fight against the British in April of 1775 reads:

> I was ploughing in the field when the news first came that the British had fired upon the Americans at Lexington and killed eight men. I stepped between the cattle, dropped the chains from the plough, and without any further ceremony, shouldered my uncle's fowling piece, swung the bullet-pouch and powder-horn and hastened to the place where the first blood had been spilled, but finding the enemy had retired, I pursued my way towards Boston, but was not able to overtake them till they had effected their retreat to the garrison. (Nichols *FP 3*)

Hawthorne, obviously intrigued by the scene, offers this rendition of the same event in the campaign biography:

> On the 19th of April, 1775, being then less than eighteen years of age, the stripling was at the plough, when tidings reached him of the bloodshed
at Lexington and Concord. He immediately loosened the ox chain, left the plough in the furrow, took his uncle's gun and equipments, and set forth towards the scene of action. (351)
CHAPTER 5

THE SEPTIMIUS ROMANCES AND THE DEDICATION

OF OUR OLD HOME

"I am sensible of a very difficult
and delicate part of my task."

--Hawthorne, in a letter to Pierce,
July 5, 1852

Hawthorne's friendship and political alliance with Pierce served as significant factors in shaping many of his writings during the 1860's. Although Hawthorne's association with Pierce is referred to less explicitly in some of these works, the friendship remains an influential force. In many of his later texts, Hawthorne employs a politically cognizant persona to address both the Civil War and the relationship of the war to his art. As was the case in Fanshawe and the Life of Franklin Pierce, Hawthorne draws upon his admiration of Pierce to voice a fascination with politics, war, and the tensions between inertia and active engagement in social crises. James Bense writes that Hawthorne "resolved [with these writings] to approach the crisis [of the Civil War] more closely" (200).

Hawthorne's responses to the war, and the consequent demands the crisis placed upon his art, were often ambivalent and complex. Often, in letters to his publishers, Hawthorne seems to want to convey a detachment from the war. Yet his self-removal ultimately fails to appear authentic. In the
spring of 1862, Hawthorne visited Washington with William D. Ticknor and noted the "incalculable preponderance" of all ranks of soldiers. On April 2, Hawthorne wrote to Fields from Washington:

I see no reason to think hopefully of the final result of this war. Things and men look better at a distance than close at hand. (CE XVIII: 446)

This comment is remarkably similar to the detached perspective exhibited by Septimius in the Septimius manuscripts. Hawthorne suggests a subtextual anxiety and dread, both of which undermine the apparent aloofness of the lines. The war appears to be bothering Hawthorne more than he will admit. In a letter to Horatio Bridge a few weeks later, on April 19, Hawthorne's apprehension reaches the surface level of his writing. Hinting at the depths of his emotional investment in the crisis, he tells Bridge:

I feel a tremendous anxiety about our affairs at Yorktown. It will not at all surprise me if we come to grief.

But I don't intend to make myself very miserable, whatever happens. (CE XVIII: 451)

Here Hawthorne's ambivalence regarding the war is plainly evident. His (to a great degree feigned) detachment and nonchalance are apparent in the line, "I don't intend to make myself very miserable, whatever happens." This sentiment counters his "anxiety," and, one would suspect, the author's
desire to actively contribute to efforts to resolve the crisis. Hawthorne's inner turmoil is the result of his two conflicting personae: that of a detached romance-writer and that of a zealous and patriotic agent of action.¹

An analysis of the unfinished "elixir of life" romances Septimius Felton and Septimius Norton, as well as discussion of the dedicatory piece "To a Friend" in the collection of English sketches, Our Old Home (1863), reveals the continuing influence of Pierce on Hawthorne's works. This study also shows that Hawthorne's art reflects the author's exaggerated, romanticized assessment of his friend's qualities.² In the Septimius works, Hawthorne employs the Civil War as a context. He expresses a glorification of war (especially the patriotic enthusiasm that accompanies preparations for war). This glorification parallels the romanticization of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the Mexican War in the Life of Franklin Pierce. In addition, Hawthorne, using the same tactics he used in Fanshawe and the Pierce biography, constructs character types that signify his interest in war and soldiery. In the Septimius story, the young British officer, who is named Francis Norton at one point in the narrative, serves as a representative of the soldier paradigm that originated in part with Hawthorne's adulation of Pierce. As will be seen, the duel between the young British officer and Septimius early in the story becomes a moment of autobiographical significance.
With this episode, Hawthorne fictionalizes tensions in his relationship with Pierce, as well as tensions within himself regarding his reactions to the war. Hawthorne's "To a Friend," written in the guise of a prefatory letter to his old friend Pierce in 1863, serves as a fitting final signifier of the importance of this friendship to Hawthorne.

In the summer of 1861, Hawthorne decided to begin work on a romance that would focus on the topic of immortality. He was fatigued by his unsuccessful efforts to write a complete work in which the American claimant theme is treated. These efforts had resulted in the unfinished manuscripts "The Ancestral Footstep," "Etherege," and "Grimshawe." Remembering a legend that Henry Thoreau had told him in 1852 about a previous owner of the Wayside who believed that he would never die, Hawthorne wrote two unfinished drafts of a romance that he hoped would treat the elixir of life theme. (Later, Hawthorne would discard these manuscripts to begin work on another unfinished work, The Dolliver Romance, in which the same theme was to be expounded.)

The two works, Septimius Felton (the first draft) and Septimius Norton (the second draft), reveal the influence of the Civil War on Hawthorne's literary imagination. The manuscripts also exhibit the continuing influence of Pierce on Hawthorne's work. In setting his narrative at the beginning of the American Revolution, Hawthorne only thinly veils his concern with the Civil War and national unity.
This anxiety, a by-product of his lasting devotion to Pierce and the Democratic party, is combined with an evident attraction to war, soldiers, and the elation that Hawthorne sees as an inherent element in patriotic military endeavors. As before, Hawthorne romanticizes military heroism by transforming historical episodes into emblematic art and by employing the soldier paradigm. Hawthorne worked on the *Septimius* drafts while contributing numerous sketches to the *Atlantic Monthly* that were based on the author's observations of English life and scenery. As will be seen later, Hawthorne saw these sketches as being almost embarrassingly irrelevant to the war crisis in America.

With the *Septimius* project, Hawthorne responded to an intense desire to combine romantic narrative with vibrant political commentary. He seized, in Nina Baym's view, "the occasion to work in ideas that he was turning over about the war" (258). The result was an uneven, overtly elaborate, and rambling narrative that nevertheless reveals Hawthorne's indebtedness to Pierce.

A brief plot synopsis of the *Septimius* story provides a necessary framework within which discussion of the influence of Pierce and politics on Hawthorne's work can be made. The narrative begins in Concord, Massachusetts, in April of 1775. British soldiers are nearing the village following the opening exchange of British-American hostilities in nearby Lexington. Early in the story, Septimius, an introspective
ministerial student who harbors a preoccupation with mortality and human limitations, kills a young British officer in a duel. Surprised and saddened by this act, Septimius finds on the soldier's dead body a manuscript that outlines in ancient, mysterious languages the formula for an elixir of immortality. Septimius studies the manuscript intensively, separating himself from his family and friends and seeking the help of his old part-Indian aunt. Later, Sybil Dacy (labeled on different occasions as Septimius's half-sister and as his would-be lover) drinks the elixir and dies. It is discovered that the mixture had one wrong ingredient. At the end of the narrative, during which melodrama and Gothic plot twists play a significant part, Septimius leaves Concord. According to various reports, he later established a claim to an English estate through his distant relationship with the young officer he had earlier killed. Newton Arvin writes that Hawthorne left the manuscripts in a "raw and sketchy condition" (277). Baym states that the author "seems to have become bogged down in rhetorical elaboration" (258) throughout the drafts. However, the romance does reveal Hawthorne's employment of a politically aware persona. In addition, Hawthorne provides commentary on the Civil War, while also manipulating the soldier paradigm that is based on his association of Pierce with soldierly valor and heroic action.

To begin with, Hawthorne, throughout the Septimius
manuscripts, offers romanticized reconstructions of war. Although the story is set in the time of the Revolutionary War, Hawthorne's obvious context is the Civil War, a crisis that both fascinated and deeply perplexed him. As he does in the *Life of Franklin Pierce*, Hawthorne employs in the works a Revolutionary War mythos to voice an interest in war-time enthusiasm and active military engagement.

The atmosphere surrounding Septimius in the story is doubtless a reconstruction of the atmosphere surrounding Hawthorne at the onset of the Civil War. The "coming war" (CE XIII: 16) of the text effects a euphoria and a spirited nationalism that Hawthorne adulates. He expresses his admiration in prose that is colorful, myth-forming, and suggestive of urgency. He describes "a cry of alarm passing all through the succession of country towns, rural communities, that lay around Boston" (CE XIII: 16). The narrator seems to imbibe some of the preparatory excitement he is describing. He notes that the "clamor" is the result of the "storm" and "wild excitement" of "a coming deed" (CE XIII: 16).

Hawthorne offers several, often exaggerated depictions of the various elements that produce the "strange rapture of the coming battle" (CE XIII: 17). In presenting passages that borrow from the patriotic vigor and political fire that generated the idealization of Franklin and Benjamin Pierce in the Pierce biography, Hawthorne elaborates on the mood of the moment. The impending "crisis," he writes,
possesses a "god-like side," as it effects the "ennobling of brute force" (CE XIII: 17).

Following his sympathetic treatment of this patriotic frenzy, Hawthorne offers brief romanticized scenes to support his assertion that "it was a good time . . . to be alive in" (CE XIII: 17). The pictures reflect his glorification of the early phase of the American Revolution. By extension, of course, Hawthorne is also glorifying the Civil War. He writes:

Horsemen galloped past the lone farm-house shouting alarm, alarm!—there were stories of marching troops, coming like dreams through the midnight. Around the little rude meeting-houses, there was here and there the beat of a drum, the assemblage of farmers, neighbors, with their weapons. . . . there was marching, there was mustering, there was trouble. (CE XIII: 16)

Such scenes as these appear to counter Hawthorne's disclaimer early in the text stating that "[o]ur story is an internal one, dealing as little as possible with outward events" (CE XIII: 15). Hawthorne seems to take great pleasure in cataloguing scenes that portray action, constructive energy, and suspense in the moments before the arrival of British troops. Like the reconstructed Pierce of the biography, the American soldiers of the romance are shown as being active contributors to a cause of great significance.
Hawthorne clearly admires their heroic acts and honest simplicity. These soldiers contrast vividly with detached, contemplative individuals (like Septimius, and, to a degree, Hawthorne himself). Hawthorne, a spectator who with a mixture of admiration and envy glorifies "the drawing of heroic breath amid scenes of ordinary life" (CE XIII: 17), writes that

men hurried along the usually lonely road in groups, with weapons in their hands, the old fowling-piece of seven foot barrel, with which the Puritans had shot ducks on the river and Walden Pond. (CE XIII: 17)

As with other works in which he treats the subject of war, Hawthorne sees soldiers as being admirably united in a single purpose. The unifying aspect of war appears to fascinate him. In his romantic translation of history, the soldiers become close comrades whose active involvement in a military and political cause creates brotherhood, identity, and a certain amount of cheer. Hawthorne intimates a degree of jealousy on his own part when he comments that soldierly enterprise produces

a nearer kindred, a closer sympathy from man to man, a sense of goodness of the world, of the sacredness of country, of the excellence of life. (CE XIII: 17)

Hawthorne's idealized soldiers, like the Pierce of the campaign
biography, who, in the Mexican War sections of the book, experiences a self-affirming closeness with the loyal soldiers in his brigade, appear to possess a manly "sympathy" that Hawthorne both values and desires.

