PUBLICATIONS OF THE MISSISSIPPI PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

1985

Publications Of The Mississippi Philological Association

1985

Editors: Ben Fisher and Jonathan Tutor

Advisory Editors:

Hilton Anderson	David C. Estes
Carmen Cramer	Evans Harrington
Patrick J. Creevy	George Horneker
Joseph Crowley	Colby H. Kullman
Michael P. Dean	Philip F. O'Mara
Louis E. Dollarhide	Joseph E. Riehl

Annual dues include a subscription to POMPA. Subscription rates for libraries--$5.00.

Manuscripts are not solicited. Correspondence concerning POMPA for 1984, 1985 should be addressed:

POMPA
Department of English
The University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

D E D I C A T I O N

To The Graduate Student Constituency

of the

Mississippi Philological Association

CONTENTS

Three Religious Parodies by Henry Taliaferro Lewis
Thomas H. Stewart

"Today's Exception Becomes Tomorrow's Rule": Stanislaw Lem's The Chain of Chance
J. Madison Davis

A Merging of the Real and the Supernatural in the Fiction of Netta Syrett
Jill T. Owens

Do Not Go Gentle: Visions of Death and Immortality in John Updike's "Pigeon Feathers" and "Packed Dirt, Churchgoing, A Dying Cat, A Traded Car"
Saundra M. Conn

Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Medieval Judgment Day Drama
Stephen E. Rayburn

Surfaces and Depths: The Metonymic Wells of Thoreau and Frost
Theodore Haddin

Miss Ola Mae
Carol Nevels

Poetry
John M. Yozzo

The Music of Mr. Poe
Sara E. Selby

The Awakening: Chopin's Metaphorical Use of Clothes
Carol A. MacCurdy

Disappointed Expectations: Artistic Strategy in Ormond
Jonathan C. Tutor

Nameless Graces: Instances of Metaphor and Inadequacy in Early Eighteenth-Century Shakespearean Criticism
David Wheeler

Jude Fawley and Little Father Time: Hardy's "New Men"
Julie A. Karsten

Joyce Carol Oates's "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?": Arnold Friend as Devil, Dylan, and Levite
Mark B. Robson

Some Notes in Vindication of the "Traditional Ending" of Mark's Gospel
Daryl R. Coats

Three Religious Parodies by Henry Taliaferro Lewis[1]

Thomas H. Stewart

The Virginia-born Henry Talliaferro Lewis received in 1847 his license to preach on the Methodist Decatur Circuit, of Mississippi. Throughout his ministerial career Lewis served in Mississippi, Tennessee, Florida, and Louisiana. After work as chaplain at the Confederate Hospital in Clinton, Louisiana, he accepted the post of president of Homer College, Homer, Louisiana. In the pulpit he reportedly "never provoked a smile"; elsewhere, however, he gained fame as a raconteur and entertaining public speaker. Lewis's greatest talents layin his ability to write (or to plagiarize skillfully) parody. His "Chronicles of Modern Jerusalem" imitates comically the style of the King James translation of the Bible, and "Uncle Billy's Pot Sermon" and the widely-published "Harp of a Thousand Strings" employ dialect and a framing essay common to many works of the humorists of the Old Southwest.[2]

Composed in 1863, the "Chronicles of Modern Jerusalem" opens by cataloguing the characters in the narrative. Among them Lewis includes himself, referring to his association with anti-liquor organizations--"Henry, whose surname was Temperance, who was a prophet among the Wesleyans, who are also called the Methodists"--and Bythel Haynes, a resident of East Feliciana Parish, Louisiana, of which Clinton is the seat. Calling Haynes _Bythelemus_, Lewis writes:

> And there was Bythelemus, who was one of the law-makers of the land.
>
> And there was Samuel, the son of Bythelemus.
>
> And there was also the kinsman of Bythelemus, who came from a far country, even from the land of Buncombe and the Buncombites.[3]

Geographical imagery abounds in "Chronicles." Lewis calls attention to "the Province of Mississippi"; "the provinces of Feliciana"; "the city of Greensburg, in the Province of St. Helena"; and "the Great River of the East, which is called the River of the Amite." In most places the author merely ensconces such references in biblical style; the word _Buncombe_, however, carries a double meaning. For the people of a Louisiana parish not a hundred miles from Baton Rouge, a county in North Carolina represented indeed in the 1860s "a far country"; on the other hand, _buncombe_,

or bunkum, denotes bombastic or deluding speech, significant because the plot of "Chronicles" consists of a man's claiming kinship to Henry Clay and, as such, receiving great honor.[4]

Lewis's familiarity with the Scriptures endued him with an ability to phrase his imitative "Chronicles." The opening pages resemble the genealogical chapters of Genesis, 1 Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Matthew, while his final paragraph suggests a number of nearly formulaic verses, such as one from the Book of Kings: "Now the rest of the acts of Ahaziah, which he did, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel?"[5] The twelve tribes of Israel appear in Lewis's "Chronicles" as "the tribes of the Clintonites," and an allusion to Elijah's relinquishing his authority to Elisha evidences itself in "they laid a mantle upon his shoulders." The so-called "parallelism in meaning" of Hebrew poetry and classical Hebrew prose appears frequently in "Chronicles":

> And there was Henry who came across the Great Waters, and who was among those who sold drugs and precious ointments, and balms and spices, and all maner [sic] of physics for the healing of the diseases of the people. . . .
>
> . . . There came into the midst of all the people a wayfaring man, a stranger, who was unknown to all the Tribes dwelling in the Province of East Feliciana and in the City of the Clintonites.
>
> And marvelous things were told among all the people concerning the wayfaring man, even the Stranger who was unknown to all the tribes of the Clintonites.

Allusions to New Testament passages appear as well in "Chronicles." Wording suggests Christ's cleansing the Temple, the promise of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the parable of the prodigal son; in at least one place Lewis follows biblical phrasing strikingly: "'Because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many.'"[6]

In all probability Lewis wrote "Uncle Billy's Pot Sermon" during his residence in Florida, between 1858 and 1861, as a humorous diversion from his day-by-day routine; but the preacher's character doubtless resembles that of a real person. The elderly "zorter" and "spounder" who

delivers the sermon carries the name "Uncle Billy," the title uncle being one that was by custom appended to the Christian name in deference to age. After the Civil War Lewis writes that his version of the sermon represents a reconstruction of the original "from memory and hasty notes"; he also attempts to re-create a semblance of the black dialect of "the better and happier days of darkydom" before the Emancipation. The brief letter that frames the sermon bears the signature Senew, an anagram of Henry Lewis.[7]

Uncle Billy chooses a text, explicates it, and then applies it. He announces: "Ef you looks into de gorspil fur de tex what ime gwine to scorse about to-day, you'll rede it in the Prof-e-sy of the fust book in de Kings--and the words of the tex is dis: 'Oh, man of God, dar's death in the pot.'" Uncle Billy transmutes the events of the ninth century before Christ as if they occurred in his own lifetime; furthermore, his sermon leads the white reader to see Elijah as a black man:

> Well you see my jur frens, on a sartin casion, when de profit Ligy had sum of the suns of de profits eatin dinner wid him (maybe so dar mout a bin fifty of um), he saunt out his servants jis as de white folks dos dese days, fur to git some yerbs fur to thicken de soop wid. Da call it pottage in dem days, but I spose it's de same as like de soop is, which we have now-a-days. Well de sarvants want is perticler is da mout a been, an' da gethered sum pizen yerbs, an' flung um in to de soop, and when de sons uv de profits da pitch in to de soop, wun of de yung men find at he's pizened, un he's tucken sick, and den it wuz, it he cry ou in the languige of de tex, in he say: "Oh, man of God, dar's deth in de pot." An den it was it de profit Ligy, he show at he is a profit, case den he wurk a my-rack-el, and he save de yung man's life.[8]

In the textual explication, as in the remainder of the sermon, Lewis's simulation of ethnic dialect creates some problems for the reader. The extremes to which the author abandons himself try the patience of the reader, who must unravel the knotty problem of overcoming a seemingly boundless array of unconventional diction. Lewis makes no distinction on occasion between in and and or at and it.

Puns are another source of consternation. For instance, the apparently synonymous to fling and to pitch carry vastly different meanings in the same sentence. The sons of the prophets fling, or toss, poisonous herbs into the pottage and then "pitch in" to eat enthusiastically.

The application portion of "Pot Sermon" far excels the biblical explication part in literary quality. Having discussed his text, Uncle Billy announces, "I'me a gwine to run man as a pot." His extended metaphor compares a clay-made pot soiled with use to a dust-made man defiled by sin. Evil so corrupts a person that "he got to be washt wid de gorspel dish-rag fore he's fit to be tucken up to heaven." Just as every pot ("if he made right") has three legs and "two yers" to which to attach pot hooks, the "gorspel plan" has its three legs--Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and all people ("ef da made rite") have two ears "for de gorspil hooks to hitch in for to life him up to Heven wid."[9]

Another material object, a pot rack, not only retains the pot image, but occasionally reflects the doctrine of "degrees" of grace taught in Methodist theology. The entire structure signifies atonement, which makes the soul of sinful man acceptable to God; and each pot rack ("ef he's made rite") allows the cooking vessel to be suspended at different heights above the fire. The only illustration for "Pot Sermon" in "The Harp of a Thousand Strings" with Waifs of Wit and Pathos depicts the preacher and his pot rack, which consists of two upright, notched pieces of wood and a metal bar parallel to the ground. A cooking pot on its hook hangs suspended from the bar midway between the upright parts of the rack. According to Uncle Billy, most pot racks have five "holes." He explains:

> Dats for to liff de pot up higher en higher. So man's potrack what he hangs on is got five holes in um too. De fuss hole in man's potrack is pentence, den faif, den justification, den sankty-fi-kashun, den glory-fi-kashun.

The spiritual pot rack typifies two doctrines. First, as the pot is lifted higher and higher, it demonstrates that the soul becomes more and more removed from the fire of hell; however, the vessel may fall into the fire. This is analogous to the "fall from grace."[10]

As he narrates the events of Elijah's "my-rack-el," Uncle Billy impresses upon the reader a sense of a certain ethnicity and educational background; however, as his sermon

progresses, its strong metaphor, doctrinal consistency, and tight structure suggest otherwise. Uncle Billy supposedly has little learning; but, aside from the manner in which he speaks, his sermon is that of a seminary graduate. Lewis's "The Harp of a Thousand Strings," on the other hand, possesses little apparent logical arrangement as the preacher delivers a rambling discourse that appears as only random, uncoordinated, unrelated thoughts.

As one of the best of many sermon parodies of its time, "Harp" made its way into frequent publication; and it underwent frequent modification. Andrew Harper published it in 1854 in the Republican, of Brandon, Mississippi, although with no name attached; and the 29 September 1855 Spirit of the Times printed the version that is accepted widely as authoritative. The Spirit of the Times, though, refers only vaguely to a source, stating that "Harp" came from a New Orleans newspaper. In 1881 a resident of Kentucky attributed authorship to Lewis, and a privately-printed book of 1907 includes the sermon. More than a hundred variants in the text of the work appear in the Spirit of the Times publication in comparison with that in "The Harp of a Thousand Strings" with Waifs of Wit and Pathos. Virtually all are incidentals; several major differences in substance exist, however. The abridged Spirit of the Times publication lacks a three-paragraph framing essay present in the 1907 copy; furthermore, the later version evidences a greater smoothness because of the presence of significant transitional expressions.[11]

The framing essay of the 1907 version of the sermon sets the scene in Waterproof, Tensas Parish, Louisiana, on the Mississippi River south of Vicksburg. Not only is the town of Waterproof not truly waterproof, but it appears "Gospel proof" as well. Lewis extends the biblical image of a vineyard to the place by writing that the town is one "where the pruning knife of the Gospel had not lopped off the rank and luxurious shoots of sin and wickedness." Further, for a minister the souls of the townspeople make the community a "hard place," fitting for the Hardshell Baptist preacher who delivers the first sermon heard there in six years. He is a native of Indiana, having floated down the Wabash, the Ohio, and then the Mississippi River on his flatboat. The preacher, Brother Zeke, appears "on the verdant order," having arrayed himself in a bizarre costume of a blue coat in a long-outdated style, skin-tight trousers, a bright red neckerchief, and a huge stiff collar. Lewis concludes his introductory remarks by stating that the

Hoosier "flatboat apostle" presents an appearance quite the "converse and opposite of our modern Shanghai gentleman."[12]

Having ended the framing introduction, Lewis shifts into dialect for the sermon itself, which focuses on the minister's educational background; on Brother Zeke's self-contradictions; on the man's method of organization of his sermon; and on his derision of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists, as well as his praise for Baptists. Lewis's preacher cannot cite a biblical passage correctly because he cannot read, but he has a familiarity with the Scriptures. The text of the sermon ("And he played on a harp of a thousand strings--sperits of just men made perfeck") conflates portions of 1 Samuel 16:23 and Hebrews 12:23 and includes modifications of Psalm 92:3 and Psalm 144:9. Throughout his discourse Brother Zeke includes words that are either biblical-sounding or fantasy. He evades a definite citation of Scripture, saying only that his text lies between "the leds of the Bible," some place between "the first chapter of the book of Generations and the last chapter of the book of Revolutions"; and only once again does he direct attention to the Bible.[13]

After his introductory remarks, Brother Zeke begins a discussion of harps and spirits. The "many kinds of harps an' other musical instruments played upon in this sinful world" include cymbals, jews' harps, banjos, pianos, and harpsichords. The preacher employs <u>harp</u> as a verb also, saying that some "folks harp upon polliticks, while others harp on no subject at all." Next, he makes the second of three bragging statements as he admits pathetically: "Not boasting, but I plays a leetle on the fiddle myself." (Earlier, Brother Zeke states that he is "not proud" of his fine clothes and magnificent flatboat.) Notably, though, Brother Zeke concludes his words about harps by alluding to David's playing before King Saul, an account which appears in I Samuel 16:14-23 and, by coincidence, contains one of the two verse fragments that constitute the sermon's "text."[14]

Various "sperits" include ghosts, turpentine, and liquor. Again Brother Zeke begins to boast, but he forgets his disclaimer and announces frankly that the hold of his boat contains as fine an "artikel" of whiskey as anyone ever floated down the river. Continuing, he notes that the "sperits" in his text are fire, saying:

> Now, thar's a great many kinds of fire in the world. In the fust place thar's the common

> sort uv fire you light your pipe or segar with, and then ther's the fox-fire and camp-phire, fire before you're ready, and fire and fall back, and many other kinds of fire, for the text says, "He played on a harp uv a thou-sand strings, sperits uv just men made perfeck."
>
> But I'll tell you the kind uv vire as is meant in the text, my brethering--it's hell fire--and that's the kind uv fire as a great many uv you'll come to, ef you don't do better nor what you've been doin'--for, "He played on a harp of a thou-sand strings, sperits uv just men made perfeck."

Brother Zeke demonstrates no great power of reasoning in concluding each argument with a quotation of his text. On the other hand, the apparently illogical, sudden shift from liquid spirits to spiritual fire exemplifies the use of the Bible in Lewis's works of humor, because the biblical chapter in which appears the phrase "spirits of just men made perfect" concludes: "for our God is a consuming fire."[15]

After loosing some fanciful, yet biblical-sounding names, among them Hepsidan and whangadoodle, Brother Zeke states that four Christian denominations have different traits. Episcopalians, "a high-sailin' and high-falutin' set," resemble turkey buzzards. The bird goes "up and up" into the sky, but suddenly it descends to the side of the road to begin "filling himself on the carkiss of a ded hoss." The education-minded Presbyterians suggest to the preacher a paper kite because "the more edication they have the higher they fly." The Methodists in their religious practice, in particular in their quest for perfection, resemble a squirrel that leaps from tree-branch to tree-branch, higher and higher--until he falls down "kerflumux." Just so, the Methodist may at any time fall from grace. The possum (the Baptist as well) demonstrates stability. The animal can hang steadfastly in a tree during even the most violent of storms. One foot shaken loose, he hangs on with another; two dislodged, he holds with yet another. Should all feet be loosened, the possum "laps his tail around the limb" and hangs forever. Just so, the Baptist perseveres to the end.[16]

Lewis's work, most of it compiled in book form in 1907, demonstrates the author's abilities to observe and imitate. His prose writing generally consists of an open frame that

sets his stage. In this feature, Lewis follows the lead of more well-known humorists of the Old Southwest--Thomas Bangs Thorpe, George Washington Harris, and Augustus Baldwin Longstreet among them; moreover, Lewis possessed a keen ear and sharp eye as he observed and mimicked the speech of his day. His intent, however, was neither to instruct nor correct; he meant only to delight.

NOTES

[1]Whether or not Henry T. Lewis was indeed the author of "Harp of a Thousand Strings" is still debated. Critics have advanced the name of Walter J. Brannan in place of Lewis, but attribution to either is, at this writing, in dispute.

[2]Henry Talliaferro Lewis, "The Harp of a Thousand Strings" with Waifs of Wit and Pathos (n.p.: privately printed, 1907), pp. 7-11, 21.

[3]Lewis, pp. 45-46, 61. One of the anti-liquor organizations in which Lewis was prominent was the Knights of Temperance, of which Col. William C. Falkner was also a member. See Blotner, Faulkner: A Biography (New York, 1974), 1:16.

[4]Lewis, pp. 44, 52-54.

[5]2 Kings 1:18.

[6]Lewis, pp. 45-47, 49-50, 58, 60; 2 Kings 2:8-15; Matt. 16:19; Matt. 21:12; Matt. 25:21-23; Luke 15:11-32.

[7]Lewis, pp. 8-9, 73.

[8]Lewis, pp. 73-74. In view of the sophisticated overtones and complex metaphor of "Pot Sermon," the inaccurate biblical citation seems enigmatic. Without doubt, Lewis knew well the account of Elijah and the deadly pottage of 2 Kings 4:38-41. Lewis may have erred, but, more probably, he could put into dialect first more easily than second.

[9]Lewis, pp. 74, 76. Internal evidence suggests

numerous printing errors, all of which impede one in arriving at authorial copy.

[10]Lewis, p. 76.

[11]Lewis, pp. 6, 19-20; Arthur Palmer Hudson, ed., Humor of the Old Deep South, 2 vols. (1936; Rpr. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1970), 1:234; "The Harp of a Thousand Strings," Spirit of the Times 25, no. 33 (29 September 1855), 387. Critical discussion is of the 1907 printing.

[12]Lewis, pp. 13-15; "The Harp of a Thousand Strings," p. 387.

[13]Lewis, pp. 15-16.

[14]Lewis, p. 16.

[15]Lewis, pp. 16-17; Heb. 12:29.

[16]Lewis, pp. 18-19.

"Today's Exception Becomes Tomorrow's Rule": Stanislaw Lem's The Chain of Chance

J. Madison Davis

After several literary experiments, The Chain of Chance (Katar, 1975) is in many ways a return for Polish author Stanislew Lem to the more traditional structures and techniques that worked so well for him in Solaris and The Investigation. A mystery is revealed; an investigator examines it and, in the progress, discovers more about himself and the nature of the universe than he does about the mystery itself. The Chain of Chance most resembles The Investigation (Sledztwo, 1959), a curious British-style mystery in which corpses independently move around, alarming the population and causing Scotland Yard to assign a detective. While The Investigation takes place in the present or recent past, The Chain of Chance takes place in the immediate future, on Earth, in familiar locations from Naples to Paris. Though many things are different in the world of The Chain of Chance, they are not nearly as alien as is the Earth to which, for example, Hal Bregg returns after 200 years in space, in Lem's earlier Return from the Stars (Powrot z gwiazd, 1961). The Rome airport has a strange new system for protection against terrorism, for instance, and the Eiffel Tower is about to be dismantled, but it's a familiar world. Terrorism is hardly a phenomenon of the distant future, and the Eiffel Tower already needs constant repairs.

Lem has commented that usually he is not fully aware of the problems he wishes to tackle when he begins a novel; in the case of The Chain of Chance, however,

> . . . I knew from the beginning precisely what I wanted to achieve: a 'rational variant' of The Investigation, the presentation of a problem and its unravelling; this time around I had a beginning and an ending for the book but had to 'wait' for more than two years for the middle part to become clear.[1]

As in The Investigation, the theme revolves around statistics and the problems of ordering chance events. The "crime," however, is not nearly as bizarre, and its pattern is based more on the statistical improbability of the coincidences rather than on the overt, bizarre incidents

themselves. The mysterious mishaps which befall the middle-aged men in The Chain of Chance would seem of little significance were it not for apparent, circumstantial connections among the victims. It is even less clear than in The Investigation that there has been any crime at all, something one erroneously takes for granted almost from the beginning of The Investigation, but the suspicious circumstances of the accidental deaths arouse mystery-loving tendencies, so that one is once again led by Lem down an apparently familiar literary path only to find oneself in a maze without end. In this case, as Lem promised, there is a solution, but it reveals no more about an order in the universe than does the lack of a solution in The Investigation.

Though structurally like The Investigation, the tone of The Chain of Chance is quite different. The investigator is evidently a secret agent for the United States, and the feeling of a closed environment, so traditional in the mystery, is replaced by the feeling of events being played out on a global scale, as in John Le Carré's powerful books. A blunt statement is made in the last chapter that Torcelli may have been part of a billiard game played out by the French ministry of Defense and the Sureté. In a traditional British mystery, characters are rather precisely defined and the solution derives only from the context. One is not ordinarily permitted, for example, to solve the crime with a previously unintroduced suspect. In the spy genre, however, anyone on the street, in a bus, or driving by might be an enemy agent. Characters need not foreshadow their betrayals. Anyone might be a traitor. The spy novel has a much more fluid, and darker, vision of the world. It would be, for example, impossible to imagine Sherlock Holmes wondering whether Watson might be a traitor, but Le Carré's George Smiley must suspect everyone, even his closest friends. Consequently, the spy novel usually seems more modern in its outlook. The use of this atmosphere lends a deeper sense of menace to The Chain of Chance and, once again, proves Lem's restless versatility.

The agent and narrator, Dr. Torcelli, is a retired American astronaut (born of Canadian parents) and is plagued by allergies which caused him to be designated a back-up for the Martian mission. Because of this designation, he seems to be facing a middle-age crisis, considering himself a failure. After all, Mars certainly lacks any household dust or pollen which would affect his performance on the planet, but nonetheless, he was never given a role in the expedition.

He has never even set foot on the moon. As a result
Torcelli's determination to solve the case is palpable, eve
to the risking of his life, as a matter of proving himself
Further, his history as a victim of chance is a parallel t
the history of the men whom he is investigating, and when h
falls victim to the same sinister forces, the parallels ar
even more emphasized.

At the beginning of the novel, in the manner of many o
Lem's novels, the reader is thrust into Torcelli's situatio
without really understanding what it is. "The last day wa
by far the longest and most drawn out" ("Naples--Rome"),
reads the first line, thereby implying that much has gon
before and stating that what will follow will be lengthy.
The chapter itself is not very long, but it does seem quit
drawn out as Torcelli describes a relatively uneventful da
in detail. He is attempting to duplicate the movements o
Arthur T. Adams II, a 49-year-old American who was foun
face-down, suffocated in his pillow in his hotel room.
Besides exhibiting erratic behavior before his death, lik
buying an innertube though he had tubeless tires, no records
of an adult suffocating in his own pillow are known to
medical history. Furthermore, Adams left a mysterious note:

> A detail you'd never suspect as being important has led me to the most incredible discovery. I've managed to get my hands on some material for a series of articles dealing with a completely new type of crime, a crime that's not only unmotivated but also indiscriminate, in the same way that scattering nails all over the road is an indiscriminate crime . . . but I've got to be careful . . . . This is the sort of bonanza every journalist dreams about. And what a lethal one it is.
>
> ("Paris [Orly--Garges--Orly]")

In the first chapter, however, this knowledge is withheld, and we experience Torcelli's duplicating Adams's movements in an attempt to offer himself as bait for whatever it was that compassed his death. The feeling of menace is always apparent in the everyday things Torcelli does on the trip: e.g., stopping for lunch and buying the innertube; and by withholding for a later chapter exactly what Torcelli is looking for, Lem increases the feeling of the unforeseeable, fortuitous menaces which lurk in the universe. Lem also thereby increases the universality of his theme by not

allowing us immediately to attach the menace to anything specific. Doing so would allow us to fix on Adams, rather than on the larger view.

