

Mariusz Marszalski

University of Wrocław

The Other Face of the Sinful Brotherhood of Man — Nathaniel Hawthorne's Ethical Measure of Humanity

Abstract: The label of a Dark Romantic exploring the dark recesses of the human heart has persisted with Nathaniel Hawthorne since Herman Melville, in “Hawthorne and His Mosses,” perceived Hawthorne’s soul as “shrouded in a blackness, ten times black.” In popular critical assessment, among the major themes of Hawthorne’s fiction are: man’s natural depravity, universal propensity to evil, the unpardonable sin, the idea of the sinful brotherhood of man and the psychological consequences of unconfessed guilt. While the author’s concern with the postlapsarian fallen condition of man is undeniable, a question arises as to the overall judgment the writer passes on the human race. Is he a misanthrope who views people as fallible, imperfect if not absolutely wicked, or is the ethical measure he takes of mankind more balanced? This paper intends to go against the prevailing critical bias that emphasizes the gloomy side of human nature in Hawthorne’s literary world, overlooking its morally brighter counterpart. An attempt is made at a more objective ethical estimation of the writer’s outlook on mankind, as presented in his fiction, that would point to goodness in his characters as capable of counterbalancing the presence of evil in communal life.

Keywords: Nathaniel Hawthorne, American Romanticism, ethics, good and evil, radical evil

The label of a Dark Romantic has long weighed heavily on Hawthorne criticism. As early as 1850 Herman Melville in “Hawthorne and His Mosses” expressed his fascination with the latter author’s “great power of blackness,” perceiving the dark side of his soul as “shrouded in a blackness, ten times black” (1980: 1471). In a similar manner, more recently, James Wallace in his paper “Stowe and Hawthorne” stated that “Hawthorne’s general view of human nature was pessimistic” as the writer “assumed a Calvinist view of human depravity and sin” (1999: 95). In 2002, Frederick Frank corroborated this opinion about Hawthorne, writing: “In the Gothic’s repository of dark images Hawthorne found a vision compatible with his pessimistic suspicions about human nature that he could employ to throw light upon these doubts and fears” (2002: 174). Also as late as 2009, Margarita Georgieva in *Critical Insights*:

Nathaniel Hawthorne acknowledges the persistent “general impression of gloom, which is regularly attributed to Hawthorne’s fictional world” (2009). Speaking of the major themes in Hawthorne’s writing, critics invariably mention the natural depravity of the human heart, man’s propensity to evil, the psychological consequences of guilt, the unpardonable sin and the idea of the sinful brotherhood of man. Even when they point to Hawthorne’s depictions of the conflict between evil and good in the human heart, they tend to drift towards the evil component of the dichotomy while neglecting its opposite. Weighing evil against goodness in the worlds created by Hawthorne, I would like to cast light on the frequently overlooked, more benevolent face of humanity in the author’s writings.

Certainly, the author’s concern with humanity’s fallen condition is indisputable. The atmosphere of gloom pervading much of his writing derives from his Puritan legacy of the common sinfulness of man. Moral corruption, though often concealed under the guise of stern righteousness or even overt benevolence, is a cancerous growth gnawing at every heart. Many a story by Hawthorne aims at making this grim truth apparent, most notably “Young Goodman Brown,” “The Minister’s Black Veil,” *The Scarlet Letter* or “Earth’s Holocaust.”

Given Hawthorne’s relentless exposing of man’s propensity to evil, it is not surprising that most critics highlight the disheartening, dark side of human nature as presented in the author’s literary world. A more objective ethical assessment of Hawthorne’s outlook on mankind would call for a consideration of the character and moral gradation of the bad deeds Hawthorne’s men and women are guilty of and the amount of goodness that counterbalances the presence of evil in communal life.

