

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
JANE E. COOPER CAMPUS HONORS PROGRAM

DIVISION OF ENGLISH

Julian Hawthorne: Reviving a Locust of Slander
Jennifer Santangelo
Spring 2012

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in English
with honors work in English

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Adam J. Sorkin
Distinguished Professor of English
Thesis Supervisor

Kimberly Blockett
Associate Professor of English
Thesis Supervisor and Honors Advisor

Phyllis Cole
Professor of English, Women's Studies and American Studies
Thesis Reader

*Signatures are on file in the Jane E. Cooper Honors Program Office

ABSTRACT

Literature written during the mid-1800's proved to be of such importance that it eventually formed the backbone of the American literary canon. During the late 19th century, when the canon was being constructed, Julian Hawthorne, son of Nathaniel Hawthorne, attempted to strengthen his father's position within the canon. In his 1884 biography of his parents, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, Julian included unflattering criticism of Margaret Fuller that Julian's father had written over twenty years previously. In his effort to secure his father's place within the canon, Julian took the unjustified liberty of altering these journal passages to depict Fuller in a most disparaging manner. Fuller was a friend and contemporary of Julian's father, as well as a significant author in her own right. The passages Julian included questioned the legitimacy of Fuller's marriage to an Italian revolutionary, and disputed her achievement as a writer. By printing his father's invective, Julian was able to create an image of Fuller as a fallen woman, thus decreasing her reputation as an author worthy of inclusion in the canon. Furthermore, in the process, he was able to attract attention to his work, thus increasing his sales. Effectively, Julian's vicious tactics removed Fuller from the roster of authors worthy of being included in the national literary canon. His printing of Nathaniel Hawthorne's derogatory remarks about Fuller had the additional result of leading to her books being nearly forced out of print. However, Fuller's supporters and friends fought back against her slandering. The battle between Fuller's followers and Julian Hawthorne was carried out in news publications and periodicals. The notoriety gained from this helped Julian to accomplish his aims.

Keywords: Hawthorne, Julian, Fuller, literary canon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Julian Hawthorne and the Early Years of Canon Formation | 7 |
| Julian Hawthorne: His Career and His Canon-Shaping Politics | 15 |
| Responses to Hawthorne's Slander | 27 |
| Academic Vitae | 42 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Adam J. Sorkin for filling the role of thesis advisor for me, and for doing so with patience and dedication. I would also like to thank Dr. Kimberly Blockett for serving as my honors advisor, and Dr. Phyllis Blum Cole for being another pair of eyes, even if from hundreds of miles away. Dr. Cole's expertise and guidance throughout this process were not only invaluable, but absolutely crucial. I could never have done this without her. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Laura Guertin for her unwavering support. Finally, I owe a debt of unending gratitude to my husband Anthony, for helping me to achieve my goals by always pushing me to do my best, and to my children Alexis, Jacob and Julia, who are a constant source of encouragement and love.

Chapter 1

Julian Hawthorne and the Early Years of Canon Formation

Julian Hawthorne was the son of famed American author, Nathaniel Hawthorne. It was during Julian's lifetime, 1846-1934, that the literary canon was being constructed. The American literary canon is an authoritative list of literary works that is widely accepted as the pinnacle of achievement (Landow). The elder Hawthorne's writings were widely viewed as a valuable contribution to the field of American letters, and as such were seen as a necessary part of the literary canon. In the early years of canon formation, women were vastly under-represented. While there were certainly female authors worthy of inclusion during these formative years, none was driven from her rightful place within the canon as swiftly as Margaret Fuller. Fuller, an old friend of Hawthorne's, had written several noteworthy books, one of the most important being *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1845. This text conveyed radically new ideas about a woman's place in society, and would serve as the archetype of the woman's suffrage movement. The significance of Fuller's work and the originality of ideals expressed in her writing should have cemented her place within the American literary canon. However, as this paper will show, Hawthorne's son Julian managed to effectively remove Fuller from the canon while ensuring his father's inclusion. In fact, according to late nineteenth-century commentator and suffragist Sarah Clarke, Julian Hawthorne dug up what she called a "locust of slander" about Margaret Fuller in order to secure his father's place in the American literary canon, while also furthering his own literary ambitions.

Nathaniel Hawthorne and his wife Sophia first befriended Fuller in 1839, and over the years their relationship developed into a deep and lasting friendship. Both Hawthorne and Fuller

were part of the group who stayed at Brook Farm, a utopian communal society formed on Transcendental beliefs, in 1841. When Hawthorne and his wife-to-be, Sophia Peabody, were planning their wedding, Sophia sent a letter to Fuller sharing this happy news. Fuller responded by first applauding Sophia's choice in a mate, and then went on to praise the man that would become her husband. Fuller wrote Sophia to say that Hawthorne "combined delicate tenderness to understand the heart of a woman, with quiet depth and manliness enough to satisfy her" (Mitchell 66). Fuller spent a great deal of time with the couple, visiting them frequently in Concord and writing letters to them in her absence. There were many things that drew Fuller to the Hawthornes – their proximity to the Emersons' house where she frequently stayed, and their relationship with the Channings. Ralph Waldo Emerson was a close friend and contemporary of Fuller, and the distinguished poet Ellery Channing, a Hawthorne intimate, was married to Fuller's sister Ellen. Hawthorne enjoyed Fuller's visits to his home, as evidenced by his journal entries. Fuller's journal chronicles the shared literary interests that fueled long talks between herself and Hawthorne. Furthermore, both writers discussed their joint frustrations with the writing process.

Additionally, Fuller worked in tandem with Elizabeth Peabody to promote Hawthorne's writing career. Peabody, Sophia's sister, owned the bookstore that first hosted Fuller's famous "Conversations" for women. Undertaken in the autumn of 1839, these "remarkable conversational class[es] for which she is best known today . . . stimulated the minds of the more cultivated women of Boston," and rendered Fuller's "influence imperishable from the social order as well as the traditions of the period" (Egan 255). Peabody, an admirer of Fuller, also printed *The Dial*. This Transcendental publication was founded in 1840 and edited by Fuller for

two years. In the pages of *The Dial*, Fuller “was one of the first to do justice to Hawthorne” (Egan 256). In this way, Peabody and Fuller worked to advance Hawthorne’s literary career.

The summer of 1844 marked the last time Hawthorne and Fuller saw each other. In September, Fuller embarked on her career as a literary critic for Horace Greeley’s *New York Tribune*. However, Fuller did not abandon her Concordian contemporary. In fact, in her role as a critic, she reviewed Hawthorne frequently. In 1846, she proclaimed him to be “the best writer of the day” (Mitchell 62-63). She further sought to increase his readership by applauding his efforts to reveal “the truths of profound importance” in his work (Mitchell 123). As contemporaries, Fuller encouraged Hawthorne in his writing while also challenging him. She attempted to inspire Hawthorne to develop the “delicate satire of his writing” by delving deeper into the plot and furthering the exploration of the relationships contained within (Mitchell 63). Her positive reviews were no doubt uplifting to a man who tended to doubt his own abilities.