Yet, somewhat like Septimius, Hawthorne fears that he, in writing what he sees as irrelevant, non-political sketches, has removed himself from this "sympathy." He appears to be concerned that he has avoided politically relevant participation in the crisis. The logic of the text suggests that, because of his role as spectator-artist, Hawthorne has divorced himself from "the sacredness of country." A tension results from his conflicting desires to contribute actively to the war effort and to observe and write about it. Hawthorne wrote a letter to Ticknor on May 16, 1861, that reflects this anxiety. Expressing the frustration that his attempt to combine political action with romantic art has created, he tells Ticknor:

The war continues to interrupt my literary industry; and I am afraid it will be long before Romances are in request again, even if I could write one. I wish I could turn my hand to any useful labor. If I were younger, I would volunteer; but, as the case stands, I shall keep quiet till the enemy gets within a mile of my own house. (CE XVIII: 379)

In the passage, Hawthorne implies a belittlement of romantic literature. His line, "I wish I could turn my hand to any
useful labor," suggests that what he has been doing—writing sketches and romances—has not been "useful labor." The depth of Hawthorne's uneasiness is evident. He, it appears, would much prefer to be a Pierce, to be a brave soldier "drawing . . . heroic breath" while experiencing "a closer sympathy" with his fellow men, than a Septimius, who possesses "a mind bewildered in certain errors" (CE XIII: 16). Suddenly turning his attention away from the Revolutionary War to the crisis at hand, Hawthorne interrupts the narrative. He suggests that in many ways he, a spectator, is indebted to the war (as he often was to Pierce) for giving him a renewed patriotism. The war has reminded him of the dangers of self-isolation and political neutrality. After a lengthy, romanticized description of the "wild excitement" (CE XIII: 16) that preceded the Battle of Concord, Hawthorne writes:

We know something of that time now; we that have seen the muster of the village soldiery on meeting-house greens, and at railway stations; and heard the drum and fife, and seen the farewells, seen the familiar faces that we hardly knew, now that we felt them to be heroes, breathed higher breath for their sakes, felt our eyes moistened; thanked them in our souls for teaching us that nature is yet capable of heroic moments; felt how a great impulse lifts up a people . . . (CE XIII: 17)

Then, changing his focus from his society at large to
himself, Hawthorne indicates the ability of "heroic moments" to elevate even an artist (like Hawthorne) who is inclined to remove self from social engagement. Hawthorne writes that war even "lifts up"

every cold, passionless, indifferent spectator, lifts him up into religion, and makes him join in what becomes an act of devotion, a prayer, when perhaps he but half approves. (CE XIII: 17)

Although he is clearly wary of the war and its destructive aspects (it is an "ennobling of brute force" that he "but half approves"), Hawthorne also sees the crisis and the patriotic excitement it engenders as a muse-like force, as a source of artistic and even religious inspiration.

Hawthorne's ambivalence--his simultaneous criticism and glorification of the war--is especially evident in the creation of two characters, Septimius and the young English officer (referred to as Francis Norton, among other names). Like Edward Walcott and Fanshawe in Fanshawe, as well as the idealized Pierce and the admiring narrator in the Life of Franklin Pierce, Septimius and Francis represent two contrasting character types. Both of these types have an historical origin in Hawthorne's relationship with Pierce. Septimius is another of Hawthorne's moody introverts, a studious, isolated spectator. Displaying a "natural turn for study," Septimius is determined to "devote himself to the ministry" (CE XIII: 5). He is characterized by the narrator
as being a contemplative, sensitive individual who, like Fanshawe, often expresses resignation. Septimius also exhibits many traits of Hawthorne himself. Septimius's passivity is remindful of the melodramatic self-deprecation that is evident in many of Hawthorne's letters. Brooding on the topic of the limitations of human life, Septimius at one point states:

"[W]e live so little while, that (always setting aside the effect on a future existence) it is little matter whether we live or no."

(CE XIII: 7)

The passage illustrates Septimius's dejection. A character who, through his "meditations" and "speculations" arrives at "no end" (CE XIII: 6), he mirrors what Hawthorne saw as his own tendencies to divorce himself from society and withdraw into his art, or "meditation" (CE XIII: 6). This, Hawthorne suggests, is an isolation that is particularly condemnable during wartime. Hawthorne thus appears to be indirectly criticizing his own inability to provide what he termed "useful labor" to the war effort. By criticizing Septimius's inertia, he criticizes his own. Hawthorne writes:

As for Septimius, let him alone for a moment or two, and then you would see him, with his head bent down, brooding, brooding, with his eyes fixed on some chips, some stone, some common plant, any
commonest thing, as if it were the clue and index to some mystery. (CE XIII: 6)

Septimius's habitual pacing upon a hill near his "small wooden house . . . [which was] of some score of years standing" (CE XIII: 4) conveys an autobiographical resonance. One thinks of the numerous strolls Hawthorne took on the hill behind the Wayside, contemplating, often without reaching resolution, the outlines of never-to-be-completed romances. Hawthorne writes that Septimius's "favorite haunt" and the site of his "daily walk" was "the summit of that long ridge, which rose abruptly behind his dwelling" (CE XIII: 195). Hawthorne describes Septimius's house in a manner that suggests the Wayside. It was, the narrator tells us, a house

[that was] crowded upon a hill, which rose abrupt behind; a house of thick walls, as if the projector had that sturdy feeling of permanence in life which invites people to make strong their earthly habitations. (CE XIII: 4-5)

The "projector" here clearly refers to the previous owner of the Wayside whose alleged belief in his own immortality is translated by Hawthorne as a "sturdy feeling of permanence in life." Septimius, labeled "an American Faust" (141) by William Bysshe Stein, and described as exhibiting a "Faustian craving for infinite knowledge" (229) by Richard Harter Fogle, appears in many ways to be Hawthorne's romanticized self-portrait. Noting the similarities between
Septimius and Hawthorne, Millicent Bell states:

In his desire for a magic elixir [Septimius] expresses the same impulse to get outside the human sphere which Hawthorne felt to be dangerous for the artist. (70)

Voicing the hazards of extreme isolation into which he believed himself prone to enter, Hawthorne constructs what Philip Young terms an "unheroic hero" (85) in the character of Septimius. Despite his efforts to do otherwise, Septimius cannot detach himself from the war and social responsibility for very long.

To create a foil for the introspective Septimius, whom Miller calls "the last of the beautiful youths in Hawthorne's fiction" (491), Hawthorne constructs the young British soldier. The soldier's demeanor, statements, and gestures illustrate the author's continued employment of the Pierce-based soldier paradigm. Like other representatives of this paradigm in Hawthorne's works, the young officer whom Septimius meets early in the story is an opposite to the contemplative, self-absorbed, and inert protagonist. Hawthorne once again distills from his idealization of Pierce--his impressions of Pierce as a buoyant and popular soldier-student at Bowdoin College, as a valorous leader of his troops during the Mexican War, and as a rigid, Jacksonian supporter of the Constitution and national unity while president--a fictional character whose traits Hawthorne both admires and envies. First of all, Hawthorne's general interest in soldiers is evident. The redcoats who are approaching Concord represent
the pragmatic, earthly opposite to lofty-minded, brooding, and monomaniacal characters like Septimius. They are "ruddy, lusty Englishmen" with "sweat . . . run[ning] down from their powdered locks" (CE XIII: 21). Apparently fascinated with their appearance, Hawthorne offers more details. He writes that their faces were "heavy, cloddish, good-natured, [and] human" (CE XIII: 21), while also taking notice of "their black gaiters bemuddied and bedraggled, and their powdered locks a little in disorder" (CE XIII: 321). In contrast to Septimius's "dreamy composure" (CE XIII: 225) and solitary nature, the soldiers are active contributors to a cause. The admiring narrator interprets them as being energetic and dedicated members of a type of community. Evoking a subtextual adulation and envy of this membership, Hawthorne writes:

[Each of their red-coated ranks moved as if its component individuals were welded together, their cross belts all aslant in one direction, their bright musket barrels all gleaming in a line. (CE XIII: 221)

This readiness for action—implied by the enthusiastic mention of "gleaming" muskets and the overall "enthusiastic excitement" (CE XIII: 223) of the scene—is deliberately contrasted with Septimius. A "person of shy habits with no propensity for action" (CE XIII: 220), Septimius presents a solitary, static demeanor. As "enemies" of the inertia that Septimius represents, the redcoats receive the narrator's praise.
They are examples of honest, active men who
needed only a half-hour's rest, a good breakfast,
and a pot of beer apiece, to make them ready to
face the world. (CE XIII: 21)

The passage is reminiscent of Hawthorne's exaggerated
description of Pierce's wartime stamina in the campaign
biography. Noting that "Nature" has "endowed" Pierce with
"a rare elasticity," Hawthorne writes in the biography:
After the severest toil, a single night's rest does
as much for [Pierce], in the way of refreshment,
as a week could do for most other men. (401)

The young English soldier, a representative of this
"lusty" and "human" breed of men, displays traits that link him
to the soldier archetype and Hawthorne's lifelong admiration of
the soldierly aspects of Pierce. In fact, the character
resembles various reconstructions of Pierce in Hawthorne's
writings. We are told that the soldier, whom Septimius
encounters on the hill behind his house, is "a petulant boy,"
being "extremely handsome, and of gay and buoyant
deportment" (CE XIII: 21). At one point in the Septimius
Norton manuscript, Hawthorne makes a note to himself that
signifies his interest in this character. Before the
beginning of a paragraph, Hawthorne jotted "<make him very
fascinating>" (CE XIII: 218). Unlike Septimius, who
exudes a "cold composure" (CE XIII: 218), the soldier
presents evidence of "a kind of insolent good nature"
(CE XIII: 219). In addition, he is seemingly in his element in a warlike "state of intense excitement" (CE XIII: 223). His looks are "handsome," the narrator tells us, even "beautiful" in "his fresh, budding rosy youth" (CE XIII: 232). His "free buoyancy" (CE XIII: 232) counters Septimius's inability to be "stirred by . . . motives of patriotism" (CE XIII: 223). His charm and physical beauty mirror Hawthorne's construction of Pierce in the campaign biography. The young Pierce, we are told, presented a "delightful picture" of radiant beauty and energy, being "a beautiful boy, with blue eyes, light curling hair, and a sweet expression of face" (356). Like the soldier in the Septimius works, the Pierce of the biography was a "brave, faithful, and able citizen of his native country" (354). Even "Francis Norton," the name given to the English officer at one point in the text, is suggestive of the Pierce analogue, as "Francis" and "Franklin" bear similarities.

To enhance his fictionalization of the tensions between meditative inertia and soldierly action, Hawthorne depicts a duel between Francis Norton and Septimius. With this depiction, Hawthorne also signifies the tension between Pierce and himself and the tension between two opposing motivations in his own character. Septimius, angered by the soldier's teasing of Rose and "outraged and humiliated" by Norton's "look of defiance" (CE XIII: 22), agrees to participate in a duel with the young officer.
In the exchange of fire, the soldier misses Septimius, but Septimius's shot hits the soldier in the breast, delivering a fatal wound. Here, Hawthorne transforms the admiration, competitiveness, and envy he feels regarding Pierce into a moment of melodrama. Interestingly, it is Septimius, the shy, reticent artist, and not Francis, who fires the fatal shot and becomes an active participant in an aggressive act. The consequence of this action is a sympathy between the men. Hawthorne thus presents a bridging, of sorts, of the Hawthorne/Pierce, artist/soldier, and inertia/action oppositions. As the young soldier is dying, Septimius realizes, presumably for the first time, a brotherhood, a connection, and a "sympathy" (CE XIII: 30) with human society. The soldier, Septimius recalls, had put himself on equal ground with [Septimius] . . . so generously--that the latter, often so morbid and sullen, never felt a greater kindness to a fellow-man, than at this moment, for this youth. (CE XIII: 26)

Hawthorne, it appears, fictionalizes his own climactic appropriation of elements--popularity, social interaction, political engagement, military heroism, and professional eminence--that throughout his life he associated with Pierce.