It is easy to assume the position of *advocatus diaboli*, finding fault with Hawthorne’s mankind; it seems more of a challenge to act as *advocatus angeli* in its defense. The latter would likely ask a question: if people in Hawthorne’s assessment are fallible, which cannot be denied, how evil are they, assuming that there are wrongdoings and ill-meaning attitudes of different degrees? Are there among them individuals who have given their hearts over to the unmitigated form of wickedness which, as Stanley Benn remarks, “Coleridge saw instantiated in Iago as ‘motiveless malignity,’ and which Milton’s Satan epitomizes in ‘Evil be though my good’” (Benn 2007: 121)? This kind of absolute wickedness is defined as pursuing evil for evil’s sake, without contemplating it as resulting in a good for the perpetrator. Unlike a selfishly wicked person who craves his own good showing disregard for the well-being of others, “a malignant person, by contrast, should take account of the suffering of someone else as a reason for action, irrespective of self-love” (Benn, 121). He would “rejoice in the suffering ... not because he sees it as a good, even for himself” but because “for the malignant person, someone else’s suffering is a pleasure to contemplate, but as an evil, apprehended as such” (Benn, 121–122). “Correspondingly,” Benn adds, “it is unalloyed wickedness to hate the good, apprehended as good, and because it is good, and to seek its destruction on that account” (122).

Arguably, there seem to be three Hawthorne figures — the eponymous character of the story “Ethan Brand,” Roger Chillingworth in *The Scarlet Letter* and Judge Pyncheon in *The House of the Seven Gables* — who, according to popular judgment, are regarded as malignly wicked. A closer scrutiny of their characters and actions shows, however, that while they meet some of the category’s determinants, they fail to meet the paramount one, namely the incentive to pursue evil as their highest and only goal.

Ethan Brand is both a practitioner and a searcher of evil; it has been his life ambition to discover the uttermost evil, the Unpardonable Sin, that would be beyond God’s mercy and forgiveness (Hawthorne 1959d: 477–478). He is said to have done appalling things to a girl Esther, whom he “had made the subject of a psychological experiment, and wasted, absorbed, and perhaps annihilated her soul, in the process” (Hawthorne 1959d: 480). A legend also holds that he had conversed with the Devil. As he delves into the mysteries of sin, he grows detached from common humanity and, as Hawthorne states, “Thus Ethan Brand became a fiend” (Hawthorne 1959d: 482). The problem with seeing Brand as a malign villain is that, while he has experimented with evil and undeniably committed evil deeds, the evil he did was never an end in itself. What he searched for when he left his kiln to pursue his mission was not evil concretized in action, but the knowledge of Evil above all evil. He did commit horrible crimes, but, as Roger Shattuck comments, “Presumably, Ethan Brand believes that his quest for knowledge will serve mankind and will bring him some form of reward and satisfaction for his devotion to a lofty goal” (2001: 47), which consequently transforms his search into a pursuit of a peculiarly understood good.

Thus, though he has sought and found the source of evil, Ethan Brand is not malignly wicked, and neither is Roger Chillingworth, another acclaimed Hawthorne arch-villain. The author’s heavily symbolic depictions of the physician-chemist do not seem to support a positive assessment. When he recognizes Hester on the scaffolding being set up to public shame, something reptilian and satanic shows on his face: “A writhing horror twisted itself across his features like a snake gliding swiftly over them” (Hawthorne 1983b: 169). Later, when his growing attachment to Arthur Dimmesdale becomes a matter of gossip, those prejudiced against him would see that “there was something ugly and evil in his face” (Hawthorne 1983b: 227). As the narrator states, “According to the vulgar idea, the fire in his laboratory had been brought from the lower regions, and was fed with infernal fuel” (Hawthorne 1983b: 227). In a widely held opinion, Arthur Dimmesdale “was haunted either by Satan himself, or Satan’s emissary, in the guise of old Roger Chillingworth” (Hawthorne 1983b: 227). Eventually, when his patient examination of Dimmesdale’s heart reveals to him the minister’s secret sin, his ecstasy is such that one seeing it “would have had no need to ask how Satan comports himself, when a precious human soul is lost to heaven, and won into his kingdom” (Hawthorne 1983b: 237). Violating the sanctity of the human heart, Chillingworth commits the unpardonable sin and as he keeps tormenting his victim, he becomes

a striking evidence of man's faculty of transforming himself into a devil, if he will only, for a reasonable space of time, undertake a devil's office. This unhappy person had effected such a transformation by devoting himself, for seven years, to the constant analysis of a heart full of torture, and deriving his enjoyment thence and adding fuel to those fiery tortures which he analyzed and gloated over (Hawthorne 1983b: 264).