By the time Sophia gave birth to Julian in 1846, Fuller was busy leaving her imprint on the literary world. According to suffragist Lavinia Egan, some 75 years later, the time she spent as a critic “lifted the business of literary criticism from the puerile efforts of inexperienced youths and poorly paid hacks” while “stamp[ing] the pages of the *Tribune* with her intellectual ability and the writing of criticisms with a dignity that . . . has clung to it for all time” (Egan 255). While with *The Dial*, Fuller had penned her “The Great Lawsuit: Man vs. Men, Woman vs. Women.” This series of articles formed the backdrop of what would arguably become her best work, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1845. Previously, Fuller wrote, *Summer on the Lakes* in 1844, which was hailed as “the first book to give the East the true spirit and vigor of the great West, from which so much of the strength of the development of the nation was to come” (Egan 255). However, this book did not just contain her poetic impressions of the beauty

of nature found in the Midwest. In it, she sympathized with the plight of the Indians and their mistreatment by the whites (Myerson 1692). This created quite a stir, as women of that time were not supposed to hold such opinions, and certainly not to voice them. However, through *Summer on the Lakes*, Fuller gained recognition as an author of substance. She also penned numerous essays such as “Dialogue Between Poet and Critic,” “Goethe,” “Lives of Great Composers,” “Festus,” and “Essay on Critics,” to name a few (Egan 255).

However, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* was Fuller’s crowning jewel. In it, she explored the idea of equality between men and women. Caroline Dall, once a member of Fuller’s conversation group and an outspoken feminist in her own right, “endorsed Fuller’s central work as ‘the most brilliant, complete, and scholarly statement ever made upon this subject’ ” (qtd. in Cole 10-11). Fuller felt that education was the key to women’s obtaining equal status, and also to their maintaining independence. Advocating for education of females, she dared to suggest that women step out of the sphere of domesticity and enlarge their minds. Her campaign for parity between the sexes became legendary. Although they were radical concepts at the age in which Fuller first wrote them, her ideas and writings were used extensively by women’s rights members. Her concept of what women’s role in society should be would become the bedrock of the women’s suffragist movement. This movement campaigned for equal rights for women, and gained national attention during the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848. Due to the ideals expounded in her writing, Fuller was canonized by the nineteenth century women’s rights movement (Cole 1). This adoption of Fuller’s feminist views was widespread. As the women’s rights movement gained momentum, Fuller’s name became synonymous with the guiding principles of equality, lending a voice to those who were previously silent. This celebration of

Fuller by the women's rights movement was a direct result of her belief in a larger sphere for women.

Fuller's eloquent expression of ground-breaking feminist thought as expressed in her "Conversations" for women, and her well-earned reputation as a significant writer should have earned her canonical status. Her writing reflected a social conscience, and through her works, she sought to further women's advancement by encouraging them to throw off the shackles of patriarchy and emancipate themselves "from the inhibitions of custom and the narrow conventions of their lives" (Egan 255). In this way, Fuller established herself as one of America's earliest reform writers. While writing for *The Tribune*, Fuller completed articles about Hopper Home, a halfway house for female convicts. She also detailed the life of immigrant slums, and the horrors of city hospitals. Wherever Fuller saw social injustice, she used her pen as a combat weapon by attempting to draw attention to unjust situations. In this way, she became a vocal opponent of social injustice, even lending her voice to the abolitionist cause (Myerson 1693).

In 1846, Fuller traveled to Europe as the first female foreign correspondent. She wrote articles pertaining to European art and literature, and sent them back to *The Tribune* to be published in New York. When the Italian revolution broke out, Fuller was on the scene. She worked tirelessly to capture the spirit of the revolutionaries and the climate of war torn Italy for her American audience. By the summer of 1847, Fuller had moved to Rome, where she became deeply involved in the revolutionary movement. In her correspondence with *The Tribune*, she implored Americans to support the revolutionary uprisings in Italy, particularly in Rome. It was during this time she met and fell in love with Marchese Giovanni Angelo d'Ossoli. Ossoli was a revolutionary soldier whose family had divided loyalties during the Italian revolution. He was

uneducated and much younger than Fuller, and while she may have broken down many barriers in her lifetime, she was helpless to change her heart, so she surreptitiously surrendered to her sexuality. Fuller became immersed in Ossoli and his cause, eventually taking charge of a hospital for wounded soldiers. All the while, Fuller was recording her observations in order to compile a history of the Italian revolution. By the fall of Rome in 1848, Fuller had given birth to a son, Angelo, and had possibly married Ossoli in a private ceremony. The couple decided to set sail for America, and left aboard the cargo ship *Elizabeth* in May of 1850. Fuller had her most prized possessions on board with her – Ossoli, baby Angelo and her manuscript. This manuscript was heralded as Fuller’s Magnus Opus. Tragically, the ship ran aground in a storm, and sank off of Fire Island, on the coast of New York. The baby’s body eventually washed ashore, but Fuller’s and Ossoli’s were never recovered, nor was the manuscript. In fact, the manuscript was of such potential value that Henry David Thoreau spent five days combing the beach looking for it.

While Fuller was challenging societal norms and leaving her indelible mark upon the literary establishment, Nathaniel Hawthorne was busily carving out his place in American letters. Having already penned classics such as “My Kinsman, Major Molineux” and “Young Goodman Brown,” Hawthorne was well on his way to literary immortality. His *Mosses from an Old Manse*, published in two volumes in 1846, was very well received. In addition, Hawthorne penned *The Scarlet Letter*, published in 1850, which tells of the redemption of a woman named Hester Prynne who is portrayed as a meaningful and weighty character. Thus, it appeared that the old friends had entered the major productive years of their careers at the same time, with works that should have earned both a place within the literary canon. The promise of greatness seemed to end for Fuller aboard that fated ship; however, her work as a progressive agitator would live on in her writing. Although the last bit of correspondence known to exist between Hawthorne and

Fuller dates from May of 1845, their influence on each other was permanent. Some of Hawthorne's fictional characters are said to be based on Fuller, such as Beatrice in his 1844 story, "Rappacini's Daughter," and Zenobia from *The Blithedale Romance*, published in 1852 (Mitchell 112- 113). One would assume that their mutual admiration was lasting.

This did not appear to be the case when in January of 1855, a mere five years after Fuller's untimely demise, Hawthorne wrote to his publisher William Ticknor that "America is now wholly given over to a damned mob of scribbling women, and I should have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash – and I should be ashamed of myself if I did succeed!" (qtd. in Marshall 10-11). This anti-feminist rhetoric is unexpected from an author who creates such strong, substantial female heroines. Given the rising tide of feminist literature, Hawthorne may have felt threatened. According to Bridget M. Marshall, author of "Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Canon of American Literature," either due to "frustration or a sense of superiority, Hawthorne was disdainful of many of his contemporary writers (particularly women) and often dismissed the American readership" (Marshall 10).

Perhaps it was fear or scorn that drove Hawthorne to make his derogatory remarks about women writers. Yet, he would again make anti-feminist remarks, this next time in the form of condemnatory judgments of his old Concordian friend Fuller. However, Hawthorne's disapproval of Fuller was based on gossip from a questionable source, the American sculptor Joseph Mozier, who visited Hawthorne in 1858. Mozier divulged less than flattering news about Fuller. He told Hawthorne that Fuller had become involved with an Italian of dubious rank and intelligence named Giovanni Ossoli. Hawthorne responded to Mozier's revelations about Fuller in his journal, writing that Ossoli "could not have had the least appreciation of Margaret; and the wonder is, what attraction she found in this boor, this hymen [man] without the intellectual

spark, - she that had always shown such a cruel and bitter scorn of intellectual deficiency” (Hawthorne 261). Furthermore, Hawthorne questioned why the younger and more physically attractive Ossoli would have been sexually attracted to Fuller, for “she had not the charm of womanhood” (Hawthorne 260). Moreover, he remarked that she “fell as the weakest of her sisters might” (Hawthorne, *The French and Italian Notebooks* 157).