The second chapter ("Rome--Paris"), however, treats the theme of randomness in an episode of great violence and action. Torcelli is nearly killed on an airport escalator by an Oriental terrorist with a corundum grenade and only saves himself and a girl named Annabella by leaping with her into a vat designed to muffle the effects of a bomb. An exciting chapter which seems to have no direct bearing on the case at hand, it nonetheless provokes the reader to look for clues that integrate it into the mystery of the middle-aged man simply because, in so much mystery fiction, seemingly irrelevant events later prove to be relevant. This episode does not, however, have any direct bearing on the facts of the mystery, and Annabella has no larger role in the novel. It does, however, bear directly on the theme of chance. It is only by chance that Torcelli is standing near the terrorist. By chance, he saves the girl. By chance, he escapes the "escape-proof" vat. His reactions in the few seconds in which he sees the terrorist pull the pin result in his being alive, and yet the position of the people around him, an entanglement that slowed his jump, any number of circumstances, it is implied, might have interfered. Life and death is a matter of the coming together of infinitesimally small events, objects, and circumstances--most of which are considered trivial, though they are not.

All of this is emphasized in the long subsequent chapter in which the details of the case which Torcelli is investigating are revealed to Dr. Philippe Barth, a computer expert and consultant to the Sureté. Barth, in many respects, resembles statistician Harvey Sciss, the consultant to Scotland Yard in The Investigation, though he is never the suspicious character Sciss seems to be. Barth has invented a computer program to correlate large amounts of data, the extent of which make it impossible for a normal person to ascertain any pattern. It, therefore, might be possible for Barth to reveal the underlying pattern of this case, if any. Middle-aged, single men with allergies have been suffering mysterious deaths while in Italy: one drowned, one was struck by a hit-and-run, one shot himself, one threw himself off the Colosseum, one slashed his wrists, and so on. Fits of madness accompanied most of the deaths, and at least two left records that they had discovered something which might have endangered them, but other than

that, the pattern is unclear. Taken of themselves, each seems like a random event. Only in the overview of these previously unconnected events does there seem to be something evil or criminal going on. But what is it?

The long recital of facts to Barth takes over thirty pages, and as typical readers plod along with it, they undoubtedly seek the pattern of the crimes just as they would in Agatha Christie or Dick Francis. The sheer volume of facts, however, is prohibitive. How much is significant? What is significant--the spa the victims attend, the anti-allergy medication, the food, and/or their unmarried state? How many of the incidents are really part of a pattern, and how many are truly accidental? As Torcelli points out, they are faced with the classic dilemma of induction. Before the limits of the unknown subject can be defined, the agent of causality must be identified, but before the agent of causality can be determined, the limits of the subject must be defined. This dilemma is that faced by scientists whenever they try to construct a coherent theory of natural phenomena, and as has been pointed by commentators such as Jacob Bronowski,[3] a creative leap of the imagination, or a chance recognition of the relative significance of the disparate parts of a phenomenon, is needed to break the cycle implicit in the inductive dilemma. A mere accumulation of data leads nowhere.

In this novel, unlike The Investigation (in which no satisfying solution is revealed), the inductive dilemma is broken and the case is solved. Chance brings about the solution, and in many respects, this makes the novel seem more contrived than The Investigation. The solution is convincing, given the context of the novel, and is quite clever; one might suspect, however, that an artificial theory is being constructed which overlooks certain details. The theory is rational, but is it yet another example of human beings desperately fabricating a paradigm of the universe? Is Lem attempting to reveal, as he does in many of his works, the subjective nature of reality? This theme comes up also in Torcelli's conversations with scientists at a get-together at Barth's. They discuss the possibility of extraterrestrial life, and a scientist named Saussure remarks,

> Other civilizations exist and at the same time do not exist . . . . They do not exist as projections of our own concepts of civilization, from which it follows that man is incapable of

defining what makes these civilizations be civilizations.

("Paris [Orly--Garges--Orly]")

Saussure further explains that the quest for knowledge was originally motivated by a desire for simplicity. As scientific knowledge accrued, however, a number of cosmic phenomena could not be contained within its scheme of things:

> Man's hunger for simplicity paved the way for Ockham's razor, the principle stating that no entity, no category can be multiplied unnecessarily. But the complexity that we refused to acknowledge overcame our prejudices. Modern physics has turned Ockham's maxim upside down by positing that everything is possible. Everything in physics, that is; the complexity of civilization is far greater than that of physics.
>
> ("Paris [Orly--Garges--Orly]")

This assertion that the amount of scientific knowledge has so accumulated that it becomes nearly impossible to reach a simple overview is supported early in the book by the very fact that these disparate events are connected at all and by the later anecdote concerning a Dr. Dunant, who, in trying to develop a chemical weapon, recognized the very effect he was trying to produce in his optician Proque. He deduced that the drug was transmitted to Proque on his glasses and then somehow strengthened by something in Proque's shop. Later Dunant tested all the reagents in Proque's darkroom; took samples of everything in the shop, including plywood, varnish, and dust; yet found no substance which would amplify his drug. The multiplicity of possibilities which the scientist could perceive overwhelms his ability to unify them.

Despite all this multiplicity, Torcelli finds a solution in a frightening last chapter in which such disparate things as allergy medicine, almonds which have been disinfected with sulfur compounds and sugar roasted, wine which has sulfurized, and a hormone ointment for baldness interreact. Chance, of course, plays a crucial role in the solution of the mystery and in saving Torcelli's life, as he notes: his hotel radiator is made of cast iron instead of a weaker modern substitute. Handcuffing himself to the radiator when the madness besets him, he prevents his

fatally throwing himself out the window.

Dr. Saussure pronounces the final words on the cas when Torcelli visits Barth before his return to the U.S Saussure sees the case as a premonition of things to come Humankind (and its inventions) has multiplied to such a extent that it is now, he says, governed by atomic laws Torcelli's success might seem like a string of extraordinar coincidences, but it only seems that way. As the movemen of gas atoms seems chaotic and yet produces organizable dat like temperature and specific gravity, so human existence i governed by a chaos that can be interpreted into order. H likens the whole story to marksmen attempting to shoot a fl speck on a postage stamp. If enough shots are fired someone will succeed. If enough are fired, it is eve possible that three flies will be killed by a single bulle which also strikes the speck. It will only seem remarkabl in isolation, as Torcelli's deciphering the mystery seems i itself quite incredible. Given a barrage of shots, however the striking of three flies and a speck seems inevitable, just as solving the mystery was inevitable if enoug attempts were made to do so. Saussure continues, stating a theme that Lem has traced in various ways throughout hi career:

> The Naples mystery was the result of a random causality, and it was the same random causality which solved it . . . . sooner or later someone would have met all the conditions . . . . And that is because we now live in such a dense world of random chance, in a molecular and chaotic gas whose "improbabilities" are amazing only to individual human atoms. It's a world where yesterday's rarity becomes today's cliché, and where today's exception becomes tomorrow's rule.
> ("Paris [Orly--Garges--Orly]")

Chance becomes order; order derives from chance; and humanity is caught in the middle, imagining it has dominion over both.

NOTES

[1]"The Profession of Science Fiction: XV: Answers to a Questionnaire," trans. Maxim and Dolores Jakubowski, Foundation, 15 (January 1979), 42.

[2]Like the works of most science-fiction authors, Lem's works appear in a variety of editions with different pagination. For this reason, chapter titles are indicated parenthetically instead of conventional documentation. All quotes are from The Chain of Chance, trans. Louis Iribarne (New York, 1978). The Polish edition is Katar (Warsaw, 1975).

[3]Science and Human Values. (New York, 1965).

A Merging of the Real and the Supernatural
in the Fiction of Netta Syrett

Jill T. Owens

Fairies, ghosts, devils, nymphs, gods, and Gothic horrors: all come under the category "supernatural" and permeate literature from Homer through Shakespeare to Tolkien. The Gothic craze of the late eighteenth century is one ready example of a time when works featuring the supernatural were highly popular. The years around the turn of this century constitute another crest in the ebbing and flowing stream of supernatural interest. At that time folk tales of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland experienced a burst of popularity, and the Celtic revival had a dramatic impact or the modern artist's imagination. Also, serious investigation of such topics as telepathy, hypnotism, extra-sensory perception, mediums, and other psychic phenomena carried over into literature, as we see in the works of such authors as Henry James, H. G. Wells, E. M. Forster, Arnold Bennett, and George du Maurier. Alongside the intense and serious-minded realistic literature examining the harsh realities and problems of contemporary life, which certainly characterized this period, existed a body of delightful, imaginative literature peopled with dream ladies, ghosts, fairies, and mediums.

Among those writers interested in the occult and ir folkore was the novelist Netta Syrett. She probably needs some introduction, for her works are not readily available to the modern reader. Her novel Rose Cottingham (1915) is her only work currently in print, but between 1890 and 194(she published thirty-eight novels, eighteen short stories, four plays, and twenty children's books. Despite this impressive bibliography, few students of late Victorian or modern literature know her works because of their present scarcity. Netta Syrett was an active participant in the vibrant and colorful movement surrounding John Lane's publishing house, The Bodley Head, and was a member of the Yellow Book coterie. Such accepted authorities as W. Somerset Maugham, John Lane, Max Beerbohm, and Arthur Waugl considered her a gifted writer, and her works receive(favorable reviews. She made her living as a writer for ove: forty years. An examination of her supernatural theme: provides insights into the literature of the 1890s and earl; twentieth century. Syrett's interest in the supernatura manifests itself in two forms--stories featuring psychi

protagonists who communicate with the past or future and stories treating folklore and mythology.

Syrett's use of psychic experiences in her plots is not as unrealistic as current readers might imagine if we consider the intellectual climate at the turn of the century. To the Edwardians, psychic forces seemed no more mysterious than such recently discovered physical phenomena as X-ray, radioactivity, and the electron. Psychic research held out a promise of broader, richer possibilities than the prevailing mechanistic conception of the universe. To those interested in the study of "psychology," life was not necessarily limited to one terminal span of a few years, and death did not have to mean an end to existence. Syrett's psychic writings extend over her career from her story "A Birthday" (1892) to her last novel Gemini (1940). In such novels as The House in Garden Square, The House That Was, and Angel Unawares, she presents characters who transcend present time and either see scenes from the distant past or envision a future event. In these novels the person becomes highly distraught and fears incipient madness. Unlike Henry James, who in The Turn of the Screw consciously employs ambiguity and leaves readers debating whether the ghosts are real or the narrator deranged, Syrett makes clear that her characters are not mad--their experiences are real.

Syrett describes varied types of occult experiences. In the play Two Elizabethans (1924) the Elizabeth of 1650 dreams of a future when men wear strange clothes and can fly. The Elizabeth of the 1920s has experiences which closely parallel those of her predecessor. The House in Garden Square (1924) features a man and woman who share visions of the same scenes from the past. Between them, they slowly piece together an entire story and find themselves the embodiments of former lovers. The Shuttles of Eternity (1928), one of Syrett's most colorful novels, captures the mystery and wildness of the Hebrides Islands. A memorable older woman and her granddaughter both possess the psychic gift of seeing into the future. Who Was Florriemay? (1932) concerns dual personality. Angel Unawares (1936) deals with reincarnation or "continuation" and features a visitation by the ghost of Emily Bronte. In The House That Was (1933) a young man falls heir to a fortune after psychic visions lead him to discover proof of the legitimacy of his branch of the family. An eighteenth-century letter hidden in a secret panel within a mantle reveals the truth. Gemini (1940), Syrett's last novel, centers on twins with telepathic powers.

The best wrought of her novels is The Farm on the Dov (1936). A delightfully imaginative work, it is a romant paeon to the mythical days of satyrs, nymphs, and dryac The novel begins conventionally enough. Jim and Christi Oakley arrive to take over duties as farm hand a housekeeper for Stephen Blackwood, a prosperous Suss farmer. The move for Christian is dramatic; she has nev before been away from the Hebrides island where she was bo Soon the farmer begins to have psychic dreams of the pa that feature his housekeeper in a wild, pre-civiliz setting. As the farmer and Christian are inexorably dra together, the husband goes mad with jealousy. The nov evolves into a violent fantasy tale in which Blackwo becomes a satyr and Christian a nymph. Blackwood's na certainly suggests a connection with Algernon Blackwood, novelist contemporary with Syrett who wrote tales in whi trees were embued with personalities and even souls. T name "Christian" carries ironic echoes throughout, f Christian clearly epitomizes the pagan spirit. Syre handles the combination of ancient myth and twentiet century realistic story skillfully. She evokes myth beings, half animal, half human; transports them to t Sussex woodlands; and makes the transition almost credible no small feat.

Syrett not only incorporates stories from classic myth but also from Irish, Welsh, and Scottish folklore. most of her novels, she mentions fairies and folk tales on in connection with the mental life of an imaginative chi and as a source of delight and escape from harsh realit In her novel A Castle of Dreams (1909), however, she us folklore as a primary element in recounting the experien of Bridgit O'Shaughnessy. Bridgit lives in a feudal Iri castle in county Connemara, woefully neglected by h absentee landlord father who gambles away what money he do not spend on luxuries for himself. In this novel Syre captures the fears of a child who, tucked away in a mediev castle with only servants for company, believes that she a changeling. A mad old woman in the neighborhood, Eile O'Mara, convinces Bridgit that she is a fairy child. Eile O'Mara "was an odd fantastic figure. A red handkerchie tied over her head added to the effect of eyes glitteri with the troubled light of madness, beneath straggling gr hair." She is reminiscent of Hubert Crackerthorpe's Lis La-Folle who, is an old, once-beautiful, mad woman. Eile has told the young Bridgit that the real daughter of Lo and Lady O'Shaughnessy was stolen by fairies and that she i

a fairy child:

> It was Eileen O'Mara who had told her the wonderful news; whispered it to her as a rare and precious secret, never to be divulged, never to be breathed aloud, lest "They" should hear, and be offended. And Eileen O'Mara knew, for as everyone in the village was aware, she had dealings with Them. She was "fey." Many times her soul had left her body, had whirled on stormy nights with the Shee, who Bridgit knew were the spirits of the air; had danced with them over the lake, had watched while they stole babies from their cradles to carry them away to the other country. And strange and mysterious as it seemed, she, Bridgit, had been one of those babies. (p. 14)

The child finds it not only "very interesting" to be a fairy child but also "horribly frightening." According to Eileen, at night her little "sowl" dances above the lake and along the mountain tops, but when she awakens she remembers nothing of her experiences. She is often frightened in the forest by a sense of powers watching her:

> There were days on which she was afraid of the mist, of the very shapes of the mountains as they revealed, and hid themselves again; of the wind and the trees, of the black shadows on the lake, of the call of the passing birds. Above all, she was afraid of those wild night journeys, when the "sowl av her" aped away, away to some mysterious kingdom, in which her identity was changed. In which she was not Bridgit anymore.
> (p. 47)

She is freed from her terrors by the intervention of George Henry Cathcart, a scholar who comes into the desolate village to settle. His advent is Bridgit's salvation. Completely neglected by her father, Bridgit has no opportunity for schooling or converse with people of her class. Mr. Cathcart offers instruction and love to the child. Luckily "he had acquired amongst the learned, even in comparative youth, a certain reputation as a philologist and antiquary" (p. 29). Attracted by the rich folk-lore and mysterious myths of Ireland, he has come to Connemara. In

Bridgit he finds invaluable aid:

> She told him story after story in which he discerned the thread of something he had been seeking. Stories of "sowlths" and "thivishes," of water and wood fairies, related to her by the peasants, and by old women in many a cottage, where she was known and welcomed; stories which he could never have gained for himself. She told them dramatically, vividly, with a wealth of quaint imagery suggested by the poetic Celtic mind, and Cathcart listened, pleased and interested. (p. 44)

Cathcart eventually gains Bridgit's confidence; she tells him of her fears, and he dispels them. She experiences a keen relief when Cathcart assures her that the Shees and Thivishes do not actually exist.

Bridgit and Cathcart develop a close bond. Each helps the other immeasurably. Cathcart, escaping the pain of a broken marriage and an unfaithful wife, finds solace in giving Bridgit lessons. She becomes quite a scholar, an expert on folklore herself. She accumulates an impressive library on the subject, including works by Lady Gregory and William Butler Yeats. Without Cathcart's guidance and instruction, her life would have been unbearable.

From Bridgit's belief in fairies as a child to her serious study of the subject as a young woman, the romantic trappings of fairyland pervade this novel. The main plot involves Lord O'Shaughnessy's return to the castle when Bridgit is twenty-two. Discovering that she has grown into a lovely woman, he determines to cover his debts by marrying her to his nouveau riche friend Charles Robinson. In London, rumor has it that Lord O'Shaughnessy's daughter is kept in Fomor Castle and never seen in society because she is mad. Crushed by the discovery that people think her mad, when in actuality she has been cruelly neglected, Bridgit seeks revenge. She plays the role of the charming, gracious hostess to the obnoxious up-starts her father brings to the castle, but she tantalizes them with elusive, suggestive remarks; sings Gaelic songs in her lovely, evocative soprano; and effectively communicates the idea that she is indeed mentally unbalanced. For example, Bridgit makes her entrance to meet her houseguests just as a thunderstorm breaks and a tremendous gust of wind blows the candles:

> Before the gust died, a terrific peal of thunder, apparently just overhead, broke with a crash and a roar as of booming guns, whilst almost simultaneously, vivid lightning flashes lit up the darkened hall, and the fragile figure of a girl in a gauzy green dress, paused at the head of the staircase, one foot pointed for the descent.
>
> It was an instantaneous effect, but for one second the little figure, brilliantly illuminated, stood out with the unnatural distinctness of a vision against the darkness behind her. The small white face, the piled mass of silken hair, the eyes deep and dark as night sky, the slender white shoulders framed in vivid green, the cluster of scarlet berries in the hair, and at the breast, made the apparition startling enough to excuse Mrs. Stanley Cotton's sudden sharp scream of terror.
>
> In another second, with the sound of a slamming door somewhere above, the wind subsided, the candles shot up, and the place assumed its normal appearance. (pp. 122-23)

This highly dramatic entrance initiates Bridgit's scheme to mystify and confuse these people. Having commissioned a village child to provide far-away ghostly harp music, she stages eerie scenes and uses her flair for drama to keep two silly women in hysterics. Charles Robinson, the man her father wishes her to marry, is a ludicrous fool--an easy dupe for Bridgit.

The theme of madness recurs in this novel. Syrett again has a creative, intelligent heroine who fears for her sanity. Cathcart recognizes that, if he had not come along, given the setting and situation at Fomor Castle, Bridgit could well have gone mad. Her father had left her "to a life and a dwelling place solitary and weird enough to unhinge her mind" (p. 52). Bridgit emerges as a witty, talented, and lovely girl despite her background. She is one of Syrett's most charming and vivacious heroines.

Netta Syrett consistently used the fairies and other creatures of fantasy to evoke the mystery and wonder of life. She disdained those people with no imagination who, with intense seriousness, tackled the problems of modern society; she exalted those who possessed a sense of humor and an appreciation for beauty and mystery. Her works incorporating supernatural elements, both the occult stories

and those featuring fairy lore, stretched her readers' imaginations and enabled them to see beyond contemporary social, political, and economic problems of the period and to perceive a broader context. Like many others of her age, she sought assurance of existence beyond the tangible, commonsense, and mundane world, and she provided two alternatives. Her fiction depicting psychic phenomena offered one answer to the existing mechanistic, scientific view of the world. Her fiction depicting fairies and magical creatures offered another--the imagination.

Do Not Go Gentle: Visions of Death and Immortality in John Updike's "Pigeon Feathers" and "Packed Dirt, Churchgoing, A Dying Cat, A Traded Car"

Saundra M. Conn

In the stories "Pigeon Feathers" and "Packed Dirt, Churchgoing, A Dying Cat, A Traded Car," both from the 1962 volume Pigeon Feathers and Other Stories,[1] John Updike addresses the eschatological questions of faith and doubt, death and immortality. The volume is an early but important one in Updike's career, for its themes permeate his total body of writing.[2] As a youth in the first story and as a young adult in the second, David Kern, a somewhat autobiographical hero, experiences the realities of evil and death, suffers a consequent loss of faith, and struggles to reestablish faith and disillusionment. In these narratives, Updike repetitively employs literal then imaginative vision as catalysts for Kern's disillusionment, struggle, and growth.

The pattern throughout both stories is that of a common, everyday object or scene leading David to an imaginative vision and thus serving as a vehicle for transcendent truth.[3] David Kern is one of the seekers who recur in Updike and of whom the writer spoke in a 1967 interview with the Paris Review: "A person who has what he wants, a satisfied person, a content person, ceases to be a person. Unfallen Adam is an ape . . . . I feel that to be a person is to be in a situation of tension."[4] The David Kern of these stories, then, is still very much a person as he grapples with the ultimate existential human problem--amid death, even death of faith, how to accept that death yet maintain a faith in life. David's "situation of tension" causes him to observe his surroundings investigatively and speculatively. His imaginative visions, then, are less conscious and actively achieved products than graces bestowed on him in reward for the nobility of his quest. He views an object or scene, immerses himself in it, and is transported into a realm of the imagination. There he comes to understanding. Though he emerges with somewhat different levels of awareness in the two narratives, ultimately both times David comes to see God or, more precisely, to see objects or scenes as manifestations of immortality.

In "Pigeon Feathers," David experiences his first major imaginative vision, that of his own death, while sitting in an outhouse.[5] Earlier in the story, David had seen volumes

of books out of order on the shelves and, ironically discovered H. G. Wells as he was trying to rearrange th books, i.e., to return to the old, comfortable, fathomabl existence. The scientific rationalism of Wells's renditio of the life of Christ initiated David's doubts of th existence of God and the immortality of Christ. In hi vision, however, this general fear moves to a more specifi one. First occurs the presence of the literal visua stimulus--the overall scene of the outhouse and, centrally the image of the skeletal silhouette of an insect impaled o the wall by the beam of the flashlight. David's imaginativ reverie then begins. He imagines his body being cast dow into a dark hole, void of heavenly starlight. He feel eternally forgotten. Critical to Updike, being eternall forgotten is the final manifestation and determination o being eternally dead.[6] Memory is a recurrent motif i Updike, serving to connect past, present, and future an placing importance upon the individual.

David's vision teaches him of the personal, existential horror of death, the initial step in his growth process. He has seen his own death, so he knows that death is real. Though terrified, he finds a mite of comfort in the notion of his being too small to be crushed by the dark universal forces from death in the grave below and from the death of God above. He thereby regains enough composure to race home. En route, he imagines himself to be pursued by science-fiction monsters, one of many indicators that David's fear of death and eternal nothingness is a product to Updike of twentieth-century scientific rationalism divorced from the faiths of the past. Here and throughout the stories, Updike juxtaposes old and new, traditional and modern, past interconnection and present dislocation and fragmentation.

The second of David's three major visions occurs that night as he is in his bed trying to go to sleep. Again the sequence begins with a physical object and an emphasis upon light as David sees the crack of light projecting from his parents' bedroom door. He makes an imaginative leap to associate this light with a similar crack of light at the time of the end of the universe. Repeating his earlier movement from general to specific, he next envisions his own, specific dying. He vows never to touch another doorknob again, never to probe, to question, to tempt the furies. David prays for an affirmative touch from Christ and extends his hand. Feeling none, he tries to convince himself that perhaps the touch came but was too gentle to have been felt.

Having looked twice into the face of his own death, David continues through most of the rest of the story in tension. He searches frantically for answers in churches, from ministers, and in the Bible. His mother correctly intuits his problem and tries to no avail to help him first with her pastoralist and Platonic consolations and then by sending him to his Stoic, tragically accepting father. David at the same time strives with equal fervor for escape from harsh realities--in school, in his father's presence, and, most significantly, in the city. Both answers from traditional sources and easy evasion, however, are now impossible. David must continue to touch doorknobs.

But his salvation is to come. And just as hell has come in the form of visions, so will heaven. David's culminating redemptive vision results from a classic initiation experience in which he directly participates in evil and death. With a .22 rifle, epitome of the destructive tendencies of modern mechanization, David goes to a barn and kills pigeons, creatures of a pastoral nature. While destroying, David feels like a creator, making the paradoxical association of the co-existence of opposites which is so much a part of the death/immortality issue. One must kill to experience life; things must die for new things to be born; old faiths must give way to new ones.

The culminating vision occurs as David picks up the pigeons to bury them. He begins to gaze intently at the intricate designs of their feathers, again first moved by the physical object. Updike notes that David significantly and characteristically "lost himself in the geometrical tides" of the feathers (PF, 149). Yet in losing himself, he may truly find himself. He then ponders the paradox inherent in the Biblical adage of God's eye being on the sparrow; a God who would be concerned for these creatures which "bred in the millions and were exterminated as pests" must much more be concerned with man (PF, 149). Suddenly, again in another epiphanic leap, he becomes "robed in this certainty; that the God who had lavished such craft upon these worthless birds would not destroy his whole creation by refusing to let David live forever" (PF, 150).

