

## Haunted Houses: George Lippard, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Middle-Class America

Shelley Streeby

Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts 38.3 (Summer 1996): p443-472. Rpt. in *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism*. Ed. Kathy D. Darrow. Vol. 198. Detroit: Gale. From *Literature Resource Center*.

Full Text: COPYRIGHT 2008 Gale, Cengage Learning

Full Text:

[(essay date summer 1996) *In the following essay, Streeby maintains that Lippard's base language, graphic imagery, and overall sensationalistic approach allow him to provide a more accurate vision of the faults of capitalism and the problems of the middle class than could be presented in works by such writers as Nathaniel Hawthorne.*]

In a recent essay in the collection *Rethinking Class: Literary Studies and Social Formations*, Michael Gilmore argues that class is the "subordinated" category in what he calls the "currently fashionable triad of American literary studies, race, gender, and class." "Disagreements abound over whether race or gender should occupy the top tier in the new cultural ranking," Gilmore suggests, "but about the subordination, even the effacement, of class, there can be no doubt." Thus in "Hawthorne and the Making of the Middle Class," Gilmore's laudable purpose is to take "issue with the critical consensus that relegates class to the margins of antebellum American literature." He chooses to do so, however, "not by examining the novels of a certified labor activist like [George] Lippard"--the Philadelphia editor, journalist, and writer of cheap sensational literature--"but rather by turning to a familiar and much analyzed classic of the American Renaissance, *The Scarlet Letter*."<sup>1</sup> As he focuses on what is probably *the* most canonical U.S. novel, the idea of class conflict is relegated to the margins of his discussion, resurfacing only briefly at the end of what is in the main an account of the vicissitudes and ambiguities of American middle-class identity.

Why does Gilmore turn to Hawthorne as the privileged example in an article that argues for the importance of class in the making of "our cultural inheritance"? Why choose the literary classic over the work of the "certified labor activist"? Gilmore's choice is symptomatic of a problem that recurs in many recent analyses of Hawthorne's fiction. Whether Hawthorne is read as a radical, a reactionary, or something in between, much of this work assumes that his writing amply displays the complexities and contradictions of his culture. Many critics who have otherwise very different agendas and commitments still agree that Hawthorne's literature is peculiarly representative, that it works as an especially sensitive barometer of the dynamics of antebellum culture, registering, as one critic puts it, both "the official meanings of the political public sphere" and the "popular knowledges that constitute counter-memory."<sup>2</sup> This (re)marking of Hawthorne's corpus as a privileged index to the vicissitudes of mid-nineteenth century culture doubtless derives in part from the belief that the complexity and the self-reflexivity of Hawthorne's literary language, or in Gilmore's words, the "textual vacillations" that it showcases, make it particularly meaningful.<sup>3</sup> If you want to think about class formation in the U.S., for example, why consult the work of a certified labor activist when you can simply turn to your bookshelf, pick up one of Hawthorne's classic novels, and find there both a contribution to and a critique of an emerging American middle-class hegemony?

In what follows, I will argue that reading class through the classics and leaving the work of writers like Lippard unread almost inevitably works to exorcise more aggressively anti-capitalist forms of counter-memory and thereby reinscribes the myths of a middle-class America that have haunted American Studies, from Cold War theories of American exceptionalism to more recent accounts of an almost all-pervasive middle-class hegemony.<sup>4</sup> By exploring Lippard's radical Protestant "body-politics," I hope to flesh out scenes where bodies, affects, and sensations play different roles than they do in Hawthorne's novels.<sup>5</sup> While Lippard's obsessive focus on flesh, blood, and low and lurid sensations has disgusted many literary critics, I will

suggest that this very sensationalizing strategy helped him to elaborate a critique of liberal capitalism that isn't available in Hawthorne's fiction.<sup>6</sup> As we shall see, the uncanny bodies that are domesticated and thereby put to rest in Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables* return with a divisive vengeance in Lippard's sensational literature.<sup>7</sup>

## Two Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism

George Lippard's sensational radical Protestant body-politics are grounded in a particular place and time: Philadelphia in the 1840's and 1850's, a center of artisan radicalism, ethnic and racial conflict, and religious heterodoxy. Many of Lippard's novels, including his most famous book, *The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk Hall*, focus on Philadelphia scenes, personalities, events, and problems; as its title suggests, in his labor story-paper, *The Quaker City* weekly, he extensively addresses local as well as national issues; and in general his critique of U.S. liberal-capitalism was impacted by the diverse contributions of Hicksite Quakers, German immigrant socialists, and radical republicans to Philadelphia's heterogeneous and often violently divided public sphere.<sup>8</sup> Lippard himself contended that the complex of religious and political traditions he inherited as a Pennsylvanian provided fundamentally different ideological resources for thinking about bodies than did those circulating in and around Boston, and he warned that contemporaneous efforts by historians and literary men to identify "America" with Puritan New England contributed to the marginalization or even erasure of positions that placed dominated bodies at the center of a politics.

As several critics have suggested, since the middle of the nineteenth century Nathaniel Hawthorne's eminent position in the U.S. literary canon has supported such an identification of "America" with New England.<sup>9</sup> Most of the men of letters, cultural entrepreneurs, and other early literary tastemakers who valued Hawthorne's work did so because it foregrounded New England landscapes, scenarios, and characters, and thus installed Puritanism and New England history as the source of a nineteenth-century, "American" self. In his career-making notice in *The North American Review*, Longfellow conflated New England and the nation when he commended Hawthorne's tales. "One of the most prominent characteristics of these tales is, that they are national in character. The author has wisely chosen his themes among the traditions of New England ... The Puritanical times begin to look romantic in the distance ..." <sup>10</sup> And a few years later, Evert Duyckinck, the influential literary nationalist, *Young American*, and editor of the literary journal *Arcturus*, judged Hawthorne's writings to be both unique expressions of a specifically "American" genius and "part of the genuine recorded experience of humanity" precisely because they focused on Puritan history.<sup>11</sup>

All of this would seem to support Sacvan Bercovitch's theory that Hawthorne and his contemporaries traced the "cultural genealogy" of a triumphant "New World liberal identity" to Puritan New England.<sup>12</sup> In *The Office of the Scarlet Letter*, Bercovitch suggests that this "rhetoric of descent" provided "cohesion in the movement from republican to Jacksonian America" and thus helped to secure a liberal consensus. Antebellum references to and reconstructions of a mythical Puritan past, he argues, supported an emerging, pluralist, laissez-faire, gradualist, and exceptionalist middle-class hegemony which extended to virtually every domain of American life. In Bercovitch's account, Hawthorne, especially, as *the* canonical American writer, taught generations of readers to trace the origins of a liberal American self to Puritan New England; for Hawthorne, New England Puritanism represented "a distinctly protomodern way of life--a commercial venture undertaken mainly by the mobile 'middling classes', a contractual, profit-making 'enterprise' whose leaders were virtually all professionals."<sup>13</sup> Commercialism, mobility, middle classes, contract, enterprise, professionalism: all of these ideological ingredients, staples of a nineteenth-century "liberal" identity, may be found in Hawthorne's revisions of American Puritanism. According to Bercovitch, this obsession with Puritan origins also pervaded the popular literature of the period. "The nostalgia for Puritan New England as for the antidote to current ills," he contends, "was a main theme of virtually every form of popular literature" in the antebellum period.<sup>14</sup>

George Lippard, however, constructed a "cultural genealogy" which mapped different geographical

coordinates--Philadelphia and Pennsylvania's Germantown rather than Plymouth, Salem, and Boston--and derived from a more politically radical Protestantism that was influenced by Quakerism, evangelical Methodism, and German communitarianism. Lippard was born on a farm in rural Pennsylvania; after his father was injured in a wagon accident, he lived with his grandfather and aunts in Germantown, along the Wissahickon River; and during his short adulthood (he died of tuberculosis at age 31), he lived in Philadelphia.<sup>15</sup> Instead of tracing the origins of a middle-class American self in New England history, Lippard tried to build working-class identities by inventing counter-histories focused on Pennsylvania and by using a contemporary Philadelphia divided along lines of class, race, religion, and national origin to ground his reconstruction of a different national genealogy.