This malicious depiction of Fuller was quite out of character for the elder Hawthorne. While he could practice sarcasm as well as criticism, vituperation was not typically his style. Sophia knew this, so when she published his journals in 1868, the slurs against Fuller were omitted. To have based judgments of his old friend Fuller on nothing more than mere conjecture was indeed abnormal behavior for a man of Hawthorne’s intellect. The castigation of Fuller by Hawthorne is especially ironic when viewed in light of the comments Fuller had made about Hawthorne years earlier stating that he “combined delicate tenderness to understand the heart of a woman.” It appears then that Hawthorne could not understand Fuller’s heart, and his reproach of her would, unfortunately take on a second life when his son Julian brought it to publication.

Chapter 2

Julian Hawthorne: His Career and His Canon-Shaping Politics

Although Hawthorne had recorded his disparagement of Fuller in his journal, it was his son Julian that would sear a “locust of slander” into the American psyche (Clarke 3). Julian attempted to follow in his illustrious father’s footsteps, but he did not fare as well as his forebear. According to Barbara Tyson, author of *Julian Hawthorne’s Nonfiction Prose: His Social Thought in Context of a Personal Ethic*, Julian was a “literary vagabond, or more bluntly, a literary hack” (6). Julian wrote many works of fiction – twenty-four novels and over eighty short stories. However, his works tended to be greeted with poor reviews and scathing commentaries. In fact, the only writing Julian produced that met with much acclaim was the biography of his parents, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, published in 1884.¹ Initially, the book met with positive reviews. However, there was soon an outcry over passages in *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* that printed the material previously omitted by Sophia. These were deemed “bitter” and “uncalled for” (Burrage qtd. in Mitchell 38). Julian’s inclusion of these passages successfully maligned Fuller, besmirching her lifetime of scholarly contributions and “literary achievements” (Cole 1).

Nathaniel Hawthorne had not only questioned Fuller and Ossoli’s union in his journal, but he had further written that Fuller was a “great humbug,” who “had stuck herself full of borrowed qualities.” His comments also included, as Julian’s biography brought to light, “She

¹Hereafter referred to as *NHaHW* in the text citations.

had a strong and coarse nature, which she had done her utmost to refine, with infinite pains; but of course it could only be superficially changed” (Hawthorne, *NHaHW* 260). What would Hawthorne’s old Brook Farm friend Fuller have made of this condemnation, considering what she had written in her own journal in 1842: “I will bear the pain of imperfection, but not of doubt” (qtd. in Mitchell 2). The elder Hawthorne obviously doubted Fuller. In addition to calling her authenticity into question, Hawthorne comments on how she had supposedly lost her literary talent, perhaps considering her much sought after manuscript of the Italian revolution imaginary. Hawthorne questions its existence because “Margaret had quite lost all power of literary production before she left Rome” (Hawthorne, *NHaHW* 260). This is a particularly outrageous charge, considering Fuller was one of the most prolific writers of her time. In view of Hawthorne’s earlier charge that America was “now wholly given over to a damned mob of scribbling women,” it seems plausible to assume that Hawthorne may have been under the impression that Fuller lost her “power of literary production” when she became a wife and mother. Conceivably, Hawthorne may have reasoned that Fuller could not possibly be both of those things while still retaining her mental acumen. It is credible then that Hawthorne may have been of the opinion that Fuller had traded her brilliant mind for a questionable marriage and motherhood. The invective with which Hawthorne pronounces Fuller’s talent gone, and her husband an oafish idiot who could not possibly be attracted to her, is puzzling.

Perhaps the most vicious comment in the entire journal passage that Julian prints in his biography is when Hawthorne declares that “Providence was, after all, kind in putting her clownish husband and their child on board that fated ship” (*NHaHW*, Hawthorne 261). The death of Fuller and her family was an extremely tragic event. This marks Hawthorne’s criticism of her even more mystifying. For an affront of this magnitude, one would expect that Fuller had

somehow harmed Hawthorne, yet this was not the case. It was bewildering that a man who had once been her friend would find it necessary, or even acceptable, to sully her memory so. The outrage against Hawthorne for his vilification of Fuller was swift and immediate. However, the libeler had been dead for twenty years. The fault now lay directly with the son. Unfortunately, Julian lacked the sense of decorum his mother demonstrated when she left these passages out of her original printing of the journal. While Fuller supporters as well as later scholars acknowledge Julian's lack of discretion in putting into print what never should have seen the light of day, Julian claimed to have only "organized family documents and allowed the subjects to speak for themselves" (qtd. in Mitchell 18). However, to the contrary, it can be argued that Julian Hawthorne used his father's maligning of Margaret Fuller not only to secure his father's place in the American literary canon, but also to further his own ambitions.

Julian Hawthorne was the middle child of Nathaniel and Sophia. According to Hawthorne biographer Maurice Bassan, Julian was the prince of the household. His older sister Una was enthralled with him, writing in her journal that "He is not earthly! He certainly is the flower of ideal chivalry and trust," while Rose, the youngest Hawthorne, declared him to be her "dearest Herculean boy" (40). His mother, Sophia, was equally smitten with her son, recording updates on his progress almost daily in her journal. Julian was also extremely close with his father, and they spent a great deal of time together. During his early formative years, Julian was schooled at home, under his father's tutelage. The family read together classics such as *Gulliver's Travels* and *The Faerie Queene*. Sophia's sister Elizabeth taught the boy history with the help of colored charts that held his attention. When the family traveled to Italy, the son developed an interest in natural history, one which his father sought to foster. The elder Hawthorne chronicled the months in Italy "with great detail" (Bassan 19). During their several

years abroad, Nathaniel kept meticulous journals that included his remarks about Fuller. These would later serve as a source of income for Sophia, and a stepping stone for Julian.

Eventually, Julian's father decided it was time his son receive a formal education, and he encouraged Julian to apply for admittance to Harvard. While Julian was accepted to this prestigious university, his academic life was short lived. The death of his father in 1864 was a heavy blow, and he made an early exit from the university. It was around this time that Sophia, desperately needing funds, published her husband's "English, French and Italian notebooks" (Bassan 46). In doing so, she enabled the family to move to Dresden where Julian could pursue an education in engineering. While in Dresden, Julian met and fell in love with his future wife, May Albertina Amelung. They returned to the States and were wed in 1870. The year before this marked the first time young Hawthorne's writing was in print. *Putnam's Magazine* published two poems, "Yes" and "The Usurper" (Bassan 51). Most likely penned with Amelung in mind, they featured a flowery style and were highly romanticized. *Putnam's* was an important magazine to be published in, and it is quite possible that the family name allowed Julian inclusion in such a significant periodical.

It was around this time that Julian began to work as an engineer in the New York Dock Department. He continued to write in his free time, and he enjoyed the extra income this afforded him. Julian wrote several short stories, sketches and poems, most of which appeared in *Appleton's* between 1870 and 1872. It was clear that the task of living up to his literary roots had begun, but what remained to be seen was if Julian was capable of carrying on the Hawthorne literary tradition. Within the next few years, he published stories in *The Aldine* and *Harper's Magazine*. In fact, he was "one of the few American authors whose novels were to be serialized in *Harper's* in the 1870's and 1880's" (Bassan 62). *Bressant* was the first of these, and the story

met with little critical acclaim. Novelist and critic Henry James reviewed *Bressant* in an essay from 1874 and termed it “valueless in performance” (Poupard 230). Indeed, the plot was complicated and lacked cohesion. The story line itself was weak, and muddled by allusions to past relationships between characters that were never fully explained. Julian relied heavily on plot devices such as strange letters, ominous happenings and flashbacks, yet none of these were effectively executed because they lacked explanation or development. In fact, when Julian introduced these devices into his plots, he rarely referenced them again, leaving the reader with the impression that something was missed or left unfinished.