Literal and imaginative vision, then, have led David seriously to consider the problems of evil, death, and immortality. He emerges with a refined and more deeply personal understanding of immortality. Both his keen observations and troubled experiences, largely the results of visions and imaginings, confirm in David Kern a sense of the pattern of divine presence amid death and nothingness.

Perhaps to David, in fact, a transcendent power lies behind and has its very nature mirrored in such a commonplace article as the pigeon feathers. Perhaps, after all, there is design and thus interconnectedness at work in the universe.

In the second of the two stories--"Packed Dirt, Churchgoing, A Dying Cat, A Traded Car"--the commonplace, minute images gain increasing significance as vehicles to transcendent truth. Updike focuses immediately on the critical nature of objects in the opening line of his narrative: "Different things move us" (PD, 246). David was only fourteen when he became "robed in certainty." As a young adult now in "Packed Dirt . . . ," he has lost faith, presumably that certain faith he had gained at the end of the earlier story. David tells of himself the second time by assimilating four of these "things" that "move us" to serve, according to Michael Novak, as images "for that serene, deep, perennial way of looking at life which the secular, active West has lost."[7]

The first of the "things" Updike considers is the packed dirt of paths worn by repeated human passage. This packed dirt is an image of repetition. Hence it is one of the invaluable ceremonies of which Updike speaks at the end of the narrative, and of which the design in the pigeon feathers was also allusive. In a clear juxtaposition of traditional ceremonial acts with the destructive tendencies of twentieth-century America, David finds consolation especially in paths worn by children over ridges and mounds produced by the cutting into the earth by bulldozers to accomodate cars. Updike is affirming the possibility of adaptation of faith in the modern world through the retention of ceremony. Because children still pack dirt and because worshippers still mar the toes of saints with kisses, it is possible in the modern world, Kern concludes, to appropriate John Dewey's conception of God as "the union of the actual and the ideal" (PD, 249).

In "Churchgoing," David ponders why more people do not attend church, then meditates on churches he has known in youth, in the city, and on a remote, somewhat paradisaical island. The churches again serve as visual images. Even more clearly, David always makes points in reference to the windows of these churches, the orifices through which light, vision, and the external world to a greater or lesser degree pass. Churches, of course, speak of man's and of David Kern's attempts to know God. They are, moreover, preservers of those ceremonial rites and rituals which the modern world

is in danger of losing. Though the open apertures of the island church were able to allow for greater permeability to and from the external world, the country church's windows had to defend against a "nihilistic" wind as the city church had to defend against the equally threatening presence of the city itself. But all, through their close connection with traditional ceremony, serve as yet another image of immortality, of the presence of divine design and the ability of man to perceive and connect with it.

In the third section, Updike moves to an image of a dying cat. Here he links birth and death by having the cat die at or near the moment of the birth of his first child. When David sees the dying cat, he experiences a brief translation to the level of imaginative vision, the recurrent motif in both stories. He sees the cat as a black puddle amid the dim streetlight of the night. Updike's point is that a birth necessitates a death.[8] Thus again creation and destruction are intimately linked, as they were when the birth of revitalized faith appeared at the death of the pigeons.

The fourth and most critical section of the story revolves around the image of a car. David uses his car as a vehicle in which he will return home to the farm to confront the issue of his father's impending death and, at the same time, as the vehicle which will transport him back to New York City, where he must assume the role of his father. David's most important visions in this section occur during his two trips, especially the latter.

First, however, David undergoes yet another initiation experience which culminates in an imaginative vision reminiscent of what he experienced in his bed as a child. He goes to a party, lusts for a woman not his wife, and later, while gazing at the streetlights through his bedroom window--again, vision, light, window, insight--David is led to contemplate the evil in a universe which would allow such lust and his own participation in evil. He is led by the thought and the light to an imaginative vision in which he once again pictures his own death and his being forgotten. He awakens his wife, but she makes empty consolations similar to those of his tragically-aware father--namely, that sometimes death does not seem too bad. But to David, it still does.

On his birthday, David learns of his father's critical illness and is consoled by the fact that his father, like Christ, can bear the burden of death for him. On his journey home, the car regresses to appear as a wagon to

David, yet also seems to regain the speed of its youth as the car, the countryside, and the inhabitants are transfigured to become images of David's earlier faith. Once home, David finds that his father has lost his faith and cannot face death in confidence. He continues, however, to reassure others by bestowing faith, David says, as a dying star continues to illuminate the heavens even after its death. David again experiences a vision of death in the hospital, this time the death of his father. When he sees the red stripes on his father's pajamas, the stripes become blood. Once more, an old faith must die for a new one to be born.

But his father does not actually die; the crisis does not culminate; so David returns by car to his home, New York City--in David's mind the eternal image of megalopolis. A product of and participant in modern America, David must return with a faith sufficient for and adapted to life there. Here the car serves both as an image for and as a vehicle by which David can reach that faith. And the car serves him well. Even when his will is gone, the car carries him on. Hypnotically losing himself in his surroundings, David is carried home by the car to rejoin a world in which, though the old has been destroyed by the new, still "the stars were frozen in place" (PD, 279). Light, vision, insight, evidence of immortality remain.

Yet at the heart and soul of the car is change, so even this all-important symbol must soon be traded. A single car, a single faith, Updike seems to be saying, can no more stay with man throughout life than could the idyllic innocence of childhood or the robed certainty of youth.[9] But the problem with modern America, Updike implies, is that we treat our cars as gods in their lives, but unceremoniously discard them when they have ceased to be functional. Updike concludes in the last sentence of his narrative: "We in America need ceremonies, is I suppose . . . the point of what I have written" (PD, 279). The tragedy today, then, is that man throws his faith and his car away without ado and thereby loses touch with the redemptive ritual and design inherent in such ordinary images as pigeon feathers, packed dirt, churches, birth and death, and even progress itself. Though faith may change, it need not be lost. Ceremony merely needs to be added to and thereby retained amid the passing of faith. David did so in taking his final journey home before the trading of his car. This ceremony, by nature, can serve to link man with the faith of his past and bridge him to the faith of

his future.

In both "Pigeon Feathers" and "Packed Dirt, Churchgoing, A Dying Cat, A Traded Car," Updike will not go gentle. He clings to his belief that death can be accepted, even surmounted.[10] In "Pigeon Feathers," David Kern reaches a degree of certainty about faith and doubt, death and immortality in the design of the pigeon feathers. He loses his faith, but finds a tenable foundation for belief in immortality at the end. And he finds that personally-sustaining faith by leaps of imaginative vision. He moves from observing concrete visual images to perceiving these images as reflections of divine nature and its presence in the world. In "Packed Dirt . . . ," David, now at maturity, has once more lost his faith and again struggles to regain or to replace it. In the death of his faith, now, is birth; in the loss of the innocence of childhood and naiveté of youth, he gains at manhood a car. Amid uncertainty and flux, only acts of true imagination seem restorative, redemptive. That this world reflects divine order and that immortality exists, accessible to man, are born of deeply felt visual experiences interpreted by hard-won individual imaginings. By the close of both stories, David leaves readers robed with certainty; namely, that however tenuous and changing the individual's hold upon faith, images and experiences exist which may convince us that life and truth are good and that man may overcome doubt with conviction and death with visions of immortality.

NOTES

[1]John Updike, Pigeon Feathers and Other Stories (NY, 1962). References to the stories will be documented in the body of the text with title abbreviations and page numbers.

[2]Updike maintained in a 1967 interview with George Plimpton for the Paris Review that, if he were to choose one volume of his as a gift, it would be the Vintage Olinger Stories, a volume which contains both these works. Michael Novak, "Updike's Quest for Liturgy," John Updike: A Collection of Critical Essays, Ed. David Thorburn and Howard Eiland (Englewood Cliffs, 1979), p. 434.

[3]Critics agree in emphasizing the significance for Updike of both the mundane item and the epiphanic moment. As Rachel Burchard notes, "The small scene is [in Updike]

the key to life's greatest values." Rachel C. Burchard, John Updike: Yea Sayings (Carbondale, 1971), p. 138. Arthur Mizener, furthermore, has contended that Pigeon Feathers "shows Updike's celebration of the blessed moment." Quoted in Donald J. Grenier, The Other John Updike: Poems/ Short Stories/Prose/Play (Athens, 1981), p. 92.

[4]Plimpton, p. 441.

[5]John Detweiler notes the propriety of David's confrontation with death amid decaying matter. John Detweiler, John Updike (NY, 1972), p. 62.

[6]Note the epigraph from Kafka which prefaces the volume of stories.

[7]Novak, p. 184.

[8]Burchard connects this affirmation with the one Updike makes in The Centaur. Burchard, p. 146.

[9]According to Novak, "Out of flux, Updike fashions a symbol of permanence of spirit in which we might at last be able even to understand immortality." Novak, p. 191.

[10]Detweiler concludes that the adult David's "approach to being and his defense against nihilism remain essentially the same . . . . [Updike] is suggesting that various rituals for approaches and departures, for being and death, impose at least a provisional order--an order that substitutes for the religiously based traditional order that is fading fast." Detweiler, p. 78.

Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Medieval Judgment Day Drama

Stephen E. Rayburn

In the introduction to Drama of the English Renaissance, Russell A. Fraser asserts "English Renaissance drama is primarily an exfoliating, perhaps a grand perversion, of the religious drama of the Middle Ages."[1] The dramatists of the Renaissance were the natural heirs of Medieval drama. Christopher Marlowe certainly built upon the foundation of earlier drama, particularly in his Doctor Faustus. Of Marlowe's debt in Faustus, W. L. Godshalk notes:

> Since the play is linked in several ways with the morality tradition, it can be argued that Faustus is an early play revealing Marlowe's transition from religious drama, which he undoubtedly knew as a youth, to popular drama, which he practiced as a playwright in London.[2]

Many point to the similarities between Faustus and the morality plays, but Marlowe's debt goes farther than the morality plays which developed in the latter part of the Medieval period. Numerous similarities also exist between Doctor Faustus and the Judgment Day plays of the Corpus Christi cycles.

In Medieval Drama David Bevington points out, "The rise of the Corpus Christi cycle during the fourteenth century was one manifestation of a larger movement in religious art of the Middle Ages toward what is known as the Gothic style."[3] A primary component of this Gothic style comes through juxtaposition, such things as the grotesque gargoyles against the delicate, heavenly spires of a Gothic cathedral. The Last Judgment lent itself especially well to this juxtaposition. Medieval graphic artists primarily portrayed Judgment Day on divided canvases, showing Heaven and the host of saints and angels surrounding Jesus on the top with the demons and horrors of Hell below. The emphasis in this art fell on the depiction of Hell. The Medieval church placed severe restrictions on the way Heaven could be visually portrayed, so the artists turned to Hell for their most creative expressions. The Judgment Day plays are replete with the same juxtaposition. The plays contain both angels and devils, the saved souls and the damned souls, visions of Heaven and nightmares of Hell. The plays,

however, primarily center on Hell or its representatives since it was here that the Medieval imagination was allowed free rein. Despite the heavy emphasis on Hell, though, the structure of the Last Judgment plays rests on juxtaposition.

In the same manner, Marlowe constructs Doctor Faustus through juxtaposition. For instance, Faustus contains both good and bad angels. These angels are dramatically pitted against each other in the struggle over Faustus's soul. Near the end, the increasingly evil Faustus encounters the Old Man, who represents the good in this continuing struggle over Faustus's soul. This struggle between good and evil arises, too, in the appearance of Lucifer and the suggestion of Christ. Lucifer appears in Act II, scene ii. Although Christ does not appear physically in the play, his presence is implied, as in Faustus's assertion "Consummatum Est" when he signs the contract with Mephistophilis. Of this line, W. L. Godshalk notes, "That Faustus and Christ share these words suggests that Marlowe wishes us to draw a contrast between selfless savior and egoistic magician."[4] This type of contrast forms a foundation for both the Judgment Day plays and Faustus. A final apposition in Faustus bears remarkable echoes of the Corpus Christi plays. Like his Medieval predecessors, Marlowe gives views of both Heaven and Hell in his play. But he, like the earlier dramatists, shows a wider, more detailed, explicit view of Hell, making Heaven merely implicit in the work. Indeed, Faustus contains some sixty-one references to Hell but only thirty-six to Heaven.[5] Marlowe, too, rests the structure of his play on juxtaposition.

This emphasis on juxtaposition accounts for the comic elements found in both plays. When the Medieval imagination turned to representing Hell and its inhabitants, a comic tradition developed. In the Corpus Christi cycle, comic scenes sit alongside serious scenes. The character of Herrod, who comes to represent both evil and buffoonery, offers an example whose influence reached far into Renaissance drama. The Judgment Day plays follow this tradition. The play opens to the almost slapstick action of the devils as they prepare for what they think will be a trial over souls. They frantically search for the materials they will need to argue with Christ over their right to the souls of the damned. These devils are characterized as bumpkins who confuse the issues and who stumble through almost everything they do. Their one strong point stems from their penchant for committing evil. Into this melee comes Tutivillus, an emissary of Lucifer. Together these

demons run through a catalog of sins and sinners, all providing low comedy. After Christ has passed judgment on the souls before him, these demons return to claim their due, taunting and tormenting the lost souls in a broadly comic fashion. These comic scenes provide a touchstone for the serious intentions of the play by putting the important, serious scenes into relief.

Doctor Faustus follows this tradition. The play presents the comic scenes in juxtaposition to the serious plot line concerning Faustus. Even though the major ideas of the play are found in the serious scenes, these comic interludes serve an important function. Like the comic scenes in the Judgment Day plays, these low style scenes in *Faustus* offer a reflection of the main themes of the play. The characters of Clown, Robin, Dick, Ralph, and their compatriots are literary descendants of the demons in the Judgment Day plays, inheriting from those earlier characters an aptitude for buffoonery, bungling, and mischief. Their function is more obvious than their dramatic ancestors', for their scenes prove to be mirrors of the more important main plot and its themes. An excellent example comes in Act IV, scene iii. Faustus, having tricked the Horse-courser, falls into despair and sits down to sleep. The Horse-courser re-enters, and in an attempt to wake Faustus, he pulls off the magician's leg. Faustus awakes, yelling of murder, and the Horse-courser frantically departs. It is, of course, another of the comic pranks that pervade the play. Underlying this comedy, however, rests the foreshadowing of Faustus's death, the horrible scene when the doctor is indeed murdered by dismemberment. Surprisingly, these low characters develop an insight into Faustus denied the more serious characters. Through their simplicity and as a result of their antics, these characters discover that Faustus is the ultimate trickster who masquerades sham and deception as reality. In Act IV, scene v, Faustus must use his magic to silence this group. Although Faustus can prevent these comic characters from revealing him to the other characters in the play, he cannot prevent their message from coming through to the spectators. Through the mirror-effect of the comic scenes, the serious scenes gain importance. Just as in the Judgment Day plays, the comic scenes provide more than entertainment; they show just how important the more serious aspects of the play are.

Another similarity between *Doctor Faustus* and its Medieval predecessors stems from the use of the Seven Deadly Sins. Because of the limitation of space and time, the

Judgment plays did not depict the sins individually. Nevertheless, these sins play an important role in the drama. As the demons prepare to appear before the judgment seat, they catalog the sins of the damned souls they plan to claim. They pay particular attention to the Seven Deadly Sins, noting specific instances of the sins in connection with certain damned souls. At one point, Tutivillus asserts:

> Yit of the sinnes seven, somthing speciall
> Now nately to neven that renys over all;
> This laddys, that leven as lordys riall,
> At ee to be even picturde in pall
> As kingys.[6]

In Faustus, too, the Seven Deadly Sins play an important part. Marlowe, however, presents the sins much more like Bosch. In Act II, scene ii, in an attempt to sway Faustus away from repentance, Lucifer summons the Seven Deadly Sins and parades them before Faustus. Each sin lists his characteristics, painting a psychological portrait of those who practice that particular sin. Faustus becomes infatuated with this show, exclaiming, "Oh, how this sight doth delight my soul."[7] Just as the Judgment plays speak of individuals committing specific sins, so Doctor Faustus illustrates each sin in action. Faustus is more than delighted with these sins; he puts each into practice. Within the course of the play, Faustus either commits or tells of committing each of the Seven Deadly Sins.

In addition to these major points, some minor similarities exist between Marlowe's play and the Last Judgment plays. Both include devils or demons. Each play contains a devil who is more developed as a character than the mass of devils. In the Judgment Day plays that devil is Tutivillus; in Faustus it is Mephistophilis. Both of these demons take as their responsibility manipulating souls into damnation. Both are quick-witted and resourceful. In both, the demons serve to reinforce the existence of Hell. Despite Mephistophilis' contention to the contrary, Faustus continues to ignore the reality of his damnation. In much the same way, the souls on Judgment Day realize that they, too, ignored the facts before them pointing to their damnation. Both bring the reality of Hell's existence into play in the final scene. In the Judgment plsys, the end sees the legions of Hell leading off their charges and tormenting them. These plays close with the redeemed souls singing praise to God. In a similar vein, Faustus ends with

the formerly-scoffing main character agonizing over the debt he has to pay and literally being torn apart by the demons who come to carry him to Hell. The play concludes with the scholars lamenting the loss of Faustus and the chorus noting the doomed doctor undertook "more than heavenly power permits" (V, i). Although there is no direct praise of God, the closing implies that the audience look heavenward rather than follow the path chosen by Faustus.

The ending of the plays leads to the single most important and overlooked link between _Faustus_ and the Judgment Day plays: similarity of theme. The entire Corpus Christi cycle aims at instructing its audience in Christian virtues. The Judgment Day plays end the cycle with an appropriate note of warning. The message is clear: repent now, for on the Judgment Day it will be too late. Repentance becomes impossible only when Judgment Day arrives, and the play points this out by focusing on the damned souls who have waited too long. Early in the play, one of the damned souls laments:

> Alas, that I was borne!
> I se now me beforne
> That Lord with woundys fife.
> How may I on him loke,
> That falsly him forsoke
> When I led sinfull life? (ll. 11-16)

This idea echoes through the play, picked up time after time by the damned souls. These souls, because they did not repent in time, seek to avoid facing Jesus and Judgment, for they know the outcome. They realize, too, that they deserve their fate, that their punishment is just. Underlying all rests the notion that several opportunities were missed. One demon points out "All this was token domysday to drede./ Full oft was it spokyn; full few take hede" (ll. 197-198). The play continually reminds the audience that the ways of this world are to be shunned since the wages of sin are eternal death. It also seeks immediate results. One purpose of depicting Hell so graphically is to frighten the people into returning to God and his Church before that graphic Hell becomes a reality. Implicit in this play lies the idea that no one will know when the Day of Judgment is coming, so one had better take no chances.

Faustus is much less obvious with this theme. Indeed, many critics feel the play has no significant religious comment to make. The religious theme may not be avoided,

however. Paul H. Kocher asserts: "Faustus is the only one of Marlowe's plays in which the pivotal issue is strictly religious and the whole design rests upon Protestant doctrines. This issue, stated simply, is whether Faustus shall choose God or the evil delights of witchcraft."[8] The entire dramatic tension of the play depends on the struggle within Faustus between damnation and repentance. Each time Faustus reaches the point of repenting, Mephistophilis or some other demon is there to sway him away. Faustus knows, too, when his "Judgment Day" is coming, yet he refuses to repent until it is too late. Because of his hesitancy, he suffers the mutilations of Hell in the end. Even more clearly than in the Corpus Christi cycle, then, the audience receives the message that the time to repent is now. Faustus is Everyman. The Prologue to Act I describes him in terms that encompass virtually every strata of social life. He was born to poor parents, rose through societal ranks by education, became accepted by the gentry. He knew theology, law, and medicine. He was a true Renaissance man. The audience identifies with him. The theme plays off of that identification, for if Faustus can make a pact with Lucifer, so can anyone. The play shows that Faustus fails to realize the extent of his error, avoids repentance, and suffers a horrible death. Like the Medieval Judgment plays, Doctor Faustus portrays the judgment of a soul for the purpose of educating the audience to prevent their making the same mistake.

To say that Marlowe deliberately drew from the Medieval Judgment Day plays when constructing his play would be overstating the case. Yet there are enough echoes of the earlier plays in this particular Renaissance work to assume that the Corpus Christi cycles shaped Marlowe's ideas of drama in part. Obviously, Marlowe's debt to earlier drama goes back farther than the morality tradition of the late Medieval period. Doctor Faustus, then, becomes an even more important work in the development of English drama.

NOTES

[1]Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin, eds., Drama of the English Renaissance (New York, 1976), p. 1.

[2]W. L. Godshalk, The Marlovian World Picture (The Hague, 1974), p. 27.

[3]David Bevington, Medieval Drama (Boston, 1975), p. 233.

[4]Godshalk, p. 189.

[5]Robert J. Fehrenback, Lea Ann Boone, and Mario A. DiCesare, eds., A Concordance to the Plays, Poems, Translations of Christopher Marlowe (Ithaca, NY, 1982).

[6]"Last Judgment," in Medieval Drama, ed. David Bevington (Boston, 1975), p. 648. All subsequent references to this play will be followed in the text by the line number from this source.

[7]Christopher Marlowe, Doctor Faustus, in Drama of the English Renaissance, eds. Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin (New York, 1976), p. 306. All subsequent references will note act and scene as found in this volume.

[8]Paul H. Kocher, Christopher Marlowe: A Study of his Thought, Learning, and Character (Chapel Hill, 1946), p. 104.

Surfaces and Depths: The Metonymic Wells of Thoreau and Frost

Theodore Haddin

Citing parallels or sources, critics have established that Robert Frost had more than a passing acquaintance with Thoreau's *Walden*. It now seems clear enough to us that Frost's reading of parts of the chapter on "Former Inhabitants and Winter Visitors" influenced his writing of an important poem, "Directive."[1] His admiration of Thoreau as "self-cast away" and his preference for the loon passage in "Brute Neighbors" are further evidence of his appreciation of *Walden*. Like Thoreau, Frost had the habit of metamorphosing his experience in a poem as he came at the truth. I propose here to make use of yet another parallel--this time one of perception--that occurs when Thoreau describes his pond as a well and when Frost views the well in his relatively undiscussed poem "For Once, Then, Something." Examining this poem in the light of our reading of *Walden* shows the poem to be a paradigm of Thoreau's perception of the pond and leads to an understanding of the self-truth that we find in many of Frost's poems, often revealed through surrogate or metonymic images[2] of a well (the lake, spring, brook, or cellar hole), the object through which the speaker's self evolves from poem to poem as meaning. Attention to this meaning helps us to understand both writers' symbolistic use of language.

I

We have heard a good deal about Thoreau's pond as symbol, but little on the matter that he often called it a *well*. In the New England of Thoreau's day, much concerning the history of the farm and life of the farmer was implied by the quality of the well. We are amused, perhaps, by Thoreau's comment on John Field's well in "Baker Farm" as he says, "When I had got without I asked for a drink, hoping to get a sight of the well bottom, to complete my survey of the premises; but there, alas! are shallows and quicksands, and rope broken withal, and bucket irrecoverable,"[3] an image that seems later to have haunted both Thoreau and Frost.[4] By comparison with the water of Walden, the drink o "seemingly distilled . . . not yet suffered to cool, not ye to settle" which was finally passed out to him gave a accurate picture of the low life at John Field's. Thoreau'

pond, on the other hand, was his "well ready dug":

> A clear and deep green well . . . a perennial spring in the midst of pine and oak woods, without any visible inlet or outlet . . . The water is so transparent that the bottom can easily be discerned at the depth of twenty-five or thirty feet . . . . I do not know a third of this pure and well-like character. (W, 159, 161)

Having once asserted that the bottom of his well "can be easily discerned," Thoreau has prepared us for the experience of looking into his well and of sharing the truth he has already, through numerous perceptions, found there. Frost makes this same gesture to us in several of his poems.