Lippard attributed the antebellum nostalgia for Puritan origins to a pernicious project devised by New England historians and Boston critics to suppress counter-histories and to definitively link the "national character" to New England Puritanism. "Pennsylvania has been very shabbily treated by New England historians," Lippard agreed in a response to a letter from a reader of *The Quaker City* weekly on this subject (6 January 1849). In a later number, Lippard suggested that this regional rivalry and Boston's disproportionate power as a site of literary production not only worked to marginalize Pennsylvania history, but also produced harmful stereotypes.<sup>16</sup> "It is a common thing for New England men, and men of the South, to speak contemptuously of the Pennsylvania Germans," he complained. "The very name of Pennsylvania German in some parts of the Union is the synonym of ignorance and stupidity."<sup>17</sup> Perhaps Lippard was trying to redress this imbalance when he tersely rejected a story entitled "The Pilgrims of Plymouth Rock" submitted by a subscriber to *The Quaker City* weekly: "[T]here have been 120,001 quires of good letter paper wasted on this subject already, and we are sorry to see another sheet, worth one cent, added to the number" (*QC*, 20 January 1849). In a book review of his own *Paul Ardenheim*, described by Lippard as "an embodiment of the German mind of Pennsylvania," he attributes this proliferation of New England-centered national narratives to the powerful preferences of Boston critics. "For a Boston critic will forgive you for any act of crime, sooner than he will overlook an honest attempt to do justice to the 'national character' (if we so phrase it) of Pennsylvania," Lippard charged. "To please Boston, you must drivel about Plymouth Rock, and, at the same time, calumniate William Penn." Worried that the New England historians and Boston critics might "blot out the History of Pennsylvania" (*QC*, 17 March 1849), Lippard tried to intervene in the politics of memory by preserving traces of the past that supported different modes of local and national identity.

If Lippard rejected New England Puritanism as the source of an American self, neither did he embrace a middle-class identity. In fact, he was quite hostile to the very idea, as he understood it, of such an identity. "In every age, the classes improperly styled by this title," Lippard argued in *The Quaker City* weekly, "have been the veriest lick-spittles of Power" (2 June 1849). Far from simply reinforcing an emerging middle-class consensus, Lippard tried to articulate a kind of early working-class position that emphasized the material underpinnings of both spiritual and republican virtue--the importance of attending to the body as well as to the individual soul. Rather than merely insisting on abstract political rights, or patiently waiting for the democratic utopia to come in the next world, Lippard consistently argued that unless the social system was reorganized to ensure the material well-being of "the great masses of people," democracy was a sham, a meaningless word uselessly gracing "the dark land, where white and black slavery, cloaked under various names, blasphemes the memory of the Revolution, and turns the Declaration of Independence into a lie" (*QC*, 6 October 1849). "The mere *name* of a Republic, the mere *name* of a Democracy, will not heal the misery of these Millions of Mankind, who in all the nations of the world, are now toiling and dying for the benefit of the Few" (*QC*, 11 August 1849), Lippard contended elsewhere. As his focus shifts back and forth from "American" ideals to the poor in "all the nations of the world," Lippard's dreams of social and political revolution oscillate between distinctly nationalist fantasies and a more broadly transnational vision. While Lippard's writing does not escape the national frame, however, it *does* foreground class conflict and thereby forces us to confront the limits of Hawthorne's vision and to move beyond the ambiguities of an emerging middle-class identity.

Certainly Hawthorne and Lippard provide two very different models of the mid-nineteenth century literary career. Although Hawthorne produced other kinds of writing, most notably children's literature and a campaign biography of his college classmate, Franklin Pierce, Lippard was more intimately involved in a wider literary public sphere. Lippard started out as a writer of news stories, political essays, literary criticism, legends of the American Revolution, and gothic narratives for local papers like the Philadelphia *Spirit of the Times* and *The Citizen Soldier*, and eventually, from 1848 to 1850, edited his own labor storypaper, *The Quaker City* weekly, which included the gothic serials ***Memoirs of a Preacher***, ***The Killers***, and ***The Empire City*** as well as lengthy political editorials, book reviews, and responses to letters from readers. During the early 1840s, then, Lippard was a member of what Bourdieu, following Max Weber, calls the "proletaroid intelligentsia"--those who "make a living, however precarious, from all the minor jobs tied to 'industrial literature' and journalism."<sup>18</sup> In 1844, however, while Hawthorne was secluded in the Old Manse, worrying about his inability to support his family and writing short tales which obsessively allude to his failure to attract a large audience, Lippard's sensational novel ***The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk Hall*** was published as a series of pamphlets and quickly became a controversial best-seller. Lippard was subsequently able to earn \$3000 to \$4000 a year as a writer--a fantastic amount in the 1840s.<sup>19</sup> Finally, in the early fifties, during Hawthorne's most productive period--when he composed, in quick succession *The Scarlet Letter*, *The House of the Seven Gables*, and *The Blithedale Romance*--Lippard cut back on his writing in order to put more energy into a new project, his Brotherhood of the Union, a secret society which he described as "a practical, everyday Worker--in the cause of Labor" (*QC*, 5 January 1850). Lippard hoped that the rites and symbols associated with the Brotherhood of the Union could educate the illiterate as well as the literate and thus initiate as many of the poor as possible into "the great mystery of COMBINATION." "Many persons, who cannot receive ideas through the means of Books, or oral lessons, may be instructed by means of rites and symbols" (*QC*, 29 September 1849), Lippard argued. Thus if in the 1840s Lippard believed that he could most effectively represent what he called the "lower million" by participating in the literary public sphere, at the end of his career he seemed to lose faith in the public sphere of letters and literature as an ensemble of sites from which informed citizens might work to change national practices.

Despite the changes in the methods that he used to try to construct working-class identities, however, a "sensationalized" Protestantism remained an important ideological resource for Lippard throughout his career. In what follows, I will explore some of the ways that sensationalism, Protestantism, and republicanism are reconfigured and recombined in Lippard's writing, especially in his novel ***The Entranced; or The Wanderer of Eighteen Centuries***, which was serialized in *The Quaker City* weekly and then published later in a slightly revised form under the title ***Adonai; or the Pilgrim of Eternity*** in *The White Banner*, a collection of some of his more militant pieces that he circulated among the membership of The Brotherhood of the Union. Edited and published by Lippard himself in 1851, the same year that Hawthorne published *The House of the Seven Gables*--a novel I will return to at the end of this essay--*The White Banner* contains "Legends of Everyday Life" (brief stories about corrupt rich men, the suffering poor, the demonization of socialism in the press, and other topics), a lecture on the history of Protestantism, various materials relating to the Brotherhood, and the text of ***Adonai***, a wild and bloody historical and religious fantasy that moves from the time of Nero and the Roman Empire to the nineteenth-century U.S. by following the intermittent "awakenings" of Lucius or Adonai, a Christian who falls into a magnetic trance that lasts for centuries. Grafting the history of Protestantism onto a sort of travel guide narrative focusing on Washington D.C., Lippard exposes the nation's corrupt republican institutions and juxtaposes abstract formulations of democratic personhood with the uncanny bodies of slaves, factory workers, and the "poor of the World."

Ultimately, Lippard argues that the American Empire is just another version of the Roman Empire; what purports to be the "Senate of a free people," for instance, is actually "the Senate of a land of tyrants and slaves, governed by the Sceptre of some new Nero, who is counselled by Senators fond of human blood."<sup>20</sup> Lippard's weird bloody allegory comes to an apocalyptic close on the Day of Judgement, which takes place during the nineteenth century, when the Poor of the World rise up against the priests, kings, and rich men of all nations. While Lippard concludes by affirming that society is capable of social reorganization, this violent

climax underlines a prophecy made earlier in the novel that "[w]hen the robbers of the Poor are not moved to mercy by the Book of God, or the Declaration of our fathers, then must the Poor teach unto these Robbers the Gospel of the Rifle" (79).

In Lippard's account, the "Book of God" and the "Declaration of Our Fathers" fail to protect the poor and laboring because the rich and powerful exploit, crush, and cannibalize their bodies, and then interpret these two documents in self-serving ways, emphasizing a disembodied soul and an abstract citizen, the rewards of the afterlife and the sanctity of "Commerce and Manufactures." While elsewhere Lippard is more optimistic about the possibility of reinterpreting and reclaiming republicanism, in *The White Banner* the disembodied abstractions of republican reformism are rejected decisively by Lippard's "Arisen People."