Reading this novel today, one finds the love triangle drawn between the main character, Bressant, and two sisters Cornelia and Sophie, extremely feeble. Bressant is an orphan of undetermined parentage. The girl’s father is a widowed minister named Professor Valeyon. He receives a strange letter from a Mrs. Vanderplank explaining that Bressant will arrive to be tutored in theology, and it is imperative that no one know his true identity, lest he lose his rights to his inheritance. This inheritance is hinted at, yet it is never determined what he must do to gain it. When Bressant arrives at the parsonage, he first falls in love with Cornelia. The two dance together at a party and share “a dreamy feeling of magnetic communion” (Hawthorne, *Bressant* 11). When Cornelia leaves for a summer in New York, Bressant becomes engaged to Sophie, the sickly younger sister. Sophie, having recently recovered from typhoid pneumonia, nurses Bressant after he has an accident. She tells her father of her love for the young man, saying that she “forced [herself] upon him ... took advantage of his illness and helplessness, pretended all the time [to] be thinking only of his spiritual welfare ... that was the wicked part” (Hawthorne, *Bressant* 185). It is interesting to note that Julian ascribes wickedness to the same young lady he

has rendered naïve. Sophie's naivete stems from her inability to ascertain her own identity independent of a man.

Furthermore, the fact that both women fall under Bressant's spell without knowing anything about him or without much in the way of courting is indicative of Julian's lack of perception into the female mind. This representation renders both women weak and ineffectual in regards to their decision-making abilities. Neither woman is presented as intelligent, for both accept Bressant immediately, without question, and promptly fall in love with him. Depicted as possessing few intellectual interests, the girls' lives revolve around taking tea, sewing and socializing. Although their father is presented as a highly intelligent and educated man, there is no mention of schooling for his daughters. It appears as if they exist only for adornment, to be married off one day. Moreover, Bressant is described as deaf, yet he seems to have no difficulty hearing or communicating with the sisters, albeit the communication is limited. In the course of the narrative, there are few cultivated conversations between Bressant and the sisters.

When Cornelia returns from New York, Bressant returns to wanting her. Cornelia feels the same despite her sister's obvious joy at her engagement. When Cornelia experiences pangs of jealousy, Julian writes that "the hour of evil found Cornelia a creature of far higher powers and more vigorous development than she could ever . . . have attained. She showed most gloriously and greatly when illuminated by that lurid light whose flame was fed by all that was most gentle, womanly and sweet within her" (Hawthorne, *Bressant* 268). This passage serves to show that Julian's female character is only attributed power when she is entertaining improper thoughts or indecent emotions. Therefore, Cornelia will only attain gloriousness or greatness if she shows a superficial interest in Bressant. Additionally, Cornelia is presented as "fallen," that is to say she

has become debased because of her sexual inclinations. Submitting to her passion has led her astray, and she is devalued as a person because of this.

The theme of a fallen woman, brought down by her inability to maintain an identity independent of a male, is common to Julian's fiction. In *Prince Saroni's Wife*, for example, the main female character, Ethel, is in love with the title character. A prince in name only, he must marry a wealthy debutante in order to maintain his expensive lifestyle. Ethel is heartbroken, and it is presumed that she drowns herself in the lake where she and the prince used to picnic. However, the prince marries, and he and his newlywed wife move away. Ethel's father, a minister, regrets his loveless years with his now-dead daughter, and makes it his mission to find out what happened to her. He can't accept that she would commit suicide. When years later, the prince and his wife return from America, the minister comes to their home and discovers that Prince Saroni's wife is actually his daughter Ethel. The narrator explains to the reader that Ethel had been coerced by Prince Saroni into taking part in a plot to drown his wife, and pass the body off as that of Ethel. Meanwhile, he and Ethel stole away to embark on a new life together.

Once again, Julian has written a weak story with a flimsy plot. The ending is abrupt, details are brushed off, problematic situations are glossed over, and explanations are halted. Most importantly, Julian has again penned a story depicting a fallen woman. She falls in love with a man, strays from the security of her home, and is doomed to a miserable existence. Julian's Ethel is characteristic of a woman who is unable to exist on her own. Her identity is indistinguishable because she is blinded by love. She does not assert her own identity instead she chooses to be whatever Prince Saroni wants her to be, and thus ends up duped into a life of falsehood by him. She is portrayed as unintelligent, and incapable of directing her own agency. Julian's fiction presents women as passive and vacuous. They have not the strength to stand on their own, and

they are duped into a life of falsehood by a man. This depiction is demonstrative of the speciousness of a woman's life as seen from Julian's fiction. It reasonably appears then that the females in Julian's books have no voice of their own, and their existence is meaningless unless validated by a male.

Another example of this is Julian's *The Pearl-Shell Necklace*. In this story, a young lawyer named Firemount comes to stay with a sailor and his family. The lawyer is quite taken with the sailor's daughter, Agatha. Agatha always wears a beautiful necklace made of shells and pearls. Firemount has a vague recollection of a similar necklace being in his family years ago. When he inquires about the necklace, the sailor tells him a story about a girl who washes ashore with nothing to reveal her identity. She is found by a scholar named Gloam and is wearing a pearl shell necklace. Gloam allows the girl, who is called Swanhilda, to be raised by a miller's widow who is also raising a son, David, on her own. However, Gloam is very possessive of the girl, always insisting she spend time with him. The scholar is also very jealous of Swanhilda's relationship with David.

Of their relationship Julian writes, "Every woman is both weaker and stronger than she believes, and it is well for her, if when the trial comes, her strength be not the betrayer of her weakness" (Hawthorne 89). Swanhilda betrays her strength, and becomes pregnant with David's child. This signifies that Swanhilda is passive and weak. Her infidelity with David is definitive of her status as a fallen woman. After the birth of the baby, David and Swanhilda are drowned in a jealous rage by Gloam, who is David's secret half-brother. Their baby is Agatha, whom the sailor is raising as his own. Firemount happens to be Agatha's distant cousin, but they marry anyhow. The story is improbable and the plot is inane. However, it is worth noting that the woman, Swanhilda, meets an untimely death by drowning because she has fallen prey to a man.

She sinned with David, and paid the ultimate price. This characterization of a fallen woman led astray is common to many of Julian's stories. Additionally, it was integral to his father's *The Scarlet Letter* in which the main character, Hester Prynne is an inherently fallen woman.

Julian was acutely aware of the looming shadow of his father's work. According to Hawthorne biographer Maurice Bassan, the father was a literary giant, the son a mere "pygmy" (169). Carving out a name for oneself when the name is already immortal is a hard task indeed. As Henry James observed, "It has been remarked more than once that, on the whole, the penalties attached to bearing an eminent name are equal to the privileges. To be the son of a man of genius is at the best to be born to a heritage of invidious comparisons . . ." (Poupard 232). While this may be true, the quality of Julian's body of work simply could not compare to his father's. Where the father wrote romantic stories with supernatural events that were symbolic and significant, Julian's were simply melodramatic. The elder Hawthorne's genius and gift for story telling were not passed onto the son, as evidenced by Julian's works. However, this did not deter Julian from trying, and one must admire his obstinacy.