At various places in Walden, Thoreau puts the matter broadly: "I will endeavor to speak a good word for the truth" ("Economy"); "No face which we can give to a matter will stead us so well at last as the truth" ("Conclusion"); "Rather than love, than money, than fame, give me the truth" ("Conclusion"). It does not take an extensive reading of Walden to determine that Thoreau's "truth" is of a more than ordinary sort: it is self-truth, ultimately related to the Divine. In the parallel with Frost, the quality of this truth is revealed by the manner in which he looks into the well and by the variety of things which he sees in it. But there is an essential difference in the end of their perceptions. This difference is evident by reference to an oft-quoted passage of Thoreau's, "Time is the stream I go a-fishing in. I drink at it; but while I drink I see the sandy bottom and detect how shallow it is. Its thin current slides away, but eternity remains. I would drink deeper; fish in the sky, whose bottom is pebbly with stars" (W, 88). For Frost, the experience of the concrete ends with the poem he writes; there is no ordered universe outside the order Frost can make of his immediate experience. Frost's aim is not transcendental union, but the understanding of being itself that can only occur in time as the self perceives from poem to poem.

Thoreau's interest in reflections of all sorts constitutes a subject too elaborate for the present paper, but one which I shall discuss in a future article.[5] Likewise, time does not permit treatment of all the poems of Frost that could be developed here. Suffice that the surfaces and depths of Walden, which alternately attracted Thoreau's attention, called forth some of his most elaborate

and satisfying descriptions, revealing in the process the manner by which the mind experiences truth. Though Frost's end was avowedly not the same as Thoreau's, he was similarly interested in this process for himself.[6]

Thoreau combines interest in fact with mystery. He first hints at a historical or mythical background to his well by citing "the account of that ancient settler . . . who remembers so well when he first came here with his divining-rod," and "saw a thin vapor rising from the sward, and the hazel pointed steadily downward, and he concluded to dig a well here" (W, 165). Then, in observing the stones under the water, he speculates:

> At first you wonder if the Indians could have formed them on the ice for any purpose, and so, when the ice melted, they sank to the bottom; but they are too regular and some of them plainly too fresh for that. They are similar to those found in rivers; but as there are no suckers nor lampreys here, I know not by what fish they could be made. Perhaps they are the nests of the chivin. *These lend a pleasing mystery to the bottom.* (W, 168, italics mine)

Although Thoreau does not give a direct answer at this point as to what the mystery of the bottom is, his speculations are calculated to evoke in the reader the manner by which perceptions can, and do, lead us to the truth, to *reality*, the "hard bottom" he speaks of in his second chapter.[7] Everything is in the looking. Next, in one of his most significant statements about the pond, he says, "It is earth's eye; looking into which the beholder measures the depth of his own nature" (W, 168). Thoreau's identity with the well here has a two-fold purpose: it is the means of measuring the truth about the self and, in a larger sense, about the truth that in time comprises the history of his perceptions of the pond, his great self-truth, that is, after all, his main purpose everywhere in *Walden*.

This latter is always an active enterprise of his evolving perceptions, all different, yet connected. They are related as the parts to the whole, or they sometimes stand for the whole. If we could put all of the mind's perceptions back together at once, we would have a complete history of the mind, but we never do this. Thus *some* objects become self-identified and stand for the whole

because we come closest to realizing this sense of wholeness when we perceive these particular objects. These are metonymic images. Thoreau consciously describes this process in one of his surface-scenes of Walden:

> Not a pickerel or shiner picks an insect from this smooth surface but it manifestly disturbs the equilibrium of the whole lake. . . . Not a fish can leap or an insect fall on the pond but it is thus reported in circling dimples, in lines of beauty, as it were the constant welling up of its fountain. . . . Nothing so fair, so pure, and at the same time so large, as a lake, perchance, lies on the surface of the earth. . . . a mirror in which all impurity presented to it sinks, swept and dusted by the sun's hazy brush,--this the light dust-cloth,--which retains no breath that is breathed on it, but sends its own to float as clouds high above its surface, and be reflected in its bosom still. . . . It is remarkable that we can look down on its surface. (W, 169-170)

The pickerel, the shiner, and insect are connected to the "whole lake" by their capacity to affect the equilibrium of its surface. Thoreau's self participates in this same experience of the whole in the act of perceiving the connection and in writing about it. And the lake will go "in circling dimples" later still in the reader. Thus Thoreau's perceptions of his well ultimately give a personal character to the pond itself, as of a mind in the act of perceiving itself and creating its own truth.

II

Surfaces, as well as the mystery of the bottom, attracted Frost, too, especially in his poem "For Once, Then, Something." It closely parallels Thoreau's habit of looking at and into his pond:

> Others taunt me with having knelt at well-curbs
> Always wrong to the light, so never seeing
> Deeper down in the well than where the water
> Gives me back in a shining surface picture
> Me myself in the summer heaven godlike
> Looking out of a wreath of fern and cloud puffs.
> Once, when trying with chin against a well-curb,

I discerned, as I thought, beyond the picture,
Through the picture, a something white, uncertain,
Something more of the depths--and then lost it.
One drop fell from a fern, and lo, a ripple
Shook whatever it was lay there at the bottom,
Blurred it, blotted it out. What was that whiteness?
Truth? A pebble of quartz? For once, then, something.[8]

As brief as this poem is, it goes far in helping us to connect the two writers. Frost pared down much of Thoreau's experience of looking to a scant, fifteen-line sonnet, but many of the elements of Thoreau's pattern of perception are there--the habit of an original way of seeing, the image of the self reflected in water, the yielding of a new perception upon the intrusion of natural fact, and the perceiver left to deal with his new perception, which includes the object's being lost. The extent of the similarity here is perhaps not apparent until we recall that, to perceive the object in the first place, Frost must lose himself, a concept quite evident in Frost's "Lost in Heaven" and in more important poems like "A Fountain, a Bottle, a Donkey's Ears and Some Books," and "Directive." This act recalls Thoreau's "Not till we are completely lost, or turned around . . . do we appreciate the vastness and strangeness of nature. . . . not till we have lost the world, do we begin to find ourselves" (W, 154-155). This finding of ourselves is what Walden and the poems of Frost are about.

In "For Once, Then, Something" the speaker's habit of looking at the surface of water in a well has yielded a second possibility, that of truth beyond the reflection of the self. The first possibility mimics the myth of Narcissus, while the second instigates the problem altogether of how the mind perceives reality, how it comes at the truth, as when Thoreau speculates about the origin of the stones on the bottom of Walden. "A something white," "uncertain," "something more of the depths," "whatever it was," "a pebble of quartz" are all terms which express the mind's attempt to reduce the uncertainty of the object to the concrete. The only thing Frost does not do is tell exactly what was in the bottom. He cannot, for he does not know, and the poem captures the mind in the act of attempting to perceive it. Possibly, the pebble of quartz, like the insects in the previously-quoted passage by Thoreau, may be a metonymic image of the "truth." Frost makes a successful metaphor of truth-seeking. For once he

was able to get beyond the reflection which, as "others" imply, is the way of delusion.

Truth, whether regarded as the object or as a way of seeing, will nevertheless require a greater expenditure of effort than the subject was aware of at the beginning of the poem--at the moment when the perceiver looked over the well-curb. The poem thus describes the two acts of perception as the subject's willingness to enjoy the possibilities of whatever truth his looking will bring, from the delusion of self-enjoyment to the elusiveness of fact itself. Reality, for Frost, inheres in this willingness of the self to exist in a somewhat contradictory, incomplete state that is always self-generating from the facts of experience. While this process may place limitations on the individual's capacity for knowing, the observer, like Thoreau, may become an extraordinarily exacting perceiver of everything that is. This process constitutes, per se, the real subject of Frost's poetry.

I should like to quote here from a passage in Thoreau's Walden which, if it did not influence Frost directly, at least demonstrates a fine similarity in their ways of approaching truth. On a November afternoon, paddling his boat when the surface of Walden was particularly smooth, Thoreau says:

> But, as I was looking over the surface, I saw here and there at a distance a faint glimmer, as if some skater insects which had escaped the frosts might be collected there, or, perchance, the surface, being so smooth, betrayed where a spring welled up from the bottom. Paddling gently to one of these places, I was surprised to find myself surrounded by myriads of small perch, about five inches long, of a rich bronze color in the green water, sporting there, and constantly rising to the surface and dimpling it, sometimes leaving bubbles on it. In such transparent and seemingly bottomless water, reflecting the clouds, I seemed to be floating through the air as in a balloon, and their swimming impressed me as a kind of flight or hovering, as if they were a compact flock of birds passing just beneath my level on the right or left, their fins, like sails, set all around them. . . . When I approached carelessly and alarmed them, they made a sudden plash and rippling with their tails, as if one had struck

> the water with a brushy bough, and instantly took refuge in the depths. . . . Even as late as the fifth of December, one year, I saw some dimples on the surface, and thinking it was going to rain hard immediately, the air being full of mist, I made haste to take my place at the oars and row homeward; already the rain seemed rapidly increasing, though I felt none at my cheek, and I anticipated a thorough soaking. But suddenly the dimples ceased, for they were produced by the perch, which the noise of my oars had scared into the depths, and I saw their schools dimly disappearing; so I spent a dry afternoon after all. (W, 171-172)

In this passage Thoreau is concerned about surfaces and depths, and he is, like Frost, aware of illusions at the surface, and he is enjoying the possibilities of both. At first, paddling over the surface, he sees what seems to be skater insects or a spring welling up from the bottom; but approaching the place, he discovers the natural fact, the "myriads of small perch, about five inches long . . . rising to the surface." Then, like Frost's "Me myself in the summer heaven godlike," Thoreau describes himself "as in a balloon" floating in the air, over the apparently "bottomless water." Like Frost's "One drop from a fern," Thoreau--himself a natural fact--disturbs the perch and they vanish "in the depths." In the other example he gives, the perch create the illusion that it is raining on the surface--Thoreau hastening to "row homeward"--but again, as his oars disturb the surface, the perch disappear "into the depths." Thoreau's abrupt but comic realization, "I spent a dry afternoon after all," compared with the splendid play in himself of surfaces and depths in the earlier passage, causes us to recast our assumptions about "the truth" and which sort of it indeed is the more valuable. Thoreau shows that both are needed.

This passage of Thoreau's is a realistic prelude to further comment about the mystery of the bottom of Walden, for it prepares the reader for the more nearly mythological commentary by Thoreau that might resist our belief, were it not for the way in which he has attuned our senses to focus upon concrete, natural facts (the perch) which have their origin in the depths. Thoreau can thus tell of an old man who "used an old log canoe which he [had] found on the shore," (W, 172) crudely made by someone before him, which

had sunk to the bottom. "It belonged to the pond" (W, 172).

Thoreau then tells how pleased he was "to hear of the old canoe," for it probably

> took the place of an Indian one of the same material but more graceful construction, which perchance had first been a tree on the bank, and then, as it were, fell into the water, to float there for a generation, the most proper vessel for the lake. I remember that when I first looked into these depths there were many large trunks to be seen indistinctly lying on the bottom, which had either been blown over formerly, or left on the ice at the last cutting, when wood was cheaper; but now they have mostly disappeared. (W, 173)

The canoe, the trees, and even an old iron chest previously mentioned by Thoreau become metonymic images of the bottom. In comparing the old log canoe, the Indian one, and the tree that had fallen into the water--"the most proper vessel for the lake"--Thoreau quickly antedates the makers of canoes to the original natural fact, indeed, by implication to the original Maker of the tree, when the shore of the pond was nearer its original state of creation. Thoreau connects himself with this time when he says that upon "first looking into these depths" he had seen "many large trunks" that had either been blown over formerly (italics mine) "or left on the ice at the last cutting." The latter possibility brings the truth in the pond closer to Thoreau's day, but the so-called unchanging pond can, as it were, both create and erase time by taking it back into itself. The old iron chest that recedes when we go for it is the same sort of gesture Frost was to make in "For Once, Then, Something."

Thoreau's self is ultimately identified with the earliest natural fact, the making of the pond, and the divine Maker of it. As when he first saw it,

> The same thought is welling up to its surface that was then; it is the same liquid joy and happiness to itself and to its Maker, ay, and it may be to me. It is the work of a brave man surely, in whom there was no guile! He rounded this water with his hand, deepened and clarified it in his thought, and in his will bequeathed it to Concord. (W, 174-175)

In keeping with his use of the well image, Thoreau celebrates the "thought . . . welling up to its surface," that may be a joy to him. His identity with it conveys the sense of the lines in John 4:14, where Christ says, "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." In the whole of Walden and in his life, Thoreau was always close to this truth.

Looking before and after "For Once, Then, Something" (published in 1928), we can now see how Frost sometimes uses the image of a natural well (a spring or a brook, which may not be quite the same), or how, in the absence of a literal well, he speaks of the "cellar hole" that represents the foundation of a house or family, the broken cisterns, as it were of Ecclesiastes and closed wells and cellar holes of Walden. In contrast to the single pond, Frost seems to have needed to divide his attention, in some of his more significant poems, about equally between the cellar hole and the brook. Sometimes he is all cellar hole, as in "Ghost House," or all brook, as in "West-Running Brook." But the perceiving and creating self that focuses upon these inspires us to learn the Divine secret of Walden. There remain several of Frost's poems which can be discussed in these contexts.

NOTES

[1]See S. P. C. Duvall, "Robert Frost's 'Directive' Out of Walden," AL, 31 (1960), 482-488. See also Lyle F. Domina, "Thoreau and Frost: The Search for Reality," BSUF, 19, iv (1978), 67-72, which attempts to connect Thoreau and Frost on more general grounds.

[2]Cf. Darrell Abel, "Black Glove and Pink Ribbon: Hawthorne's Metonymic Symbols," NEQ, 42 (1969), 163-180.

[3]Henry Thoreau, Walden and Other Writings, edited Brooks Atkinson (New York, 1950), p. 186. All quotations from Walden are from this edition and are indicated in the text by the abbreviation W and the page number following the quote. Some references are given by chapter heading only.

[4]See also Whittier's reference to the well-sweep in "Telling the Bees," and compare Whitman's description of the old cellar hole in "The Maternal Homestead" section of Specimen Days.

[5]See Richard J. Schneider, "Reflections in Walden Pond: Thoreau's Optics," Emerson Society Quarterly, 21 (2nd Quarter, 1975), 65-75, for an excellent recent treatment of this subject.

[6]By far the most probing collection of recent essays on Robert Frost is Frost: Centennial Essays, Committee on the Frost Centennial of the University of Southern Mississippi (Jackson, MS, ca. 1974). The nature of Frost's mind and art is a compelling subject in essays by Frank Lentricchia, "Robert Frost and Modern Literary Theory," 315-332; Rexford Stamper, "Robert Frost: An Assessment of Criticism, Realism, and Modernity," 60-86; Charles Carmichael, "Robert Frost as Romantic," 165-176; James M. Cox, "Robert Frost and the End of the New England Line," 545-561; and John F. Lynen, "Du Coté de Chez Frost," 562-594 (including a superb treatment of Frost's "Directive").

[7]Cf. Joseph Allen Boone, "Delving and Diving for Truth: Breaking Through to Bottom in Thoreau's Walden," Emerson Society Quarterly, 27 (3rd Quarter, 1981), 135-146, which treats Thoreau's themes of digging or penetration (related to land) and diving (related to water). A comparable but differing study is Walter Benn Michaels, "Walden's False Bottoms," Glyph 1: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies (Baltimore and London, 1977).

[8]Robert Frost, Complete Poems of Robert Frost (New York, 1949), p. 276. All quotations of Frost's poems are taken from this edition.

Miss Ola Mae

she had read all
the romantic
Southern novels,
believed fervently
someday Rhett Butler
would come
to take her away.

i see her sad face
hollow before her
in the mirror.
dear lady, i could
have told you:
that a gallant knight
brings but a
galloping horse
and a sore arse.

remembering the butterfly--
her fickled search
from flower to flower
for the sweet perfect one
(never found):
do not lament
the breath of change
which coldly blew her
back into oblivion, or
the snow on the magnolias
where she once danced
with gypsy abandon.

--Carol Nevels

her floating breasts soapy and slick
a nereid splashes in her bathing tub
and sings within her bonds not the sea's;
oh that I could have forever her
to learn the fabric of her febrile form
and know the days' discovery of years in her,
beneath her buoyant gaze
and fondly fret these gravities of love

I wonder what she saw in the mirror
that last instant before the trigger
was it the painful weariness
she showed us a quarter hour before
or resolution, the sad sweet knowledge
of our painful end of life
she foreshortened as if to counter
the inexorable loss of sanity
in some thumbing of fate's step
and found instead a longer sleep
than the nap she told us she so badly needed

it is insufficient
to recall that particular day
and in which midnight's hour
of this adolescence she
propitious as it were died
early on in the calendar's meanest month
in an historical olde towne where
everything that bleakest winter
but the gas failed

a husband still outrunning and
disciples overrunning,
succeeded she in painting
the ceaseless poem of life;
having arranged for her salvation
she lay down relieved, almost
hopeful as though saying
this will set me free.

--John M. Yozzo

The Music of Mr. Poe

Sara E. Selby

Pity poor Poe the poet. In his own day, his verse was castigated by critics for its "sing-songy" quality and only recently has it been deemed worthy of scholarly pursuit. The displeasing "sing-song" quality evolved from Poe's predilection for intricate sound devices and repetition, techniques that produce almost hypnotic effects and strike some ears as monotonous. If one undertakes close examination of Poe's poetic principle, however, he may find that the basis of Poe's poetry is musical, and that reading the poems as akin to songs will open new doors of comprehension.

Music was important to Edgar Allan Poe, but how much technical knowledge of music he possessed is open to speculation. Some basis exists in Poe's background for musical tendencies; his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Arnold, a singer, married a pianist named Charles Tubbs. She appeared on the stage in England and the United States, sometimes accompanied by Poe's mother, Elizabeth Arnold.[1]

As early as 1831,[2] Poe in his "Letter to Mr. --" stated: "Music, when combined with a pleasurable idea, is poetry; music without the idea is simply music; the idea without the music is prose from its very definitiveness."[3] Clearly, Poe realized a relationship between poetry and music, and one would assume that, if he wished to be proficient in poetry, he would also have a working knowledge of the mechanics of music. On 5 December 1835, Judge Beverley Tucker wrote to Poe concerning poetry:

> I do not know to what to liken those occasional departures from regular metre which are so fascinating. They are more to my ear like that marvellous performance-- "clapping Juba," than any thing else. The beat is capriciously irregular; there is no attempt to keep time to all the notes, but then it comes so pat & so distinct that the cadence is never lost. The art of Moore, which enables him to throw out a syllable, or to throw in a couple of them, without interrupting his rhythm is the great charm of his versification. But such irregularities are like rests and grace notes. They must be so managed as neither to hasten or retard the beat. The time of the bar

must be the same, no matter how many notes are in it. Do not think therefore I counted your feet. I did not.[4]

Judge Tucker probably would not have used such musically technical language unless he knew that Poe could understand it, so one can reasonably assume Poe's decided interest if not proficiency in music. Further support of this assumption is found in comments by F. W. Thomas: "Poe, I have a song here that has been set to a very pretty tune, by a gentleman here. I would like to have it published, and will give it to any music publisher who would undertake it. Can you manage it for me?"[5] This seems a strange request unless Thomas knew that Poe had some sort of dealings with music, as well as literary, publishers.

In 1842 Poe published in Graham's Magazine a review of Longfellow's ballads that revealed his theory of the bond between poetry and music--later more clearly expounded. Poe considered music "as one of the moods of poetical development." He recognized that "in Music, perhaps, . . . the soul most nearly attains . . . the creation of supernal beauty." He wrote:

> Contenting ourselves . . . with the firm conviction, that music (in its modifications of rhythm and rhyme) is of so vast a moment in Poesy, as never to be neglected by him who is truly poetical--is of so mighty a force in furthering the great aim intended that he is mad who rejects its assistance--content with this idea we shall not pause to maintain its absolute essentiality, for the mere sake of rounding a definition. We will but add, at this point, that the highest possible development of the Poetical Sentiment is to be found in the union of song with music, in its popular sense.[6]

Poe undeniably looked at music as a form that poets should strive to master, and since he began his career as a poet, he probably developed a sense of the composition of music, at least lyrically if not melodically, early in his literary life. Mabbott records that Poe wrote a song, supposedly sung to the tune of "The Star-Spangled Banner," for the presidential campaign of 1844.[7] Poe's interest in music was not passing, for he kept returning to it throughout his lifetime. On 2 July 1844, he wrote to James Russell Lowell:

"I am profoundly excited by music. . . . Music is the perfection of the soul, or idea, of poetry. The vagueness of exaltation aroused by a sweet air (which should be strictly indefinite and never too strongly suggestive) is precisely what we should aim at in poetry."[8]

His excitement led him publicly to express his views twice again: in "The Rationale of Verse," published in 1848, and in "The Poetic Principle," published after his death in 1850. In the first he discussed the simplicity of ballad airs, saying that "the advocates of the simpler melody and harmony have infinitely the best of the argument." He applauded this simplicity, saying that "in verse, which cannot be better designated than as an inferior or less capable Music, there is, happily, little chance for complexity." Poe's views again surfaced in "The Poetic Principle," in which he restated what he had earlier said about music in "Longfellow's Ballads" and discussed his admiration for Thomas Moore's "Irish Melodies" and William Motherwell's Minstrelsy Ancient and Modern, works well-known as preservations of ancient Irish, Scottish, and English folk songs. Poe was evidently familiar with at least the lyrics of traditional ballads if not the tunes. He was certainly exposed to some type of music in his home, for in a letter dated 4 January 1844, he writes, "Six years ago, a wife, whom I loved as no man ever loved before, ruptured a blood-vessel in singing."[9]

The best insight into Poe's attitude toward music comes from his Marginalia of 1849:

> There are few cases in which mere popularity should be considered a proper test of merit; but the case of songwriting is, I think, one of the few. In speaking of songwriting, I mean, of course, the composition of brief poems with an eye to their adaptation for music in the vulgar sense. In this ultimate destination of the song proper, lies its essence--its genius. It is the strict reference to music--it is the dependence upon modulated expression--which gives to this branch of letters a character altogether unique, and separates it, in great measure and in a manner not sufficiently considered, from ordinary literature; rendering it independent of merely ordinary proprieties; allowing it, and in fact demanding for it, a wide latitude of Law; absolutely insisting upon a certain wild license

> and indefinitiveness--an indefinitiveness recognized by every musician who is not a mere fiddler, as an important point in the philosophy of his science--as the soul, indeed, of the sensations derivable from its practice--sensations which bewilder while they enthral--and which would not so enthral if they did not so bewilder.[10]

Poe appears to equate poems to songs, but in many respects he views songs as greater artistic achievements. Later in the same piece, he writes, "For my own part, I would much rather have written the best song of a nation than its noblest epic."[11]

Clearly, Poe was intrigued with music and songs for a greater part of his life; so, his wish to "have written the best song of a nation" should not be lightly dismissed. From what he is known to have written about the subject, songwriting attracted him. As stated earlier, he wrote one song in 1844, of which only a four-line fragment remains.[12] Anyone possessing the ability to write such a song impromptu had to have known what he was doing. That Poe was a practiced songwriter is no idle speculation.

The language of songwriting appears often in Poe's poetry, in such titles as "Song," "Hymn," "Song of Triumph," "Serenade," "Spiritual Song," and "Bridal Ballad," and in numerous lines. Poe himself referred to "Ulalume" as a song and "Annabel Lee" as a ballad.[13] Poe's use of "ballad," interpreted as meaning traditional folk ballad and not literary ballad, brings to mind specific characteristics associated with the form, characteristics which Poe knew and loved and strove to capture in his poetry.

Ballads were originally transmitted orally by means of song and thus were short, impersonal, narrative poems not bound by rules applicable to conventional literary forms. M. J. C. Hodgart states that "ballads are distinguished from all other types of poetry by their complete freedom from the poetic diction fashionable in any period: they have their own peculiar rhetoric and phraseology."[14] Features distinctive of the ballads include elements of the supernatural, incremental repetition, refrains that often appear nonsensical or irrelevant, irregular metres, and mixed musical time--features that may surely be applied to Poe's poetry.

That supernatural elements abound in much of Poe's writing goes without saying; such poems as "The Haunted Palace," "The Conqueror Worm," or "The Raven" give solid

evidence. Incremental repetition appears in numerous poems, especially in lines 2 and 3 and 6 through 7 of "Ulalume":

> The skies they were ashen and sober;
>   The leaves they were crisped and sere--
>   The leaves they were withering and sere;
> It was night in the lonesome October
>   Of my most immemorial year;
> It was hard by the dim lake of Auber,
>   In the misty mid region of Weir--
> It was down by the dark tank of Auber,
>   In the ghoul-haunted woodland of Weir.

Refrains are especially prevalent in works like "The Raven" or "Annabel Lee." Who could forget that dreary, hypnotic "Nevermore" or that magical, mystical "kingdom by the sea"?