The scene in which brotherly sympathy binds Septimius and Francis Norton at Norton's death is one of the most moving and poetic moments in Hawthorne's fiction. In illustrating the intimacy between these two very disparate characters, Hawthorne
effectively transforms his relationship with Pierce into a poignant literary episode. As a partly textualized Hawthorne and Pierce, Septimius and Francis exhibit both the tension and closeness of this friendship. The young officer refers to Septimius as "'my good friend'" (CE XIII: 27) as he nears death, forgiving his former enemy for what was mere "'boy's play'" (CE XIII: 27). The union between Septimius and Francis becomes, then, a "'brotherly act'" (CE XIII: 27).

In exercising their differences, the two men recognize their similarities. Francis, referring to Septimius as "'my enemy that was, my friend that is'" (CE XIII: 28), speaks tenderly to his "brother":

"Let me down as softly as you can on mother Earth--the mother of both you and me--so we are brothers." (CE XIII: 27)

Hawthorne describes the moment as a beautiful union of opposites. It is a synthesis of factions that Hawthorne no doubt sees in himself and in the nation. After Septimius tells Francis that he "'grieve[s]'" for him "'like a brother,'" Francis poetically expresses Hawthorne's theme of synthesis. He tells Septimius:

"Methinks, next to the father and mother that give us birth, the next most intimate relation must be with the man that slays us--... You and I are strangely connected, doubt it not, in the scenes of the unknown world." (CE XIII: 28)
The moment in which the two youths embrace is a significant one. Hawthorne writes:

[F]rancis's] eyes met those of Septimius with a wild troubled gaze, and as the latter caught him in his arms, he was dead. (CE XIII: 31).

This embrace is Hawthorne's artistic projection of his desire to resolve numerous tensions: his desire to merge romantic art and "relevant" political discourse, his desire to unify the opposing inert and assertive inclinations of his own character, and his desire to resolve the tensions of his friendship with Pierce. Hawthorne effects a type of closure with this scene. In real life, however, Hawthorne did not achieve closure on several issues. He was unable to finish a book-length romance after 1860, and he maintained ambivalent responses to such matters as the Civil War, the role of his art, and his relationship with Pierce.

In 1863, Hawthorne included a dedication and dedicatory letter, entitled "To a Friend," in Our Old Home. The book was a collection of sketches many of which he had submitted to Fields for publication in the Atlantic Monthly while working on the Septimius drafts. The dedicatory materials achieve a twofold purpose: they demonstrate publicly the author's personal friendship with an increasingly unpopular Pierce, and they covertly communicate his own political perspective. The dedicatory documents illustrate Hawthorne's ability and apparent eagerness to use seemingly innocuous prefatory
material (in this case, an acknowledgment of a personal friendship) to voice politically charged, distinctly partisan rhetoric. In a letter to Fields on July 18, 1863, Hawthorne wrote that the dedication was "altogether proper," for without Pierce the book "would have had no existence." Those readers bothered by the gesture, he goes on to tell Fields, ought to just "let [the book] alone." Discussion of the contexts, twofold nature, and consequences of the dedication and letter reveals how Hawthorne complicates a seemingly personal communicative act. Significantly, Hawthorne makes this gesture in a decidedly public medium, and one that, in light of Hawthorne's popularity and the success of The Marble Faun in 1860, would have certainly drawn attention. In the dedicatory materials, Hawthorne presents political gesturing, criticism of the Lincoln administration, an expression of his disenchantment with the Civil War ("the hurricane that is sweeping us all along with it") (CE V: 4), and a display of loyalty to the Democratic party.

The act of dedicating the collection to Pierce can only be seen as an explosive, political act, if viewed within historical contexts. Pierce, having retired from politics after an unsteady, often unproductive and harshly criticized single term (1853-1857), was critical of the Lincoln presidency. Also, he was an inflexible defender of Constitutional unity who relentlessly criticized the engagement of Northern military forces in the Civil War.
This criticism, along with what many saw as a sympathetic regard for the South, prompted anger and suspicion in the North. Pierce's continuing friendship with Jefferson Davis also made many Northerners resent him. As Claude M. Simpson notes,

Hawthorne evidently did not expect his dedication to go unchallenged, for Pierce was considered traitorous by Northerners who deplored his Constitutional opposition to the war and his attacks on the Lincoln administration. (CE V: xxv)

Nevertheless, one wonders whether or not Hawthorne foresaw the complexities, delays, and harsh responses that the political intonations of the dedicatory materials would generate. The dedicatory letter, "To a Friend," was the subject of many mildly quarrelsome letters between Hawthorne and Fields. Finally, Hawthorne decided to revise the document. As he tells Fields in his letter on July 18, 1863, Hawthorne made slight changes to present "not a word that ought to be objectionable to any set of readers" while still serving as "justice" to his friend Pierce. The dedicatory items provoked numerous negative responses from newspapers and reviews. Predictably, the dedication was considered "objectionable" by many of the New England literati. Those who expressed disapproval of the gesture included Ralph Waldo Emerson, Judge E. R. Hoar (of the Saturday Club and the Atlantic Club), Ellery Channing, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, and
Harriet Beecher Stowe. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow approached Fields and asked that he caution Hawthorne about the potentially damaging consequences of the dedication. (Chapter 6 treats the responses of Hawthorne's contemporaries to the dedication and the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship at greater length.) Annie Fields later noted that Hawthorne's insistence on publishing the dedicatory materials was a "beautiful incident" in the author's life. The dedication, she writes, reflects Hawthorne's admirable "determination at all hazards to dedicate this book to his friend"--even if, as she notes, "Pierce's politics at present shut him away from the faith of patriots" (CE V: xxvii-xxviii).

Hawthorne's dedication and "letter" to Pierce, then, like the earlier "Chiefly about War Matters" (about which Fields also expressed concern, and which also underwent revision by Hawthorne to delete "objectionable" content), assume political dimensions and voice a political stance that in 1863 was exceedingly unpopular.16

The texts of the inscription and the dedicatory essay first yield ample illustrations of Hawthorne's efforts to maintain his intimate friendship with Pierce. The friendship had been established some forty years earlier at Bowdoin College. "Hawthorne has loved [Pierce] since college days," Annie Fields noted in her memoirs, "and he will not relent [in pressing for publication of the dedication]" (CE V: xxviii).

The language of the two documents is sincere, poetic, and
candid. On the surface level of the text, Hawthorne creates the persona of a friend writing to a friend. He had employed the same strategy years earlier in the "letter" to Horatio Bridge in the preface to *The Snow-Image and Other Twice-told Tales*. In the dedication to Pierce, Hawthorne states that his gesture is but "a slight memorial of a college friendship, prolonged through manhood, and retaining all its vitality in our autumnal years." Hawthorne, in the inscription, effectively establishes the "friend" persona that he also uses in the accompanying piece, "To a Friend." The title of the letter, "To a Friend," is significant. In using the word "friend," Hawthorne privileges Pierce's role as friend over his status as ex-president, patron, or retired statesman. Hawthorne thus affirms the closeness of the relationship. In fact, "friend" and "friendship" appear frequently as key terms in the text. Hawthorne tells his "dear friend" (*CE V*: 5) that he has

> long desired to connect [Pierce's] name in some book of mine in commemoration of an early friendship that has grown old between two individuals of widely dissimilar pursuits and fortunes. (*CE V*: 3)

A significant modifier that recurs in the essay is "dear." Hawthorne opens the letter by referring to Pierce as "my dear General" (*CE V*: 3). The adjective-noun sets involving "dear" are numerous: "my dear General" (*CE V*: 3), "my dear friend" (*CE V*: 5), and "our dear country" (*CE V*: 4). Hawthorne thus
gives to his association with Pierce a distinctly political tenor, suggesting that those things he values—earned status ("my dear General"), friendship ("my dear friend"), and national unity ("our dear country")—are shared by Pierce.

The letter discloses a political bias that suggests a politically relevant fabric beneath Hawthorne's friendly discourse. Hawthorne's narrator undergoes a shift in persona. He assumes a political pose that, operating concurrently with the "friend" persona, expresses the author's loyalty to political precepts associated with Pierce. These precepts include criticism of the Lincoln administration, disapproval of the Civil War, and emphasis on the unity of the nation. To construct this politically observant persona, Hawthorne first expresses self-deprecation, a marginalization of "aesthetic literature" (CE V: 3), and the implied privileging of political, or, at least, relevant, discourse. Hawthorne's apparent embarrassment for what he sees as irrelevant romantic narrative is remindful of his predicament when composing the Septimus romances. Almost apologizing for dedicating "so slight a volume" (CE V: 3) to Pierce, Hawthorne states:

I wish that the offering were a worthier one than this volume of sketches, which certainly are not of a kind likely to prove interesting to a Statesman in retirement, inasmuch as they meddle with no matters of policy or government, and have very little to say
about the deeper traits of national character.

(CE V: 3)

Hawthorne thus conveys a desire to please his dedicatee with politically relevant communication, with prose that presumably would have something "to say about the deeper traits of national character." The sketches in Our Old Home, Hawthorne notes, "in their humble way," are linked "entirely [to] aesthetic literature, and can thus achieve no higher success than to represent to the American reader a few of the external aspects of English scenery and life" (CE V: 3).

The journal entries that evolved into the sketches that comprise Our Old Home, then, are relegated by Hawthorne himself to a minor status. He states that these sketches are merely "intended [to be used] for the side-scenes, and backgrounds, and exterior adornment" of an "abortive project" (CE V: 4). These pieces are thus labeled as being ultimately futile and marginal aspects of a work that "will never now be accomplished" (CE V: 4).

The narrator of "To a Friend" exhibits an intense preoccupation with utility, and with obtaining the "higher success" the author associates with political endeavor. The socio-political context of the Civil War appears to influence the language of the piece, as Hawthorne gives to the letter an urgency and a concern for the war crisis. Presumably, the dedicatory letter provides Hawthorne with an opportunity for political expression that he could not
find in the "side-scenes and backgrounds" of "aesthetic literature" (CE V: 3). Contemplation of his relationship with Pierce, after his return from England and Italy, apparently creates in Hawthorne the need to express a political conscience. Hawthorne intimates a compunction to respond to the war and, by implication, to do the opposite of what the letter states that the sketches in *Our Old Home* do. Hawthorne wants to comment on "the deeper traits of national character." Not content with the "abortive" novel that had "imperfectly developed itself in [his] mind" (CE V: 3-4), Hawthorne seems, at this late point in his career, to urgently seek political relevance. He surprises us by stating that this relevance cannot be found in "aesthetic literature," a field in which he has employed his skills for almost forty years. Hawthorne states flatly at one point in the letter: "the Present, the Immediate, the Actual, has proved too potent for me" (CE V: 4).

As evidence of his eagerness to respond to "the Present, the Immediate, the Actual," Hawthorne offers subtle criticism of the Civil War. The war becomes for Hawthorne a political reality that forces him to reconsider the relevance of literary modes with which he has been very successful. Hawthorne's response to the war, in contrast to the detached, unfeeling perspective that many critics and biographers have hastily attributed to him, reflects the author's authentic (though tempered) anger. In the letter, Hawthorne dramatically
employs metaphor and an apocalyptic tone to illustrate future horrors that will appear if the war continues. He writes that the war is a hurricane that is sweeping us all along with it, possibly, into a Limbo where our nation and its polity may be as literally the fragments of a shattered dream as my unwritten Romance. (CE V: 4)

Later, Hawthorne emphasizes his concern for the "catastrophe" by stating that he will, because of the urgency of the moment, make his letter brief and "defer a colloquy with [Pierce] till some calmer and sunnier hour" (CE V: 5). Amidst the chaos of war, political dissension, and criticism of Pierce, Hawthorne states that his friendship with the former president remains "as among the few things that time has left as it found them" (CE V: 5). The letter displays numerous markers--modifiers, emphatic phrases, charged verbs--that indicate Hawthorne's concern for a fragmented nation and the turmoil of the crisis. Such words and phrases include: "hurricane . . . sweeping," "Limbo," "fragments," "shattered dream," "catastrophe," and "afflict."