### **The "Corses of Murdered Labor" and "Horror, Too Deep for Words": Sensationalizing Protestantism and Republicanism**

Dark and horrifying gothic revisions of republican discourses proliferated during and after the revolutionary period. Uncanny bodies haunt the gothic visions of the nation created by Charles Brockden Brown, Susanna Rowson, and others after the American Revolution; they are resurrected in the cheap sensational literature that floods the literary market in the wake of the print revolution and in the gothic fiction of American Renaissance writers like Hawthorne and Poe; and they figure prominently in the litany of horrors described in slave narratives.<sup>21</sup> In these texts, uncanny bodies are enmeshed in fleshly particularities that resist universalizing abstractions. They are deeply marked by gender, class, and race, and their appearance signals the return of what was repressed or abjected by republican constructions of personhood and citizenship: the particularities of persons and the material histories of different kinds of bodies.<sup>22</sup>

Both Lippard and Hawthorne foreground uncanny bodies, writing what I will call "republican gothic" narratives that dwell uneasily on the meaning of the revolutionary legacy, on strange eruptions of the old in the guise of the new, and on the disquieting effects of dominated but still restless bodies on liberal capitalism's abstract and universal norms of personhood. While in *The House of the Seven Gables*, as we shall see, Hawthorne tries to refine and domesticate the working-class bodies that he figures as a threat to women and, by extension, to a feminized middle-class American self, Lippard exploits the disturbing properties of unruly and distressed bodies, juxtaposes them with republicanism's disembodied norms, and uses the laboring, sweating, wounded body of a militant mechanic Christ to jump-start a revolutionary politics. Although an emphasis on the body can work at times to naturalize distinctions of class, race, sexuality and gender or to provide footholds for normalizing projects, an in-your-face body politics can also unsettle such distinctions and provoke perverse sensations which stimulate different constructions of collective identity. In Lippard's writing, uncanny bodies are archives "of incongruous kinds of social materials, different modes of knowledge and memory, and ... multiply-determined 'positions'" that under certain conditions can call into question official, abstract, and decorporalizing national narratives.<sup>23</sup>

Lippard's interest in uncanny bodies probably derived in part from a Pennsylvania Quaker tradition which had splintered in the first half of the nineteenth century over disagreements about the importance of the earthliness (as opposed to the remote and disembodied divinity) of Jesus and the relationship between the accumulation of capital and spiritual virtue.<sup>24</sup> Like Walt Whitman, who was himself the child of Quakers, Lippard believed that, "if life and the soul are sacred the human body is sacred."<sup>25</sup> While Lippard was raised by evangelical Methodists rather than Quakers, he derived similar ideas about the importance of the body from a Pennsylvania German communitarian tradition which, he argued, had tried to address "the great problem, which divides the world--Can education and mental progress be conjoined with hard-handed Toil?" (*QC*, 19 May 1849). Lippard was especially fascinated by the early immigrant socialists who had founded religious colonies such as Ephrata and Johannes Kelpius's "The Woman of the Wilderness" along the Wissahikon River in Pennsylvania.<sup>26</sup>

If Lippard drew upon Quakerism and German communitarianism to construct a spirituality that was attentive to the corporeal and material aspects of earthly existence, he condemned "the relentless bitterness of New England Calvinism" because he believed it ignored the spiritual and, especially, the physical and material well-being of "the vast PEOPLE, whom the Pope and Henry the Eighth alike despoiled,--whom Luther sometimes dimly felt, but did not fully know,--whom Calvin consigned to poverty in this world, and in the next to remediless Hell" (136). In *The White Banner*, Lippard chose "John Calvin, with his hollow eyes, his granite heart and hands dripping with the blood of souls" (135) as the exemplar of a "coldly intellectual form of Protestantism" (133). "If he presented an image of Christ at all," Lippard charged, "it was an image which wore a lurid smile in the face,--which seemed to woo the sick and suffering with its smile,--but once embraced, sharp knives started from the arms and breast of the image,--and mangled and tore the worshipper to bloody fragments" (134).

How can we account for Lippard's lurid, bloody, sensational language? Why does Lippard imagine John Calvin as a sort of devil-doll from hell, complete with hidden pop-up knives? Lippard argued that Calvinist theology effectively divided the world into classes and thus actively prepared the way for the institutionalized violence of nineteenth-century capitalism. According to Lippard, "the Modern Oligarchy of the Money power" was "the richest blossom of John Calvin's Idea." "Reduce Calvin's theology to political economy, and you have this result: The poor, the laboring, the unfortunate, are the castaways, damned in this world, beneath the hoof of oppression and destined to damnation in the next, beneath the frown of God--the Rich, the powerful, the successful, who coin their riches, power and success, out of the last dregs of human woe, are the ELECT destined to hold the wealth, the power and fame of this world, and to enjoy the eternal happiness of the next" (134). Lippard's visceral, sensational images of a rich and powerful "Elect" coining "their riches, power, and success out of the last dregs of human woe" make exploitation and physical suffering "sensational" and tangible and thereby call into question forms of religion, political economy, and government that repress, exploit, or abstract from poor and laboring bodies.<sup>27</sup>

As he takes *Adonai* into the nineteenth century, Lippard's emphasis shifts from religious to political formations. In the year 1848, for instance, Adonai dons the Tunic of Labor--a garment "very rude in outline and course (sic) in texture, but there was no blood upon it nor was it enriched with stolen gold" (33)--and wanders around Italy and France, checking out, among other things, the scene in Paris, where he meets the deposed king as well as the heroes and heroines (including Georges Sand) of February. The former ruler, now a pathetic wreck of an Old Man, confesses that he had indulged in "the Alchemy of Kings, which transmutes the sweat and blood of the Poor, into Gold." As the Old Man describes it, the Alchemy of Kings is a gory ritual that requires a daily "harvest of dead men" and "a continual current of human blood and tears." The Old Man has learned the hard way, however, that suffering bodies cannot be so seamlessly transformed into money, for "from the Alembic, started the ghost of the ten thousands, whose blood and tears had fed its fires; and through the casements of my palace, came the cry of a Million of the Poor" (35). Adonai wanders into the city and listens to the "Prophets of the Poor"--Sand, Lamartine, Ledru Rollin, and others--argue with the "Men of Money" over the new form of government and ultimately, Lippard suggests, the second group wins out as it tries to give new life to a dead social system, represented here by the corpse of a lacquey dressed in royal livery, which the Men of Money try to rejuvenate through the shocks of a galvanic battery. The lesson in all of this, Lippard suggests towards the end of *The White Banner*, is that "Europe cannot pass to Liberty but through the Red Sea." "When her people rise again they must strike and spare not," Lippard warned. "Mercy to the tyrants is death to the People. You were merciful in 1848, were you not brave People? How have you been rewarded? Europe dead in the night of despotism gives the answer" (146).

Lest any of his readers be lulled into thinking that the horrors he is describing are confined to Europe or that they are the relics of a superseded past, Lippard reanimates them in mid-nineteenth century America as Adonai visits the New World. By comparing sites of struggle in the Europe of 1848 with structures of oppression in the U.S., Lippard tried to counter theories of American exceptionalism, which are still influential today, that posit the U.S. as a relatively fluid society free of the inequalities that had plagued the Old World.

Lippard sets up this type of a response only to undermine it. While Adonai expects America to be the land of a "free people, dwelling in Brotherhood, without a single slave to mar their peace, or call down upon their heads the vengeance of God" (42), the first sight he sees in Washington D.C. is a slave-mart run by a man who proudly claims that his grandfather fought for Liberty under Washington. Reeling from "a horror, too deep for words" (47), Adonai goes on to visit several different body-transforming republican institutions, including a prison--"embodiment" of "the Law of the New World" (65)--and a factory, a temple devoted to CAPITAL, "the God of the Nineteenth Century" (59), "whose worship is celebrated upon the very crosses of murdered Labor" (61). While visiting the factory, Adonai recognizes the Executioner, a malign figure who has shadowed him through his various awakenings, performing a new role as the overseer of the factory. Reversing contemporaneous narratives that represented America as the culmination of a westward-moving history of perpetual progress, Lippard's strategic positioning of the Executioner within a U.S. factory suggests that the exploitation engendered by nineteenth-century U.S. capitalism gives new life to old forms of oppression. As the Executioner puts it, "I am better off, as the Overseer of a Factory, dedicated to Capital, and kept in motion by the murder of Labor, than I have ever been, during the course of eighteen hundred years!" (60).

When Adonai moves on to the U.S. Senate, other republican institutions come under fire as Lippard suggests that capitalism, the state, and the men who foster the symbiotic relationship between the two effectively control the meaning of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, so that democratic-republican promises of equality and freedom become empty words masking the return of supposedly superseded forms of inequality. As Adonai listens to the debate on the floor, one Senator argues that the Declaration's premise that "all men are born free and equal" is an "error," since "[t]here must be classes in this world; there must be castes; there must be rich and poor. ..." (51-2). Another suggests that "Commerce and Manufactures" are "the great ideas of America," and that the Constitution is meaningless unless they are fostered and protected "even at the expense of nine-tenths of the People, and by robbing nine-tenths of the fruits of their Labor" (52). Again, Adonai discovers that the old has returned in the guise of the new. If the Constitution establishes "a thousand and ten thousand petty tyrants, Lords of the Mart and Lords of the Loom" (53) in place of the King, the President is himself a force more powerful than a King, holding "a power such as no Monarch of the Old World ever grasped" (55). If Liberty is simply the freedom "to obey laws which made for Capital and through Capital, drive Labor to the jail, the gibbet or the grave" (71), then republican institutions are simply a kind of machinery that helps the powerful to govern workers by "transforming Labor into Coin and Strips of Paper" and "drain[ing] the sap and blood from its heart" (72). In other words, capitalism drains the sap and blood from the heart of republican institutions and entitlements, transforming words like freedom and equality into meaningless abstractions and making the U.S. democracy a more murderously efficient engine for powerful exploiters of bodies rather than a vehicle for the transcendence of inequalities.