The question of Poe's metre has often puzzled readers, for he used intricate patterns of internal and interior rhymes, approximate rhymes, identical rhymes, and imperfect rhymes to create "sing-songy" and at times monotonous metre that was often viewed as artless poetry.[15] If one views Poe's poems as song lyrics, however, they become not monotonous, but melodic. The beat almost leaps from the page and the tone transcends the monotony.

Obviously, Poe owed a great debt to music for his principle of poetry. To infer that all his poems were actually song lyrics to which the melodies were never recorded may be stretching the point, but the speculation is certainly worth considering for some titles. He admired ballads and thought that music was the highest accomplishment of artistic expression, so it seems only natural that he would at least dabble in the art of songwriting. That many of Poe's works have been adapted to serious and popular music only supports his theory.[16] Did he imagine melodies while he was writing his verse? Only Poe could know.

NOTES

[1]Thomas Ollive Mabbott, Collected Works of Edgar Allan Poe (Cambridge, 1969), 1: 530.

[2]Mabbott gives the publication date as 1831. The date varies in other sources.

[3]"Letter to B--," The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe, edited by James A. Harrison, Virginia Edition (New York, 1965, 1979), 7: xxxvii.

[4]Harrison, 17: 22.

[5]Harrison, 17: 103.

[6]Harrison, 11: 74-75.

[7]Mabbott, 1: 340-342.

[8]Quoted in note 236 in Selections from the Critical Writings of Edgar Allan Poe, edited by F. C. Prescott (New York, 1981), p. 342.

[9]Harrison, 17: 287.

[10]Marginalia, introd. by John Carl Miller (Charlottesville, 1981), pp. 167-168.

[11]Marginalia, p. 170.

[12]Mabbott reports that the song, written impromptu, originally contained five stanzas and a chorus, 1: 341.

[13]Harrison, 17: 346-288.

[14]M. J. C. Hodgart, The Ballads (New York, 1962), p. 11.

[15]For a more detailed study, see Helen Ensley, Poe's Rhymes (Baltimore, 1981).

[16]In 1939, May Garrettson Evans published Music and Edgar Allan Poe: A Bibliographic Study (Baltimore), listing 252 compositions to which R. C. Archibald added some eight compositions in N & Q, 179 (1940), 170-171.

The Awakening: Chopin's Metaphorical Use of Clothes

Carol A. MacCurdy

Most critics acknowledge Kate Chopin's use of symbols and images to unify The Awakening's structure and to express characterization. Natural symbols abound in the story (the ocean, sun, and birds) to illustrate Edna's awakening to her sensuality. The freedom suggested by these natural elements, however, contrasts with the restraint imposed by social obligation to friends, husband, and children. The tension between freedom and restraint is evident in the symbolism of the novel. To offset the physical images of the seductive sea, burning sun, and soaring bird, Chopin suggests the restrictions of society through dress. Subtly and successfully, she uses clothing to illustrate social convention. An examination of Chopin's metaphorical use of clothes provides insight into Edna's awakening.

Early in the novel Chopin establishes the significance of clothing to characterization. On the way to the beach, Edna wears a "cool muslin"--"white, with a waving vertical line of brown running through it; also a white linen collar and the big straw hat."[1] Adorned in white, Edna possesses a "graceful severity of poise and movement," that makes her "different from the crowd" (p. 216); the lines of her body are "long, clean and symmetrical" (p. 215). Described in terms of a sleek animal, her appearance differs from the plump ripeness of the quintessential "mother-woman," Adele Ratignolle:

> Madame Ratignolle, more careful of her complexion, had twined a gauze veil about her head. She wore dogskin gloves, with gaunlets that protected her wrists. She was dressed in pure white, with a fluffiness of ruffles that became her. The draperies and fluttering things which she wore suited her rich, luxuriant beauty as a greater severity of line could not have done. (p. 216)

Edna's dress is obviously more tailored with the "vertical line of brown" and the "linen collar"; her clothing is elegant, but does little to enhance her femininity. The "severity of line," in fact, represses it. In contrast, Adele wraps her curves in flowing gauze and fluffy ruffles suggesting her abundant beauty.

Once seated near the beach, the two women confront "the heat, the sun, the glare." Adele removes her veil and fans while Edna takes off her collar and opens her dress at the throat. The ladies are forced to surrender their protective clothing when faced with nature's heat: "But there was a breeze blowing, a choppy, stiff wind that whipped the water into froth. It fluttered the skirts of the women and kept them for a while engaged in adjusting, readjusting, tucking in, securing hair-pins and hatpins" (p. 217). Nature not only makes them shed their unnecessary coverings, but also disorders their attempts at form and causes them to rearrange.

Edna's dress opposes external nature, but more importantly, it begins to oppose her inner nature. A division exists between her and her environment as well as between her social character and her awakening instincts. Edna herself is aware of this split: "At a very early period she had apprehended instinctively the dual life--that outward existence which conforms, the inward life which questions" (pp. 214-15). Her "cool muslin" and "white morning gown" (p. 264) suggest the cool distancing reserve of her "visible" character. Thus her apparel conveys the illusion that she wishes to establish as her persona. Chopin emphasizes the point that Edna's external appearance is an illusion by draping her in filmy white gowns and peignoirs. In "Thanatos and Eros: Kate Chopin's The Awakening," Cynthia Wolff writes: "The words which recur most frequently to describe her are words like melting, drifting, misty, dreaming, shadowy."[2] Later, F. Scott Fitzgerald relies on similar description to depict Daisy Buchanan in The Great Gatsby. Daisy's illusory whiteness represents her boredom--her "absence of desire." In contrast, Edna's cool white gowns are attempts to conceal her desire--her yearning for intensity, for passion. Her romantic reveries about hopeless loves reveal her dreaminess and attachment to illusions.

The Awakening is a story of Edna's gradual uncovering of her inner self until she reaches the point that her outer and inner selves merge: "That summer at Grand Isle she began to loosen a little the mantle of reserve that had always enveloped her" (p. 215). In this statement Chopin uses a garment as a figure of speech to imply Edna's inhibitive covering. As her "habitual reserve" loosens, her "sensuous susceptability" becomes apparent. She responds to the "touch of the sea" when it enfolds her "body in its soft, close embrace" (p. 214); her face appears "flushed"

and is "set off by her dainty white gown" (p. 248). No longer do her white dresses conceal her excitability. When Mademoiselle Reisz plays Chopin, Edna weeps and imagines "the figure of a man standing beside a desolate rock on the seashore. He was naked. His attitude was one of hopeless resignation as he looked toward a distant bird winging its flight away from him" (p. 229). With this image Kate Chopin evokes Edna's desire for free expression. Beneath her clothed restraint exists what Lewis Leary calls "a questing animal."[3] From this point on, Edna begins gradually to disrobe until she becomes the naked man on the beach.

Various stages of undress signify the steps in Edna's sexual awakening. On the day she and Robert take the boat trip to Chêniere Caminada, her sense of freedom becomes apparent: "Edna felt as if she were being borne away from some anchorage which had held her fast, whose chains had been loosening--had snapped the night before when the mystic spirit was abroad, leaving her free to drift whithersoever she chose to set her sails" (p. 240). The experience's fairy-tale quality and easy drifting leave her overwhelmed with drowsiness. Seeking rest, Edna goes to Madame Antione's to nap. Once she is alone, the tone shifts from one of stifling exhaustion to sensuous enjoyment:

> Edna, left alone in the little side room, loosened her clothes, removing the greater part of them. She bathed her face, her neck and arms in the basin that stood between the windows. She took off her shoes and stockings and stretched herself in the very center of the high, white bed. How luxurious it felt to rest thus in a strange, quaint bed, with its sweet country odor of laurel lingering about the sheets and mattress! She stretched her strong limbs that ached a little. She ran her fingers through her loosened hair for a while. She looked at her round arms as she held them straight up and rubbed them one after the other, observing closely, as if it were something she saw for the first time, the fine, firm quality and texture of her flesh. She clasped her hands easily above her head, and it was thus she fell asleep. (p. 243)

In this scene after Edna removes her clothes, she expresses her sensuality by narcissistically appreciating her own body. Relaxed and unencumbered by the reserve of dress, she is

able to sleep after a previous night of restless frustration.

Describing Edna's sensual uncovering, the author reveals "that she was becoming herself and daily casting aside that fictitious self which we assume like a garment with which to appear before the world" (p. 269). Clothes are donned just as personalities are assumed to express desired images. This quotation acknowledges clothes as a symbol not only for social conformity, but also for Edna's desire to shed such convention. Repeatedly, the author turns to the symbolic value of clothes to suggest the emerging animal quality of her heroine's new self as opposed to the inhibitive quality of clothes. Dress presents the character's social self, but covers "the other self" (p. 248).

When Edna learns to swim that summer on Grand Isle, her newly-mastered skill marks another stage in her shedding of restraint:

> A feeling of exultation overtook her, as if some power of significant import had been given her to control the working of her body and her soul. She grew daring and reckless, overestimating her strength. She wanted to swim far out, where no woman had swum before. (p. 232)

She senses a new self awakening as she reaches out to blend herself with the limitless sea. Significantly, Chopin tells us through the artist-figure, Mademoiselle Reisz, that Edna looks good in a bathing suit (p. 259), suggesting far more than a nice figure. Edna's natural beauty is expressed as she removes her conventional clothes.

Once Edna gradually loosens "the mantle of reserve," her clothes begin to reflect her state of mind as well as her new physicality. When she hears of Robert's abrupt plans to leave for Mexico, she goes to her room and changes her gown "for a more comfortable and commodious wrapper" (p. 251). No longer "dressed," she proceeds "to set the toilet stand to rights," to gather "stray garments that were hanging on the backs of chairs, and put each where it belonged in closet or bureau drawer," and to rearrange "her hair, combing and brushing it with unusual energy." Trying to control her anger, she immediately tries to impose order. After he departs on his journey, Edna swims more than ever; Chopin expresses Edna's despair: "Robert's going had some way taken the brightness, the color, the meaning out of

everything. The conditions of her life were in no way changed, but her whole existence was dulled, like a faded garment which seems to be no longer worth wearing" (p. 255). Again Chopin uses clothing as a figure of speech for Edna's state of mind. Her whole life becomes "a faded garment" that she wishes to cast aside.

Indeed when the Pontelliers return to New Orleans after their vacation, Edna does cast aside her established lifestyle. Previously, Tuesday afternoons were reception day when she put on a handsome receiving gown while her mulatto boy wore a "dress coat" and the maid a "white fluted cap" (p. 260). No longer desiring to maintain this formal social convention, Edna leaves home on Tuesday. At dinner her husband notices that she "did not wear her usual Tuesday reception gown," but was "in ordinary house dress." Such an action demonstrates Edna's wish to free herself from "that fictitious self which we assume like a garment with which to appear before the world" (p. 269). Her process of removing herself from social form and expressing her inner self parallels the decreasing formality of her dress. Finally, after Léonce leaves for New York, she dines alone "in a comfortable peignoir" (p. 288).

The man who sexually awakens Edna is Alcée Arobin, who possesses "a good figure, a pleasing face, not overburdened with depth of thought or feeling" and whose dress is "that of the conventional man of fashion" (p. 289). Ironically, the woman who desires to shed "fictitious" garments is seduced by a "man of fashion." After he kindles her sexual passion, Edna ceases to wear white dainty gowns. The next day she packs to move to the "pigeon house" in an "old blue gown, with a red silk handkerchief knotted at random around her head" (pp. 302-3). Chopin tells us that "she was splendid and robust, and had never appeared handsomer" (p. 302). Edna has given up her dual life in which her clothes hide her inner self and create an illusion. Now she appears ready to pursue the experience of her dreams.

To celebrate her move and her birthday, Edna stages a sensual feast complete with cushioned chairs, satin tablecloth, brass candelabra, yellow and red roses, crystal, champagne, and music. Per Seyersted says that the description of the party carries "overtones of a ritual for Eros."[4] Edna's alluring appearance, which complements the luxurious atmosphere, suggests her entrance into the world of erotic love:

> The golden shimmer of Edna's satin gown

> spread in rich folds on either side of her. There was a soft fall of lace encircling her shoulders. It was the color of her skin, without the glow, the myriad living tints that one may sometimes discover in vibrant flesh. There was something in her attitude, her whole appearance when she leaned her head against the high-backed chair and spread her arms, which suggested the regal woman, the one who rules, who looks on, who stands alone. (p. 308)

In her world of Eros, Edna still remains alone with her illusion of love: "There came over her the acute longing which always summoned into her spiritual vision the presence of the beloved one, overpowering her at once with a sense of the unattainable" (p. 308). She sits surrounded by flesh-colored lace and in the presence of a lover, but remains unfulfilled. The indefinite quality of Edna's longings implies that Robert is not specifically what she longs for, but that a perpetual romantic image to feed "her spiritual vision" persists. Rather than celebrating the pleasures of Eros, the description of the feast bears an ominous tone since its queen distances herself by dreaming of the illusion of love.

Edna's changes in dress no longer just reflect her sexual awakening, but illustrate her withdrawal from society and her obsession with illusion. Chopin tells us that Edna can "weave fancies" (p. 270), suggesting that she clothes herself in illusion. In contrast, Adele spends her summer sewing garments for the winter. To the rest of society, clothing connotes domestication. Madame Lebrun busily engages herself at the sewing machine all summer long. Only once does Edna suffer such domestic tendencies. When Léonce prepares to leave for his long stay in New York, she is "solicitous about his health and his welfare." She bustles "around, looking after his clothing, thinking about heavy underwear, quite as Madame Ratignolle would have done under similar circumstances" (p. 287). The rest of the time, she has a quadroon nurse for her children--"good to button up waists and panties and to brush and part hair" (p. 207). Different from other "mother-women," Edna disdains homely duties; she prefers to weave illusions in her mind.

When Edna's illusion appears in the flesh, his return is a disappointment: "She had been with him, had heard his voice and touched his hand. But some way he had seemed nearer to her off there in Mexico" (p. 325). Her vision of

him is more of a reality than his actual presence. Because her romantic vision had begun to define her life, his reserve and lack of passion distress Edna and intensify her longing. Chopin tells that "all sense of reality had gone out of her life" (p. 326). Edna now sits at her table "only half dressed."

When Edna meets with Robert again by chance, he confesses his love and admits to dreams "of wild, impossible things" (p. 331). Edna mocks his dreams that picture her as one of her husband's possessions to be freed and suggests through her passionate declaration of love that she is ready to cease dreaming. She tells him, "It was you who awoke me last summer out of a life-long, stupid dream" (p. 332). She has awakened from her illusion of marriage and her former life, but she has replaced it with a stronger romantic illusion. It takes the witnessing of Adele's childbearing for her to shed her romantic illusions about Robert. Just at the point when Edna is willing to act on her longings and to express her new self, she is reminded of her earthly, mortal ties. Willing to give up her life for her children, but not willing to sacrifice her awakened self for them, she sees no meaningful choice. Now shed of all illusions, she tells Dr. Mandelet, "The years that are gone seem like dreams--if one might go on sleeping and dreaming--but to wake up and find--oh! well! perhaps it is better to wake up after all, even to suffer, rather than to remain a dupe to illusions all one's life" (p. 335). Edna's awakening is complete, for her illusions are incompatible with reality.

Throughout the novel Edna has clothed herself with her illusions. At the end when she returns to Grand Isle and the sea, "there was no one thing in the world that she desired" (p. 339). Freed of all illusions, she discards her old bathing suit:

> . . . when she was there beside the sea, absolutely alone, she cast the unpleasant, pricking garments from her, and for the first time in her life stood naked in the open air, at the mercy of the sun, the breeze that beat upon her, and the waves that invited her. (p. 340)

Chopin makes clear the ambiguity involved in Edna's final nakedness. The freedom evidenced in her nudity brings with it a sense of exhilaration, sensuality, and courage. Feeling like a "new-born creature," Edna is once again an infant--proud, free, yet also vulnerable and unprotected.

She is "at the mercy of the sun" and the breeze that beats upon her. This picture of Edna's white body merges with one of the novel's central images: a naked man standing on the seashore and watching a distant bird. Mademoiselle Reisz has warned her: "The bird that would soar above the level plain of tradition and prejudice must have strong wings" (p. 301). Edna now stands alone on the beach like the man in her imagination and sees "a bird with a broken wing . . . beating the air above, reeling, fluttering, circling disabled down, down to the water" (p. 340). Identified with both the man and the bird, she likewise desires free flight. The ambiguity of the novel is expressed in the paradoxical nature of this central image. Edna simultaneously longs for freedom and for complete fulfillment. Since she is unable to satisfy her desire for completeness with another human being, she turns to the ocean to incorporate herself with the infinite. The sea offers both liberation and annihilation. Making the sea her final garment, she swims out into the distance with romantic visions once more in mind. This closing image of Edna, as well as the image of the bird with the broken wing beating the air, suggests the famous ending of The Great Gatsby: "So we beat on, boats against the current, being borne back ceaselessly into the past." In this romantic novel Gatsby never awakens from his dreams, and his body clad in a bathing suit is found at the bottom of his swimming pool. Edna dies, on the other hand, not as a victim of her romantic illusions because she has already shed them. What this novel as well as The Great Gatsby suggests is that life is not worth living without dreams. In the process of awakening into this naked reality, Edna chooses death. Thus we last see her swimming into the limitless distance and envisioning lost images.

NOTES

[1]Kate Chopin, The Awakening and Other Stories, ed. Lewis Leary (New York, 1970), p. 216. All subsequent references to the text are to this edition and appear parenthetically.

[2]Cynthia Wolff, "Thanatos and Eros: Kate Chopin's The Awakening," AQ, 25 (Oct. 1973), 466.

[3]Lewis Leary, "Introduction," The Awakening and Other Stories, p. xi.

[4]Per Seyersted, Kate Chopin: A Critical Biography (Baton Rouge, LA, 1969), p. 157.

Disappointed Expectations: Artistic Strategy in *Ormond*

Jonathan C. Tutor

The bulk of Brown criticism indicates the characters of *Ormond* as a manifestation of his torn personal philosophy. Although Paul Rodgers attempts to excuse Charles Brockden Brown's supposed artistic sloppiness as commercially-based,[1] Norman Grabo accounts persuasively for the use of thematic techniques highly appropriate to a lengthy romance and psychologically delineates the characters.[2] Also involved in psychological probing, John Cleman argues that Brown suppressed the Gothic supernaturalism, that his characters betray an unhealthy thought-pattern, and that major villains--such as Ormond--do not follow their initially-benevolent philosophies to their logical ends.[3] Michael Bell claims that Brown's villains undermine the Lockean theory of perception and suggest the artistic imagination as the cause of this disintegration.[4] William Hedges specifies contemporary sociological forces leading to disintegration and deepened characterization,[5] and Carl Nelson indicates a Manichaean division in the characters.[6] As expected, criticism finally drifts toward discrediting Sophia Westwyn as a biased narrator and the focal character.[7] While also focusing upon character development, I wish to direct attention to Brown's use of situational irony and fatal undertones in *Ormond*[8] as a means of luring the reader into as perplexed and disappointed a state as that experienced by the characters. My method will necessitate some degree of plot summary to show these events and their attendant disappointments.

Granted, American psychological fiction is rooted in Brown's four major novels--*Wieland*, *Ormond*, *Edgar Huntly*, and *Arthur Mervyn*--yet the artistic technique employed in *Ormond* also raises it far above its predecessors in sentimental fiction. Upon the publication of *The Power of Sympathy*, *The Coquette*, and *Charlotte Temple*, the American reading public experienced the excessive woes of the typical novel of seduction and didacticism. Working against this background, Brown composed a tale of seduction in which the villain attempts not only to violate the heroine's body, but also--as S. J. Krause points out--to enslave her mind. Krause states that Ormond "deploys as complete an assortment of weaponry as any Renaissance sonneteer might have used: reason, common sense, double entendre, shock, irony, wit, hyperbole, and metaphor" and that "his plea is so thoroughly

civilized that on grounds of ingenuity alone Ormond should have won."[9] Brown creates the ultimate seducer, a man so sophisticated that no woman should be able to withstand his power; yet, Constantia does. Throughout Ormond, Brown builds a series of expectations not only for his characters, but also for his readers; that he purposefully undermines these expectations gives the novel its sophistication and verisimilitude.

The opening chapter relates how Thomas Craig duped the would-be artist Stephen Dudley into allowing the former to serve as an apprentice and later to share as a partner in the shop. Sophia Westwyn, the narrator, somberly intones that "plans, however skillfully contrived, if founded on imposture, cannot fail of being sometimes detected" (Ch. 1); she refers to Craig's claiming to support his mother by mail and Dudley's discovering the embezzlement and subsequent flight of the younger man. Of course, the irony finds a heightened tone because Dudley had not only trusted in Craig's facade, but had also by this misdirected trust, or seduction, provided the means for his own financial collapse. That Dudley, the sensitive artist, could not perceive the spurious contents of Craig's forged letters (supposedly in reply from his mother) contrasts with Ormond's keen perception later; when Ormond shows Constantia a letter supposedly written by her and betraying her affair with Craig's brother, all the heroine must do is show Ormond that Craig copied her handwriting, not her thought-patterns (Ch. 15). The sudden reverse of fortune, consistent throughout the plot, therefore, finds explicit foreshadowing in Sophia's cry: "Thus in a moment was this man [Dudley] thrown from the summit of affluence to the lowest indigence" (Ch. 2). The implied image of Fate's wheel in revolution so common to dramatic tragedy manifests itself early on and later finds broader application with Martinette's summary of the fall of the French crown.

Brown then sets the stage with Dudley leaving New York in shame, buoyed only by his highly virtuous daughter Constantia. In desperation he secures work as a legal scrivener;[11] this job brings about a double irony. First, by this arduous work, Dudley loses his sight; Brown almost seems determined to destroy any romantic hopes his readers have of Dudley's rescuing his financial standing by artistic pursuit. Second, the very profession for which he slaves is the same that Constantia "had not the means of bribing . . . into activity" (Ch. 10) when she re-encounters Craig and could prosecute him. Lest one should suppose Dudley too

gullible at this point and actually worthy of his fate because of his blindly trusting Craig, the reader may recall Sophia's pronouncement upon the latter: "Deception was so easy a task, that the difficulty lay, not in infusing false opinions respecting him, but in preventing them from being spontaneously imbibed" (Ch. 11). Moreover, the context of this passage pertains to Craig's duping Ormond, claiming that Constantia had acted promiscuously, and getting (and embezzling) one hundred dollars from Ormond to pay Constantia's debt. Ormond, on the other hand, cannot overcome the "incredulity in him that hears" of his Utopian/Illuminatian schemes (Ch. 26).[12]

Dudley becomes bitter since "the serpent which had stung him was nurtured in his own bosom" (Ch. 2), and the reader becomes psychologically prepared for the ultimate irony when, later, Constantia feels attracted to Ormond even though she knows of his sexual immorality.[13] Ironically, Constantia refuses the proposal of an unnamed suitor because of his youth; Brown prepares the way for her later refusal of Balfour's proposal although both pure men seemingly offer a solution to her family's economic dilemma. Temporate Balfour, sexually virtuous by reason of his "constitutional coldness" (Ch. 9), does not appeal to Constantia because he only wants a showpiece in his partner, because he knows nothing of her mind, because they have nothing in common, because "she herself would become the property of another" (rather than her gaining wealth, Ch. 9), and because he had bad judgment. Oddly, she does not raise this final objection when Ormond approaches her--despite his avowed aversion to marriage and complicity in a conspiratorial society. She overlooks his questionable judgment. Perhaps Constantia refuses her first two suitors simply because her family would benefit too quickly and easily; one wonders whether Constantia might have an egotistical need to prove that she can pull her family through the crisis alone.