While purposefulness and deliberation in inflicting suffering do make Chillingworth an abominable character of a nearly satanic quality, there are extenuating circumstances that contradict a charge of unmitigated malignity. First of all, however effectively cruel they might be, his actions are not driven by a mere propensity to evil, but by his hurt feelings of a betrayed husband and a consequent desire to take revenge, a motivation that can be humanly understood. As Colin McGinn says commenting on the moral assessment of revenge, there is ambivalence attending this kind of retribution for "In revenge we seek the suffering of the other for his evil deeds: we thus derive pleasure from the other's pain, justly administered. This makes revenge fall into the category of evil, but it is also a case in which justice is done. So it partakes of both good and evil" (1999: 70). Besides this attenuating argument, still another one should be raised; namely, even when Chillingworth is already bent on pursuing vengeance, he sticks to his own idea of justice. In response to Hester's remorseful admission — "I have greatly wronged thee" — he answers:

We have wronged each other ... Mine was the first wrong, when I betrayed the budding youth into a false and unnatural relation with my decay. Therefore ... I seek no vengeance, plot no evil against thee. Between thee and me, the scale hangs fairly balanced. (Hawthorne 1983b: 182)

It is the unrepentant culprit that he wants to settle scores with. Fiendish as he becomes in the process, Chillingworth remains capable of evincing sorrowful sympathy for he deems it not in his power to stray from the path he has taken. As he says gravely:

By thy first step awry, thou didst plant the germ of evil, but, since that moment, it has all been a dark necessity. Ye that have wronged me are not sinful, save in a kind of typical illusion: neither am I fiend-like, who have snatched a fiend's office from his hands. It is our fate. (Hawthorne 1983b: 268)

At least in his belief, justice has to be done, which seems to him more a matter of predestination than of a free personal decision. Eventually, when his task is done and his life spent, Chillingworth makes a perhaps whimsical, but overall un-fiendish gesture of bequeathing most of his considerable fortune to Pearl, indirectly the cause of his suffering and degradation.

Judge Pyncheon in *The House of the Seven Gables*, "a villain ... treated even less generously than Roger Chillingworth" (Crews 2007: 34), may be rightfully terrifying in his ruthlessness, concealed under the mask of well pretended kindness. People around him see "an exceedingly pleasant countenance, indicative of

benevolence,” but a daguerreotype reveals another man behind, “sly, subtle, hard, imperious, and, withal, cold as ice” (Hawthorne 1983a: 431). Manipulative and deceitful, Judge has no scruples pursuing power and wealth at all cost, even somebody’s life. Thirty years before the events of the present plot, he framed his cousin Clifford for the presumed murder of his uncle, in order to obtain the other’s legacy. Now he would do the same to anyone standing in his way. Hideous as he appears, with his lack of humane feelings, Judge Pyncheon does not pursue evil for its own sake. As Jane Luecke observes, his villainy amounts to “a deliberate plotting to destroy the physical freedom of others for the purpose of personal material gain” (1963: 555). His prime motivation is nothing but material greed, at the same time “the mental or other distress suffered by [his] victims is only coincidental and not part of the desired end” (Luecke 1963: 555).

Though apparently not fiendishly malign, the evil represented by the three selected Hawthorne villains is vile enough to be classified under the Kantian rubric of *radical evil* of the highest degree, that is “wickedness (*vitiositas, pravitas*) or... the *corruption (corruptio)* of the human heart” (Kant 1960: 24–25), which chooses wrong rather than right with cold deliberation. However, for the sake of our search for the brighter countenance of humanity in Hawthorne’s writing, it must be noted that gross and conspicuous as the above examples of evil are, they are relatively rare. Prevailing, Hawthorne’s characters are guilty of evil that is of earthly, not metaphysical proportions. For instance, the robbers in the story “David Swan” want to rob their victim and would unthinkingly kill him, should he wake up, for no other reason than material gain. They are wicked, but their wickedness is common, not universal. Of similar nature are the criminal motivations of the three rascals planning the murder of a gentleman in “Mr. Higginbotham’s Catastrophe.”