The solution as Lippard imagines it involves world revolution, not the gradual refinement and perfection of U.S. democracy. Near the end of the narrative, Adonai encounters "a multitude of people, gathered from all the nations and tribes of the earth" (84) on a plain in the desert. These people, "all the Poor of the world," are gathered around a sepulchre containing Christ's body which is guarded by a circle of priests, kings, and "Rich Men of all Nations" (85). While the poor crave Christ's body and the healing rays of light (perhaps Lippard's version of the Quaker Inner Light) which emanate from it, they are told that only the rich have the right to the body of the Lord. Even as Adonai wonders why the multitude doesn't thrust the kings, rich men, and priests aside, one poor man runs up and hurls his body against the wall of men. Instantly, however, a priest zaps him with a cross and kills him, and in a satanic inversion of the Last Supper, the kings and rich men divide his body among themselves and feed upon the flesh. As others try to break down the human wall, they are "rent to pieces and devoured" (87). Finally, a man "clad in rags," with limbs "distorted by labor," knotted hands, and a face "covered with scars" exhorts the poor of the world to revolt against their masters: "You have prayed to these priests--they have answered you with death. You have shed your tears at the feet of these kings--they have fed upon your flesh. You have clutched the garments of these rich men--they have

quenched their thirst with your blood ... NOW THE DAY OF PRAYERS AND TEARS HAS PASSED. THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT HAS COME" (86). As the chapter ends, the Arisen People, inspired by a glimpse of the blood of Holy Revolution, advance upon the trembling rich men, priests, and kings. While elsewhere Lippard focuses more narrowly on poor and working people in northeastern cities, here his vision of the Arisen People extends beyond the national frame to include "Negroes, Caffirs, Hindoos, Indians" as well as people from China, Japan, the "islands of the sea," Europe, and the New World (84).

No doubt Lippard radically simplifies complex questions when he suggests that the Poor of the World can overcome the powerful simply by revolting and claiming Christ's body. But it is important to understand that the body of Christ possessed a meaning for Lippard and for many of his readers that could, under certain circumstances, underwrite powerful appeals for radical social, economic, and political changes. Although Lippard argued that most versions of Protestantism had focused on the freedom of the soul at the expense of the freedom of the body, he read a counter-tradition in the New Testament, which he interpreted as the story of a militant mechanic Christ who fought to advance the temporal and corporeal as well as the spiritual interests of the poor. As Lippard interpreted them, the Gospels provided a sort of textbook for revolutionary laborers: "The whole Gospel, the very mystery of Life and Death is wound up in the simple question--'How shall we give to labor its proper fruits?'" (*QC*, 20 January 1849). In widely disseminated stories like "**Jesus and the Poor**," "**The Imprisoned Jesus**," and "**The Carpenter's Son**," and in religious gothics like *Adonai* and *The Nazarene*, Lippard focused on the material body and the earthly suffering of an incarnated Jesus. Lippard's Jesus is "the only Redeemer of the poor," a "son of toil" clad in "the coarse garb of labor," "who, the other day, was toiling with his father, at the carpenter's bench," wiping "the laborer's sweat from his brow." Lippard lingers over his representations of Christ's laboring, sweating, wounded, suffering body because he wants to bring Christianity down to earth, to use the apocalyptic temporality of the New Testament to interrupt what he constructs as an eighteen-century-long history of exploitation and oppression.<sup>28</sup> While others had described religion "as a matter far-off from the masses," Lippard argued, "The Carpenter's Son" proved that "it was a part of the life of every Man and Woman ... ending in a re-created earth, a re-organized social world ... Not an ideal Kingdom, but a real Kingdom, whose existence would be attested as much in the physical comforts as in the moral improvement of the whole human race."<sup>29</sup> Lippard imagined fundamental social change, and he believed that this question should be settled on earth, and not deferred to some future state: "The Kingdom of God is plainly that state of temporal affairs which, by a proper distribution of labor, enables the entire human family to cultivate their best faculties. The Kingdom of God commences in this world, will progress in the next, and in all other worlds ..." (*QC*, March 30, 1850).

Although *Adonai* ends with an apocalypse, Lippard's radical Protestant vision of world revolution and a re-organized social world departs in several significant ways from the gradualist, perpetually deferring, utopian millenarianism that Bercovitch associates with the Puritan jeremiad, and more generally with mid-nineteenth-century American middle-class liberalism. Lippard's writing does not "consecrate the practice and theory of democratic capitalism"; instead it is stridently anti-capitalist, ultimately suggesting that the term "democratic capitalism" is an oxymoron.<sup>30</sup> Neither does it promote the myth of "a commonplace prosperity: the simple sunny rewards of American middle-class life" (*RA*, 46); Lippard's writing explodes that myth and exposes the distances and differences between classes. Nor could it be accurately described as a ritual meant "not to offer alternatives, but to induce a state of anxiety, an apocalyptic urgency, that would enforce compliance" (*RA*, 62). *Adonai* is in many ways centrally concerned with teaching poor people that they may need to take up arms against the wealthy and powerful; democratic-republican institutions, Lippard suggests, have failed to protect the poor from the depredations of the rich. Far from encouraging a ritually contained quietism, the texts which frame many of Lippard's writings on Protestantism--his labor storypaper and his textbook for the Brotherhood of the Union--attempt to construct working-class identifications among his readers that are antagonistic to "the goals of free enterprise" (*RA*, 45). For example, Lippard hoped that the Brotherhood which he promoted in *The Quaker City* weekly and *The White Banner* would "[combine] and [associate] the workers, into an organized body, because this combined and associated strength, will provide a fair antagonist for all the Overgrown Capitalists and Monopolists in the world" (*QC*, 16 June 1849).

Not that there aren't problems with this angry working-class vision. While Lippard is quite capable of looking outside of republican institutions to reorganize society, and while the collective protagonist towards the end of *Adonai* is "the Poor of all Nations" rather than American workers as such, he is also invested in reinterpreting republican rhetoric and the meaning of America so as to oppose them to the industrial capitalism that he finds so threatening. In short, Lippard often promotes a working-class myth of America by trying to wrest "America" as a utopian symbol away from capitalism. What's more, the combination of "America" and Protestantism has generally been bad news for non-Protestants, to put it mildly. Even though Lippard's (re)vision of American Protestantism is anticapitalist, that anticapitalism sometimes takes imperialist and/or nativist forms. When Lippard suggests that imperialist policies in the southwest might free up more land for workers, as he does in *Legends of Mexico* or, *Bel of Prairie Eden*, he conveniently forgets about or at worst justifies the displacement and dispossession of Indians, Mexicans, and Spaniards that this plan will require. Lippard's paranoia about Catholic conspiracies no doubt reinforced his willingness to find an imperialist solution to the problem of industrial capitalism: the belief that Jesuits were conspiring to take over the west certainly (mis)informed Lippard's decision to support the Mexican War. While Lippard attacked anti-Catholic nativists in his story-paper, condemning their "blind rage" and their hypocrisy, he still believed "that a body of men exist in the [Catholic] Church, who have sworn eternal wrath against every form of human liberty and democratic truth" (*QC*, 12 May 1849). These are some of the limits of Lippard's radical Protestant revision of America as a utopia for redeemed labor.

We can only discover the limits and possibilities of the positions represented in literature like Lippard's, though, if we read some of it. What Lippard's work and a great deal of sensational literature can provide is an opportunity to think about the obstacles some Americans encountered as they tried to respond to an emerging capitalist economy with the ideological resources they had at hand, and pursuing this topic would allow us to confront the impasses they arrived at, especially where radical Protestantism and radical republicanism devolve into nativism and the shrill cries of Manifest Destiny. But it would also encourage us to acknowledge the working-class identifications that *were* constructed in this literature, to address the relationship between class and imperialism in the U.S. more fully, and to explore the conflicts between classes that tend to disappear in many theories of an American middle-class hegemony.