As Julian continued to publish, critics continued to identify the faults found in his texts. In "A Reassessment of Julian Hawthorne Through Consideration of his Short Fiction," John William Teel states that "the characters in [Julian's] stories are categorically implausible" (31). Indeed, females are misrepresented by Julian's portrayals of weak women who are lost to the world for succumbing to their sexuality, thereby becoming fallen. Additionally, Julian's characteristic women are depicted as possessing no intellect, nor the ability to question their circumstances. Furthermore, the females in these stories demonstrate an inability to make choices. In fact, they are not usually presented with choices, for the nonsensical plots dictate that these women not possess the mental capacity to direct their own actions. Therefore, women's

lack of agency in Julian's stories indicates an anti-feminist predisposition throughout his work.

When Julian printed his father's invective against Fuller, he was not only attempting to position his father for inclusion in the canon while removing Fuller completely, but he was additionally attempting to boost sales of his book. By publishing the slanderous comments about Fuller, Julian gained notoriety, which sells books. Thomas Mitchell observes in his book, *Hawthorne's Fuller Mystery*, that "Fuller's sudden devaluation in the very year that promised to raise her literary and historical currency was, in fact, part of Julian's strategy to strengthen his father's position as a celebrated American author." Mitchell further asserts that during the closing decades of the nineteenth century when the traditional American literary canon was being constructed, Julian's written invective "clearly damaged" Fuller's "position within the American literary canon" (Mitchell 15). By printing his father's defamation of Fuller and presenting her in the worst possible light, Julian succeeded in displacing Fuller and, insofar as this was needed, cementing his father's position within the canon. Sales of *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* were strong. By the end of 1884, over four-thousand copies were printed, and within the next five years, three additional editions would appear (Scharnhorst 31). Julian's biography of his parents outsold any other book he had written, thus increasing his literary stock.

In contrast, Fuller's *Memoirs*, published in 1852, enjoyed five reprints in its first year alone. However, it was not published again after 1884 until 1973 (Mitchell 15). Similarly, Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, written in 1845, had been reprinted at least nine times by 1884 when Hawthorne published his parents' biography. Additionally, her *Papers in Literature and Art*, published in 1846, had been reissued six times (Mitchell 13). This surge in Fuller literature demonstrated that by 1884, she was poised on the brink of recognition for her

literary greatness. With the revival of his father's remarks and the creation of the Fuller scandal, Julian had made it his lot to dethrone "Queen Margaret" (Hawthorne, *NHaHW* 257).

Moreover, according to Gary Scharnhorst, who has researched and written about the Hawthornes extensively, Julian's *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* "illustrate[d] a pattern of character assassination the younger Hawthorne practiced throughout his life" (28). Julian had in fact attacked other literary greats. Julian wrote vindictively about Walt Whitman, saying that "His egotism is at least commensurate with his ignorance," and that the "primitive quality of his intellect renders him incapable of receiving cultivation" (Scharnhorst 152). About Henry David Thoreau, Julian wrote that "his nature was bitter, selfish, jealous and morbid. His human affections were scarcely more than rudimentary; his intellect was sharp and analytical, but small in scope and resource; he shunned society because he lacked the faculty of making himself decently agreeable." Thus, summing up his feelings for Thoreau, Julian proclaimed him to be "the most dismal fraud of the New England transcendental group" (Scharnhorst 2). In addition, Julian also carried on a very public and extremely acrid feud with James Russell Lowell that was published on the pages of the *New York World* during 1886. These incidents illustrate Scharnhorst's indictment that Julian practiced a pattern of character assassination throughout his life, and further the likelihood of his attack on Fuller as being a deliberate attempt to ruin her reputation as an author.

Furthermore, Scott Heller writes in "Margaret Fuller Gets Her Due," that Fuller "was the victim of literary character assassination.... The death blow was delivered by Julian Hawthorne" in his book, which led many to question Fuller's character while "dominat[ing] reviews and shap[ing] several generations hostility" towards her. Moreover, Heller notes that this was so damaging to Fuller's reputation that she was "virtually forc[ed] out of print for nearly one

hundred years” (41). As evidenced earlier, Fuller’s books were not rolling off the presses with the frequency that they had previously. With the American literary canon being constructed in the late 19th century, these years were especially crucial, and if an author were “simply out of print,” then he or she also wound up “out of the canon” (Mitchell 15). It would seem then that Julian successfully cut Fuller off from literary prominence.

Chapter 3

Responses to Hawthorne's Slander

While publishing houses may not have been reissuing Fuller's books, her writing persisted in periodicals and biographies dating from the time of her death through the early 1930's. Phyllis Cole writes in her article, "The Nineteenth Century Women's Rights Movement and the Canonization of Margaret Fuller," that "A vital memory of Fuller's life and thought, actively used in the cultural work of persuasion and formation of identity, persisted among the advocates of women's rights for more than half a century after her death" (2). That Fuller's writings were idealized in suffrage circles years after her demise speaks volumes of her importance to cultural progress. Her afterlife as it existed in the periodicals of the nineteenth century attests to her literary contributions in American letters. Furthermore, the adoption of her feminist theory by the women's rights movement serves as proof of her relevancy in the vastly changing world of the nineteenth century, and illustrates her immortality as viewed through her writings.

At the time that *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* was released to the public, the role of women was undergoing enormous change. Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* had attempted to facilitate this change by expounding on, as Julian put it in his book, the "never-to-be-exhausted theme of Women's Rights" (Hawthorne, *NHaHW* 256). Julian noted that "Doubtless there are disciples of this renowned woman now living who could quote pages of it" (qtd. in Cole 3). Nonetheless, he unabashedly "promoted his father's previously suppressed view of Fuller as a fallen woman" (Cole 3). These "canon-shaping politics" that Julian was practicing elicited numbers of written and oral refutations from Fuller's supporters (Cole 3). While Julian

readily admitted he had anticipated causing a “fluttering in the dove cotes of Margaret’s surviving friends, and of the later disciples,” one would doubt he was entirely prepared for the onslaught of outrage that was soon directed at him by Fuller’s advocates (qtd. in DeJong 1).

The charge was led by Fuller’s fellow feminists. A close friend of Fuller’s, Sarah Clarke, the sister of famous Unitarian minister James Freeman Clarke, was the first to launch a counterattack. She wrote a letter to the *Boston Evening Transcript* condemning the printed remarks, which in her estimation “lower[ed] greatly one’s former estimate of Hawthorne” (Mitchell 29). She decried the fact that the notebook entry was full of falsehoods and wisely reflected that this was uncharacteristic of the elder Hawthorne. She further surmised that both he and Sophia were “too wise to publish anything so crude” (Mitchell 29). James Freeman Clarke also had close ties to Fuller through his Transcendental associations; furthermore he was the minister who had married Julian’s parents (Freeman Clarke 1). Freeman Clarke shared his sister’s views about the attack on Fuller. However, both determined that waging war with Julian was distasteful, considering they had long standing friendship with his aunts, the Peabody sisters. Yet Sarah Clarke published a rebuttal, cited earlier in this paper that “blamed Julian for digging up a locust of slander that had slept for twenty-six years” (Clarke 3).

Meanwhile, Elizabeth Peabody condemned her nephew’s publishing of the slanderous passages. Although Peabody had contributed to Julian’s education when he was a young lad, she was far too progressive ever to condone libel or defend vilification, even if the slanderer was a family relation. In a letter written in late December of 1884, Peabody states that Julian’s public defamation of Fuller was far more than “an error of judgment.” Additionally, she surmises that her nephew possessed “malicious intent” in his slandering of Fuller, referring to the publication of his father’s remarks as an “iniquity.” Another letter from this same time period indicates that

Peabody had implored a mutual friend to “‘advise’ Julian to omit the disputed passage from later editions” (DeJong 15-17).