The majority of other wrongdoings committed by Hawthorne’s characters are of the lower Kantian orders of radical evil, namely of “impurity (*impuritas, improbitas*) of the human heart” and “frailty (*fragillitas*) of human nature” (Kant, 24–25). Impure and weak people perpetrate actual evil while deceiving themselves that they wish only good, but they are not always necessarily wicked. Adam Colburn of “The Shaker Bridal” is cruel in his rejection of his early love Martha, but his act can be accounted for by his religious zeal combined with a more earthly ambition of becoming the head of the Shaker community. The ruddy-faced leader of the political upheaval in “My Kinsman, Major Molineux,” as Jane Luecke notes, “belongs to this group also, since he is actually perpetrating evil but with a sincere conviction that it is for the common good — the riddance of Tories who are dangerous to the country’s welfare” (Luecke, 552). Aylmer of “Birthmark” has no intention to harm Georgiana, either. What he is guilty of is a human frailty, an inability to accept a human imperfection in his almost divinely beautiful wife, for in his sincerest belief he conducts his ill-fated experiment on her meaning nothing short of a greater good. In general, the characters do not so much attest to the radical corruption of the human heart as to its fallibility, since they are misguided in

their actions by wrong or self-serving incentives rather than by what Kant terms as essentially evil moral maxims.

The problem with spotting simple, hypocrisy-free human benevolence in Hawthorne's narratives lies in the fact that goodness is heavily overshadowed by the oppressive darkness of the all too obvious evil. Evil marches boldly in Hawthorne's tale "The Procession of Life" but when "the trumpet's brazen throat should pour heavenly music over the earth," calling the Good, no one answers the summons "for the just, the pure, the true, and all who might most worthily obey it, shrink sadly back, as most conscious of error and imperfection" (Hawthorne 1959h: 311). Admittedly, perfection is not the prime quality of goodness, the writer implies, but modesty and a self-conscious feeling of moral inadequacy.

It is this kind of inconspicuous, quiet goodness, being the product of a virtuous heart, that Hawthorne seems to both recognize and endorse. "The Village Uncle" is a case in point. Although the story can be rightfully interpreted as a "parable of the dangers besetting the artist's way of life" (Levy 1964: 205),¹ it also exemplifies the ideal of simple goodness that has traded ambition and refinement for the blessings of family life. Acting on an impulse, the protagonist is done with the vanities of artistic achievement and becomes a fisherman in a small coastal village. When he meets a mermaid-like slender maiden, he finds himself attracted to her due to her gentle goodness that transpires in all her behavior. "A frank, simple, kind-hearted, sensible, and mirthful girl," she has the gift of talking and acting carelessly "yet always for the best, doing whatever was right" (Hawthorne 1959k: 155). Describing a union of two benign souls, Hawthorne points at the capability of goodness to cast its rays around, invoking a kindred response in the other, the result of which is multiplication and complementation of the good. As the man says, Susan's "simple and happy nature mingled itself with mine ... She kindled a domestic fire within my heart ... She gave me warmth of feeling, while the influence of my mind made her contemplative" (Hawthorne 1959k: 155). In his old age, cherished by his wife and surrounded by his many children, he discovers that he has become a patriarch, a distinction he has never aspired to. The words of wisdom he speaks to his family convey a moral that amounts to a praise of a life of peaceful virtue: "In chaste and warm affections, humble wishes, and honest toil for some useful end, there is health for the mind, and quiet for the heart, the prospect for a happy life, and the fairest hope of heaven" (Hawthorne 1959k: 160).

That man is not necessarily doomed to succumb to his evil inclinations is the message of Hawthorne's allegorical tale "The Threefold Destiny." Ralph Cranfield "from his youth upward, had felt himself marked for a high destiny" (Hawthorne 1959j: 219) different from the commonplace lives of his fellow villagers. Driven by a sense of superiority, he turns down the love of his old playmate Faith Egerton

¹ The interpretation, as Levy remarks, deals with one of Hawthorne's abiding themes: "knowledge (here associated with creativity) leads to intellectual pride and to alienation from humankind" (Levy 1964: 205).

and leaves his home to roam the world in search of his selfish ambitions to acquire wealth, symbolized by his dream of “mighty treasure” of gold, and the position of power over people, like that of “a king and founder of an hereditary throne” (Hawthorne 1959j: 219). Eventually, however, when he comes back to the village after many years’ absence, he realizes he has been looking for a wrong “good.” Won over by the quiet goodness of his old love Faith, he experiences a change of heart and finds out that by seeking his own benefit he pursued an evil inclination. Now he is ready to embrace the good he has been blind to; to find the mysterious treasure he will “till the earth around his mother’s dwelling, and reap its products!” (Hawthorne 1959j: 223) and he will also rule, not as a warlike commander but as a new schoolmaster over the village children. True good proves to be possible, but only if one works for the benefit of others.