As their poverty persists, Dudley's wife perishes "a victim to discontent" (Ch. 2) and Dudley plunges into the oblivious depths of alcoholism; Sophia ruminates, "If thought degenerate into a vehicle of pain, what remains but to destroy the vehicle?" and "temptation is successful chiefly by virtue of its gradual and invisible approaches" (Ch. 2). Despite her aphoristic quality, Sophia here introduces two motifs, the first being suicidal tendency in the characters and the second being a highly ironic allusion to Ormond's chief preoccupation of spying on people while he

remains disguised. As for the death-wish, it finds ampler manifestation after Constantia discovers the death of Mr. Watson, thebook-seller, by yellow fever and after the neighbor Whiston babbles his knowledge of the epidemic to Dudley, the defeatist. Constantia's father had already abandoned drink, had shared memories of Italian scenery with his daughter (foreshadowing his later desire to take her there), and had led her to read Tacitus and Milton as well as to study sociology, math, metaphysics, and anatomy. Despite his preparing her so thoroughly, Dudley easily acquiesces to the anticipated epidemic and resultant starvation, should they weather the yellow fever. His prediction of their doom by theplague anticipates Ormond's prediction of Constantia's breakdown on her hearing the details of Dudley's death. As if irritated, Sophia complains:

> Mr. Dudley joined with uncommon discernment a species of perverseness not easily accounted for. He acted as if the evils of her [Constantia's] lot were not sufficient for the trial of his daughter's patience. Instead of comforter and counsellor, he fostered impatience in himself, and endeavored, with the utmost diligence, to undermine her fortitude and disconcert her schemes. The task was assigned to her, not only of subduing her own fears, but of maintaining the contest with his disastrous eloquence. (Ch. 3)

Almost as if in defiance of his warnings, Constantia atypically disobeys her father by going through the fever-ravaged city to pay Mathews the rent.

The reader suspects some relief when Constantia spies Mathew's corpse being removed from his house, and the reader anticipates sardonic humor in Whiston's pessimistic complaints of discomfort. Yet, M'Crea soon arrives demanding rent from his uncle's estate, and not only does Whiston indeedcontract the fever, but he also abandons his sister Mary Whiston, who is much sicker than he at the time and is on the verge of death. The chance for a relief in mood quickly becomes a prelude to one of the darkest naturalistic descriptions in early American fiction. Although Constantia attends her with some of Dudley's medicine, Mary succumbs to an agonizing death; Mary's "corroded and gangrenous stomach" spews "dark" and "poisonous . . . matter" all over the bedroom (Ch. 5) before

her death. Although Whiston ran to the country for escape, he dies slowly; at the end of three days, his corpse remains uncovered in a barn. Members of a nearby family fear the fever, refuse to bury him, plan their quick removal to escape the toxic stench, and oddly die before they can leave. Now with Mary's body nearby, the reader may anticipate such a fate for Constantia, Dudley, and Lucy; that fear subsides, though, for a kindly Negro "wood-carter" (Ch. 5) removes Mary's body for Constantia in the night. No such help is near when Constantia later, desperate for literal wood and money, contemplates suicide for her and Dudley rather than their facing a debtors' prison (Ch. 11).

As Robert Ferguson contends, surviving the yellow-fever epidemic in Philadelphia validated the moral virtue of the survivors to Brown; thus Constantia survives.[14] Ironic in its overtones, but consistent with this belief, Dudley's mentioning that the Benedictine priest of Messina aided victims of a similar plague, ate only water and pollenta, and lived several years beyond the crisis provides Constantia her plan to buy corn meal for the family (to keep starvation at bay for four months) and to spend only three dollars in the process. Although two hundred of her three hundred neighbors die within twenty-one days, priestess Constantia and her family do not. In contrast, Philadelphia appears hellish after dark with the relentless rumbling of the hearses and shrieking of the bereaved that follow. Without warning, delirious victims run out of neighboring buildings, babble disconcertingly, and fatally collapse. Constantia transcends this grisly scene and realizes that "death, which, in her prosperous state, was peculiarly abhorrent to her feelings, was now disrobed of terror" (Ch. 6). She only wishes for oblivion and a happy life after death. Visiting Sarah Baxter, Constantia discovers the woman hiding with her younger children in a room--since her husband and two daughters had just recently died. Not allowing this acquiescence to the fever, "Constantia's entrance was like that of <u>an angelic comforter</u>" (Ch. 6, emphasis mine).

Constantia's consolation proves strangely effective, for soon Sarah unhesitatingly relates the events that led to her husband's death. This seeming digression actually offers an early parallel for the subsequent tales told without reservation by Martinette to Constantia and by Constantia to Sophia. Although Martinette's tale reveals her lust for blood and although Constantia's tale reveals her lust for Ormond, both young women eagerly confide in

another trustworthy female. Mrs. Baxter's tale depict Baxter as concerned with the welfare of Miss Monros (Martinette) and Mr. Monrose--even if they are French and h was once a British soldier. Brown, quickly undermines th humor; Baxter views Mr. Monrose's makeshift funeral, run home fearfully, contracts the disease, suffers horribly fo eleven days, and dies screaming. Once the reader ha dismissed any humor by virtue of this grim passage, Brown-through his persona Sophia--counters the expectation an introduces black humor. Ruminating on Baxter's untimel death, Sophia claims that "his case may be quoted as a example of the force of imagination," that Baxter ha probably contracted the fever well before the Monros burial, and that Baxter's panic quickened the "dormant seeds withing the ex-soldier (Ch. 7).[15] On a literal level Baxter commits suicide by choosing to believe that he mus die.

With the reader dazed, Brown quickly advances his stor to the time when the whole city enjoys good health onc again and the reader expects the economic renewal of th Dudley family. Such an expectation, however, proves false for M'Crea demands the rent unpaid for several months Desperate for ready cash in quantity, Constantia sells he father's lute and gives M'Crea her miniature of Sophia a earnest. At the music shop, Constantia meets Martinette who conveniently is searching for just such a lute. Th irony in this meeting involves Constantia's faith i physiognomy. To her, Martinette's "features and shape sunk as it were, into perfect harmony with sentiments an passions. Every atom of the frame was pregnant wit significance." If "small," Martinette possesses "exquisit proportions," "eyes that anticipated speech," and "th mutability of muscle which belong [sic] to woman" (Ch. 8) Such a figure hardly coincides with that blood-thirsty, a Marchand labelled her, "Amazon"[16] revealed later in her tal of fighting in the French and American Revolutions (Ch. 20) of killing "thirteen officers" (two of them being forme lovers, Ch. 21), and of attempting to assassinate Brunswic and then commit suicide (Ch. 21). Constantia's mistake sympathy for Martinette becomes even more ironic whe Sophia, the narrator, compares Constantia's and Martinette' looks. Yet Constantia, in a way, does become a type o Martinette when Ormond tries to rape Constantia and sh stabs him in the heart.

With their economic plight worsening despite the city' recovery, Constantia accepts Balfour's intervention when tw

men almost rape her (a foreshadowing of Ormond's attempt), but refuses Balfour's marriage proposal. Unable to reach Mr. Melbourne--Dudley's firend during the latter's prosperity--and unable to get any sewing-customers, Constantia almost appeals to the city relief, but spies instead Thomas Craig. On her threat of exposing him, Craig relents and sends her fifty dollars. Finally, the reader senses Constantia's shift in fortune; the reader is wrong. At the Dudley's house, M'Crea abruptly enters, rants that the Dudleys paid him with a forged fifty-dollar note, and promises to take Dudley before the magistrate. Although horrified, Constantia goes in place of her blind father. Brown has seemingly drawn the plot to the edge of irreversible disaster with Constantia contemplating familial suicide; yet, the judge is happily recognized as Melbourne, Dudley's friend whom Constantia had sought. Not only does he arrange for the dropping of the charges, but he also gives Constantia some money and arranges for her to acquire new customers for her sewing trade. At this point, Brown allows his persona to burst into didactic rhapsody: "To what entire and incredible reverses is the tenor of human life subject! . . . . The path which we employ all our exertions to shun is often found, upon trial, to be the true road to prosperity" (Ch. 11). Along with the pointed irony just quoted and the bent of earlier American novels, one may wonder how Brown suppressed Sophia, later delineated as highly moral and religious, from such didactic outbursts.

Since numerous commentators have analyzed Brown's overwhelming villains, I will avoid too close an inspection of Ormond, but will rather direct the reader to the twelfth chapter's end where Sophia gives her impression of him. Of particularly ironic import in this chapter is Ormond's male chauvinism by which he judges all women to possess "superficial views," minds subordinate to hearts, and a dreadful lack of "intellectual energy"; in short, he considers their brains "defective." On these assumptions, "he deemed himself superior to the allurements of what is called love." In this case, the audience perceives the dramatic irony long before its execution and probably guesses that Ormond will more than meet his match in Constantia. The next chapter, by juxtaposing the superb character sketch of Helena Cleaves, promises a fulfillment of Ormond's verdicts, but delivers an ambiguous effect. Essentially, Helena is a social butterfly described as "feminine and fascinating"; perfect in "shape, complexion, and hair"; "calculated to excite emotions more voluptuous

than dignified"; and producing "a trance of the senses rather than [an] illumination of the soul" (Ch. 13). As expected, she has a typical female mind in comparison to Ormond's lofty brain. When he realizes that she cannot comprehend his "graver occupations" and that financial set-backs (on the death of her father) threaten her, Ormond makes her his mistress and hopes to improve her mind to a suitable level for possible marriage to him. Despite her efforts to learn, Ormond recognizes in Helena the normal "imbecility of her sex" (Ch. 13).[17] Surprisingly, though, Helena betrays some intellectual development with her ability to create new arrangements for music easily, to improvise a poem on a moment's notice, and to beat Ormond at chess--supposedly a very cerebral game. Perhaps the cutting irony here is that Helena does possess mental faculties unperceived in Ormond's arrogant estimation. Repeatedly the reader encounters the word "impetuousity" linked to Ormond; perhaps he has stereotyped Helena simply because that act saves him the trouble of and time for a closer, deeper scrutiny. At least Sophia seems to imply such an irony.

Despite his presumed harshness, Ormond tends to give charitably and anonymously to impoverished families. After meeting Constantia in his chimney-sweep disguise, Ormond--ironically just like virtuous Melbourne--persuades the woman in his life to give Constantia some sewing trade (Ch. 14). Of two-fold irony is Ormond's warning Constantia not to chase after Thomas Craig any longer. First, though extremely intelligent, Ormond believes Craig's lie of Constantia's sexual misconduct, a lie wholly unknown at this point to the heroine; second, Ormond proves to be sorely attracted to Constantia and warns her of Craig's Chesterfieldian attitude, even though it is the same as his own. In the meantime, Helena and Constantia meet, like each other, share their stories (as in the three occasions mentioned earlier in the paper concerning female verbal intercourse), and resolve that Constantia should try to convince Ormond to marry his mistress. Ironically, though, Ormond later tells Constantia that all of her reasonings on Helena's behalf for marriage actually defeats her purpose; Ormond's obsession for an intellectual woman seems consummated and arrested once Constantia begins her ratiocinations (Ch. 15). Realizing that "the time spent in her [Constantia's] company seemed like a doubling of existence," Ormond admires the "manlike energy" (Ch. 16) of Constantia's arguments and finds himself sated with Helena. Eventually, Ormond repudiates Helena to her face, avows his

love for Constantia, and tells the former mistress to "henceforth regard me as a brother" (Ch. 16). Later finding Helena dead from an overdose of laudanum, Ormond--contrary to the reader's expectations, since he had shown guilt earlier as the cause of her social alienation and resultant suffering--reveals his true nature when he casually utters over the lovely corpse: "If she were fool enough to die, I am not fool enough to follow her," and more apathetically, "nature is a theater of suffering" (Ch. 17). Yet the highest irony here comes from Helena's suicide-note in which she indicates her death as peaceful since she feels that Ormond deserves someone as "noble" (Ch. 17) as Constantia. The two-fold irony here rests on the facts that Constantia and Ormond do not wed, hence rendering Helena's self-removal unnecessary, and that Ormond obviously does not deserve anyone "noble" as a mate.

Ironic as Helena's death is, since Constantia actually intended to help the young lady, Constantia's inheriting Helena's property and thereby saving herself and her family from financial ruin remain the ultimate ironic climax of this passage. Ormond manages to get a doctor, whom he knows, to operate on Dudley, to restore his sight, and thereby to obligate Constantia in gratitude. That he could count on gratitude seems highly ironic since Ormond himself betrays no gratitude toward Helena's attempts to learn, her repudiation of society for his sake, and her subsequent suicide to facilitate his marriage. Yet, Ormond's obsession with an intelligent woman finds its counterpart in his desire to brainwash such a lady, possibly as the ultimate challenge to his power: "Ormond aspired to nothing more ardently than to hold the reins of opinion--to exercise absolute power over the conduct of others, not by constraining their limbs or by exacting obedience to his authority, but in a way of which his subjects should be scarcely conscious" (Ch. 18). This megalomaniac momentarily leaves town, and Constantia meets Martinette, who has "no tendencies to confidence, or traces of sympathy," but who did have "large experience, vigorous faculties, and masculine attainments" (Ch. 19). After Martinette relates the blood-spattered history of her involvement in the French and American Revolutions (Ch. 20), Constantia realizes the irony of her sensing an affinity to the virago and loses her sympathy for the girl. Two more ironies occur at this point. First, though Constantia escapes the mental pressure of Ormond, she immediately comes in contact with the overwhelming personality of (as the

reader learns in the last chapter) his sister; Constantia actually has no emotional respite here. Second, since Ormond wants a highly intelligent woman, one may wonder whether or not he--in essence--searches for this sister inspired by radical reasoning and thus sublimates a type of incest wish.

This assumption, as ironically improbable as it apears, finds strong reinforcement in the following chapter when Dudley refers to Ormond's fighting at the head of a Cossack band (Ch. 21). The reader and Constantia learn by Sophia Westwyn, who has arrived on the scene, that Ormond served in the Russian army, captured a girl, killed his friend in rivalry over her, raped her, killed her as a sacrifice to "the manes of Sarsefield" (his dead friend), slew five "Turkish foragers" the next day, tied their bloody heads to his horse's mane, threw the heads on Sarsefield's grave "more signally to expiate his guilt," and most ironically of all received "a commission in the Cossack troops" for his supposedly valorous conduct (Ch. 27). Aside from the "commission," on can easily detect the likeness between Ormond and his sister, and since he mysteriously knows of her marital actions, one may assume that Ormond's desire for a perfect woman actually finds its basis in Martinette. Both embrace radical thinking and both betray a blood-lust.

Ormond's having Dudley killed to hinder the latter's moving Constantia to Italy provides a significant ironic development. Although he does not confess to the deed until later, Ormond (via Craig) leaves Dudley's body in bed with marks of having "died in some terrific . . . manner" (Ch. 22). Constantia and Sophia reunite, and in the next chapter (23) Sophia gives her history with the presence of her maniacal, sensual mother as a dominating force. By parallel incidents, Brown is allowing his narrator to comment on the irrational nature of Ormond' thought-processes. When he admits to forcing Craig to murder Dudley, Ormond claims the act as "a due and disinterested offering on the altar of your [Constantia's] felicity and mine" and as a kindly exertion to prevent Dudley from experiencing any more pain (Ch. 28). Since he tells Constantia all his plans, even of soon raping her, one can assume that Ormond is not rationalizing, but is rather candidly expressing his understanding. Not only has he betrayed his own imbecility by discarding a wonderful woman in Helena, but he has also exposed his romanticized and warped view of love. Not only has he betrayed that cold, calculating logic to which he devotes himself, but he also makes abundantly clear that, to

him, premediated murder has become a token of love. Irony and madness merge at this point.

Meditating Constantia's vicissitudes, Sophia--although naturally of a religious inclination--figuratively shakes her fist at God: "When I reflected that all human agency was merely subservient to a divine purpose, I fell into fits of accusation and impiety" (Ch. 27). Her temporarily irrational "fits," however, subside, and she realizes such trials as appropriate for the acquirement of sagacity. That Constantia sinks into deep moroseness after killing Ormond in self-defense contradicts whatever sagacity Sophia assumed the heroine would accrue; in fact, the last we see of Constantia before her trip with Sophia to England still depicts the heroine's "eternal anguish" an self-torturing guilt over an event owing not to her intentions, but to Ormond's brutal selfishness. In the rape scene he insists that she know of his complicity in Dudley's murder and, by expecting her acquiescence, exerts a final, overwhelming, brainwashing ploy. The reader may find that the result is ironic. No only does Ormond secure his death by attempting the rape and demanding the acquiescence (when Constantia had already contemplated suicide as an escape from the "evil worse than death," (Ch. 29), but he also shakes Constantia's rational functions. Brown leaves ambiguous as to whether Constantia ever fully recovered from the emotional trauma.

In the end, Ormond remains a highly ironic work. One may wonder at Dudley's obtuseness, though he is a sensitive painter and musician. Helena Cleaves, who ironically adopts the surname of "Eden" (Ch. 14)--although her life is far from paradisiacal--proves morally weaker than Constantia; still, one may wonder if the mistress is not more humble, more selfless, and subtly more acute than the heroine. Helena appears as the only character with that highest of all attributes--selfless love. Sophia, the literal embodiment of the religious sentiments implied by Constantia's actions, finds her trust in God faltering. Constantia, who slaves throughout the novel to preserve her family and virtue, eventually loses Dudley as a result of her attention to Ormond and, though still a virgin in the end, barely has control of her wits. Finally, Ormond--who shares the blood-thirstiness and soraring idealism of his sister and who parallels the original sensuality of Sophia's mother--betrays the purely rational stance he has maintained. His logic, carefully articulated and plotted in each step, has proven itself a form of inhuman madness. Brown, therefore, has consistently raised and disappointed his

audience's expectations not as a cheap, shallow manipulation of suspense, but rather as an ironic means of depicting realism and transcience of human thought as well as human life. Insanity and death become the final fruition of such an ironic view.

NOTES

[1]See "Brown's Ormond: The Fruits of Improvision," AQ, 26 (1974), 4-22, wherein Paul C. Rodgers, Jr., claims an absence of thematic development because Brown's main concern was his publisher's deadlines and audience's demands.

[2]Norman S. Grabo, The Coincidental Art of Charles Brockden Brown, Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981. Although Grabo examines all of Brown's six novels in this excellent book, the chapter particularly pertinent to Ormond is "Constantia," pp. 30-55; the romance conventions include coincidental events, digressive narratives, and doubled characters.

[3]John Cleman, "Ambiguous Evil: A Study of Villains and Heroes in Charles Brockden Brown's Major Novels," EAL, 10 (1974), 190-219.

[4]Michael D. Bell, "'The Double-Tongued Deceiver': Sincerity and Duplicity in the Novels of Charles Brockden Brown," EAL, 9 (1974), 143-163.

[5]William Hedges, "Charles Brockden Brown and the Culture of Contradictions," EAL, 9 (1974), 107-142. Hedges specifies the dichotomizing forces as American versus European cultural sophistication, social conservatism versus Godwin/Wollenstonecraft proposals, innocence versus experience, strict rationalism versus rationalism undermined by uncontrolled passion, and benevolence versus selfishness-- with none of these tensions reaching resolution in the novels.

[6]Carl Nelson, "Brown's Manichaean Mock-Heroic: The Ironic Self in a Hyperbolic World," WVUPP, 20 (1973), 26-42.

[7]Carl Nelson, "A Just Reading of Charles Brockden Brown's Ormond," EAL, 8 (1973), 163-178. See also James R. Russo, "The Tangled Web of Deception and Imposture in Charles Brockden Brown's Ormond," EAL, 14 (1979), 205-227.

[8]Charles Brockden Brown, Ormond, edited with an Introduction by Ernest Marchand New York: American Book, 1937; rpr. Hafner Publishing Co., n.d. All further references to the novel will come from this edition and will appear parenthetically within the text by chapter number.

[9]Morton Shapiro, in his dissertation, traces the debt of Ormond to the English sentimental novels of Richardson, Sterne, and other novelists. See Morton Shapiro, "Sentimentalism in the Novels of Charles Brockden Brown," DAI, 27 (1966), 1384 A - 1385 A.

[10]S. J. Krause, "Ormond: Seduction in a New Key," AL, 44 (1973), 579, 577.

[11]Particularly on page 16 of the novel Brown castigates the legal profession. Brown's leaving law to pursue literature and the events leading to that decision appear on pp. x-xi of Marchand's Introduction to the edition used.

[12]Robert Levine defines the distinction between the fictional Illuminati to which Ormond belongs and the historical Illuminati. See Robert S. Levine, "Villainy and the Fear of Conspiracy in Charles Brockden Brown's Ormond," EAL, 15 (1980), 124-140.

[13]This embracing of the seducer/serpent with full knowledge of his character seems to be what Sophia considers as Constantia's "numerous defects" in the Preface; perhaps Brown humorously exaggerates via Sophia. However, the same fatal mistake finds a precedent in Hannah Foster's The Coquette, when Myra encourages her seducer in spite of her knowledge of his promiscuous tendency.

[14]Robert A. Ferguson, "Yellow Fever and Charles Brockden Brown: Context of the Emerging Novelist," EAL, 14 (1979-1980), 300. Ferguson also delineates how the Friendly Club and the fever helped to alleviate the social pressure that Brown felt and helped to promote his writing (pp. 293-299). See also William L. Hedges, "Benjamin Rush, Charles Brockden Brown, and the American Plague Year," EAL, 7 (1973), 295-311.

[15]To anyone who has read Wieland, this reference to an over-active imagination and its fatal effects should indeed be sobering.

[16]Marchand, p. xxxiii.

[17]For specific details of Brown's feminism, see Robert R. Hare's dissertation "Charles Brockden Brown's Ormond: The Influence of Rousseau, Godwin, and Mary Wollenstonecraft," DAI, 28 91968), 4599 A. See also Marchand, pp. xi-xii, for Brown's indictment of the typical female's education.

Nameless Graces: Instances of Metaphor and Inadequacy in Early Eighteenth-Century Shakespearean Criticism

David Wheeler

Restoration and eighteenth-century Shakespearean criticism contains many curiosities: "In the Neighing of an Horse, or in the growling of a Mastiff, there is a meaning, there is as lively expression, and, may I say, more humanity, than many times in the Tragical flights of Shakespear."[1] Thomas Rymer's splenetic tone and consistent detraction of Shakespeare afford us one such curiosity; neither that tone nor the substance of his critical remarks typifies the period's appraisal of Shakespeare, however. Rymer represents an extreme posture. Perhaps Thomas Hanmer, who with his 1744 edition sought to erect "another small monument designed and dedicated to his [Shakespeare's] honor,"[2] represents another. But most of the period's Shakespearean criticism--by critic and editor alike--is marked by combinations of praise and disapproval, resulting in a kind of curious equivocation. Given Shakespeare's formal irregularities and the Augustans' formalist critical apparatus, the disapproval is predictable. And, of course, given Shakespeare's genius, the praise, I suppose, is equally (or probably even more) predictable, but the nature of this praise, often residing in approbatory metaphor rather than concrete critical assessment, reflects an obvious conflict between these critics' appreciation of Shakespeare and the customary critical procedure by which they are forced to express it.

On one hand, Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, and Warburton are, in a way, responding to the strictly-by-the-rules, neoclassical criticism applied to Shakespeare by critics like Rymer and (to a lesser degree) Dennis. On the defensive, they invariably excuse on the basis of the age in which Shakespeare lived the formal irregularities which so profoundly offended Rymer, grounded as he was critically in French-filtered Aristotelianism. Pope's defense, buoyed by jurisprudential metaphor, is typical: "To judge therefore of Shakespear by Aristotle's rules, is like trying a man by the Laws of one Country, who acted under those of another."[3] Despite their anti-Rymer, pro-Shakespeare stance, however, the early editors were also compelled to acknowledge Rymer's position and often even parroted the critic's itemized objections to Shakespeare as they, in eighteenth-century fashion, systematically weighed faults against beauties,

And it is here, in the analysis of faults and beauties, that the central theoretical problem arises in this early eighteenth-century Shakespearean criticism.

In pointing out those instances where Shakespeare deviates from accepted eighteenth-century dramatic practice, these critics needed no Thomas Rymer to lead the way. They had at their disposal a whole critical tradition, based perhaps more on genres than on rules, replete with procedural apparatus; critical vocabulary; and the authority of Aristotle, Horace, and the French Aristotelians--Dacier, Le Bossu, Rapin, Boileau. In methodology, they had innumerable critical models--both dramatic and non-dramatic--including Dryden's formalist criticism of _Epiocene_, Addison's of _Paradise Lost_, Pope's of _The Iliad_. And since, as Pope points out, "of all _English_ Poets _Shakespear_ must be confessed to be the fairest and fullest subject for Criticism,"[4] they had little difficulty enumerating specific faults.

When it comes to lavishing praise, however, or to identifying beauties, the specificity vanishes.[5] Though we find sincere esteem expressed (Theobald even calls Shakespeare the "greatest Poet"[6]), the praise is nearly always general and vague, as these examples from Dryden, another defender of Shakespeare, suggest: "he was a man who of all modern, and perhaps ancient poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul"; "he is always great, when some great occasion is presented to him"; and "he needed not the spectacles of books to read Nature; he looked inwards, and found her there."[7] The first two examples--with their key words "soul" and "great"--hardly pinpoint the nature of Shakespeare's accomplishment; though still lacking concreteness, the third example, perhaps in an attempt to lift the praise from vagueness, includes an optical metaphor. The metaphor itself reminds us of the more famous one in Johnson's Preface, one that echoes Hamlet's advice to the players: "Shakespeare is above all writers, at least above all modern writers, the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirrour of manners and of life."[8] While the claim can be made that all good writers use metaphor and perhaps even that metaphor was especially popular in the eighteenth century, the predominance of metaphor, used particularly as an instrument of praise, creates a pattern evident enough to constitute another curiosity of eighteenth-century Shakespearean criticism.