### **The Half-Known Horror of Hawthorne's Republican Gothic: Exorcising the Specter of Labor Radicalism in *The House of the Seven Gables***

Lippard's corpus cannot simply be opposed to Hawthorne's. The messy separation between gendered public and private spheres, the widening divisions between classes, and the sensations of estrangement that accompanied the long and often painful transition to an industrial capitalist economy are registered in the work of both writers. And yet, while Lippard's literature is generally hostile to middle-class capitalism, Hawthorne's writing, as I suggested at the outset, has anchored many studies of the ambiguities of an American middle-class identity. In my opening I explored some of the difficulties of trying to read counter-memory, especially class counter-memory, through Hawthorne's classic literature. I want to end, however, by putting Lippard and Hawthorne into dialogue with each other to show some of the limits of the premise that Hawthorne's writing adequately represents the complexities of the debate over capitalism and republicanism in the middle of the nineteenth century. Reading Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables* in the lurid light of Lippard's working-class sensationalism, I will argue that Hawthorne domesticates and thereby effectively silences even as he ventriloquizes the insurgent voices that made the pre-Civil War public sphere a battleground rather than the site of a consensus.

While Hawthorne's *House* and popular sensation fiction address many of the same topics, including historical injustice, class antagonisms, and the hypocrisy of wealthy public men, Hawthorne tries to balance and neutralize the conflicts represented in the popular literature by condensing them and identifying them with a demonic working-class radicalism. In his representations of the Maules, Hawthorne yokes a watered-down

artisan radicalism to an invasive, demonic masculinity that must be exorcised and domesticated. As Hawthorne identifies artisan radicalism with a rapacious, uncanny masculinity and thereby transforms class conflicts into gender conflicts, he relies upon Phoebe Pyncheon--his ideal type of antebellum womanhood--to quell the gothic social disturbances that he has evoked.<sup>31</sup>

Rather than introducing a broad panorama of social types or setting the action in the antebellum city, as many sensational writers did, Hawthorne stages class conflict in "one of our New England towns" and reduces arguments about national identity and the republican inheritance to a dispute between two families, the artisan Maules and the aristocratic Pyncheons.<sup>32</sup> While in Lippard's *The Empire City*, for example, slaves, a mechanic, two ex-convicts, a seamstress, and a ferocious "fallen woman" battle against wealthy aristocratic oppressors, in Hawthorne's romance the male members of a single family represent all of the victims of historical injustice. Hawthorne fails to mention either the problem of slavery or the dispossessed natives who haunt sensational texts like John Neal's *Logan* and Lippard's *'Bel of Prairie Eden*; instead, he focuses on the wrong done to the white settler Matthew Maule--"the original occupant (sic) of the soil" (*HSG*, 6)--who was, it is suggested, cheated out of "the acre or two of earth which, with his own toil, he had hewn out of the primeval forest, to be his gardenground and homestead" (*HSG*, 7). Although Maule settled far from the center of the Puritan village, the value of his property increased as the years passed and the town grew larger, until finally it became "exceedingly desirable in the eyes of a prominent and powerful personage," Colonel Pyncheon, "who asserted plausible claims to the proprietorship of this, and a large adjacent tract of land, on the strength of a grant from the legislature" (*HSG*, 7). Thus Hawthorne reduces a long history of dispossession and injustice to a conflict between two representatives--one marginal, the other powerful--of New England Puritanism.

Hawthorne endows Colonel Pyncheon with many of the same traits that sensational writers like Lippard and Ned Buntline were attributing to rich capitalists: Pyncheon is "iron-hearted" and "relentless," "grasping" and "strong-willed," (*HSG*, 15) with an "iron energy of purpose" (*HSG*, 7). Like Lippard's corrupt senator Gabriel Godlike in *New York*, Colonel Pyncheon uses "his great political influence, and powerful connections" (*HSG*, 18) to bend the law to his iron will; in this way Hawthorne, like the sensationalists, suggests that legality depends on power relations. Pyncheon consolidates his claim to Maule's property by accusing him of witchcraft, and Hawthorne's interpretation of this action--"that the influential classes, and those who take upon themselves to be the leaders of the people, are fully liable to all the passionate error that has ever characterized the maddest mob" (*HSG*, 8)--would not be out of place in a sensational muckraking novel like *The Quaker City* or Ned Buntline's *The Mysteries and Miseries of New York*.

Although Matthew Maule is condemned and executed, the battle between Maule and Pyncheon continues in the next generation when Colonel Pyncheon hires Matthew's son, Thomas, to design and build The House of the Seven Gables. Thomas, who was probably "the best workman of his time" (*HSG*, 10), is a type of the master artisan who was quickly becoming an anachronism in 1850s America. As Hawthorne explores "the circumstances amid which the foundation of the house was laid" (*HSG*, 6), The House of the Seven Gables becomes a symbol for the nation, and he uses this symbol to meditate on the injustices that were built into the nation's "foundation." While Thomas was "the son of the very man, from whose dead gripe the property of the soil had been wrested," and although he "performed his duty so faithfully, that the timbre-work, fastened by his hands, still holds together" (*HSG*, 10), the house belongs to the aristocratic Pyncheons, who instruct their serving men, at the consecration ceremony, to usher guests into the "statelier rooms" or into the kitchen according to "the high or low degree of each" (*HSG*, 12). Thus "the laborer in his leathern jerkin" must steal "awe-stricken into the house which he had perhaps helped to build" (*HSG*, 12).

The Maules, however, implicitly take their revenge when Colonel Pyncheon is found dead in his study, his beard "saturated" with blood, thereby fulfilling Matthew Maule's prophecy that "God will give him blood to drink!" And this is only the beginning of a class war that continues for over two centuries. As Hawthorne traces the conflict between Maule and Pyncheon in the generations that follow, the Maules continue to

represent a diffuse "plebeian" position while the Pyncheons are associated with a New World aristocracy. However, because an American aristocracy is, Hawthorne implies, a kind of oxymoron, the genteel Pyncheons seem to be a dying breed. Nonetheless, in each generation, the narrator tells us, "there happened to be some one descendant of the family, gifted with a portion of the hard, keen sense, and practical energy, that had so remarkably distinguished the original founder" (*HSG*, 19). Hawthorne's contemporaneous "representative of hereditary qualities" is Jaffrey Pyncheon--businessman, judge, and politician--whose "hard, keen sense" and "practical energy" have allowed him to adapt to competitive capitalist America.

While Hawthorne believed that a moderate amount of "practical energy" was necessary in antebellum America, he makes Jaffrey an extreme and therefore dangerous type of the capitalist. Although Jaffrey pretends to be "liberal" and "benevolent," he is actually "a hard cold man" (*HSG*, 232), "as close-fisted as if his gripe were of iron" (*HSG*, 122), and he betrays a "certain hot fellness of purpose, which annihilated everything but itself" (*HSG*, 129). Indeed, in his description of Jaffrey, more than anywhere else in this novel, Hawthorne draws upon popular sensational literature, with its rogue's gallery of hypocritical, corrupt public men. In *The Quaker City; or the Monks of Monk Hall*, for example, Lippard's lecherous, depraved monks comprise Philadelphia's elite: "Here were lawyers from the court, doctors from the school, and judges from the bench," as well as "sleek-visaged tradesmen, with round faces and gouty hands" and "solemn-faced merchants."<sup>33</sup> Lippard's novel, like most popular sensation fiction, is structured as an expose; he promises to reveal "THE SECRET LIFE OF PHILADELPHIA" and to expose the private vices of rich men such as these hypocritical merchants, who put on pious airs by day and revel in Monk Hall by night. While Hawthorne fails to represent Jaffrey's secret crimes in such lurid and exhaustive detail, he invokes the same distinction between public and private when he contrasts the outer appearance with the hidden truth, the exterior emblems of character, and empty with the "secret abomination" beneath, and "the cold, formal words of the chisel that inscribes, the voice that speaks, and the pen that writes for the public eye and for distant time" with "private diurnal gossip" (*HSG*, 122). Although outwardly the "opulent" Jaffrey appears to be a "model" of a "very high order of respectability" (*HSG*, 56), an inside view reveals "the weaknesses and defects, the bad passions, the mean tendencies, and the moral diseases which lead to crime" (*HSG*, 119).