Another “Fullerite” who rushed to Fuller’s defense was Caroline Healey Dall. Mary DeJong, author of the forthcoming “Caroline Healey Dall and the Defense of ‘Margaret,’” identifies Dall as “an outstanding author and activist in her own right” and chronicles the fierce campaign Dall undertook in an effort to vindicate Fuller (DeJong 2). Dall employed various tactics in attempting to neutralize the damage Hawthorne had done. She first cast doubt on Julian’s “accuracy as well as judgment” (Mitchell 30). Next, she sent an open letter to the *Springfield Republican*, rallying Fuller’s old comrades to restore her honor (DeJong 4). Dall attempted to discredit Hawthorne’s statement about Fuller in his parents’ biography that she “had not left in the hearts and minds of those who knew her any deep witness of her integrity and purity” (260). It was not difficult to disprove this statement, given the droves of Fuller supporters who had saturated newspapers and publications with letters and articles seeking to negate Hawthorne’s denunciation. In fact, DeJong asserts that “Supporters of both Fuller and Nathaniel Hawthorne used periodicals to shape public opinion” (2). For six months in 1884, from the release of *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* until the beginning of February, newspapers and publications became the battleground on which proponents for Fuller would wage war with Julian. In fact, the huge outcry generated by Hawthorne’s remarks invalidated his own contention that Fuller had not left a lasting impression upon her followers.

Another outspoken exponent of Fuller’s, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, took deep umbrage at the statements Julian published about his lost but beloved contemporary. Higginson was a powerful force to be reckoned with, having been a soldier, writer, abolitionist, suffragist and Unitarian minister. He was one of the founding members of the American Woman

Suffrage Association and was co-editor of the *Woman's Journal*, a women's rights publication. Higginson penned the article "Wedded Isolation" in response to Julian's attack. In it he maintained that the Hawthornes were so entrenched in a life of seclusion, that it was only natural they should harshly judge those who, like Fuller, embraced "life more actively" (Mitchell 30). Julian reacted by writing three letters. In the first, on January 2, 1885, he counters that his mother only at the last moment yanked the Fuller entry out of inclusion in her publication of her late husband's journals, thus attempting to demonstrate that he did not lack discretion as many reviewers had claimed. He further defended his father's analysis of Fuller, stating it told the "exact truth" (Mitchell 31).

Yet he didn't stop there. Julian directly attacked Higginson, calling his manhood into question. He referred to the *Woman's Journal* as Higginson's "female organ," inferring that Higginson was not manly (Mitchell 31). While Higginson was an editor and frequent contributor to the publication, it did not serve as a mouthpiece for only Higginson. The talents of many female writers were documented in the pages of the *Woman's Journal*. Among these were notables such as Julia Ward Howe, Lydia Fuller, and Lucy Stone, to name just a few. By referring to the *Women's Journal* as Higginson's female organ, Julian demonstrated the level of debasement that he was capable of. Employing crude terminology did little to ennoble his cause. Julian closed by saying that "Margaret Fuller has at last taken her place with the numberless other dismal frauds who fill the limbo of human pretension and failure" (qtd. in Mitchell 12). Higginson returned fire by insinuating that Julian was juvenile, immature, and nothing more than a momma's boy, thus attempting to discredit him.

Meanwhile, Fuller's nephew Frederick published what Mitchell termed the "most thorough defense to be written during the exchange" (34). He noted that his aunt's journals

detailed a mutual admiration and cordial relationship between Fuller and Julian's father. He suggested that if there were any hard feelings on Hawthorne's part, it must have been due to an unconsciously "inflicted wound" that he was unable to get over (Mitchell 34). Frederick demonstrated the discretion Julian was so sorely lacking when he released the contested passages his father had written. Frederick stated that he had no intention of attempting to "belittle [Nathaniel] Hawthorne's genius" because "our American heroes and saints are not so many that we can afford to turn iconoclasts" (qtd. in Mitchell 34). Frederick mused that Julian "was not one to spoil a sensation to save a friend" (Mitchell 34). This was an excellent point. The sensation created by Julian's release of his father's remarks, while portraying Julian as somewhat villainous, did garner immense attention for his biography. It is my assertion that this was one of the younger Hawthorne's motives all along.

In fact, Mitchell highlights in his book that the "scandal" Julian created with the publication of his father's denunciation of Fuller took on a life of its own (35). Publications began running reviews of the feud as opposed to reviews of Julian's book. For example, on January 11, 1885, *The Springfield Republican* "reviewed Frederick Fuller's defense" of his aunt and found that Julian had been put in his place when Frederick's letter proved "the falsity of Hawthorne's charges" (Mitchell 35). February 5 brought the final reply from Hawthorne. In this last assault, Julian shifted gears, admitting that inclusion of his father's disparagement of Fuller was meant to incite anger – an admission that serves to support my position that Julian had an agenda. By revealing that he had ulterior motives for printing his father's derogatory remarks, Julian proves not only Frederick Fuller's earlier point that he would not "spoil a sensation to save a friend," but he also gives evidence for the validity of my assertion that he published

inflammatory remarks about Fuller in an effort to raise his own literary worth and to increase the sales and popularity of his book.

Furthermore, Julian's biography states that Fuller's book was not particularly popular with Sophia Hawthorne. In the biography of his parents, Julian cites a letter written to his grandmother by his mother. In it, Sophia cattily remarks on Fuller's book: "It seems to me that if she were married truly, she would no longer be puzzled about the rights of women." She goes on to detail that marriage is the "true destiny and place" of women, and the only reason Fuller does not realize this is because she herself has never entered the institution (257). This excerpt has significant undertones to it, given that Julian was attempting to discredit Fuller by raising questions about the legitimacy of her marriage. He quotes Sophia as continuing, "Even before I was married, however, I could never feel the slightest interest in this movement. It then seemed to me that each woman could make her own sphere quietly, and also it was always a shock to me to have women mount the rostrum" (257). In attributing these judgments to his mother, Julian is at once demonstrating and giving support to his anti-feminist persuasions. If, as he presents it, his parents' marriage is symbolic of what is virtuous and moral, then the next logical conclusion would be that women's rights members are doing their fellow females a disservice by advocating for women to be self-sufficient.

In order to preserve his father's high place within the American literary canon, Julian depicted his father as the moral crusader and champion of middle class values, thus marking his questioning of Fuller's marital status and legitimacy of her child as noble. Mitchell offers that "Julian's biography attempts to position Hawthorne as the thoroughly committed author and practitioner of the values of the market" for which recent editions of his works had been collected, the core of that market being "the middle class American home" (16). Mitchell then

concludes that Julian enhanced his “representation of his father and himself as moral crusaders” (35). Therefore, his portrayal of Fuller as a fallen woman seems to have been integral to the promotion of his book, and an essential part of his objective, which was to displace Fuller from the canon while preserving his father’s place within it. By hinting that Fuller belonged to a class of people “deleterious to civilization and discreditable to human nature,” Julian was denouncing Fuller and all she stood for (Mitchell 36). It is interesting to note that Julian feels eminently qualified to decree what is morally acceptable and what is detrimental to society.

In fact, Julian’s self-ordained role of moral crusader seems questionable, given that it has been suggested he tampered with notebook entries when preparing the biography. Mitchell notes in his book that “sufficient parallels exist to raise the possibility” of revisions made by Julian’s hand (21). This was not the only time it has been suggested that Julian altered texts to suit his purposes. Scharnhorst writes in “‘The Most Dismal Fraud of the New England Transcendental Group’: Julian Hawthorne on Thoreau” that Julian was apt to add nonfactual embellishments when he was composing texts. Scharnhorst additionally comments that Julian “gradually revised the narrative of his association with Thoreau to make more interesting copy” (2). This shows a pattern of mendacity in Julian’s writings. His habit of misrepresenting facts demonstrates repeated impropriety.