Self-sacrificing, enduring goodness that shines like a beacon of light in Hawthorne’s sin-darkened world can be found in the morally edifying story “The Wives of the Dead.” Mary and Margaret, sisters-in-law married to two brothers learn that their husbands are dead, one having drowned in the Atlantic Ocean, the other killed in a skirmish on the Canadian border. They are utterly miserable in their grief but stout in their mutual affection and sympathy for each other’s loss. They neither rave nor complain. While they bear their fate bravely and nobly, their goodness is tested, and attested to, when first one and then the other, independently of each other, is sent a message that her husband has been found alive. In each case, the one who is overwhelmed with the feeling of a happy relief refrains from waking her sister, fearing that her own joy might deepen the other’s sorrow.

Similarly pure and sweet is the goodness represented by Phoebe Pyncheon of *The House of the Seven Gables*. When she comes from the country to look after her elderly relatives, she brings warmth into the cold interior of the House of the Seven Gables marked with the Pyncheon curse of evil. She is used to being useful, like acting as a school teacher to village children, which stands in opposition to “native inapplicability ... of the Pyncheons to any useful purpose” (Hawthorne 1983a: 418). The sense of old evil that permeates the house does not affect her because she is inclined to see good rather than bad things around her. Even when a disturbing intuition grows on her that Judge Pyncheon may not be the upright person that he seems to be, she

was fain to smother, in some degree, her own intuitions as to Judge Pyncheon’s character. And as for her cousin’s testimony in disparagement of it, she concluded that Hepzibah’s judgment was embittered by one of those family feuds which render hatred the more deadly by the dead and corrupted love that they intermingle with its native poison. (Hawthorne 1983a: 465)

In all, she radiates goodness hardly aware of the place’s oppressive gloom. As Bell writes, “Phoebe is one of Hawthorne’s most charming heroines — simple, natural, unintellectual. She is the very embodiment of Heart,” and thus of unalloyed goodness (Bell 2007: 23). She is an admirable human creature and Hawthorne leaves his readers no doubt about it when he writes:

Phoebe's presence made a home about her... — a home! Holding her hand, you felt something; a tender something; a substance, and a warm one; and so long as you should feel its grasp, soft as it was, you might be certain that your place was good in the whole sympathetic chain of human nature. (Hawthorne 1983a: 472–473)

Viewed against the apparently noble, though sometimes idealized, depictions of Hawthorne's characters constituting a counterbalance to the representatives of the sinful brotherhood of mankind, arguably the most conspicuous and morally interesting example of a humanly benign heart is that of Hester Prynne, because hers is a goodness that blossoms out of sin, imperfection and shame. The measure of the benevolence of her character is her reaction to being stigmatized for her transgression and cast off by the society of Boston. Instead of growing bitter and hateful, Hester becomes sensitive to other people's weaknesses and suffering. Notwithstanding her humiliation, she finds "power to sympathize" with the sick, the wretched and the needy, developing a nature that is "warm and rich — a well-spring of human tenderness" (Hawthorne 1983b: 257). First seeking the self-serving kind of love symbolized by Eros, she finally embraces love's selfless variety, Charity. St. Paul's words:

Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh not evil; Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth. (1 Corinthians, 13: 4–8)

in the translation of *The King James Bible*, sound amazingly fitting with respect to Hester, who testifies with her life that though human heart is naturally prone to follow evil inclinations, it is also capable of astounding good.