Yet, despite the pessimism and gloom that are evoked by the author's concern with the "catastrophe" and the possible loss of national unity, the prefatory piece does reveal optimism. Hawthorne cleverly situates this optimism in the context of his friendship with Pierce. Hawthorne's sense of hope ("But I have far better hopes for our dear country")
(CE V: 4) is instilled by the preservation of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship and Hawthorne's recognition of the steadfastness, patriotism, and goodness inherent in Pierce's character. Hawthorne manipulates a rhetorical strategy that curiously parallels the strategy he employed in the Life of Franklin Pierce. He mythologizes Pierce, giving him qualities associated with the founders of the nation. As before in his career, Hawthorne strives to construct Pierce as an idealized patriot. Pierce, the letter assures the reader, will be "faithful forever to that grand idea of an irrevocable Union," which was the "earliest" lesson that Pierce's "brave father taught [him]" (CE V: 5).

As he does elsewhere in Hawthorne's works, Pierce assumes the status of icon in the letter. For Hawthorne, Pierce is emblematic of "a personal friendship between a private individual, and a Statesman." In addition, Pierce represents the durability of the Constitution and the unity of the nation itself. Pierce is "forever faithful," Hawthorne reminds us, voicing his disgruntlement with the Civil War, "to that grand idea of an irrevocable Union" (CE V: 5). The letter ends with a celebratory summation of Pierce's role as icon. Hawthorne writes:

[I]t rests among my certainties that no man's loyalty is more stedfast [sic], no man's hopes or apprehensions on behalf of our national existence more deeply heartfelt, or more closely intertwined with his
possibilities of personal happiness, than those of FRANKLIN PIERCE. (CE V: 5)

The methodology that the argument of the letter follows also provides Hawthorne with an escape clause, a convenient safety net that reflects Hawthorne's skillful employment of political rhetoric. By associating Pierce with political stability, national unity, and patriotism, Hawthorne, having established his lifelong friendship with Pierce, distances himself from blame for involvement in the Civil War. But he does not, as some have claimed, distance himself from the subject of the war. He writes: "for my individual share of the catastrophe I afflict myself little, or not at all" (CE V: 4). Hawthorne implies that he has remained faithful to the "grand idea" of national unity by remaining loyal to Pierce. Pierce, then, given several titles by Hawthorne in the piece ("General," "Statesman," "friend"), personifies Hawthorne's own political perspective. Pierce serves as the author's vision of "polity." The letter to Pierce, then, becomes a vehicle for Hawthorne. With this vehicle--with his politically relevant expression of his friendship with Pierce--he can accomplish what his "abortive project" and "imperfectly developed" plans involving the English sketches prohibited him from doing. With this vehicle, he can do what "aesthetic literature" has prevented him from doing. It seems that, with this brief dedicatory letter to a controversial friend, Hawthorne can affect the
"Present" and depict, by using Pierce as an icon, "the deeper traits of national character." Even at this late phase in his career, Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce provides him with an opportunity to voice relevant literary and political expression.
Notes

1. Hawthorne seems at times to have taken his anger regarding his inability to successfully combine politics with narrative art out on inanimate or trivial objects. In a letter to Fields on November 6, 1861, he blames his pen for his writing blocks. He tells Fields: "I never met with a good pen in my life. . . . The one I write with was made in H--- and it is d----tion to write with it" (CE XVIII: 418).

2. In March of 1862, Hawthorne put the romance aside to travel to Washington, D.C., with William D. Ticknor for a month-long visit. During his visit, Hawthorne met President Lincoln, visited Harper's Ferry, toured Union military posts along the Virginia border, and observed General George McClellan reviewing his troops. The experience provided Hawthorne with the materials for his essay, "Chiefly about War Matters," which was published anonymously in the July, 1862, issue of the Atlantic Monthly. In the essay, Hawthorne, employing the mode of Swiftian satire and presenting a kind of dialogue between a "Peaceable Man" persona and a fictitious editor, illustrates his continuing loyalty to Pierce by criticizing Lincoln and the North's active involvement in the Civil War. In addition, Charles Adams suggests that Hawthorne employs the "Peaceable Man" persona to voice his "bitter awareness of his failure as an artist to engage the War" (354).

3. As Terence Martin notes, Hawthorne intended to
introduce *Septimius Felton* with a prefatory sketch of his life at the Wayside that would include a mention of the legend Thoreau had told him. Later, Hawthorne planned to write a sketch of Thoreau (that would include the legend) to serve as the preface to *The Dolliver Romance*.

4. Francis appears particularly Pierce-like when Hawthorne describes him as possessing "[a] beauty for women to love, . . . [and a] strength and courage for men to fear" (CE XIII: 240). In the *Life of Franklin Pierce*, Hawthorne, describing Pierce at college, writes that he possessed a bright and cheerful aspect [that] made a kind of sunshine, both as regarded its radiance and its warmth; insomuch that no shyness of disposition, in his associates, could well resist its influence (357).

5. Baym adds: "Perhaps Septimius, in killing [Francis] Norton, is killing off a part of himself--the simpler, earthier, joyful, world-involved self" (264).

6. Septimius appears to be an artist-writer character also because of his attempts to decipher the text of the ancient document that he finds on the soldier's body after the duel. Baym suggests that Hawthorne constructs Septimius as a detached writer-spectator to express his "criticism of the romantic artist" (260).

7. Francis tells Septimius at one point, intimating his brotherly feelings for Septimius as well as voicing his
soldierly ethos: "'I would be loth [sic] to lie in one of your Yankee grave-yards; for I have a distaste for them, though I love you, my slayer. Bury me here, on this very spot. A soldier lies best where he falls'" (CE XIII: 29). The narrator writes that Francis exhibited "a boyish familiarity that brought the tears into Septimius's eyes" (CE XIII: 236).

8. The Boston Post responded favorably to the dedicatory material, stating that the dedication was "exceedingly to the point, . . . mellow, kindly, easy, original." However, many newspapers, both in America and in England, expressed negative criticism of the documents. The New York Tribune predicted that "the gratuitous affirmation of the loyalty and patriotism of the ex-President is a gush of Quixotic enthusiasm which will expose Mr. Hawthorne to ridicule as mistaking a windmill for a giant." The Boston Daily Advertiser deemed the gesture "hardly pardonable" and an "intrusion," while the Liberator (in England) responded to Hawthorne's idealized treatment of Pierce with barbed sarcasm: "Mr. Hawthorne is good at fiction." The Spectator (also in England) questioned Hawthorne's depiction of Pierce as a loyal statesman. The newspaper offered the counter-claim that Pierce's "only political claim to the Presidency was grounded in his servility to the champions and the cause of slavery, and, as we now know, of secession." Negative reviews also appeared in Harper's Weekly, Blackwood's (in England), the Quarterly Review (in England), and the Reader (in England).
Even the *Salem Register* called the dedication "more creditable to the strength and endurance of Hawthorne's college friendship than to his political sagacity and associations" (*CE V: xxxiii-xxxiv*).

9. In *Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1899), Annie Fields quotes her husband's remark that Emerson, Longfellow, Hoar, and others, "'on learning that [Hawthorne] intended to inscribe his book to Franklin Pierce, came to me, and begged that I would, if possible, help Hawthorne to see that he ought not to do anything to jeopardize the currency of his new volume'" (125).

10. Emerson, who reportedly cut out the inscription and dedicatory essay from his copy of *Our Old Home*, later wrote in his journal (in July or August of 1863):

> Hawthorne unlucky in having for a friend a man who cannot be befriended; whose miserable administration admits but of one excuse, imbecility. Pierce was either the worst, or he was the weakest, of all our Presidents. (XV: 361)

Emerson's sentiments regarding Pierce had obviously not changed over the years. About nine years earlier, in 1854, he wrote in his journal: "A bad president, like ours today [Pierce], is a toad in amber" (XIII: 369).

11. The original version of the letter contained passages (later deleted by Hawthorne) that convey a less subtle and more exclamatory criticism of Lincoln. One passage from the
letter reads:

Can it be, that no man shall hereafter reach that elevated seat!—that its platform, which we deemed to be so firmly laid, has crumbled beneath it!—that a chasm has gaped wide asunder, into which the unbalanced Chair of State is about to fall! In my seclusion, accustomed only to private thoughts, I can judge little of these matters, and know not well what to hope, although I can see much to fear. (CE V: 360)

On July 3, 1863, a concerned Fields wrote to Hawthorne:

Your dedication to F.P. has a paragraph in it I shd. be glad to talk over with you when you come here. But it is a charming bit of writing, that same dedication. (CE V: xxv)

Fields later convinced Hawthorne that the passage could be "omitted with safety" (CE V: xxv).

12. In 1882, Fields recalled a trip that he made in 1867 to the Pemigewasset House, where Hawthorne had died on May 19, 1864. Fields wrote that "one of the responsible persons connected with the house" offered a fond recollection of Pierce on the occasion of Pierce's and Hawthorne's arrival on May 18, 1864. Fields quotes the man as saying,

"[I]ndeed, sir, if one didn't know anything about [Pierce's] politics, it would be said of him that he was one of the best of men. There is nobody who comes
to this house of more uniform and unfailing
gentlemanliness than he." (143)
CHAPTER 6
RESPONSES TO THE HAWTHORNE-PIERCE FRIENDSHIP

"What a storm you have had to face! And how like a man you have faced it!"

--Hawthorne, in a letter to Pierce, June 7, 1855

In her private journal, Louisa May Alcott recorded a significant passage for May, 1864. She wrote:

Hawthorne was found dead while on his trip with Pierce... We dressed the church on the 23rd for the funeral which was a very peculiar one throughout. (130)

The significant term in Alcott's passage is the adjective "peculiar." What Alcott, a longtime friend and neighbor of the Hawthorne family in Concord, Massachusetts, saw as being "peculiar" at Hawthorne's funeral might very well have been the presence of Franklin Pierce.¹ To see Pierce, who sat with Sophia and the Hawthorne children during the service, in attendance at an event that also included the likes of Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, James Russell Lowell, Charles Eliot Norton, Amos Bronson Alcott, and Oliver Wendell Holmes must have been odd. At the time of Hawthorne's funeral, Pierce was very unpopular in the North, criticized for his negative responses to the Lincoln administration, the Civil War, and the abolitionist movement.² Since leaving the presidency in 1857, Pierce had espoused a
political position that was exceedingly unpopular among the liberal New England literati and intellectuals, many of whom (Harriet Beecher Stowe, for example) going so far as to label him a traitor. Although Hawthorne, as Edward Wagenknecht states, disagreed with many of Pierce's views regarding the Civil War, the former president having "views on the war [that] were far more consistent and reasonable" (124) than Hawthorne's, his friendship with Pierce subjected him to suspicion and often fierce criticism by his contemporaries. The dedication of Our Old Home to Pierce in 1863 only intensified the criticism.

As the war progressed, and the North experienced several bruising defeats by the Confederacy in the early phases of the conflict, Hawthorne found himself in a state of isolation. As Wagenknecht notes, Hawthorne was "the only great New England writer except the Quaker Whittier who did not wholeheartedly support the Civil War" (124). The author, who with a succession of well-received novels in the previous decade had assumed a prominent position in American letters, met with skepticism, disfavor, hasty criticism, and even doubts about his patriotism because of his continuing friendship with Pierce. No doubt Hawthorne was aware that Our Old Home, as Gordon Hutner writes, "was all but ensured a poor reception, hated as Franklin Pierce was in the North for his policy of conciliation [between the North and the South]" (187). But the number of negative responses still must have surprised him. The list of those who responded negatively to the friendship included Emerson,
Harriet Beecher Stowe, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, Charles Eliot Norton, and, to a lesser extent, James T. Fields, Ellery Channing, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and William Cullen Bryant. A study of the responses of these individuals to the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship, along with the responses of Hawthorne's early biographers to the friendship, reveals the author's adherence to a particular political stance, his willful rejection of many of the philanthropic and what he saw as hypocritical and unrealistic views of his contemporaries, and his "steadfast courage" (Dolis 217) in maintaining a friendship with the controversial Pierce, regardless of the consequences of this alliance to his career and popularity.