In Lippard's sensational seduction novels, the "bad passions" of corrupt capitalists threaten the virtue of women even as they undermine the "virtue" of the American republic. Although Hawthorne is somewhat coy about Jaffrey's secret life, he similarly identifies Jaffrey's "hard and grasping spirit" (*HSG*, 237) with sexual rapaciousness. "The man, the sex, somehow or other," the narrator suggests, "was entirely too prominent" (*HSG*, 118). While sensational writers, however, figured capitalism as a sexual threat in order to attack class inequalities, Hawthorne balances his critique of capitalism by also associating the plebeian Maules with a threatening, invasive masculinity. If, on the one hand, Hawthorne suggests that old Colonel Pyncheon's "great animal development" caused him to commit "certain transgressions" (*HSG* 122), he implies, on the other hand, that there is something creepy about the possibility that Matthew Maule's ghost will haunt "the chambers into which future [Pyncheon] bridegrooms were to lead their brides, and where children of the Pyncheon blood were to be born" (*HSG*, 9).

This alignment of a rapacious, intrusive power with working-class masculinity is most apparent in the sensational tale that Holgrave tells about old Maule's artisan grandson, who is also named Matthew, and the beautiful, genteel Alice Pyncheon. In this embedded narrative Matthew is both a master carpenter who demonstrates "skill and diligence in the handicraft which he exercise[s]" (*HSG*, 188) and a radical who is suspected of "holding heretical tenets in matters of religion and polity" (*HSG*, 190). From the beginning, Matthew is figured as a threat to women; his neighbors, "particularly the petticoated ones," fear "the witchcraft of Maule's eye" (*HSG*, 189). Maule's "witchcraft" consists of certain penetrating, boundary-dissolving powers: "Some said that he could look into people's minds; others, that by the marvelous power of this eye, he could draw people into his own mind" (*HSG*, 189).

If the plebeian Matthew Maule violates the boundaries between persons, he also invades the sphere of ruling class privilege. When Gervayse Pyncheon summons Matthew to The House of the Seven Gables to ask him whether he knows anything about the lost document that would give the Pyncheons title to a vast tract of lands in Maine, Matthew repeatedly oversteps clearly marked class boundaries. Instead of going to the back door, "where servants and work-people were usually admitted" (*HSG*, 191), he strides "straight to the principal entrance" and gives the iron knocker a mighty rap. When Pyncheon tries to finish his coffee before acknowledging Matthew's presence because "it never occurred to him that a person in Maule's station had a claim on his courtesy" (*HSG*, 194), Matthew steps up to the hearth, looks Pyncheon in the face, and asks him to explain his business. Finally, rather than exhibiting the deference that Pyncheon expects, Matthew defiantly claims that he is "the son of him who built the house--grandson of the rightful proprietor of the soil" (*HSG*, 194), and he agrees to help Pyncheon find the lost document only when Pyncheon agrees to cede him The House of the Seven Gables if the document is located.

This story of class transgression, however, turns into a story about quasi-sexual transgression when Matthew mesmerizes Pyncheon's daughter, Alice, a "lady born, and set apart from the world's vulgar mass by a certain gentle and cold stateliness" (*HSG*, 201). Matthew suggests that in order to find the lost deed he must employ "the clear, crystal medium of a pure and virgin intelligence, like that of the fair Alice" (*HSG*, 200). Although Alice believes that her "sphere" is "impenetrable," Maule invades it, and "a power, that she little dreamed of" thereby lays "its grasp upon her maiden soul" (*HSG*, 208). Because she has looked at him as though he were a "brute beast," Matthew retains control of her "spirit" and intermittently makes her a "slave." In the end, his tyranny kills her. While "he meant to humble Alice, not to kill her ... he had taken a woman's delicate soul into his rude gripe, to play with;--and she was dead!" (*HSG*, 210). By conflating Matthew's transgression of class boundaries with an attack on Alice's seemingly impenetrable "sphere," Hawthorne transforms class conflict into sexual aggression and identifies working-class resistance with a primitive, sadistic masculinity.

It is not surprising, then, that Holgrave, the contemporary representative of the reprobate Maules, becomes a "mature man" (*HSG*, 179) and exorcises the ghosts of the past only when he learns to respect the sanctity of Phoebe Pyncheon's "sphere" and give up his radical politics. Before Holgrave learns this lesson, Hawthorne identifies him, for the most part, with the sort of diffuse radicalism that characterized his ancestors. In the early chapters of the novel, Hawthorne places Holgrave on the margins of antebellum culture by associating him with "reformers, temperance-lecturers, and all manner of cross-looking philanthropists;--community men and come-outers" (*HSG*, 84). Hepzibah even discovers, by reading a sensational penny paper, that Holgrave has recently delivered a "speech, full of wild and disorganizing matter" (*HSG*, 84).

Holgrave's sensational story about Matthew Maule and Alice Pyncheon also aligns him with the disruptive forces in mid-nineteenth century U.S. culture. Holgrave's tale is almost too effective; he nearly repeats Matthew Maule's crime when he tries "to bring bodily before Phoebe's perception the figure of the mesmerizing carpenter" (*HSG*, 211). As Holgrave brings his narrative to a close, he comes perilously close to mesmerizing Phoebe. "It was evident that, with but one wave of his hand and a corresponding effort of his will, he could complete his mastery over Phoebe's yet free and virgin spirit; he could establish an influence over this good, pure, and simple child, as dangerous, and perhaps as disastrous, as that which the carpenter of his legend had acquired and exercised over the ill-fated Alice" (*HSG*, 212). By identifying Holgrave's sensational tale with Matthew Maule's intrusive, boundary-dissolving powers, Hawthorne figures both artisan radicalism and popular sensational literature as threats to the middle-class domestic sphere that Phoebe represents.

Ultimately, however, Holgrave's story is cathartic rather than transgressive, for he renounces the masculine "mastery" and magnetic "influence" that robbed Alice Pyncheon of her "self-control." The turning point in Holgrave's development comes when he gives up this lawless mesmeric masculinity--his only inheritance--out of "reverence" for Phoebe's "individuality" (*HSG*, 212). In doing so, Hawthorne suggests, Holgrave simply

brings to light an "identity" that had been present, if latent, all along: "Homeless as he had been--continually changing his whereabouts, and therefore responsible neither to public opinion nor to individuals--putting off one exterior and snatching up another, to be soon shifted for a third--he had never violated the innermost man, but had carried his conscience along with him" (*HSG*, 177).<sup>34</sup> Thus, at the end of the novel, Hawthorne assimilates the "vicissitudes" of Holgrave's early career to a narrative of individual interior development: Holgrave becomes a man, repudiates his radical politics, and ends the class war between the two families when he marries Phoebe Pyncheon.

Phoebe's role in effecting Holgrave's sudden conversion should not be underestimated. When Phoebe worries that Holgrave will lead her into a "pathless" wilderness if they marry, Holgrave correctly assures her that "[y]our poise will be more powerful than any oscillating tendency of mine" (*HSG*, 307). Phoebe's "poise"--her ability to balance and reconcile opposites--is the most powerful force in this novel, for it allows her to tame wild artisans and thereby to exorcise the specter of class conflict that haunts Hawthorne's novel. As the daughter of "a young woman of no family or property" (*HSG*, 24), Phoebe is herself a kind of class hybrid, a mixture of haughty highborn Pyncheon and anonymous lowly "Plebeian" (*HSG*, 81). While Phoebe represents a blending of classes, however, she is not classless, but is rather a member of "the trim, orderly, and limit-loving class" (*HSG*, 131); her personality traits identify her with "a distinctively middle-class femininity" and allow her, in Joel Pfister's words, "not only to displace the aristocracy but to 'humanize' the working class."<sup>35</sup> By aligning his romance with the domesticating powers that were increasingly being attributed to middle-class white women, Hawthorne contains class conflict within a narrative of triumphant, transcendent middle-class marriage. Class is translated into gender: working-class radicalism is explainable as an archaic masculinity that must be superseded through the powerful influences of the domestic angel and the middle-class home.

Holgrave represents Hawthorne's gesture toward a Lippard-style working-class radicalism, but in *The House of the Seven Gables* Holgrave's watered-down politics, demonized as a lawless mesmeric masculinity, are themselves the ghosts in the machine, the unruly spirits that must be subdued by loving middle-class discipline. Indeed, those who read this novel in isolation from sensational works like those written by Lippard may well wonder why Hawthorne found the working-class radicalism that he identified with Holgrave so threatening, since it is easily assimilated to the middle-class order represented by Phoebe. The ghosts that haunt Lippard's texts, on the other hand, cannot be so readily exorcised, for his "spirit of capitalism" is a more aggressively bedeviling presence. While Hawthorne's *House* contains a fleeting glimpse of such a sensational anti-capitalism, the limits of his perspective are almost certain to be reproduced in criticism that explores class by marginalizing writers such as Lippard in order to focus on Hawthorne. Instead of entombing the specter of a militant working-class within the myth of a middle-class America, we must attend to the unsettling, *unheimlich* visions of capitalism that literature like Lippard's offers if we really hope to rethink the role of class in U.S. literary studies and social formations.