These metaphors, while not overwhelming, remain memorable because of their elaborateness and their strategic

placement within the essays. Near the end of his "Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy," which he attached to the Preface to Troilus and Cressida (1679), Dryden employs a metaphor to counterbalance specific charges of bombast in Shakespeare: "If Shakespear were stripped of all the bombast in his passions, and dressed in the most vulgar words, we should find the beauties of his thoughts remaining; if his embroideries were burnt down, there would still be silver at the bottom of the melting pot."[9] Pope's use of metaphor in his final assessment of Shakespeare concludes his Preface to Shakespeare:

> I will conclude by saying of Shakespear, that with all his faults, and with all the irregularity of his Drama, one may look upon his works, in comparison of those that are more finish'd and regular, as upon an ancient piece of Gothick Architecture, compar'd with a neat Modern building: The latter is more elegant and glaring, but the former is more strong and more solemn. It must be allow'd that in one of these there are materials enough to make many of the other. It has much the greater variety and much the nobler apartments; tho' we are often conducted to them by dark, odd, and uncouth Passages. Nor does the Whole fail to strike us with greater reverence, tho' many of the Parts are childish, ill-placed and unequal to its grandeur.[10]

With the formalist nature of Aristotelian and most neoclassical criticism, Pope's choice of the architectual metaphor to illustrate his final appreciation of Shakespeare is easy to understand and somewhat conventional in the criticism of the period.[11] Theobald's Preface to Shakespeare (1733), the first preface to appear after Pope's (1725), begins with a metaphor quite similar to Pope's:

> The Attempt to write upon SHAKESPEARE is like going into a large, a spacious, and a splendid Dome thro' the Conveyance of a narrow and obscure Entry. A Glare of Light suddenly breaks upon you, beyond what the Avenue at first promis'd: and a thousand Beauties of Genius and Character, like so many guady Apartments pouring at once upon the Eye, diffuse and throw themselves out to the Mind. The Prospect is too Wide to come within the

> Compass of a single View: 'tis a gay Confusion of pleasing Objects, too various to be enjoyed but in a general Admiration; and they must be separated, and ey'd distinctly, in order to give the proper Entertainment.[12]

Theobald suggests in this passage that the object of the evaluative portion of his Preface is to separate Shakespeare's beauties, those dramatic qualities or perhaps specific passages that evince his genius, in order to enhance the reader's appreciation of the Bard. He recognizes the work at hand, for, after all, this endeavor--the critic's pointing out those literary qualities that are less apparent to the general reader--is the task of all criticism. But Theobald's criticism, while quite particular about Shakespeare's faults, relies on general statements such as the one above to bestow praise. Thus, as evaluative criticism, Theobald's Preface falls short, failing to specify Shakespeare's virtues.

Pope seems more realistic in his analysis of the inherent difficulties facing the eighteenth-century critic of Shakespeare. Implicit in his architectual metaphor is Pope's recognition of the desirability of a part-by-part analysis; indeed, when comparing the gothic and modern buildings, Pope, after making a general comparison, analyzes their respective parts: their "materials," their apartments, and the passages leading to their apartments. He ends, however, by suggesting that with Shakespeare it is the whole, rather than particular parts, that merits reverence. Such a holistic critical approach is contrary to Pope's practice in his most sustained work of literary analysis, the Preface to The Iliad. In assessing Homer, Pope's course was well-charted; The Iliad served as prototype for the Augustans' favorite genre, and the parts of the epic had long since been identified, the critical vocabulary for evaluating them long since established.

The same statement, however, could be made for the drama, especially tragedy. They had the vocabulary to discuss its elements--not just the three unities, but decorum (in its various meanings), appropriateness of diction, probability of characters, the regularity of versification, and the sentiment of the catastrophe with its attendant poetic justice. But Pope realized the procedure did not work with Shakespeare: Rymer's detailed analysis of Othello had already demonstrated that such an approach was wrong-headed and reductive. Consequently, Pope relied on

holistic appraisal of Shakespeare's canon, broad statements of praise which Pope knew were true, but supported by no theoretical apparatus other than an appeal to nature.[13] Rather than trap Shakespeare in a neoclassical formalism, Pope employs the escape valve described in The Essay on Criticism, the "grace beyond the reach of art":

> Some Beauties yet, no Precepts can declare,
> For there's a Happiness as well as Care.
> Musick resembles Poetry, in each
> Are nameless Graces which no Methods teach,
> And which a Master-Hand alone can reach.
> . . . .
> Great Wits sometimes may gloriously offend,
> And rise to Faults true Criticks dare not mend;
> From vulgar Bounds with brave Disorder part,
> And snatch a Grace beyond the Reach of Art,
> Which, without passing thro' the Judgment, gains
> The Heart, and all its End at once attains.
>
> (Essay on Criticism, ll. 141-45, 152-57)

In this passage, probably the best-known statement of the eighteenth-century je ne sais quoi, we discover how Pope (and the other critics I have been discussing) treats Shakespeare: Shakespeare 'rises" to his faults, his disorder is "brave," and "true" critics leave him alone. But implicit here, where the graces snatched are "nameless" graces that appeal not to judgment (the predominant critical faculty for most Augustans), but to the heart, is an admission that works by such masters are beyond the parameters of the existing critical methodology. If the graces are nameless, how can one make a list of them? The faults-and-beauties procedure combined with a structural bias produces a methodology that simply does not work with Shakespeare, who, like the nature he so fastidiously recreates, is unique, incomparable; thus Pope, contrary to his customary critical procedure, is forced to praise him on the grounds of holistic evaluation, and metaphor offers a convenient and colorful vehicle for that praise.

Lack of inclusiveness indicates the inadequacy of a critical system, but we begin to find a corrective of sorts in Samuel Johnson's Preface to Shakespeare which suggests a transition in eighteenth-century Shakespearean criticism. Johnson's Preface, too, abounds in the kind of metaphor we find in Pope and Theobald and, like theirs, Johnson's metaphors are often architectural in origin.

Conventionally, he uses metaphor to excuse Shakespeare because of the age in which he lived: "The palaces of Peru or Mexico were certainly mean and incomodious habitations, if compared to the houses of European monarchs; yet who could forbear to view them with astonishment, who remembered that they were built without the use of iron?"[14]

As we know, Johnson, in his Preface, also weighs faults and beauties. And like his predecessors, Johnson has little trouble listing Shakespeare's faults: the deficiency of moral purpose, the loose plots, the bad endings, the inattention to time and place, the ever-present puns, the gross jests, the pompous diction in narration. But, also like his predecessors, Johnson has more trouble bestowing praise. He, too, employs metaphors to indicate general praise in such passages as the often-quoted paragraph which contains two well-crafted metaphors working in tandem:

> The work of a correct and regular writer is a garden accurately formed and diligently planted, varied with shades, and scented with flowers; the composition of Shakespeare is a forest, in which oaks extend their branches, and pines tower in the air, interspersed sometimes with weeds and brambles, and sometimes giving shelter to myrtles and to roses; filling the eye with awful pomp, and gratifying the mind with endless diversity. Other poets display cabinets of precious rarities, minutely finished, wrought into shape, and polished unto brightness. Shakespeare opens a mine which contains gold and diamonds in unexhaustible plenty, though clouded by incrustations, debased by impurities, and mingled with a mass of meaner minerals.[15]

Though exemplifying Johnson's balanced prose style, this passage echoes Pope's concluding and Theobald's opening remarks on Shakespeare. (Indeed, when one reads these prefaces in succession, one cannot help but notice a continuity, so aware of each other were these early editors.) Here, we understand Johnson's general assessment, but I think we would be hard-pressed to identify objects in Shakespeare's drama that correspond to oaks, pines, myrtles, and roses, or even to gold and diamonds. The graces remain essentially nameless.

But Johnson was also aware of the critical difficulty confronting commentators of Shakespeare, and he again

employs a metaphor to assess the customary method of illustrating poetic beauties--quotation: "he that tries to recommend him [Shakespeare] by select quotations, will succeed like the pedant in *Hierocles*, who, when he offered his house to sale, carried a brick in his pocket as a specimen."[16] Again, the meaning is clear: a part of Shakespeare cannot represent him; like the pedant's house, Shakespeare's work must be viewed in its entirety.

Although often following the lead of the earlier editors, Johnson, however, makes considerable advances upon their criticism. When Pope confronted the incompatibility of Shakespeare and "rules and genres" criticism, he, appealing to the heart, simply removes Shakespeare from the critical system. Confronting the same incompatibility, Johnson challenges a system that cannot accommodate one of the language's greatest poets. He defends Shakespeare's characters against the charges of indecorum: "He [Shakespeare] knew that *Rome*, like every other city, had men of all dispositions; and wanting a buffoon, he went into the senate-house for that which the senate-house would certainly have afforded him."[17] And, relying on common sense, Johnson explodes demands for the unities of time and place:

> It is time therefore to tell him [the rigid critic] by the authority of Shakespeare, that he assumes, as an unquestionable principle, a position, which, while his breath is forming it into words, his understanding pronounces to be false. It is false, that any representation is mistaken for reality; that any dramatick fable in its materiality was ever credible, or for a single moment, was ever credited.[18]

If we can imagine ourselves to be in Alexandria in one scene, there is no reason we cannot imagine ourselves to be in Rome in another.

If Johnson can challenge critical commonplaces so convincingly, he still has no systematized evaluative procedure with which to replace them. Johnson still struggles with faults and beauties. Nevertheless, with his discussion of Shakespeare's dialogue, his inquiry into the psychological motivations of Shakespeare's characters, and his analysis of specific scenes, Johnson begins to explicate, to interpret. And while this kind of criticism is found largely in Johnson's notes to his edition of Shakespeare, it is interpretation, those seemingly infinite

varieties of interpretation, that lays bare the riches of Shakespeare described metaphorically by the early eighteenth-century critics as they struggled with evaluation.

My brief study is by no means exhaustive. I have examined only the most major of commentators--Dryden, Rymer, Dennis, and the early editors--but the evidence of struggle is apparent, the reliance on metaphor a result of the struggle. As the century progresses, Thomas Warton will proclaim the Elizabethan Age the golden age of English literature, and the popularity of primitivism, the rise of "the sublime," and the demand for "transporting" readers emotionally will provide new (or at least different) critical values to be applied (often more successfully) to Shakespeare.

NOTES

[1]Thomas Rymer, A Short View of Tragedy (London, 1693; rpr. New York, 1974), pp. 95-96.

[2]Sir Thomas Hanmer, Preface to The Works of Mr. William Shakespear (Oxford, 1744; rpr. New York, 1969), I, vi.

[3]Alexander Pope, Preface to Shakespeare (1725) in Warburton's edition (London, 1747; rpr. New York, 1968), I, xxxiii.

[4]Pope, in Warburton, I, xxix.

[5]In John Dennis's case, more than specificity vanishes. The Impartial Critick (1693), Dennis's reply to Rymer's Short View of Tragedy, consists of five dialogues, the last one promising an account of Shakespeare's beauties:

> Beaumont: I find then, that you do not dissent from Mr R---- in every thing.
>
> Freeman: No, I should be very sorry if I should do that; for his Censures of Shakespear in most of the particulars, are very sensible and very just. But it does not follow, because Shakespeare has Faults, that therefore he has no Beauties, as the next time we meet I shall shew

you. (The Critical Works of John Dennis, ed. E. N. Hooker [Baltimore, 1939 and 1943], I, 41).

No further dialogues were published.

[6]Lewis Theobald, Preface to The Works of Shakespeare (London, 1733; rpr. New York, 1968), I, xxxix.

[7]John Dryden, Of Dramatic Poesie: An Essay, in Essays of John Dryden, ed. W. P. Ker (New York, 1961), I, 79, 80.

[8]Samuel Johnson, Preface to The Plays of William Shakespeare (London, 1765; rpr. New York, 1968), I, viii. Johnson, by the way, also uses Dryden's "spectacles of books" metaphor in his Life of Milton.

[9]Ker, I, 227.

[10]Pope, in Warburton, I, xlv-xlvi.

[11]Nearly sixty years later, Johnson would use a metaphor drawn from the same art, as he said of Dryden: "What was said of Rome, adorned by Augustus, may be applied by an easy metaphor to English poetry embellished by Dryden, . . . he found it brick, and he left it marble" (Life of Dryden).

[12]Theobald, I, i.

[13]Warburton also makes this appeal in his Preface:

> . . . tho' it be very true, as Mr. Pope hath observed, that Shakespear is the fairest and fullest subject for criticism, yet it is not such a sort of criticism as may be raised mechanically on the Rules which Dacier, Rapin, and Bossu have collected from Antiquity; and of which, such a Kind of Writers as Rymer, Gildon, Dennis, and Oldmixon, have only gathered and chewed the Husks . . . But the kind of criticism here required is such as judgeth our Author by those Laws and Principles on which he wrote, NATURE, and COMMON-SENSE.
> (The Works of Shakespeare, I, xviii-xix)

[14]Johnson, Plays of Shakespeare, I, xxxii.

[15] Johnson, _Plays of Shakespeare_, I, xxxv-xxxvi.

[16] Johnson, _Plays of Shakespeare_, I, ix.

[17] Johnson, _Plays of Shakespeare_, I, xii.

[18] Johnson, _Plays of Shakespeare_, I, xxvi.

Jude Fawley and Little Father Time: Hardy's "New Men"

Julie A. Karsten

Jude the Obscure was savagely attacked by literary critics for the views it expressed on marriage, religion, and education. What many critics failed to note, though, was Hardy's treatment of man's inability to cope with social progress and change in the world around him. In Jude Hardy puts forth his idea of the "new" man whom he saw evolving as a result of social change.

Hardy's new man is a product of the destruction of old ways. The new man is restless, reckless, isolated, as well as extremely conscious of himself in relation to mankind (especially the suffering of mankind), and, above all, self-destructive. Perhaps this idea of the suicidal impulse is the real but elusive factor that so disturbed Hardy's readers: "[Hardy] faced more fully and openly than [his Victorian predecessors] the growing threat of self-destructiveness as man's consciousness of suffering withered his pleasure in living."[1] Hardy's idea of the new man and the growing wish not to live is seen in the character of Jude Fawley and is fully embodied in his son, Little Father Time.

Jude's wish not to live apparently stems from two major sources. The first is Jude's own psychological makeup. Jude is predetermined to suffer great pain in life. As a child, he cannot bring himself to keep the crows from eating Farmer Troutham's corn out of sympathy for their plight. He cannot bear to step on earthworms or witness the pruning of a tree: "This weakness of character . . . suggested that he was the sort of man who was born to ache a good deal before the fall of the curtain upon his unnecessary life. . ." (p. 21[2]). He is filled with pain and disgust over the killing of the pig he and Arabella raise. Hardy writes that "Jude felt dissatisfied with himself as a man at what he had done. . . . The white snow, stained with the blood of his fellow-mortal, wore an illogical look to him as a lover of justice. . . . No doubt he was . . . a tender-hearted fool" (p. 70). Indeed, the reader is introduced to Jude as a child who "has felt the pricks of life somewhat before his time" (p. 15). Jude displays a higher sensibility that the other characters in the novel do not have and cannot understand. Even Sue, who is a type of soul-mate for Jude, calls him "Joseph the dreamer of dreams . . . . a tragic Don Quixote . . . . St. Stephen, who, while they were stoning him, could see Heaven

opened" (p. 203). This higher sensibility leads Jude to make self-destructive choices such as his "do the right thing" marriage to Arabella and his failure to declare to Phillotson his love for Sue and his desire to marry her. At one point Jude himself says he is "too thin-skinned," and that he ought never to have been born. Jude is also riddled by a sense of isolation from the people around him. None of the villagers can understand his thirst for knowledge and love of learning. The rural folk see Christminster as just another city, while Jude sees it as a cultural center. Even his Aunt Drusilla does not understand him or really want him with her. She continually harps on the unfortunate past of Jude's family.

Jude's character is a significant factor for the understanding of his wish not to live, but disillusionment is the primary cause for his suicide attempts. Disillusionment is a constant in Jude's life. He no more than steadies himself after one disillusioning incident, but he is hit by another. The disenchanting follows a rough pattern, beginning with a dream or goal. After some attempts to reach the goal, Jude realizes that the goal is unattainable or that the goal he achieves is somewhat different from what he had originally conceived it to be. Jude is then disillusioned and sinks to the depths of despair. The pattern culminates in a wish not to live or in a suicide attempt. The suicide attempts are not always efforts at bodily injury, but are sometimes evidenced by heavy drinking bouts.

Jude Fawley's first disillusionment comes early in his life. He has asked Dr. Vilbert, the quack physician, to bring him some Greek and Latin grammars so that he may study the ancient tongues. Vilbert agrees to bring the grammars when he next returns to Marygreen if Jude will only gather some orders for medicines. But alas, no grammars appear with Vilbert on his return. Jude cries bitterly. This setback is not enough to deter him from his goal, however, and he writes to Mr. Phillotson, his old schoolmaster, to supply him with the necessary books. Phillotson does send the books. Jude eagerly opens the grammars only to find that he had mistaken his goal. The grammars do not supply some necessary "code" to the understanding of Greek and Latin as Jude had thought they would. Instead he realizes that the acquisition of the languages is to be had only by memorization, a process which will take years. Jude throws himself into a fit of despair and wishes "he had never seen a book, that he might never see another, _that he had never_

been born" (p. 35). This last phrase is important in the context of Jude as a "new man." This passage goes on to illustrate another characteristic of the new man: alienation from other men. Hardy writes that someone could have come to help the boy out of his despondency, "But nobody did come, because nobody does; and under the crushing recognition of his gigantic error Jude continued to wish himself out of the world" (p. 35).

Jude's second disillusionment comes with his marriage to Arabella (and the surrounding events). First, he must give up, or at least temporarily set aside, his idea of going to college at Christminster. After the marriage, Jude finds out that Arabella's long hair is only a hairpiece, that she was previously a barmaid, that her dimples are mere artifice, that she is not pregnant, and that she followed her friends' suggestion that she entrap Jude by becoming pregnant. Arabella ruins the few remaining books Jude has left (he has pawned the others) and a fight ensues. After Arabella raged for awhile, Jude "suddenly lost his heat. Illuminated with the sense that all was over between them, and that it mattered not what she did, or he, her husband stood still, regarding her. Their lives were ruined, he thought. . . " (p. 73). Again in the grip of despair, Jude walks out on a frozen pond, trying to crack the ice and drown himself. When the pond does not swallow him, he turns to another form of suicide:

> What could he do of a lower kind than self-extermination; what was there less noble, more in keeping with his present degraded position? He could get drunk. . . . Drinking was the regular, stereotyped resource of the despairing worthless. (p. 75)

Fawley's devil does not leave with Arabella. He is doomed to further pain. Again he takes up the dream of a college education and ordination into the Anglican Church. Jude does go to Christminster, his "City of Light." On his arrival he is awed by the universities and cathedrals, but the next day he finds disillusionment setting in already:

> What at night had been perfect and ideal was by day the more or less defective real. . . . [the buildings] were wounded, broken, sloughing off their outer shape in the deadly struggle against years, weather, and man. . . . [it was] a place of

crumbling stones. . . . (p. 86)

Here Jude shows another facet of the "new man": he choose self-destruction. He goes to the stone-mason yard and i struck by the contrast between the stagnation and deca evidenced in the universities and the new "modern prose being constructed in the stone yard:

> For a moment there fell on Jude a true illumination; that here in the stone yard was a centre of effort as worthy as that dignified by the name of scholarly study within the noblest of colleges. But he lost it under stress of his old idea. . . . This was his form of the modern vice of unrest. (p. 87)

Jude chooses to pursue the old, dying way of life rathe than to find his way in the new. He also shows the "moder vice of unrest," which is part of Hardy's idea of the "ne man." Finally, Jude receives a letter from a universit official advising him to stick to stone masonry. Jude i bitterly disillusioned by his inability to reach his goal The letter's "effect . . . was to make him rise recklessl . . . and . . . go . . . into the street. He stood at a ba and tossed off two or three glasses, then unconsciousl sauntered along . . ." (p. 120). Again the suicidal impuls is displayed.

Jude's next dream involves Sue Bridehead. Even thoug he can name at least three reasons why he should not see her out, he acts in a self-destructive manner, activel seeking her company. For Jude, Sue is an "ideality." Hi disillusionment begins when he sees his old schoolmaster Phillotson, with his arm around Sue. Bad becomes worse whe Sue becomes engaged to and eventually marries Phillotson After Sue's marriage, Jude turns suicidal again. He ha "that feeling which had been his undoing more than once— that he was not worth the trouble of being taken care o either by himself or others . . ." (p. 178). He also turn to drink once more. But the real disenchanting begins whe Sue leaves her husband to live with Jude. Jude repeatedl tries to get Sue to marry him (after both have obtaine divorces from their respective spouses), but to no avail. Sue quotes philosophy to Jude and cites her belief tha marriage is not a sacrament as reasons for her balking. Sh is afraid that, once she and Jude are bound by law to lov each other, they will not be able to do so. She is als

afraid of the physical aspect of involvement with a man. A list of disappointments with Sue (not the least of which involves society's disapproval of their unmarried but intimate state) leads Jude to further disillusionment. Not only is Sue not the ideal woman (a wonderful blend of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical) he had imagined her, but she has also changed her views on life. Jude felt

> a sense of inconsistency between his former dogmas and his present practice, hardly a shred of the beliefs with which he had first gone up to Christminster now remaining with him. He was mentally approaching the position which Sue had occupied when he first met her. (p. 305)

He becomes thoroughly disillusioned when Sue leaves him to return to Phillotson. He argues with her, but cannot persuade her to remain with him. After Sue's remarriage to Phillotson, Jude "turned into a public-house, for the first time during many months" (p. 368). Jude's final suicide is a result of Sue's abandonment of him (and the views they shared). Jude goes to see Sue one last time, braving the wind and rain in spite of a lung ailment. He realizes that he is seeking death. He tells Arabella, "I have seen her for the last time, and I've finished myself--put an end to a feverish life which ought never to have been begun!" (p. 386). Again the wish not to live and a (successful) suicide attempt mark Jude as a "new man."

Jude Fawley lives on the edge. He displays characteristics of the new man, yet he tries to cling to the old education system and religious views. Little Father Time does not have a choice as to which category is his. He is unmistakably Hardy's idea of the new man. Jude says, "Let the day perish wherein I was born, and the night in which it was said, 'There is a man child conceived!' That's what the boy--<u>my</u> boy, perhaps, will find himself saying before long!" (p. 271). This prophecy comes true. Father Time is isolated and misunderstood by society. He is old before his time. He, too, is overly-sensitive, even to the very flowers displayed at the fair. Before his fateful suicide, Time asks Sue, "It would be better to be out o' the world than in it, wouldn't it?" and says, "I wish I hadn't been born!" (pp. 327-328).

Clearly Little Father Time embodies all that is disillusioned and suicidal in Jude, although he is born disillusioned and does not have to go through the same

process Jude does. He is the new man. After Time's suicid
Jude remarks:

> It was in his nature to do it. The doctor says there are such boys springing up amongst us--boys of a sort unknown in the last generation--the outcome of new views of life. They seem to see all its terrors before they are old enough to have staying power to resist them. He says it is the beginning of the coming universal wish not to live. (p. 331)

Hardy saw this new man as the outcome of vast social change which had overrun and confused man. The narrator's fina comment on Father Time links him to Jude and the coming wis not to live:

> The boy's face expressed the whole tale of their situation. On that little shape had converged all the inauspiciousness and shadow which had darkened the first union of Jude, and all the accidents, mistakes, fears, errors of the last. He was their nodal point, their focus, their expression in a single term. For the rashness of those parents he had groaned, for their ill assortment he had quaked, and for the misfortunes of these he had died. (pp. 331-332)

Perhaps Time groaned for all the "new men" to come, too.