Despite the prevailing critical focus, evil, albeit inescapable, does not eclipse goodness in Hawthorne's fiction. Goodness, just like sin and evil, is not treated by the author as a metaphysical or ontological category. It is rather perceived as a profoundly human admirable quality — often fostered in suffering, self-denial and self-sacrifice — that has the power to redeem seemingly doomed mankind. Pessimistic as Hawthorne's world might seem, considering the inexorableness of evil comprehended as a natural disposition, it has its brighter, more optimistic reflection. Despite the universality of evil, goodness is presented as being capable of overcoming its other. Where evil seeks 'gain' by doing harm, goodness can find moral profit even in being victimized.

Though not numerous, Hawthorne's benevolent characters show quiet and patient endurance in the face of an evil world, thus making it something less of a hell it seems to be. They stand out as splendid figures, no matter how despicable humanity at large might be. Hawthorne may have been fascinated with humanity's postlapsarian fallen condition but, as his writings reveal, he also revealed its more favorable qualities. It would be absolutely absurd of him to subscribe to Whitman's assertion: "I am not the poet of goodness only, I do not decline to be the poet of wickedness also" (Whitman 1955: 44), but one might venture to think that he would not have denied its opposite, that is being not only the writer of sin and evil, but of goodness as well.

References

- Bell, M. 2007. "The Artists of the Novels: Coverdale, Holgrave, Kenyon." In: Bloom, H. (ed.) *Nathaniel Hawthorne*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 13–29.
- Benn, S. 2007. "Wickedness." In: Pojman, L.P. and L. Vaughn (eds.) *The Moral Life. An Introductory Reader in Ethics and Literature*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 108–126.
- Bible, *The. Authorized Version*. 1978. The Bible Societies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crews, F. 2007. "Homely Witchcraft." In: Bloom, H. (ed.) *Nathaniel Hawthorne*. New York: Chelsea House, 31–46.
- Frank, F.S. 2002. "Nathaniel Hawthorne." In: Thomson, D.H., J.G. Voller and S. Frank (eds.) *Gothic Writers: A Critical and Bibliographical Guide*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 165–176.
- Georgieva, M. 2009. "The Burden of Secret Sin: Nathaniel Hawthorne's Fiction." In: Lynch, J. (ed.) *Critical Insights: Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Pasadena, California: Salem Press, e-book.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959a. "The Birthmark." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959b. "David Swan." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959c. "Earth's Holocaust." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959d. "Ethan Brandt." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959e. "The Minister's Black Veil." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959f. "Mr. Higginbotham's Catastrophe." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959g. "My Kinsman, Major Molineux." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959h. "The Procession of Life." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959i. "The Shaker Bridal." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959j. "The Threefold Destiny." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959k. "The Village Uncle." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959l. "The Wives of the Dead." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1959m. "Young Goodman Brown." In: Hawthorne, N. *The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Hawthorne, N. 1983a. *The House of the Seven Gables*. In: Hawthorne, N. *Novels*. New York: The Library of America.
- Hawthorne, N. 1983b. *The Scarlet Letter*. In: Hawthorne, N. *Novels*. New York: The Library of America.
- Kant, I. 1960. *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Levy, L.B. 1964. "The Mermaid and the Mirror: Hawthorne's 'The Village Uncle'." In: Booth, B. (ed.) *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 19, No. 2 (Sep.), University of California Press. 205–211.
- Luecke, J.M. 1963. "Villains and non-villains in Hawthorne's fiction." *PMLA* 78, No. 5 (Dec.). 551–558.
- McGinn, C. 1999. *Ethics, Evil and Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Melville, H. 1980. "Hawthorne and His Mosses." In: McMichael, G. (ed.) *Anthology of American Literature. I. Colonial through Romantic*. New York: McMillan Publishing, 1470–1475.
- Shattuck, R. 2001. "Narrating Evil: Great Faults and 'Splendidly Wicked People'." In: Geddes, J.L. (ed.) *Evil after Postmodernism. Histories, Narratives, Ethics*. London and New York: Routledge, 45–55.
- Wallace, J.D. 1999. "Stowe and Hawthorne." In: Idol, J.L. and M.M. Ponder (eds.) *Hawthorne and Women: Engendering and Expanding the Hawthorne Tradition*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 92–103.
- Whitman, W. 1955. "Song of Myself." In: Geismar, M. (ed.) *Whitman Reader*, 21–62.