## Notes

1. Michael Gilmore, "Hawthorne and the Making of the Middle Class" in *Rethinking Class: Literary Studies and Social Formations*, ed. Wai Chee Dimock and Michael Gilmore (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 215, 216. This collection of essays is in general a welcome addition to the field of cultural theory. I share the editors' desire to "entertain a range of interactive relations--class and culture, class and race, class and gender--without making causality a one-directional phenomenon, and without attributing to the first term a determinative weight" (3). It is important to "rethink class" without abandoning the concept as we move away from orthodox Marxist models that posit the working-class as the privileged actor in a universal history. See also the anthology *Class*, ed. Patrick Joyce (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

I worry, though, that in the context of the overwhelming emphasis within U.S. literary studies on America as a middle-class nation, Gilmore's exclusionary move (opening by excluding Lippard in order to focus on

Hawthorne) could well contribute to the erasure of work like Lippard's from the literary and historical record. Ironically, the middle class has been the "privileged actor" within most of the versions of U.S. literary history that we have inherited. On the other hand, while his focus isn't on literary texts, Eric Lott's essay in this volume, "White Kids and No Kids at All: Languages of Race in Antebellum U.S. Working-Class Culture," addresses some of the same problems I am identifying here as he explores the antebellum minstrel show as a "class-defined, often class-conscious, cultural sphere" (181). See also Lott, *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

2. Lauren Berlant, *The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Everyday Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 6. Berlant's book is the most compelling and certainly the most theoretically savvy of the recent attempts to read antebellum culture through Hawthorne. Drawing on the work of Michel Foucault, Berlant defines counter-memory as "the residual material that is not identical with the official meanings of the political public sphere--for instance, the material of popular memory in which public or national figures, bodies, monuments and texts accrue a profusion of meanings. The popular knowledges that constitute counter-memory work in contradistinction to the official material that so often becomes the 'truth' of a historical period and political formation" (6). Berlant's discussions of counter-memory have strongly influenced my use of the term in this essay. Other studies that focus on Hawthorne's writing as an index to antebellum U.S. culture include Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Office of the Scarlet Letter* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Gillian Brown, "Hawthorne's Gothic Revival" in *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 63-132; T. Walter Herbert, *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthornes and the Making' of the Middle-Class Family* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Joel Pfister, *The Production of Personal Life: Class, Gender, and the Psychological in Hawthorne's Fiction* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1991); and Walter Benn Michaels, "Romance and Real Estate" in *The American Renaissance Reconsidered*, ed. Walter Michaels and Donald Pease (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 156-182. Bercovitch, Brown, and Michaels see this culture as basically middle-class and they tend to emphasize, as Brown puts it, how "cultural coherence" is maintained "through differences" (9). Berlant, Gilmore, Herbert, and Pfister are more attentive to the existence of differences, to the Others that an emerging middle-class culture tried to dominate or erase.

3. Pfister suggests that Hawthorne's "self-reflexivity" (56) allows him to critique "the historical emergence" of the middle-class conception of personal life that he is also helping to create; Gilmore argues that the "textual vacillations" in *The Scarlet Letter* help it to "[undo] its own synchronizations of gender roles, private and public spaces, and socioeconomic categories" (217). He concludes that the novel works "to exhibit and to dissolve the structures of middle-class existence" (230).

4. For a convincing summary and critique of this body of work, see Michael Denning, "'The Special American Conditions': Marxism and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 38.3 (1986): 356-80.

5. See Michel Foucault's "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977). Foucault suggests that genealogy must delve into "the most unpromising places, in what we tend to feel is without history--in sentiments, love, conscience, instincts ... not in order to trace the gradual curve of [the evolution of events] but to isolate the different scenes where they engaged in different roles" (139-140). I take the phrase "body-politics" from Michael Moon's *Disseminating Whitman: Revision and Corporeality in Leaves of Grass* (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1991).

6. For a critique of the anticapitalism that is articulated in popular sensational literature, see Jochen Schulte-Sasse, "Can the Disempowered Read Mass-Produced Narratives in their Own Voice?" *Cultural Critique* (Fall 1988): 171-199. While Schulte-Sasse is right to argue that the audience for sensational literature was not limited to working-class readers, he too quickly dismisses it as the vehicle for a "conservative anticapitalism." Even when "sensational" anti-capitalism takes conservative forms, it is still important to study it to see what

the relationship between class formation and imperialism, for instance, might be at a given historical juncture. Schulte-Sasse seems to be advocating a narrow, purist position according to which only an authentic "proletarian culture" (whatever that might be) counts as a meaningful expression of resistance to capitalism. In his schema, downwardly mobile artisans who have been displaced by machines wouldn't, for example, count as "workers." See also Eric Lott, *Love and Theft*, 67. Lott suggests that downwardly mobile people from "contradictory class locations" constructed working-class identities, especially after the Panic of 1837, through their participation in antebellum working-class culture.

7. See Terry Castle, *The Female Thermometer: Eighteenth-Century Culture and the Invention of the Uncanny* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). In this collection of essays, Castle argues that "the uncanny itself has a history, that it originates during the Enlightenment as the underside of the "compulsive quest for systematic knowledge" and technological mastery that marks this episteme. While I find this argument persuasive, I would add that the democratic revolutions and the rise of the forms of technological mastery associated with industrial capitalism comprise two important, somewhat more specific contexts for the emergence of uncanny sensations. For a compelling analysis that links the eruption of the uncanny to narratives of U.S. identity, restrictive definitions of personhood, and laws governing citizenship, see Priscilla Wald, *Constituting Americans: Cultural Anxiety and Narrative Form* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

8. See Eric Foner, *Tom Paine and Revolutionary America* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976); Bruce Laurie, *Working People of Philadelphia, 1800-1850* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980); and Gary Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

9. For two of the most influential accounts, see Richard Broadhead, *The School of Hawthorne* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) and Jane Tompkins, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

10. J. Donald Crowley, ed. *Hawthorne: The Critical Heritage* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971), 58.

11. *Ibid.*, 76.

12. Bercovitch, *The Office of the Scarlet Letter*, xv.

13. *Ibid.*, 51.

14. *Ibid.*, 49.

15. See Emilio de Grazia, "The Life and Works of George Lippard," diss., Ohio State University, 1969; David Reynolds, *George Lippard* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982); and David Reynolds, *George Lippard, Prophet of Protest, Writings of an American Radical, 1822-1854* (New York: Peter Lang, 1986). Lippard's position in antebellum social space, as it was inflected by a series of economic disasters, no doubt influenced his construction of an antagonistic working-class identity, his identification with those he called "the lower million" against "the upper ten." Accident and illness intervened early in Lippard's life when his parents, the children of German immigrants, were forced to part with their small farm after his father, Daniel, was injured during a wagon accident in 1824. One year later, Lippard's parents moved to Philadelphia, leaving George and his sister Harriet with his paternal grandfather, Michael, and two aunts, Catherine and Mary, who shared a household in Pennsylvania's Germantown. In 1831 Lippard's mother, Jemima, died in childbirth. Later, when Lippard's grandfather and aunts moved to Philadelphia, he rarely (if ever) saw his father; when Daniel Lippard died in 1837, he left George nothing, though his estate was worth two thousand dollars. Moreover, the fortunes of Lippard's household were adversely affected by the economic vicissitudes of the 1830's. de Grazia suggests that the Lippard family lost the Germantown homestead, "either through the failure of the United States Bank and the Bank of Philadelphia, whose depositors lost all they had during the crash of

1837, or through a heartless and perhaps unscrupulous business procedure" (33).

16. William Charvat, *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1968), 302. Charvat suggests that "Boston firms had few important rivals in the publishing of American belles-lettres" after 1850; he concludes that "[f]or the literary man, Boston had importance far out of proportion to the volume of its publishing business."

17. *The Quaker City* weekly, 19 May 1849. [Hereafter QC in text.]

18. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 195.

19. David Reynolds, *George Lippard*, 9.

20. George Lippard, *The White Banner* (Philadelphia: George Lippard, 1851), 52. [Hereafter citations given parenthetically in text.] A shorter, slightly different version of *Adonai* was serialized in *The Quaker City* weekly, beginning December 30, 1848 and ending September 29, 1849, under the title *The Entranced, or The Wanderer of Eighteen Centuries*.

21. On the revolutionary period, see Cathy Davidson, *Revolution and the Word* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 212-253; on popular sensationalism, see Michael Denning, *Mechanic Accents: Dime Novels and Working-Class Culture in America* (London: Verso Press, 1987) and David Reynolds, *Beneath the American Renaissance* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989).