Mitchell further asserts that “Julian’s desire to legitimize his own antifeminism through the authority of his parents may have led him, in fact, to rewrite and misdate his mother’s letter in order to strengthen her condemnation of Fuller’s book” (21). This seems reasonable in light of another entry where Julian’s father worries that he has not “implicit faith in Mr. Mozier’s veracity” (Sanders 62). Interestingly, Julian chose not to include this remark in his account. Once again, it seems that Julian had an agenda when deciding to publish the unflattering criticism of

Fuller. Mitchell posits that Julian revised the inflammatory passages about Fuller in an effort to portray “his father in the best possible light.” For example, he writes that Julian substituted the word “man” for “hymen” when rewriting his father’s passage about Ossoli, and also suggests that Julian deleted the phrase “purely sensual” to reflect that Hawthorne had reached his prudish limits (22-23). By rewording his father’s phraseology, Julian took unjustified liberties with the text. This manipulation was done in an effort to depict his father as saintly, while demonizing Fuller and the father of her child. Mitchell is correct when he writes that Julian “intentionally provoked a literary scandal he hoped would realign and strengthen his father’s position in literary history even as it destroyed Fuller’s” (36).

When the elder Hawthorne wrote his scathing comments back in 1858, they were certainly “not his final consideration of Fuller” (Sanders 58). In “Margaret Fuller: By No Means a Weak Sister,” Karen Sanders writes that “Hawthorne’s remarks about Fuller are not to be interpreted as his lasting definition of her.” She suggests that the remarks were due to a “dark mood and ill health prevailing the spring of 1858” (60). Sanders further posits that the malady that had plagued Hawthorne during the time he wrote these passages belies his true affection for Fuller. During the weeks Hawthorne was visiting Italy, and when he penned his assault against Fuller, he was suffering from what Sanders terms as an “indisposition so grave that he is unable to make further entries in his journal for an entire week” (8). This entry then is “an aberration, not a consummation of Hawthorne’s sentiments” (Sanders 60).

Even when it was made known that a friend of Fuller’s, Emelyn Story, could verify the legitimacy of the Ossoli union, Julian did not retract the statements. His representation of Fuller as a fallen woman was necessary to the preservation of the virtuous image he had constructed for his father. Formulating an unseemly impression of Fuller for the public’s consumption allowed

Julian to position his family as advocates for what was decent and ethical. He attempts to color people's perceptions of Fuller by presenting her as lacking moral principles, while his parents are depicted as the righteous. Furthermore, Julian likens his position to that of a man defending the institution of marriage through his father's writings. He dedicates the biography to his wife as "Records of a Happy Marriage," writing that "If true love and married happiness should ever be in need of vindication, ample material for that purpose may be found in these volumes" (Hawthorne, *NHaHW*v, vi). By portraying Fuller as a woman fallen from grace due to her sensuality, he is able to present her as a "misguiding influence on women in general" (Mitchell 20).

Julian released his book in 1884, which was a time of enormous change. The era of progress had dawned, and with it came masses of disadvantaged women. The women's rights movement of this period was viewed by some as a threat to the stability of middle class America. As Mitchell writes, "Julian published *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* when the role of women in American society was undergoing a rapid change and profound redefinition, and his biography registers that change by resisting it with the weight of his father's prestige" (16). His antifeminist sentiment is reflected in Julian's work. The larger issue found in Julian's defamation of Fuller and the canonization of Hawthorne is the son's reading of his own father. While the elder Hawthorne has often been celebrated by critics for his use of strong female characters, Julian defies this interpretation with his representation of Fuller. In addition, Julian's attempts at fiction give insight into his antifeminism. In his stories women are depicted as weak and powerless. They seemingly exist only for the convenience of men. Females are a mode of adornment allowing men to showcase their virility and strength. The representation of his female characters and his denouncement of Fuller mark his attitude towards feminism. In fact, even the

title of his biography suggests this, as his mother is listed as merely Nathaniel Hawthorne's wife and not a person in her own right. It appears once again that to Julian, a woman's identity is reliant on a male.

The idea of women becoming fallen was a popular concept during the women's rights movement. Fallen women were formerly virtuous but were led astray by their poor choices. The mindset behind this notion of fallen women entailed the traditional assumption that women were too weak to take care of themselves, and additionally too intellectually feeble to make the proper choices needed for success. When a woman wandered from the security of her home, she was apt to fall prey to a conniving man. Since women were not seen as autonomous enough to protect themselves, they therefore required a man to sustain them in the perilous world. This theme allowed misogynists and those lobbying against women's rights to strike a chord of fear in women who were asserting their own identity. This scare tactic was central to swaying women away from suffrage. The women's rights movement fought against this image. They challenged the idea that women were not a force unto themselves, and they encouraged women to break down the barriers of disenfranchisement. The feminists of the nineteenth century advocated that women stand on their own, independent of men. Women wanted to be seen as equal partners in their marriages, not property. The path to self-sufficiency and independence was education. Fuller agitated for this in her writings, thus becoming the guiding light of the suffrage movement.

At the time, the ideals the women's rights movement endorsed were considered radical by many of the mainstream establishments of America. Fuller can be seen as a "radical" feminist because of her work. As Cole writes, "Women's claim to self-discovery through Fuller was becoming a public trope" (5). This feminine self-discovery was threatening to men such as Julian

Hawthorne. In his biography, Julian presents Fuller as a “potentially disruptive influence on his parent’s marital bliss” (Mitchell 20). However, when Fuller seeks the same marital bliss, she is judged as fallen. It appears that Fuller provides a convenient pretext by which Julian can demonstrate the evils of independent women: if Fuller had not strayed from home to Italy, she might not have fallen. Interestingly, Fuller, whom Julian would present as his prime example for women gone wrong, indeed had sought a mate, and embarked on her life’s journey with him. It is ironic that in Julian’s characterization, her need and desire for the same marital bliss that Julian’s parents shared caused her fall from grace.

In closing, Julian Hawthorne’s *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* was the only work Julian ever wrote that was a best-seller. In it, Julian included vehement slurs his father had written about Margaret Fuller twenty-six years previously. Inclusion of these slanderous passages derived and slightly modified from his father’s journal allowed Julian to maneuver Fuller out of the literary canon that was being constructed in the nineteenth century, while positioning his father into a fundamental place within this canon. In addition to practicing these “canon shaping politics,” Julian was able to garner enough attention to propel sales of his book into a realm his work had not previously occupied. Digging up this “locust of slander” about Fuller ensured Julian’s father a place within the canon, while displacing Fuller from this canon. Inclusion of these slanderous passages generated a huge outcry from Fuller’s supporters that dominated publications and periodicals for months after the release of his book. The disparagement of Fuller also permitted Julian to increase his personal literary worth and advance his own literary enterprise. In 1884, Julian had labeled Fuller a “dismal fraud.” It is perhaps old fashioned poetic justice then that in 1913, Julian, himself having failed as a literary writer, wound up being found guilty of mail fraud. Ironically, he was sentenced to one year

imprisonment in the Atlanta Penitentiary for writing of a different sort: false claims penned in an effort to entice prospective investors in a company that he was part owner of.