In the 1860's, Hawthorne found himself in a sort of political vacuum. He was separated from many of his contemporaries by his criticism of the Civil War and his consistent loyalty to Pierce. Critics have offered numerous observations of Hawthorne's isolation from Emerson and the literary circles of Boston and Concord during the Civil War. Many have suggested that this isolation, a by-product of the author's relationship with Pierce, contributed at least in part to Hawthorne's struggles with many never-to-be-finished manuscripts late in his career. John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry in 1859 was another point of opposition between Hawthorne and some of his liberal contemporaries. Hawthorne criticized Emerson's claim that Brown was a martyr whose hanging made the gallows venerable just as Christ's crucifixion made the
cross venerable. In "Chiefly about War Matters," Hawthorne bluntly offered the opposing view, stating that "no man deserved hanging more" than Brown. Wagenknecht writes that Emerson and others "exerciated [Hawthorne] as having been corrupted by his association with Franklin Pierce" (124). Asserting that Hawthorne lost "sympathy" with many readers in the North and "could not meet them on intimate ground" (188), Hutner states:

Hawthorne believed that his friendship with Pierce canceled any need for public discretion, and this conviction may have strengthened his sense that he had lost touch with his time and his audience.

(187-88)

The dedication of Our Old Home to Pierce further demonstrated Hawthorne's purposeful distancing of himself from the views of Pierce's enemies, including Republicans, anti-Pierce Democrats, Whigs, Free Soilers, and abolitionists. The dedication and prefatory letter thus served to announce, in Dolis's terms, that Hawthorne's "position [ran] counter to the public sentiment of the North" (217-18). Hawthorne seemed not to be concerned that this display of his support for Pierce "might damage not only the sale of the book but also his very reputation" (Dolis 217). Mellow writes that this period in Hawthorne's career subjected him to numerous "bitter private criticisms" until the author, toward the end of his life, became "weary of the controversy [his loyalty to Pierce] had
aroused" (570). In spite of the fact that recent crippling defeats of the Northern army by the Confederacy made Hawthorne's support of Pierce seem poorly timed (and even politically obtuse), Hawthorne's dedication struck some as being a brave and moving testimonial to a lifelong friendship. Stanton Garner writes that Hawthorne's dedication of *Our Old Home* to Pierce was the author's "finest hour" (219). Garner adds that the gesture illustrated that Hawthorne "possessed a rare moral courage" (218). The dedication, and Hawthorne's alliance with Pierce in general, was indeed a risky, bold act, but, as Hawthorne himself was aware, "the price was high" (Garner 219).

Negative reactions to Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce were expressed in a variety of ways by literary figures in and around New England. William Cullen Bryant, editor-in-chief of the *New York Evening Post* for fifty years and a one-time, cautious supporter of Pierce, voiced his disagreement with many of the policies and legislative actions that Pierce endorsed. In a letter to his brother John Howard Bryant in August of 1852, just as Hawthorne was completing the *Life of Franklin Pierce* and the Pierce presidential campaign was getting into full swing, Bryant wrote:

I see not the least chance of a repeal or change of the fugitive slave law. Its fate is to fall into disuse. . . . We must make it odious, and prevent it from being enforced. (185)
Hawthorne was aware of the opposition to Pierce. In a letter to Pierce on June 7, 1855, midway through his friend's presidential term, Hawthorne writes:

> What a storm you have had to face! And how like a man you have faced it! I long to talk over all these matters with you by the fireside, after the events of your government shall have become history.

(*CE XVII: 351*)

In 1863, after the publication of *Our Old Home*, Saturday Club member Charles Eliot Norton interpreted Hawthorne's dedication of the book to Pierce as an act of pointed satire by the author. A staunch opponent of Pierce, Norton read Hawthorne's gesture as signifying vindictive criticism. Mellow writes that Norton thought the dedication "the bitterest of satires."

> "What a blow his friend has dealt to the weakest of ex-Presidents," Norton wrote to George Curtis. (570)

Norton vented his ardent antagonism to Pierce by calling the former President at one point "'the correspondent of Jefferson Davis, the flatterer of traitors, and the emissary of treason'" (*Garner 219*).

Such sentiments as Norton's, often intensified by politically motivated scandals and rumors that sprang up concerning Pierce's loyalty to the North, were apparently common. Ellery Channing was another consistent critic of slavery and the South. Declining to confront Hawthorne directly
about the *Our Old Home* dedication, Channing asked Hawthorne's sister-in-law, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, to write a letter to the author warning him of the potentially damaging consequences of the dedicatory materials. It was in fact Channing who suggested to Peabody that she mail clippings of newspaper reports criticizing Pierce to Hawthorne, a strategy that greatly irritated Hawthorne and only strengthened his ties with Pierce. On July 24, 1863, Hawthorne wrote to Pierce:

> Some spiteful Abolitionist took the trouble to send me a compendium of abusive paragraphs from the newspapers in reference to you; and it seemed to me that the best method of disappointing his malice was to toss them aside without reading one of them—which I accordingly did. (*CE* XVIII: 595)

Annie Fields, whose husband, in Mellow's words, had taken a "circumspect view" (566) of the dedication, saw Hawthorne's gesture as a noble and endearing tribute to a friendship. But she also sympathized with the criticism voiced by her contemporaries. Mellow, noting that Emerson had commented to Annie that *Our Old Home* as a whole was "'pellucid but not deep'" (570), writes: "In her diary, [Annie] noted, '[Emerson] has cut out the dedication and letter as others have done'" (570).

An event that further demonstrated opposition to Pierce occurred immediately after Hawthorne's return to Concord from Europe in 1860. In the summer of that year, a party was held in
Boston by Hawthorne's publishers to welcome the author home. At the dinner, which Pierce attended, Hawthorne spoke at length with James Russell Lowell, an opponent of slavery, regarding Lowell's recent complimentary review of *The Marble Faun*. As Randall Stewart notes,

The dinner was a pleasant affair, though one guest--Franklin Pierce--seemed to Lowell out of place in such a company. (215)

In addition, Longfellow, whose collection *Poems on Slavery* (1842) reflected his criticism of slavery, was bothered by Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce. The poet approached Fields and asked that he attempt to persuade Hawthorne to reconsider dedicating *Our Old Home* to the controversial former president. In response, Hawthorne rigidly defended his decision to include the dedication in the work, giving as his rationale that if Pierce had not appointed him to the Liverpool consulship, then he would not have had the opportunity to write the English sketches that comprised *Our Old Home*. Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce remained unshaken. As Julian Hawthorne later noted in his *Memoirs*,

[Hawthorne] loved and respected [Pierce], and no other time appeared to him so suitable for declaring it as when the currents of public favor ran against him.

(188)

One of the most vocal of the representatives of the "currents of public favor" running in opposition to Pierce was
Harriet Beecher Stowe. Stowe's indictment of slavery and her sympathy for the abolitionist movement were vividly reflected in several of her works, including the enormously popular *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) and *Dred: A Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp* (1856). She admired Hawthorne's works and claimed that his writings made a major contribution to the formation of a distinctly American literature. As Wagenknecht notes in *Harriet Beecher Stowe: The Known and the Unknown* (1965), Stowe praised [Hawthorne] for his ability to describe homely scenes, in *The American Note-Books* and such sketches as "The Old Apple Dealer," and for his freedom from cliches. (153)

But her anti-slavery stance prohibited her from supporting his dedication of *Our Old Home* to Pierce. "[Hawthorne's] temperament may not have been much like hers," writes Wagenknecht, "but she lost patience with him only when he defended Franklin Pierce" (153). No doubt Stowe was astonished and appalled by what she had heard concerning Hawthorne's prefatory letter to Pierce in the collection, in which he acknowledges the former president's "deeply heartfelt" "apprehensions" concerning "national existence" (CE V: 5) and implicitly criticizes the Civil War. As Wagenknecht states, Stowe's response was exclamatory and incredulous.

"Do tell me," [Stowe] wrote Fields, "if our friend Hawthorne praises that arch traitor Pierce in his preface, and your loyal firm publishes it. I never
read the preface, and have not yet seen the book, but they say so here, and I can scarcely believe it of you, if I can of him. I regret that I went to see him last summer. What! patronize such a traitor to our faces!" (247)

It was this kind of heated opposition, rooted in doubt about how "loyal" Hawthorne was to the North (and, according to some, to the nation itself), that isolated him from many of the influential literati in America. Criticism, suspicion, and, often, condemnation were intensified by the horrors of the war itself and early Union losses. As a result, Hawthorne was forced to experience what Frederick Newberry aptly terms "a special sense of homelessness" (229). This "homelessness" was the consequence of Hawthorne's "desire to be a writer-artist in a culture [that was] uncongenial and even hostile" (Newberry 229).

Hawthorne was politically keen enough to foresee the negative responses Emerson would have to the dedication of Our Old Home to Pierce. In some ways, Emerson's negative response might very well have amused Hawthorne. Emerson was a rigid supporter of Lincoln, the Republican party, and the abolitionist movement. Emerson's idealization of John Brown, along with his sympathetic view of the Harper's Ferry raid, galled Hawthorne. In his eulogistic essay on Lincoln, Emerson displays his support for Lincoln's policies and the war. Countering the satirical depiction of Lincoln as the crafty "Uncle Abe" figure in Hawthorne's "Chiefly about War Matters," Emerson writes that
Lincoln was "a man without vices," adding that he "had a face and manner which disarmed suspicion, which inspired confidence, which confirmed good will" (331). That Emerson would criticize Hawthorne's alliance with Pierce, to whom Emerson once referred in his private journals as "a toad in amber," was certain.

On the day after Hawthorne's funeral, Emerson expressed his views on the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship in his journal. Claiming that Hawthorne's increasing remoteness in his later years was the result of his association with Pierce, Emerson writes:

Lately [Hawthorne] had removed himself the more by the indignation his perverse politics and unfortunate friendship for that paltry Franklin Pierce awakened, though it rather moved pity for Hawthorne, and the assured belief that he would outlive it, and come right at last. (40-41)

Considering the fact that it was written only a day after Hawthorne's burial, the note seems particularly indelicate and harsh. Emerson describes Hawthorne's isolation from liberal Northerners as causing an "indignation," a word that conveys a negative charge, to express his disapproval of the author's friendship with Pierce. In addition, Emerson explicitly shows his unwavering partisan perspective, even at a eulogistic moment, when one would think that sympathy would be more appropriate. He writes that Hawthorne's, and, of course, Pierce's, politics were "perverse." Again, the word choice
clearly reflects a biased and narrow attitude, as Emerson codifies the political perspective that opposes his as being twisted, morally repugnant, and even wrong ("perverse"). Emerson concludes the passage with condescension. He states that he had entertained hopes that Hawthorne would "outlive" his (presumably temporary, in Emerson's view) association with Pierce and ultimately join Emerson's political side ("come right at last"). Later writing that he "found in [Hawthorne's] death a surprise and disappointment" (40), Emerson egotistically implies that Hawthorne simply was not given the time needed to "come right" politically and endorse Emerson's political views. Emerson's "pity" was no doubt the result of his realization that he and Hawthorne had never established a meaningful, intimate friendship. His charge that Hawthorne had "removed himself" is somewhat unfair, for Hawthorne had strengthened his ties with such old friends as Pierce, Horatio Bridge, and William D. Ticknor in his later years, while remaining distant from the likes of Emerson, Bronson Alcott, and Elizabeth Palmer Peabody. Embedded, then, in the lines of Emerson's passage are the very egoism, monomania, and patronizing manner that Hawthorne associated with Emerson and reformers in general.