22. See Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1990). Warner claims that a "principle of negativity" was a condition of legitimation for participants in the late eighteenth-century public sphere. In other words, within republican theory the "abstract and universal" norms of public discourse required the negation of other, more particular aspects of personhood.

23. Berlant, *The Anatomy of National Fantasy*, 181. Berlant is careful to point out that counter-memory and official memory do not always oppose each other. According to Berlant, while in itself counter-memory "is a politically neutral category of knowledge and experience," when "the law's control of the reality of the appearance breaks down ... then it becomes apparent that the materials of counter-memory are always available for the purposes of social disfiguration" (149).

24. See Robert Doherty, *The Hicksite Separation: A Sociological Analysis of Religious Schism in Early Nineteenth Century America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1967), 31; Bliss Forbush, *Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956); Thomas D. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), 16; and H. Larry Ingle, *Quakers in Conflict: The Hicksite Reformation* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1986). In 1827 the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends had split into two factions. According to Doherty, Orthodox Pennsylvania leaders tended to be wealthy men who believed that elites should guide the general membership and that "secular success might well be used as a guide to one's spiritual progress" (31). On the other hand, the Hicksite Quakers that the Orthodox opposed were. Thomas Hamm suggests, a more "motley group" composed of "artisans displaced by an industrial economy, farmers with heavy mortgages, extreme conservatives fearful of innovation, and liberals opposed to intolerance" (16). While the Hicksite movement was undoubtedly, as Doherty suggests, a heterogeneous response to Orthodoxy, many of its adherents were hostile to commercial values and some, following Hicks, conceived of Jesus as a kind of Everyman rather than a unique vessel of Divinity.

While Lippard's own beliefs don't completely line up with any of the contemporaneous versions of

Pennsylvania Quakerism, the aftermath of schism, and Lippard's response to that splintering, can be detected in some of the remarks he made about Philadelphia Quakers in *The Quaker City* weekly Lippard suggested, for instance, that contemporary Philadelphia Quakers could be divided into "two classes" represented by two different social types. "The former is a devotee of the Dollar; he has heard of a man named Penn, but he does not think his doctrines, worth half as much as a good mortgage ... The latter is a dreamer who believes that mankind can be made better, and that the right way to begin to make it better, is to clothe and feed the body, and then attempt the elevation of the soul" (30 December 1848). If the first "class" allowed selfish commercial interests to obscure Penn's more "egalitarian" principles, Lippard contended, the second "class" understood that the material well-being of mankind in general must be secured before their religious "elevation" could be expected.

25. For more on Whitman and bodies, see Moon, *Disseminating Whitman*.

26. See QC 19 May 1849 and Reynolds, *George Lippard, Prophet of Protest*, 104-113. See also David Reynolds, *Faith in Fiction: The Emergence of Religious Literature in America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), 187-196. According to Reynolds, Lippard trained for the Methodist ministry but then changed his plans because he was disgusted by the contradiction between the theory and the practice of Christianity.

27. In an important chapter near the beginning of *Adonai*, Lippard also chastises Martin Luther for failing to preach of "the freedom of the body" as well as "the freedom of the soul," and for endorsing "the falsehood of a bestial submission to the rich" (28). According to Lippard, Martin Luther "had not the courage to proclaim the whole Gospel. He was brave enough to denounce one falsehood; he was neither great enough, not brave enough, nor enough like the Great Teacher, to say that No Law, Philosophy or Religion was true, that did not advance the temporal as well as the spiritual interests of the whole human race." Thus Lippard dedicated the story-paper version of *Adonai* to "that class, in particular, who believe that Christianity is not merely a theological fable, but a practical matter altogether, designed to improve not only the spiritual but the physical condition of man" (QC, 27 January 1849).

For a critique of Marx's use of sensationalism in *Capital*, see Ann Cvetkovich, *Mixed Feelings: Feminism, Mass Culture, and Victorian Sensationalism* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992). While Cvetkovich concedes at the outset that Marx's text allows us to see "how progressive politics can incorporate mass culture, sensationalism and affective experience rather than dismissing them" (167), she goes on to chastise him for "[fetishizing] the abuse of the worker's body as the tangible evidence of exploitation" (179). Such a sensationalizing strategy, she contends, cannot account for "the possible disarticulation of bodily sensation and exploitation" (189); it thereby fetishizes "the male body in the factory" and ignores the "invisible psychic pain" suffered by the middle-class woman. Neither, she argues, does such a model work for "twentieth-century post-industrial modes of production" which have improved working conditions, she suggests, to the point that "factory labor is no longer as demanding as it once was" (189-90). Cvetkovich doesn't consider the fact that many women were workers as well; in her account, only men are workers and all women seem to be middle class. Moreover, while factory conditions may have changed, it is surely overly optimistic to imagine that "physical suffering" has disappeared as a result.

28. For more on Lippard's representations of the human Jesus, see Reynolds, *Faith in Fiction*, 137-8, 188, and 194. Reynolds suggests that "Lippard created the freest variations on the Bible yet to appear in American fiction" (137). He notes that, while "portraits of the poor Jesus at work" would become more common later in the century following the rise of Christian Socialism, in the late 1840s they "were quite new and ambitiously secular" (137-8).

29. Reynolds, *George Lippard: Prophet of Protest*, 89.

30. Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Rites of Assent: Transformations in the Symbolic Construction of America* (New

York: Routledge, 1993), 43. [Hereafter *RA* in text.]

31. There is a long tradition of unhappiness with Hawthorne's ending. See, for example, F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), 331-335. Matthiessen notes that although the ending "is meant finally to transcend the old brutal separation of classes ... the reconciliation is somewhat too lightly made" (332); he argues that Hawthorne "took for granted that in a democratic society the domineering influence of private wealth would not be able to hold the evil sway that it did in the narrowly autocratic era of Colonel Pyncheon" (333). At this point Matthiessen observes in a footnote that "the emerging labor movement, dating from the late eighteen-twenties" (333) provides an important corrective to Hawthorne's idealism. While Matthiessen's point is well taken, the structure of his argument (antebellum culture read through Hawthorne's work in the body of the text, the labor movement relegated to a footnote) follows the pattern I tried to problematize in the opening. At best, such an approach will marginalize working-class radicalism; at worst, it will ignore and thereby silence it.

My reading agrees at several points with Pfister's reading and with David Leverenz's discussion in *Manhood and the American Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989). While Leverenz reads *House* as a "drama of male invasiveness" (90) and notes that "the narrator blatantly uses class conflict as a stalking horse for indicting male dominance" (92), he, like Hawthorne, tends to collapse class distinctions within a monolithic model of "entrepreneurial" masculinity. Leverenz doesn't consider any popular sensation fiction in his study, although sensational literature was one of the most important sites where definitions of manhood were elaborated and contested. Reynolds briefly discusses the relationship between sensational fiction and Hawthorne's *House* in *Beneath the American Renaissance*, 268-70.

32. Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The House of the Seven Gables* (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1965), 5. [Hereafter *HSG* in text.]

33. George Lippard, *The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk Hall* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), 55, 56.

34. From the beginning, Holgrave's radicalism is tempered by other qualities and other commitments. While he has lived in a "community of Fourierists," delivered public lectures on Mesmerism, and worked as "the political-editor" of a newspaper (176), he has also served the emerging middle-class capitalist order by working as "a salesman in a country store" and as a "pedler" for a manufacturer of cologne water. And although Holgrave writes sensational fiction, he publishes it in distinctly middle-class journals like *Godey's* and *Graham's* instead of in the lurid lowbrow penny papers that provided the context for Lippard's and Buntline's sensational serials.

35. Joel Pfister, *The Production of Personal Life*, 149, 157.

I delivered a version of this essay as a talk at Wayne State University, and I would like to thank the members of the English Department there, particularly Kathyne Lindberg, Donna Landry, Jerry Herron, and Ross Pudaloff, for the thought-provoking questions that they raised. Thanks are due to Mitch Breitwieser, Bruce Burgett, Curtis Marez, Michael Rogin, and The Group at UC Berkeley for their careful readings of earlier drafts. Conversations with Chris Cunningham, Lauren Muller, and Kathryn Claire Gage Traul also helped to clarify matters.

#### Source Citation (MLA 8<sup>th</sup> Edition)

Streeby, Shelley. "Haunted Houses: George Lippard, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Middle-Class America." *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism*, edited by Kathy D. Darrow, vol. 198, Gale, 2008. *Literature Resource Center*, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/H1420084383/GLS?u=nape29724&sid=GLS&xid=4bd07241>. Accessed 13 Mar. 2018. Originally published in *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts*, vol. 38, no. 3, Summer 1996, pp. 443-472.

**Gale Document Number:** GALE|H1420084383