Works Cited

- Bassan, Maurice. *Hawthorne's Son*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1970. Print.
- . "Hawthorne's Son: The Life and Literary Career of Julian Hawthorne." *The New England Quarterly* 44.1 (1971): 169-170. Print.
- Clarke, James Freeman. "1810-1888. James Freeman Clarke additional correspondence, 1787-1886." MS. Harvard University Lib., Cambridge. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.
- Clarke, Sarah. "Hawthorne's Notion of Margaret Fuller." *Springfield Daily Republican*, 29 Dec. 1884: 3. Print.
- Cole, Phyllis. "The Nineteenth-Century Women's Rights Movement and the Canonization of Margaret Fuller." *ESQ*. 44 (1998): 1-33. Print.
- DeJong, Mary. "Caroline Healy Dall and the Defense of 'Margaret.'" Forthcoming in *Exaltadas: A Female Genealogy of Transcendentalism*, ed. Phyllis Cole and Jana Argersinger (Athens, GA: U of Georgia P). Manuscript provided by author and editors.
- Egan, Lavinia. "Margaret Fuller-Feminist and Literateur." *Equal Rights*. 1.32 (1923): 255-6. Print.
- Fuller, Margaret. *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1980. Print.
- Hawthorne, Julian. *Bressant*. New York, 1873. Print.
- . *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*. 2 vols. Boston, 1884. Print.
- . *Prince Saroni's Wife and the Pearl-Shell Necklace*. New York, 1884. Print.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The French and Italian Notebooks*, Ed. Thomas Woodson. *The Centenary Edition of Nathaniel Hawthorne XIV*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1980. Print.

- Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. "Writings of Thomas Wentworth Higginson." MS. University of Nebraska-Lincoln Lib., Web. 29 Feb. 2012.
- Heller, Scott. "Margaret Fuller Gets Her Due." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 41.38 (1995): 38-43. Print.
- Knox, George. "The Hawthorne-Lowell Affair." *The New England Quarterly*. 29.4 (1956): 493-502. Print.
- Lane, Charles. "Transcendental Ideas: Social Reform." *The Dial*. January 1844: 351-7. Web. 3 March 2012.
- Landow, George P. *The Literary Canon*. Brown University Lib., Web. 1 April, 2012.
- Myerson, Joel. "Sarah Margaret Fuller." *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. 5th ed. Ed. Paul Lauter and John Alberti. Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin, 2006. 1692-1694. Print.
- Marshall, Bridget M. "Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Canon of American Literature." *Critical Insights*. Web. 28 Feb. 2012.
- Mitchell, Thomas R. *Hawthorne's Fuller Mystery*. Boston: U of Massachusetts P, 1998. Print.
- Poupard, Dennis. "Julian Hawthorne 1846-1934." *Twentieth-century Literary Criticism: Volume 25*. Detroit: Michigan, 1988. Print.
- Sanders, Karen. "Margaret Fuller: By No Means a Weak Sister." *Journal of the College English Association, Middle Atlantic Group*. 11 (1998): 57-67. Print.
- Scharnhorst, Gary. "'I didn't like his books': Julian Hawthorne on Whitman." *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review*. 26.3 (2009) 151-156. Print.
- . "'The most dismal fraud of the New England Transcendental Group': Julian Hawthorne on Thoreau." *Concord Saunterer*. 17 (2009): 125-136. Print.

---. "We Remember No Biography Having So Many Poorly Concealed Antagonisms':

Character Assassination in Julian Hawthorne's *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*."

Nathaniel Hawthorne Review. 36.2 (2010):28-48. Print.

Smith, Nicole. "What is the Literary Canon and What Criteria Define It? The Examples of

Hawthorne, Dickinson, and Melville." *Article Myriad*. 2012. Web. 2 March 2012.

Teel, John William. *A Reassessment of Julian Hawthorne Through Consideration of his Short*

Fiction. Morgantown: West Virginia U, 1984. Print.

Tyson, Barbara Marie. *Julian Hawthorne's Nonfiction Prose: His Social Thought in the*

Context of a Personal Ethic. Austin: U of Texas, 1972. Print.

Woodlief, Ann. "The Dial: A Magazine for Literature, Philosophy, and Religion." *The Web of*

American Transcendentalism. Web. 2 March 2012.

Jennifer Santangelo
 Academic Vitae
jms1084@psu.edu

Education

The Pennsylvania State University, Brandywine Campus, Media, Pa. May 2012

- Jane E. Cooper Honors Program
- Bachelor of Art in English
- Minor in American Studies

Honors Research

- Honors Option with Dr. Paul Orlov, Associate Professor of English, *Understanding the Inspiration Behind 19th Century Literature*
- The Council on Undergraduate Research with Dr. Laura Guertin, Associate Professor of Earth Science, *The Mixed Legacy of Julian Hawthorne*
- Senior Honors Thesis with Dr. Adam Sorkin, Distinguished Professor of English, *Julian Hawthorne: Reviving a Locust of Slander*
- Completed CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative, IRB Research Curriculum

Independent Studies

- Independent Research with Dr. Phyllis Cole, Associate Professor of English, American Studies and Women's Studies, *The Afterlife of Margaret Fuller*
- Independent Research with Dr. Laura Guertin, Associate Professor of Earth Science, *Veterans Interred in Historic Cumberland Cemetery*

Internship Experience

Department of University Relations, Penn State Brandywine Campus Fall 2011 &
College Intern, 3-credit internships Spring 2012

- Composed press releases for campus website and Penn State *Live Wire*
- Conducted research and interviews for stories
- Wrote human interest stories for *Brandywine Pride*, campus magazine
- Two stories placed in Penn State's Top 10 Stories for 2011
- One story earned first place in Penn State's Top 10 Stories for 2011

Scholarships

- Richard and Sylvia Schaffer Scholarship 2010-2012
- Osher Adult Re-entry Scholarship 2010-2011

Awards

- Presidential Service Award Silver Level 2010
- Presidential Service Award Bronze Level 2011
- Academic Achievement Award 2008 - 2012

Presentations

- Santangelo, J. *Fishing for Fuller*. Presented at EURECA- Exhibition of Undergraduate Research and Creative Accomplishment, Penn State Brandywine, Media, Pa. April, 2011.
- Santangelo, J., Neville, S., Guertin, L., Dimperio, N., *TEDxPSU*. November 2011.
- Santangelo, J. Guertin, L. *Waterbytes*. April 2011.
- Santangelo, J. Sorkin, A. *Julian Hawthorne: Reviving a Locust of Slander*. April 2012.

Professional Memberships

Sigma Tau Delta, the International English Honor Society 2011- present

Extracurricular Activities and Service

Lion's Eye Staff Writer and Campus News Editor 2008-2010

- Wrote and edited articles for the school newspaper.
- Proofed copy for spelling and grammatical errors.
- Conducted research and interviews for feature articles.

Parish religious education teacher at Nativity BVM School, Media, Pa. 2009-2011

- Responsible for over 20 sixth grade students
- Prepared students for sacrament of Confirmation
- Coordinated events to help students fulfill service hours
- Assisted students in researching and writing a Saint report
- Conducted Confirmation interviews with students and parents

Girl Scout Leader of Troop 57090 2009-present

- Responsible for fifteen girls
- Plan and coordinate events, guest speakers and badge activities
- Take girls on field trips, camping and walking tours
- Help scouts stay civically engaged
- Coordinate booths for the annual cookie sale

Canstruction – Philadelphia, Pa. May 2011

- Hosted canned good drives
- Practicing building canned good structure with the team
- Participated in Canstruction event
- Canned goods used for event donated to Philabundance

Technology Proficiency

- Microsoft Word
- Microsoft Excel
- Microsoft Power Point
- Garageband
- Google Docs
- Dropbox
- Mendely
- Voice Thread
- Delicious
- Facebook