James T. Fields, in his Yesterdays with Authors (1872), attempts to avoid political bias in attesting to the lasting quality of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship. Fields was impressed by Hawthorne's determination to dedicate Our Old
Home to the author's old friend regardless of negative reactions. Muting his own opposition to Pierce's politics, Fields recollects the tensions that Hawthorne's dedication caused in those "troublous days, full of war gloom and general despondency" (107). Fields writes:

Hawthorne proposed to dedicate his new book to a very dear friend, indeed, but in doing so he would draw public attention in a marked way to an unpopular name. Several of Hawthorne's friends, on learning that he intended to inscribe his book to Franklin Pierce, came to me and begged that I would, if possible, help Hawthorne to see that he ought not to do anything to jeopardize the currency of his new volume. (107)

Hawthorne's publisher glosses over the negative responses to the dedication by stating that, after publication, the collection was "everywhere welcomed" (108). Fields recalls two incidents to depict the closeness of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship. First, Fields remembers Hawthorne's statements to him regarding the funeral of Jane Appleton Pierce. Fields notes:

[Hawthorne] told us, as an instance of the ever-constant courtesy of his friend General Pierce, that while they were standing at [Mrs. Pierce's] grave, the General, though completely overcome with his own sorrow, turned and drew up the collar of Hawthorne's coat to shield him from the bitter cold. (112-13)

Next, Fields remembers standing in the room in the Pemigewasset
House in Plymouth, New Hampshire, in which Hawthorne died. Fields also recalls Pierce's moving description of Hawthorne's death. Again, Fields's admiration of the tender friendship between the two friends is evident, as he writes:

The room in which death fell upon [Hawthorne] . . . looks toward the east; and standing in it, as I have frequently done, since he passed out silently into the skies, it is easy to imagine the scene on that spring morning which President Pierce so feelingly describes in his letter. (124)

Although he, like Emerson and others, disagreed with Pierce on numerous political issues, Fields, in hindsight, admired Hawthorne's devotion to the former President. Without any sense of exaggeration, Fields writes that Pierce, despite his flaws, was "the companion of [Hawthorne's] youth and his manhood, for whom he would willingly, at any time, have given up his own life" (124).

In letters to both Bridge and Fields, Hawthorne displays both his awareness that he had many views that differ from Pierce's (views regarding the Civil War, the South, and national unity) and his continuing admiration of what he saw as Pierce's steadfastness and patriotism. On February 13, 1862, Hawthorne wrote a letter to Bridge in which he reconstructs an evening in which a shared concern for the nation strengthened the Hawthorne-Pierce camaraderie. The letter signifies the intimacy that Hawthorne saw as a defining trait of this
relationship. He tells Bridge:

Frank Pierce came here and spent a night, a week or two since; and we drank a bottle of arrack together, and mingled our tears and condolences for the state of the country. Pierce is truly patriotic, and thinks there is nothing left for us but to fight it out . . . He is bigoted to the Union, and sees nothing but ruin without it; whereas, I, (if we can only put the boundary far enough south) should not much regret an ultimate separation. (CE XVIII: 427-28)

When the matter of the dedication of Our Old Home became a controversial, political issue in the spring of 1863, Hawthorne found the occasion to express his continuing loyalty to Pierce. As earlier in his career, the friendship with Pierce made a significant effect on the content and tone of many of his letters. After telling Fields in a letter on May 3, 1863, that inscribing the book to Pierce "with a few pages of friendly and explanatory talk" would be "very gratifying to [Hawthorne's] lifelong affection for him" (CE XVIII: 567), Hawthorne, several weeks later, almost became indignant regarding the subject. On July 1, Hawthorne, evidently tiring of the controversy that was surrounding the planned dedication, told Fields:

It requires some little thought and policy in order to say nothing amiss at this time; for I intend to
dedicate the book to Frank Pierce, come what may.

*(CE XVIII: 579)*

After receiving more warnings from Fields, Hawthorne's indignation turned to anger. On July 18, 1863, Hawthorne wrote a letter to the publishers in which his stern defense of the dedicatory gesture is voiced in forceful rhetoric. Telling Fields that it would be "a piece of poltroonery" for him "to withdraw either the dedication or the dedicatory letter" *(CE XVIII: 586)* from the book, Hawthorne offers a final justification for the dedication:

My long and intimate personal relations with Pierce render the dedication altogether proper, especially as regards this book, which would have had no existence without his kindness; and if he is so exceedingly unpopular that his name is enough to sink the volume, there is so much the more need that an old friend should stand by him. *(CE XVIII: 586)*

Aware of the political sensitivity of the dedicatory materials, Hawthorne wrote to Fields: "[W]hile doing what I know to be justice to my friend, [the dedicatory letter] contains not a word that ought to be objectionable to any set of readers" *(CE XVIII: 586)*. Finally, Hawthorne concludes his rationale for the dedication with a not very subtle critique of those who would respond negatively to the gesture. He tells Fields,

If the public of the north see fit to ostracize me for this, I can only say that I would gladly
sacrifice a thousand or two of dollars rather than retain the good will of such a herd of dolts and mean-spirited scoundrels. (CE XVIII: 586-87)

One of these "scoundrels" who did not muffle her opposition to Pierce and the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship was Hawthorne's sister-in-law, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody. A vocal and active supporter of the abolitionist movement, Peabody was particularly distressed to hear of Hawthorne's intentions to dedicate Our Old Home to the former President. After Fields attempted unsuccessfully to persuade Ellery Channing to talk to Hawthorne about the potentially damaging effects of the dedication to the author's reputation and income, he sought the assistance of Peabody. Without hesitation, she went into action. After mailing numerous clippings from newspapers to Hawthorne that labeled Pierce as a pro-South traitor, Peabody wrote a letter to the author attempting to convince him not to include the Pierce dedication in the book. Unfortunately, her letter does not survive (it was probably burned by Hawthorne). But, judging by Hawthorne's ireful response to the letter in his letter of July 20, 1863, her attempt backfired. As Mellow notes, the "mounting fervor" (567) that is evident in Hawthorne's reply illustrates that he was "supremely irritated by his sister-in-law's meddling" (567) and by her patronizing "attempts to save him from himself" (568).

Whatever Peabody wrote in her letter met with an explosive, forceful response, as Hawthorne defends his dedication to Pierce
and his lifelong association with the controversial ex-President. The letter is one of the most significant textualizations of Hawthorne's devotion to Pierce, a convincing reminder of the influence of this relationship on his thinking and career. Rarely in Hawthorne's correspondence is his rhetoric so demonstrably angry, direct, and exclamatory. Telling Peabody that the "Dedication to General Pierce" will not create "the momentous political consequences which you apprehend" (CE XVIII: 589), Hawthorne begins by summarizing his defense of Pierce. He almost repeats phrases he used in defending Pierce in earlier letters to Fields. The dedication, he tells Peabody, is "a proper memorial of our life-long intimacy" and a symbol of his "confidence in [Pierce's] loyalty and unalterable devotion to the Union" (CE XVIII: 589). Then, Hawthorne's patience appears to dwindle, quickly replaced by anger. Instead of apologizing for the dedication, he writes, he is "glad to have the opportunity" to voice publicly his support of Pierce at this particular "moment" when "all the administration and abolition papers are calling him a traitor" (CE XVIII: 589).

Hawthorne's exasperation then reaches its pinnacle, as he exclaims:

A traitor! Why, he is the only loyal man in the country, North or South! Every body else has outgrown the old faith in the Union, or got outside of it in one way or another; but Pierce
retains it in all the simplicity with which he inherited it from his father. (CE XVIII: 589)

Hawthorne returns to the strategy he employed in writing the Life of Franklin Pierce eleven years earlier—to persuade others of Pierce's virtues by associating him with heroes of the Revolutionary War and the early years of the nation. Hawthorne states that Pierce, unlike many of his contemporaries, has remained "true" to "ideas . . . entertained by the fathers of the constitution and the republic" (CE XVIII: 589). Hawthorne adds that he knows these things "with the same certainty as if I had just come from a talk with [Pierce]" (CE XVIII: 589).

Although he does acknowledge that he differs from Pierce "in many respects" (CE XVIII: 589), Hawthorne vigorously defends his dedication of Our Old Home to Pierce. Candid, direct, and firm ("You do not in the least shake me," he tells Peabody at one point), Hawthorne displays his political savvy by foreseeing the negative responses that the dedicatory materials will prompt. Like the dedication itself, the letter to Peabody becomes an opportunity for Hawthorne both to express (this time in a private medium) his loyalty to Pierce and to distance himself from his liberal contemporaries. He writes to Peabody:

The Dedication can hurt nobody but my book and myself. I know that it will do that, but am content to take the consequences, rather than go back from what I deliberately judge it right to do. (CE XVIII: 590)
Hawthorne follows this passage with criticism of Peabody and like-minded New England reformers. Shifting from a serio-comic tone ("woe to the Abolitionists! I offer you in advance the shelter of the nook in our garret") (CE XVIII: 590) to one of great seriousness, Hawthorne tells Peabody:

As for Posterity, it will have formed a truer opinion of General Pierce than you can do; and yet I should suppose that you have breadth and insight enough (however disturbed by the potent elixir of political opinions) to appreciate the sterling merits of this kind of man. (CE XVIII: 590)

The statement, of course, only thinly disguises an insult, as Hawthorne states that Peabody has been "disturbed" by the "potent elixir" of political zeal and abolitionism. Hawthorne ends the letter powerfully. He informs Peabody that he will not discuss Pierce or his friendship with Pierce with her again. This was a vow which, as Peabody noted in her letter to Horatio Bridge on June 4, 1887, Hawthorne kept. After stating that "it is a pity" (CE XVIII: 592) that the dedication should create so much apprehension, he closes the letter with a sense of finality for which it would be difficult to find an equal in Hawthorne's correspondence. He writes:

The older I grow, the more I hate to write notes and I trust I have here written nothing now that may make it necessary for me to write another. (CE XVIII: 592)
Hawthorne thus bluntly states that he has concluded his gestures in behalf of Pierce, to whom he had referred in a letter to Bridge on August 31, 1854, as being, beyond the trappings of political ideology and controversy, a "true man and a true friend" (CE XVII: 253).

The enigmatic quality of Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce sparked a diversity of responses from Hawthorne's early biographers as well. Fifteen years after Pierce's death in 1869, Julian Hawthorne published his two volume biography, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* (1884). In this work, Julian presents a markedly romanticized, heroic, and unidimensional Pierce whose friendship with Hawthorne (and with Julian himself, after Hawthorne's death) attests to what Julian saw as Pierce's faithfulness and good character. Hawthorne's son-in-law, George Parsons Lathrop, in *A Study of Hawthorne* (1876), attempts to provide a rationale for the author's youthful attraction to such athletic, extroverted "country boys" (110) as Pierce, Bridge, and Jonathan Cilley. Bridge's *Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1893) complements Julian's biased, idealistic perspective regarding the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship. Later biographer Frank Preston Stearns, in *The Life and Genius of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1906), offers a more skeptical, critical assessment of Pierce. Frequently, the cynical undertone of Stearns' text counters the unchecked praise that is evident in earlier biographies. A review of the varied treatments of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship that these works
present indicates the intriguing and often perplexing nature of this relationship—a relationship in which, as Hawthorne noted in a letter from which Julian quotes, "'each did his best for the other, as friend for friend'" (211)—and the techniques (including myth-formation, speculation, romanticization, and skeptical inquiry) Hawthorne's early biographers employ in depicting it.

In Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, Julian Hawthorne exhibits a subjective, nostalgic, and biased reconstruction of Pierce and the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship. To describe Pierce as a noble-minded, heroic, and paternal figure, Julian quotes frequently from letters written by his parents, Bridge, and others whose views support his adulation. Julian records his mother's assertions, expressed in a letter she wrote to her father in May of 1853, that Pierce's assigning of the Liverpool consulship to Hawthorne was "'a very noble act'" that reflected Pierce's good character. Stating that Pierce "'might have made great political capital'" by giving the position to another individual, Sophia concludes that Pierce "'acts from the highest, and not lowest motives, and would make any sacrifice to the right'" (12). Later in the biography, Julian strives to present Pierce as a patriotic, selfless, and compassionate leader by quoting from a lengthy letter Sophia wrote to her mother. Julian estimates that this letter was written "a month or two before [Hawthorne's] appointment [to the consulship] was made, and confirmed by the Senate" (485). Sophia writes:
"I wish I could convey to you what I know to be the truth about him. He is an incorruptible patriot, and he loves his country with the purity and devotion of the first of our early Patriots. . . . The personal homage and love he commands, the enthusiasm of affection felt for him by his friends, are wonderful. His gentleness is made beautiful by a granite will. . . . " (482)

Julian's selection of these excerpts from Sophia's correspondence demonstrates his employment of myth-building techniques in his biography. He mirrors his father's use of similar techniques in the Pierce campaign biography thirty-two years earlier. Using his mother's elegant and often poetic phrases, Julian characterizes Pierce as an inheritor of patriotic virtues (Pierce, Sophia's letter notes, displays a heroism that is reminiscent of "'the first of our early Patriots'"), moral platitude ("'He is modest and captivating from a natural courtesy and grace of address,'" Sophia writes to her mother, "'based upon kindness and generosity of heart'"), and an admirable balance of strength and tenderness ("'His gentleness is made beautiful by a granite will,'" she adds) (482).

Julian effectively uses quotations from letters written by Hawthorne, Bridge, and Pierce himself to demonstrate the former President's altruistic nature. One of his primary modes of reconstructing Pierce in the biography, then, is to
present statements made by illustrious, influential figures (the prominent one for Julian, of course, being Hawthorne) as vehicles to convey his own romanticization of Pierce. Recalling Pierce's stay with the Hawthorne family in Rome in 1856--and Hawthorne's statement that he "'found all [his] early friend in Pierce'" (211)--Julian recreates a scene from the visit to show Pierce's compassion and the closeness of the relationship between Pierce and Hawthorne. Julian writes:

I recollect the first evening that Pierce came to our house, and sat in the little parlor, in the dusk, listening to the story of Una's illness. "Poor child! poor child!" he said occasionally, in a low voice. His sympathy was like something palpable,—strong, warm, and comforting. He said very little, but it was impossible not to feel how much he cared. He knew of his own experience what it was to lose children. He stayed in Rome several weeks, and he and Hawthorne talked over all their former years and adventures, since they were boys in college together. (211)

The quietly compassionate, tender aspect of Pierce's character--as well as the magnetic "sympathy" that Julian remembers existing between the two men--is also evident in the letters of Bridge from which Julian often quotes. Julian presents passages from letters Bridge wrote to Hawthorne on October 16 and December 25, 1836, in which Bridge asserts that Pierce is
"'an honorable man,'" an individual "'of kind feelings'" who no doubt possesses the "'inclination'" to "'do something for [Hawthorne]'" (148).

To justify the excessive praise of Pierce, Julian includes a letter that Pierce wrote to J. N. Reynolds on March 28, 1837, in which Pierce recommends Hawthorne for an assignment on a South Seas expedition (an expedition that Hawthorne did not undertake). Noting that Hawthorne is "'not subject to any of those whims and eccentricities which are supposed to characterize men of genius, and which might disqualify him for any solid and steady business'" (156), Pierce tells Reynolds that Hawthorne is

"extremely modest, perhaps diffident,—a diffidence, in my judgment, having its origin in a high and honorable pride; but he is a man of decided genius, without any whims or caprices calculated to impair his efficiencies or usefulness in any department of literature." (154)

Julian's inclusion of the concise statement with which Pierce closes the letter--"'I know Hawthorne's worth'" (156)--reflects the intimacy of the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship. George Parsons Lathrop offers a less subjective, less idealized treatment of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship in A Study of Hawthorne (1876). His primary concern regarding the issue is attempting to explain Hawthorne's fascination with Pierce. Lathrop's inquiry displays a subtextual skepticism,
and his account of the friendship privileges a balance of imaginative speculation and objective criticism over excessive romanticization. Lathrop suggests that, while at Bowdoin College, Hawthorne made friendships more easily with outgoing, athletic individuals who enjoyed outdoor activities (walking, swimming, hunting, fishing, ice skating, and so on) than with studious, solitary individuals. For example, later in his life, Hawthorne preferred spending time boating with Thoreau on the Concord River over philosophizing with Emerson, George Ripley, and other transcendentalists at meetings of the Saturday Club. Lathrop writes:

I think [Hawthorne] must have sided, in fact, with the country boys. . . . Being a sea-captain's son, [Hawthorne] would naturally make his connections at college with men who had the out-of-doors glow about them. (110-11)

Lathrop's reference to Bridge as "a more confidential friend [to Hawthorne] than Pierce" (110) illustrates a skeptical counter-statement to Julian Hawthorne's idealization of Pierce and the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship.

Although Lathrop does acknowledge the length of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship and recognizes Pierce's status as a trusted companion of Hawthorne's, he balances his depiction of their friendship with an awareness of difficulties their alliance caused. Lathrop notes that Hawthorne and Pierce "preserved their cordial relations intact for forty years,
sometimes amid confusions and misconstructions, or between
cross-fires of troublous [sic] counter-considerations, with
a rare fidelity" (111). Later, he adds that Hawthorne "never
swerved from his early loyalty to Pierce, though his
faithfulness gave him severe trials, both public and private,
afterward" (115). However, Lathrop fails to specify the
"confusions and misconstructions" that he intriguingly states
led to "severe trials" for Hawthorne.

Lathrop's text offers an interesting thesis—the claim that
Hawthorne's friendship with Pierce was based on the writer's
idealization of Pierce from the Bowdoin College days through the
Civil War—but qualification of the "confusions" generated by
the friendship is lacking. Nevertheless, Lathrop's biography
astutely notes Hawthorne's ability to observe and analyze
color character. Lathrop writes:

I believe if [Hawthorne] had ever found that the
original nucleus of honor and of a certain candor
which had charmed him in Pierce was gone, he would,
provided it seemed his duty, have rejected the
friendship. As it was, he saw his old friend and
comrade undergoing changes which he himself thought
hazardous, saw him criticized in a post where no one
ever escaped the severst criticism, and beheld him
return to private life amid unpopularity, founded,
as he thought, upon misinterpretation of what was
perhaps error, but not dishonesty. (115)
Hawthorne, as Lathrop notes, remained faithful to his interpretation of Pierce's character and willingly encountered the injurious consequences (the negative reaction to the dedication of *Our Old Home* to Pierce in 1863, for example) of maintaining their friendship. Lathrop adds that Hawthorne felt that the old "Frank," his brother through Alma Mater, dwelt still within the person of the public man; and though to claim that brotherhood exposed Hawthorne, under the circumstances, to cruel and vulgar insinuations, he saw that duty led him to the side of his friend, not to that of the harsh multitude. (115)

In his *Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (1893), written when he was in his eighties, Horatio Bridge supports Julian Hawthorne's romantic textualization of Pierce's persona. Bridge's description of the physical traits of Pierce corresponds with Pierce's soldierly bearing and his service in the army. "In person," Bridge writes affectionately, "[Pierce] was slender, of medium height, with fair complexion and light hair, erect, with a military bearing, active, and always bright and cheerful" (27). The brief analysis of Pierce's personality also promotes Pierce as an idealized, paradigm-like figure, rather than as a flawed, dimensional human being. Bridge writes:

In character [Pierce] was impulsive, not rash;
generous, not lavish; chivalric, courteous, manly,
and warm-hearted; and he was one of the most popular students in the whole college. (27)

The modifiers—"impulsive," "chivalric," "courteous," "manly"—contribute to a treatment of Pierce as an archetypal soldier-figure, an idealized warrior-companion whose determination is balanced by "warmhearted"-ness. The description is remindful of Edward Walcott, the popular boy-soldier in Fanshawe. Bridge's statements also bring to mind Sophia Hawthorne's comment, which Julian includes in Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, that Pierce's "'gentleness is made beautiful by a granite will'" (482). Bridge's memories of Pierce, along with his recollections of Hawthorne, are textualized in subjective, nostalgic language. Bridge accentuates his favorable view of Pierce's character by quoting from a letter Hawthorne wrote to him on October 18, 1852, regarding Pierce. Hawthorne's opinions echo Bridge's position. Hawthorne writes,

"I have come seriously to the conclusion that [Pierce] has in him many of the chief elements of a great ruler. . . . There are scores of men in the country that seem brighter than he is; but Frank has the directing mind, and will move them about like pawns on a chess-board, and turn all their abilities to better purpose than they themselves could do."

(132)

Frank Preston Stearns, whose The Life and Genius of Nathaniel Hawthorne was published in 1906, offers a more
critical treatment of Pierce's relationship with Hawthorne. Like Lathrop, he voices a skeptical perspective regarding Pierce that is antithetical to Bridge's views. Agreeing with his Harvard classmate Julian Hawthorne that Pierce "possessed the rare gift of personal magnetism" (62-63), Stearns presents a description of Pierce that clearly avoids romanticization. In a passage that conflicts with descriptions of Pierce by Julian, Bridge, and Sophia Hawthorne, Stearns states that Pierce

was not much above the average in intellect, and, as Hawthorne afterward confessed, not particularly attractive in appearance; with a stiff military neck, features strong but small, and opaque gray eyes—a rather unimpressive face, and one hardly capable of a decided expression. (62-63)

Viewing the Hawthorne-Pierce relationship as a relationship between artist and "patron and protector" (63), Stearns argues that Pierce exercised, in an almost opportunistic fashion, his influential powers to gain political achievements. "It seems as if there must have been some magic faculty in the man," Stearns writes, "which enabled him to win high positions so easily" (93). Stearns concludes, cynically, that Pierce "illustrated the faculty for 'getting elected'" (93). This view explicitly deviates from Sophia Hawthorne's opinions, expressed in a letter Sophia wrote to her mother in 1853. In the biography of his parents, Julian
presents the following passage from Sophia's letter:

"Ambition has not touched [Pierce]. The offices which he has filled were brought and laid at his feet, without any interference of his own; and it was also so with regard to his nomination for the Presidency."

The variance of the two positions demonstrates the complexity of the responses of biographers to Pierce and his friendship with Hawthorne, as well as indicating the effects of partiality, nostalgia, and political motivations on biographical texts.

Despite the different responses to the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship expressed by Hawthorne's contemporaries and his early biographers, the allure that Pierce had for Hawthorne is uncontestable. Hawthorne's lifelong friendship with Pierce thus presents numerous intriguing questions for the critic, as Hawthorne himself, from his first novel to many of his works in the 1860's, reveals the influence of Pierce on his art. The mutual loyalty and intimacy inherent in the relationship provoked significant responses from both supporters of the friendship and detractors. In a letter to her mother in May of 1845, which Julian includes in Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, Sophia Hawthorne perhaps best synopsizes the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship. She writes: "'My husband says Mr. Pierce's affection for and reliance upon him are perhaps greater than any other person's'" (Hawthorne 281). The responses of Hawthorne's
contemporaries and early biographers to the relationship attest to the influential, idiosyncratic, and compelling loyalty Hawthorne exhibited throughout his life to his "dear General," Franklin Pierce.
Notes

1. As Frederick Newberry notes, Pierce's final gesture at Hawthorne's funeral signified the bond between the two men. After the service, which was directed by James Freeman Clarke, ended, Pierce, writes Newberry, "scattered a few final blossoms into the open grave" (579).

2. On December 19, 1859, Democrats gathered at the Academy of Music in New York to respond to the raid on Harper's Ferry. According to Stanton Garner, the meeting was organized to "deplore [John] Brown's action and to reassert their traditional position that the rights of the Southern states must not be abridged" (45). At the meeting, over which the mayor of New York presided, letters written by prominent individuals in support of the agenda of the meeting were read. Among the letters read were those by Franklin Pierce, Winfield Scott, Martin Van Buren, and Millard Fillmore.

3. Often, Hawthorne's letters to Bridge express the author's concern for Pierce's health and welfare. On April 18, 1854, Hawthorne wrote to Bridge: "I feel a sorrowful sympathy for the poor fellow (for God's sake, don't show him this!)") (CE XVII: 207). Later that year, on December 14, Hawthorne expressed more concern, writing: "Write to me about Pierce, and how his health and spirits are . . . it is a devilish sight harder to write to the President of the United States (especially when he has been an intimate friend) than to
a private man" (CE XVII: 294).

4. In his entry of May 24, 1864, Emerson records the following in his journal:

Yesterday, May 23, we buried Hawthorne in Sleepy Hollow, in a pomp of sunshine and verdure, and gentle winds. . . . Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, Agassiz, Hoar, Dwight, Whipple, Norton, Alcott, Hillard, Fields, Judge Thomas, and I attended the hearse as pallbearers. Franklin Pierce was with the family. (39)

Emerson's giving Pierce the final position in the long list of attendees, as well as demonstrating that Pierce was not one of the pallbearers (and thereby distancing Pierce from the current stream of political and intellectual thought in New England), indicates his low regard for the former President.

5. As Garner points out, a scandal regarding Pierce's friendship with Jefferson Davis erupted in August of 1863, just as Our Old Home was going to print. Garner writes: "[T]he Northern Press published a report that there had been secret correspondence between Pierce and Jeff Davis which proved that for years he had conspired in the rebellion. It was a malignant but often imitated attempt to implicate the political opposition in an invented conspiracy that explained a national misfortune" (219).

6. In her letter to Bridge on June 4, 1887, Elizabeth
Palmer Peabody, apparently still irritated by Hawthorne's forceful reply to her requests that he not include the dedication to Pierce in Our Old Home almost twenty-five years earlier, writes:

[Hawthorne's letter] did great injustice to his character & sense of human justice. I know that he knew nothing about slavery--He had never been at the South. He never saw a slave or fugitive slave. He looked at all antislavery literature as beneath the consideration of a reasonable man--It was perfectly true what he often said--that he knew nothing about contemporaneous history, that he could not understand history until it was at least a hundred years old. (445)

7. Julian Hawthorne's idealized treatment of Pierce is particularly evident in Hawthorne and His Circle (1903). Julian writes:

There was a winning, irresistible magnetism in the presence of [Pierce]. Except my father, there was no man in whose company I liked to be so much as in his... He was a good, conscientious, patriotic, strong man, and gentle and tender as a woman. He had the old-fashioned ways, the courtesy, and the person and dignity which are not often seen nowadays. His physical frame was immensely powerful and athletic; but life used him hard, and he was far from
considerate of himself, and he died at sixty-five, when he might, under more favorable conditions, have rounded out his century" (359).
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

"I shall hope to revive rapidly when once we are on the road."

--Hawthorne, in a letter to Pierce, May 7, 1864

As an artist, Hawthorne borrowed from numerous sources and worked within a wide variety of socio-historical contexts. He employed a methodology of transforming historical moments into complex, romantic art, and he applied this process to historical personages and episodes that intrigued him as being signifiers of both the American and the human experience. Once transformed into ambiguous, poignant literature, these episodes become timeless indicators of Hawthorne's complicated artistic perspective. The context of American Puritanism served to enrich Hawthorne's moral probing in such works as *The Scarlet Letter*, "Endicott and the Red Cross," "The May-Pole of Merry Mount," "The Minister's Black Veil," and "Mrs. Hutchinson." The persecution of witches in Salem in the 1690's and Hawthorne's own ancestral ties to what he referred to in *Famous Old People* (1840) as "the old witchcraft delusion" (CE VI: 102) were backdrops that enhanced the author's bitter condemnation in "Young Goodman Brown," *The House of the Seven Gables*, and "Alice Doane's Appeal," among others. In *Biographical Stories for Children* (1842), Hawthorne reconstructed such historical
figures as Samuel Johnson, Sir Isaac Newton, Benjamin Franklin, and Oliver Cromwell to entertain and enlighten his "little readers" (CE VI: 214). Such famous individuals as John Eliot ("Apostle" Eliot), Roger Williams, and Anne Hutchinson appear in romanticized renderings of events in their lives in *Grandfather's Chair* (1840).

Hawthorne also looked to his own personal history for literary sources. His observations of the aspirations and fallacies of New England transcendentalism are reflected in "The Celestial Railroad," while the author's brief involvement in George Ripley's Brook Farm experiment provided the historical basis for *The Blithedale Romance* (1852). The detailed descriptions of Roman ruins, villas, and landscapes in *The Marble Faun* (1860) owe a debt to the descriptions of scenery Hawthorne recorded in his voluminous notebooks during his stay in Italy after his term as United States consul in Liverpool ended. However, no list of Hawthorne's contexts would be complete without Franklin Pierce, whose forty-year friendship with Hawthorne made a significant impression on the author's career. Hawthorne's relationship with Pierce, which, as Hawthorne noticed with some awe, grew stronger with the passage of time, not only served as a context for many of the author's writings, but it also provided a real-life example of the "magnetic chain of humanity" that, as a theme, prevails in his art.

An understanding of the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship and
Hawthorne's transformation of Pierce from his historical personage into a literary and political icon provides new insight into Hawthorne's artistic method. Throughout his career, Hawthorne returned to his relationship with Pierce as a viable source for his writings. In Fanshawe, Pierce and Bowdoin College served as historical shadows lurking behind Hawthorne's creation of Edward Walcott and Harley College. Years later, in 1852, Hawthorne undertook the task of writing his friend's campaign biography, his adulation of Pierce prodding him onward in a decidedly uncomfortable moment. During the Civil War, Pierce again served as a sort of influential force, guiding Hawthorne's pen in the employment of the soldier paradigm in the Septimius manuscripts. When Hawthorne, not long afterwards, dedicated Our Old Home to Pierce, the former President again can be seen as a sort of influential phantom, a magnetic presence adrift among the many contexts in Hawthorne's mind. Pierce was a valued and intimate companion to Hawthorne, but he also served, in an often shadowy, subtle, and contextual (though very formidable) way, as a token of Jacksonian America, a symbol of patriotism, an image of the steadfast soldier, and an exemplar of lasting virtues. Just as Septimius and the young British officer are "brothers" of the same "mother Earth" in the Septimius romances, Hawthorne and his "general" were linked by a shared sensibility regarding political ideology, duty, and the uplifting effects of a long, genuine friendship.
Not only a context that influenced many of Hawthorne's writings, Pierce was also a real-life friend who often appeared at crucial moments in Hawthorne's life and career. The points at which the lives of the two men intersected were numerous. Like Edward Walcott or the dashing brigadier-general in the campaign biography, Pierce seemed to serve Hawthorne as a faithful hero and protector. At Bowdoin College in the 1820's, Pierce introduced the rather shy Hawthorne to the sphere of politics, literature, and socialization in the Athenaean Society. In the summer of 1852, Pierce sought Hawthorne's skills for the writing of his campaign biography, thus providing Hawthorne with an entry into national politics. Pierce's giving Hawthorne the Liverpool consulship in 1853 provided the author with the opportunity to travel to England, his "old home," where he would record numerous journal entries that he would later develop into travel sketches and the American claimant manuscripts. Without the consulship, it is doubtful whether or not Hawthorne would have traveled to Europe or have written *The Marble Faun*.

Pierce was present at other significant events in Hawthorne's life as well. The former President's lengthy visits with the Hawthorne family in Rome in 1859 during Una Hawthorne's perilous illness afforded Hawthorne with passage over what he later admitted was the greatest difficulty of his life. Hawthorne wrote in his journal that he and his old friend hold just the same relation to one another, as of yore; and we have passed all the turning-off places,
and may hope to go on together, still the same dear friends, as long as we live. (CE XIV: 519)

When Hawthorne returned to America in 1860, Pierce, his patron and friend, attended a dinner party held in Boston to welcome him. (In light of Pierce's unpopularity, the event, which was attended by several prominent individuals who opposed Pierce politically, could not have been comfortable for the former President.) Pierce was present at both Hawthorne's death and funeral in May of 1864, mourning Hawthorne's passing alongside the likes of Emerson, Longfellow, and Whittier.²

From the day the carriage on the Boston-Portland line carrying Hawthorne to Bowdoin College stopped on the New Hampshire seaboard, and Pierce, a seasoned, attractive sophomore climbed on board, to Hawthorne's death in the early hours of May 19, 1864, in an inn at the foothills of the White Mountains in New Hampshire, Pierce was an influential confidante in Hawthorne's life. Hawthorne wrote that, over the years, Pierce conveyed "the manly sympathy of a friend" (CE XIV: 518).

It is appropriate that Hawthorne's last known letter was written to Pierce. Composed on May 7, 1864, the letter—its jagged, uneven script reflecting Hawthorne's intense physical pain in writing the note—serves as a significant conclusion to the Hawthorne-Pierce friendship. Although one senses Hawthorne's awareness that the end of his life is near, the letter expresses Hawthorne's hope in recovery and revitalization once he is in the company of his old friend. He writes:
I am rejoiced to hear of your well-being, and shall do my best to join you at the Bromfield House on Wednesday next. My own health continues rather poor, but I shall hope to revive rapidly when once we are on the road. (CE XVIII: 655)

At this point in his life, Hawthorne appears again to see Pierce as an almost larger-than-life synthesis of friend and heroic savior, as a dear and intimate companion whose presence will enable the failing author to "revive rapidly." Hawthorne's old friend, then, is a source of inspiration, hope, and rejuvenation. One wonders whether or not certain images from Hawthorne's writings that are associated with Pierce passed before his mind's eye as he wrote this last letter to his friend: the charismatic and chivalrous Edward Walcott in Fanshawe, the selfless brigadier-general of the Mexican War section of the Life of Franklin Pierce, the tender soldier-"brother" of the Septimius romances, and the intimate, steadfast "friend" who is the focus of the dedicatory materials in Our Old Home. The prospect of being "on the road" with the man who to some degree inspired these images--to at least contemplate, if not achieve, the vitality that Pierce symbolized for him--must have accounted for the letter's surprising note of optimism.

It is fitting that, on the reverse side of Hawthorne's last letter, Pierce made the following notations, sealing the Hawthorne-Pierce dialogue with tenderness and loyalty:
Nathl Hawthorne / May 7 -- 64 / This was the /
was the last note / written by dear / Hawthorne --.
(CE XVIII: 656)
1. Hawthorne recorded the following entry in his journal on March 23, 1859, during Pierce's visit in Rome:

Before [Pierce's] nomination for the Presidency, I had a sense that it was coming; and it never seemed to me an accident. He is a most singular character, so frank, so true, so immediate, so subtle, so simple, so complicated. (CE XIV: 514)

2. On May 19, 1864, Pierce sent a telegram and a letter to James T. Fields announcing the death of Hawthorne. Recalling the events surrounding his friend's passing, Pierce writes in the letter:

We came from Centre Harbor yesterday afternoon, and I thought he was on the whole brighter than he was the day before. . . . He retired last night soon after nine o'clock, and soon fell into a quiet slumber. In less than half an hour he changed his position, but continued to sleep. I left the door open between his bedroom and mine,—our beds being opposite to each other,—and was asleep myself before eleven o'clock. The light continued to burn in my room. At two o'clock, I went to H--'s bedside; he was apparently in a sound sleep and I did not place my hand upon him. At four o'clock I went into his room again, and as his position was unchanged, I placed my hand upon him and
found that life was extinct. . . . He lies upon his side, his position so perfectly natural and easy, his eyes closed, that it is difficult to realize, while looking upon his noble face, that this is death. He must have passed from natural slumber to that from which there is no waking without the slightest movement. (CE XVIII: 656)
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