NOTES

[1]Frank R. Giordano, Jr., "I'd Have My Life Unbe": Thomas Hardy's Self-destructive Characters (University Alabama, 1984), p. 47. The following works have also shape my thinking: Peter J. Casagrande, Unity in Hardy's Novel (Lawrence, Kansas, 1982); Albert Pettigrew Elliott, Fatalis in the Works of Thomas Hardy (New York, 1966); Bert G Hornback, The Metaphor of Chance: Vision and Technique i the Works of Thomas Hardy (Athens, Ohio, 1971); Dale Kramer Thomas Hardy: The Forms of Tragedy (Detroit, Michigan 1975); G. W. Sherman, The Pessimism of Thomas Hard (Cranbury, New Jersey, 1976); Anne Smith, ed., The Novels o Thomas Hardy (New York, 1979).

[2]This and all subsequent page numbers refer to _Jude the Obscure_, "Afterward" by A. Alverez [Signet edition] (New York, 1980).

Joyce Carol Oates's "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?": Arnold Friend as Devil, Dylan, and Levite

Mark B. Robson

Joyce Carol Oates's much-anthologized short story "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" has been the focus of limited critical attention since it first appeared in 1966, but much within the story still remains unexplained. While it is generally accepted that the story is an allegory dealing with "the simultaneous mystery and reality of the contradictions of the human heart"[1] and "The moral indifference of the entire adult society,"[2] together with the universal experience of "the loss of innocence,"[3] there has been little or no attempt to explain the confusing and bizarre happenings which take place within the story. Despite Walter Sullivan's statement to the contrary that "There are to my knowledge no symbols here,"[4] that the character of Arnold Friend is representative of the devil and that his quest is to claim Connie are generally accepted, but again no previous explanations have accounted for his arrival and symbolic appearances. It would appear, however, through a close analysis of "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" that Oates's construction and symbolism clearly point to Connie's fall being the direct result of her having committed the seven deadly sins; that Arnold Friend, while clearly symbolizing the devil, is at the same time, through the person of Bob Dylan, a symbol of the corrupting forces of the youth in the 1960's; and that there are parallels between Oates's story and specific Biblical passages which are cryptically referred to within the text. Such an approach places "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" in a more allegorical light and also accounts for many of the unexplained circumstances within the story.

I

Connie, the fifteen-year-old protagonist of Oates's story, can be seen as a typical teenager, as she exhibits all of the outward and inward characteristics of the generation which Oates was observing, but she can also be extended allegorically to represent teenagers in any period. If it is accepted that Arnold Friend is the devil, as Joyce M. Wegs has convincingly argued,[5] it must also be explained why he chose Connie as a specific target. One of Wegs's

arguments deals with the use of irony in the choice of names: Friend is close to fiend, a name which refers to the devil. To refine further this aspect of Arnold Friend's character, if the R's are removed from his first and last names, the resulting phrase is "an old fiend," which is an even more specific reference to the devil. The question of why the devil chose Connie has a two-fold answer. First, she symbolically represents all of the corrupted youth, but secondly, and more importantly, she has invited the devil to claim her by committing the seven deadly sins. Before Friend and his companion, Ellie Oscar, arrive at Connie's "asbestos ranch house"[6] to take her away, Oates clearly shows that Connie has, in varying degrees, committed all of the seven deadly sins.

Pride: Connie's vanity is a constant theme throughout the opening pages of the story. She is always concerned about her outward appearance, especially when she is away from her home and indeed, "Everything about her had two sides to it, one for home and one for anywhere that was not home." Similarly, her first thought when Friend and Ellie Oscar drove up was her appearance: "she whispered, 'Christ, Christ,' wondering how bad she looked." Connie's pride, together with her sloth, is her most evident sin.

Covetousness: When Connie and her friends visit the shopping plaza, they never buy anything but only, presumably, wish to have the items in the store windows.

Lust: Connie's sexuality is one of the most prominent aspects of "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" as she is constantly aware of her sexual role. One of the themes throughout much of Oates's works is a fascination with sexuality and how it affects people's lives. The lust Connie exhibits is evident outwardly in her relationship with Eddie and inwardly with her dreaming of "the caresses of love." After eating with Eddie, Connie drove with him "down an alley a mile or so away," thus satisfying her lusty desires. Arnold Friend's impending "rape" of her body and soul is not surprising, as Ellen G. Friedman states, since "Connie's fantasies must yield to a more disturbing reality as dreams must always yield to the realities of life."[7]

Anger: The anger which Connie exhibits is clearly directed at her mother, who "kept picking at her" and reminding her that her sister, June, was a better person and more industrious: "Connie wished her mother was dead and she herself was dead and it was all over." By the end of the story, the latter part of the wish comes true, as Friend quotes a line, "My sweet little blue-eyed girl," from a Bob

Dylan song, "It's All Over Now, Baby Blue," and prepares to leave with her.

Gluttony: When Connie and Eddie were together in the restaurant, they "ate hamburgers and drank Cokes in wax cups" for three hours, indicating that Connie, at least, ate and drank excessively.

Envy: While she showed anger towards her mother because of her sister, Connie was also clearly envious of June's position in the household and community as a "steady" person who was "praised all the time by her mother and her mother's sisters." The envy caused a rift between the sisters and can be seen as a contributing factor to the detrimental nature of Connie's character.

Sloth: Sloth is perhaps the most dominant of the seven deadly sins in the story. Connie is constantly seen as inactive, lazy, and prone to daydreams. Oates gives no indication that Connie had ever been anything other than slothful, and it is at times difficult to separate one sin from another since most instances of Connie's sinning revolve around her sloth. That the day when Friend came for Connie was a Sunday is also significant. The rest of Connie's family was at a barbeque, but none of the family "bothered with church" and "Connie got up at eleven."

Thus the stage was clearly set for the arrival of Arnold Friend, who had, after all, observed Connie's behavior. By committing the seven deadly sins, Connie invited the devil to enter into her life and ultimately to succeed in taking her away with him. Within the context of the story, it is extremely possible and most probable that Connie caused her own downfall through her own sinful actions. On the allegorical level, countless Connies are inviting their own downfalls, and the overall tone of "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" indicates that Oates was most concerned about the lack of morals and high standards in society. It is not, however, only Connie who is to blame, as the parents do not ask the vital questions, "where are you going?" and "where have you been?" but, rather, leave Connie and the numerous other Connies to discover "right" and "wrong" for themselves.[8] Oates herself commented that the stories which make up the collection _Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?_ "deal with human beings struggling heroically to define personal identity in the face of incredible opposition, even in the face of death itself,"[9] and perhaps because Connie has no real identity--she is simply a symbol for her generation--she ultimately fails in her quest for identity. She does, in

fact, face death itself to discover her own identity. She sacrifices herself to save her family from a similar fate, which is probably the first "virtuous" action of her conscious life.

II

The youth of the 1960's is symbolized by the person of Connie, and the corrupting force of the youth is represented by Arnold Friend in the form of Bob Dylan. Oates dedicated "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" "To Bob Dylan," which, from the context of the story, is an ironic dedication, as he--or, rather, the type he represents--is responsible for the lack of morals in society. By equating the devil-character with Dylan, Oates certainly seems to be pointing a strong finger towards what she considers to be an undesirable element. She has stated that "most young Americans" struggle "to rescue spiritual values from a society constantly in the process of devaluing itself."[10] Dylan can be seen as the spokesman for a generation who wished to revolutionize and change society, and Connie is representative of the youth who were influenced by him, thus indicating that they wished to "devalue" the standards already in place.

The physical descriptions of Arnold Friend work on two levels, both supporting the devil-Dylan theory. Wegs, among others, has shown that Friend's overall physical appearance and characteristics are contrived to make him appear to be one of Connie's generation and that such a theory would support the trickery of the devil to gain his victim: Friend's hair appears to be a wig; his face seems like a mask; he is awkward in his actions and cannot stand in his boots because his cloven hooves do not reach the bottom; and he also appears to have clairvoyant and supernatural powers. The description of Friend is also the description of Bob Dylan, however, from the physical appearance to the speech patterns. That the devil would choose Dylan's form to claim Connie would be fitting, since she would not suspect wrongdoing from one whom she so much respected and who had influenced her life. Although she did not actually recognize Friend, he was familiar to her, and he expected her to know who he was and what he wanted. Connie herself was always surrounded by music, music which the older generation could not understand and therefore attributed to the forces of evil. Music plays an important role in "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" and for Connie "it was

something to depend upon." Indeed, it is given a religious-like importance, and the "Bobby King" radio show plays throughout the events on Sunday as background music, both on Connie's bedroom radio and Friend's car radio.

Arnold Friend has "shaggy, shabby black hair that looked crazy as a wig"; he wore "tight faded jeans stuffed into black, scuffed boots, a belt that pulled his waist in and showed how lean he was, and a white pull-over shirt that was a little soiled and showed the hard small muscles of his arms and shoulders"; and his face was "slightly darkened because he hadn't shaved for a day or two." Such is also the physical description of Bob Dylan in the mid-1960's, but the similarity does not end with appearances. Indeed, Friend's speech patterns are reminiscent of Dylan's early songs: "he spoke in a fast, bright monotone"; "He spoke in a simple lilting voice, exactly as if he were reciting the words to a song"; Connie recognized "the sing-song way he talked, slightly mocking, kidding, but serious and a little melancholy"; and he also spoke "in a chant." If one did not know that Oates was referring to Friend, the reader could easily assume that she were talking about the way in which Bob Dylan sang.

Throughout "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" Connie seems almost able to recognize Friend, but is just unable to do so, indicating that he had the appearance of someone distantly familiar but not personally known--almost as if Arnold Friend had observed the appearance and characteristics of the most influential person of the youth and had imitated him. The ironic dedication takes on more importance if it is understood that Oates appears to be venting anger at the loss of spiritual values in America because of the music and influences of such people as Bob Dylan. Dylan, however, is simply representative of the trend and may have been the most influential person at the time of Oates's writing. Friend's companion, Ellie Oscar, could also be representative of the corrupting force, but in the person of Elvis Presley. Throughout the scene between Friend and Connie, Ellie simply waits in the background without actually performing any purpose within the story other than providing moral support and, although it is not needed, physical support. Ellie, like Arnold Friend, has a false appearance--he has "the face of a forty-year-old baby"--but his physical appearance is reminiscent of Presley's: "He wore a bright orange shirt unbuttoned halfway to show his chest....His shirt collar was turned up all around and the very tips of the collar pointed out past

his chin as if they were protecting him." The car in which Friend and Oscar arrived was "a convertible jalopy painted gold," perhaps representative of Elvis Presley's gold limousine. The fact that both Bob Dylan and Elvis Presley are represented in the story is significant. Oscar, as the Presley-character, represents the older music which used to be of greater importance to the youth but which is now in the background. He is still, however, in the limelight, but only as a secondary character to Dylan. Friend, as the Dylan-character, represents what is of greatest importance to the present youth, and therefore he, not Oscar, must persuade Connie to come with them.

III

In an article in The Explicator, I showed how Arnold Friend's reading of the numbers "33, 19, 17" from the side of his car cryptically referred to Judges 19:17. Judges is the 33rd book from the end of the Old Testament; and Judges 19:17 includes an approximation of the phrase "where are you going, where have you been?" and indicates a probable source for Oates's title.[11] Moreover, certain parallels between Oates's story and Judges 19 occur, indicating the possible outcome of Connie's association with the devil. In Judges 19, a man of the tribe of Levi reclaimed his concubine from her father's house. This act was only accomplished, however, after spending many days eating and drinking with the father. On their journey home, the man and his concubine stopped for the night in Gibeah, an alien town, where only one man showed them hospitality. The other men of the town, however, besieged the host's house and demanded to have the visitor in order to "know" him, but instead the concubine was given to them, "and they knew her, and abused her all the night until the morning." When the man and his concubine returned home, he "divided her, together with her bones, into twelve pieces, and sent her into all the coasts of Israel."

In Oates's story, Arnold Friend is the man of the tribe of Levi, although his position takes on an added significance with the transference to the 1960's: the Friend-Dylan character is the "leader" of the youth characterized by their wearing Levi jeans. Friend, like his Biblical counterpart, undertakes a quest for his concubine. By committing the seven deadly sins, Connie has metaphorically become the concubine of the devil, and Friend's quest is to claim her from her father's house.

There is the definite indication throughout the latter part of "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" that Friend desires to rape Connie, perhaps on the way to hell, which would symbolize the mass rape of the Levite's concubine in Gibeah. The final outcome of the concubine--death and dismemberment--is perhaps the fate which symbolically awaits Connie when she eventually leaves with Friend. Her fate as the devil's concubine would certainly be no less than that of the Levite's concubine, as she forfeited her "marriage" with Christ through sinful actions.

"Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" is probably Joyce Carol Oates's best-known short story, since it is anthologized in so many college-level literature texts, but despite this popularity, much in the story remained unexplained. The story goes beyond Wegs's contention that it is simply good versus evil, as Oates was able to manipulate many different levels of action within the same framework. Joanne V. Creighton singled out "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" as displaying "Oates's scalpellike control of the tools of her trade,"[12] and certainly to manipulate the characters in such a skillful manner is an indication of the quality which makes this short story so popular. The allegorical aspects add to the story's universal significance, and an approach such as the one taken in this study places "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" in a more critical light and may help to explain many of the situations which before were confusing or appeared inconsistent.

NOTES

[1]Joyce M. Wegs, "'Don't You Know Who I Am?' The Grotesque in Oates' 'Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?'" JNT, 5 (1975), 66.

[2]Wegs, p. 67.

[3]Joanne V. Creighton, Joyce Carol Oates (Boston, 1979), p. 118.

[4]Walter Sullivan, "The Artificial Demon: Joyce Carol Oates and the Dimensions of the Real," HC, 9 (Dec., 1972), 3.

[5]See Wegs.

[6]Joyce Carol Oates, "Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?" _Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?_ (Greenwich, Conn., 1974). All references to the text are from this edition.

[7]Ellen G. Friedman, _Joyce Carol Oates_ (New York, 1980), p. 13.

[8]Wegs, 67.

[9]Oates, p. 9.

[10]Oates, p. 10.

[11]"Oates' 'Where Are You Going, Where Have You Been?'" _Expl_, 40:4 (Summer, 1982), 59-60.

[12]Creighton, p. 117.

Some Notes in Vindication of the "Traditional Ending" of Mark's Gospel

Daryl R. Coats

Since the early eighteenth century, most works of biblical manuscript evidence have maintained that, without doubt, the traditional ending of Mark's gospel (16:9-20 in the AV of 1611) is not original to the work, but was added to the gospel at a later date by another hand. For almost three hundred years, evidence has been presented that, at first glance, would suggest that the traditional ending truly is a later addition. As a result, all English bibles since the mid-1800's either have omitted the gospel's traditional ending entirely, or have relegated it to a footnote, or have separated it from the rest of the gospel and prefaced it with warnings about its inauthenticity. However, despite the near unanimity of most critics and bibles that such is not so, the manuscript evidence in support of the traditional ending's authenticity is actually much greater than any evidence to the contrary.

"Scholarly" reasons for rejecting the traditional ending of Mark are several, and despite the reams of paper used to support them, they can be summed up very easily. According to some, Mark 16:7 "obviously" foreshadows a confrontation between Peter and the risen Lord; according to others, Mark 14:28 foreshadows a journey to Gallilee by the disciples and the resurrected Christ. Since neither that journey nor that confrontation occurs in the traditional ending, said ending must be an addition to the text. Among fundamentalists, conservatives, and even secularists, some scholars reject the traditional ending because three of its verses (16:16-18) are proof texts for some of the more extreme practices of pentecostals, charismatics, and snake handlers. Another argument against the authenticity of the traditional ending is that the tone of those twelve verses is different from that of the rest of the book. A similar argument claims that the grammar and vocabulary of the last twelve verses are "non-Marcan" and that for that reason Mark could not have written them. The most cited evidence, however, against the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20 is the supposed lack of manuscript evidence supporting that ending; as the recent NIV puts it, "The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20." Marginalia and scholia renouncing the traditional ending in manuscripts containing it are included as support of a weak textual

tradition behind it, as are "alternative endings" and writings of early church fathers.

Such a case against the traditional ending of Mark seems formidable at first. Nevertheless, when they are examined closely and in-depth, the evidences against its authenticity become less formidable and more unconvincing--the parroted arguments of ones who have never bothered to research and adequately document the matter. Though an in-depth presentation of evidence favoring the traditional ending is not within the scope of this paper, I do wish at least to describe and summarize it while showing some of the weaknesses of those arguments against it.

The first problem one must face if the gospel's traditional ending is a later addition is the problem of what happened to the gospel's original ending. Was it lost? Some say yes. But if that is the case, then how? Some have suggested that the last page of the gospel was lost shortly after the original manuscript was completed, but such a suggestion would require that the manuscript be written as a codex and not, as was customary at the time, as a scroll.[1] If the gospel's original ending somehow was accidentally removed, why does the gospel not end in mid-sentence? What are the odds that a scroll or even a codex would accidentally tear between sentences? (That the ending would be torn at all from a scroll is especially unlikely because, as Kenyon notes, "the end would be on the <u>inside</u> of the roll, and therefore not exposed to much risk of damage."[2]) How did Mark's "original ending" disappear so shortly after the gospel's completion that it is not quoted, referred to, or cited by anyone?--so shortly after the gospel's completion that it was so thoroughly (and so widely) replaced by the traditional ending? If it truly disappeared at such an early date--before copies of the gospel could have been made--could it not easily have been replaced, most likely by the original author? The only real "proof" that Mark originally contained an ending other than the traditional one is the claim that Mark 14:28 and 16:7 foreshadow events not found in the traditional ending. I have a problem with such a claim; namely, how can anyone know for certain that a passage that no longer exists (and for which no testimony has ever been found) is foreshadowed in either verse? Without the actual "original ending" to support it, this claim is tenuous and insupportable at best.

Such problems with the loss of an "original ending" have led others to conclude that the author of Mark intended his work to end with the present 16:8: "And they went out

quickly and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid" (kai ekselthousai tachu ephugon apo tou mnemeiou; eichen de autas tromos kai estasis; kai oudeni ouden eipon ephobounto gar). But this conclusion also presents some problems. The gospel commences, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (arche tou evangeliou Iesou Christou, huiou tou theou). The word "evangeliou" ("gospel") literally means "good news." What is the good news about a book that ends with the words, "neither said they any thing to any man; <u>for they were afraid</u>"? This problem is compounded by "gar," the last word in the Greek text of 16:8. According to D. E. Nineham, "gar" "is not normally used as the last word of a sentence, let alone a book." Though "gar" was "sometimes used to end a sentence, and even a paragraph," no evidence has ever been discovered that it could be used "as the last word of a whole book,"[3] partly because "gar" implies continuation. What is left to continue if the gospel ends with the present 16:8?

Rejection of the traditional ending's authenticity because portions of that ending appeal to certain fringe groups hardly does justice to the passage. One might as well reject the authenticity of some of Shakespeare's works because Mr. Bowdler found them offensive or because a film director "misinterprets" or "destroys" certain scenes. Agreement or disagreement with any doctrine that may or may not be found in the passage is of itself not enough to dismiss the traditional ending as a later addition to the gospel, just as agreement or disagreement with Bradstreet's Calvinism, Eliot's Catholicism, Emerson's transcendentalism, or Shelley's atheism is not evidence that the works of those writers are somehow counterfeit, or "later additions." If we were to reject as authentic every verse that some person, cult, sect, denomination, or movement uses to propagate its own doctrines, very little of the Bible would be left.

Many have claimed that the traditional ending cannot be authentic because it differs markedly from the rest of the gospel in tone and vocabulary. Because the last twelve verses of Mark depict post-resurrection appearances of Jesus, a subject discussed nowhere else in that gospel, it comes as no surprise that the tone of those verses might differ from the rest of the gospel. Arguments citing vocabulary and grammar simply are misinformed, however. John W. Burgon demonstrated more than one hundred years ago that the syntax and vocabulary of the <u>first</u> twelve verses of

Mark--which, like those in the traditional ending, feature a subject not discussed elsewhere in the gospel--are decidedly "non-Marcan," as much so as those of the last twelve verses, yet no one doubts the authenticity of the beginning of Mark. In answer to the argument that the traditional ending is inauthentic because it does not contain two "typically Marcan words," Burgon showed that one of those words, "eutheos" ("straightway"), does not occur in Mark 12; that the other word, "palin" ("again"), does not occur in Mark 1, 6, and 9; and that both words do not occur in Mark 13. More recently, John Broadus responded to the claim of seventeen "non-Marcan" words in the traditional ending by demonstrating that the twelve verses immediately preceeding it (15:44-16:8) also contain seventeen "non-Marcan" words, yet no one claims that Mark 15:44-16:8 is a late addition to the gospel. Within the last decade, William F. Farmer has shown not only that several passages of Mark are "non-Marcan" in vocabulary and syntax, but that half the verses of the traditional ending contain words distinctly "Marcan," some found nowhere else in the Greek New Testament <u>except</u> in the first fifteen chapters of Mark. Supposed differences in tone and vocabulary, then, are hardly adequate evidences that the gospel's traditional ending is a later addition, and as even Samuel Tregrelles admitted, "arguments on style are often fallacious, and . . . by themselves they prove very little."[4]

The most often cited evidence against the traditional ending is the supposed lack of manuscript evidence supporting it. However, every complete Greek manuscript of Mark <u>except</u> <u>two</u> contains the traditional ending, and the two that do not either at one time <u>did</u> contain it or else left room for it to be inserted later. The two Greek manuscripts which omit the traditional ending are Codex Vaticanus (or Codex B) and Codex Sinaiticus (or Codex Aleph), both Alexandrian manuscripts originating from the same region and, in the case of Mark's ending, possibly the same scribe.

Whenever a book concludes in Codex B, the remainder of the column in which it ends is left blank and the book following begins in the very next column. This is true of the endings and beginnings of every book in the manuscript--with one exception: the beginning of Luke's gospel. One-and-one-half blank columns separate the "ending" of Mark (16:8) from the beginning of Luke, the only place in the entire manuscript where such a thing happens and an obvious piece of evidence that the scribe who penned the manuscript knew about the ending of the gospel and for some reason

omitted it, probably intending to return and insert it (or another ending) in the one-and-one-half columns he left blank.

Codex Aleph's testimony against the traditional ending of Mark is even less convincing than that of Codex B. In Codex Aleph, the leaves containing the end of Mark and the beginning of Luke are not original to the manuscript, nor were they written by the same scribe who wrote the rest of Mark and Luke. As Skeates and Milne reported when they examined the manuscript for the British Museum after the museum had purchased it, "It is well known that in the Sinaiticus the last leaf of Mark and the first leaf of Luke . . . were written by Scribe D, presumably to replace an earlier bifolium written by the normal scribe, namely A."[5] The original leaves were removed because they contained something that should not have been there, and another scribe recopied them, omitting the excess material and writing larger than the original scribe so as not to leave a blank space that would indicate something had been removed. Since Mark 16:9-20 are now missing from the manuscript, it would seem most likely that the omitted material was none other than the gospel's traditional ending. For scholars such as Skeates and Milne, however, such a possibility is impossible for two reasons: "Such an idea seems alien to the spirit of the manuscript" (my emphasis); and such an idea assumes that the leaves in question were re-written "because it had been decided to omit Mark xvi.9-20"![6] If such "reasoning" is correct, what, then, was omitted? According to Skeates and Milne, the original scribe must accidentally have written the beginning of Luke twice and the corrector of the manuscript merely removed one of the beginnings! Such a claim seems a trifle far-fetched, especially since Constantine Tischendof, who discovered Codex Aleph, concluded, after studying it and Codex B, that the scribe who rewrote the ending of Mark and the beginning of Luke in Codex Aleph was the same scribe who wrote all of the New Testament in Codex B. Surely, then, any testimony given by these two manuscripts, written in the same place and possibly by the same scribe, is flimsy at best.

To bolster the sagging testimony of Codices Aleph and B, some scholars cite other manuscripts that supposedly omit the gospel's traditional ending. For example, William L. Lane, among others, claims that two other Greek manuscripts besides Codices Aleph and B omit the traditional ending: miniscules 304 and 2386, both from the twelfth century.[7] Unfortunately for Lane, however, 2386 is an incomplete

manuscript from which the last leaf of Mark has disappeared, and as Metzger notes, the lectionary sign at the end of 16:8 is "a clear implication that the manuscript originally continued with additional material from Mark."[8] As if this were not bad enough, according to the critical apparatus to the third edition of the UBS Greek New Testament, miniscule 304 is an unchecked manuscript which apparently is not a Bible at all but a lectionary. It would seem that Lane, in his desire to dismiss the authenticity of Mark's traditional ending, simply chooses not to investigate his evidence as fully or as closely as he should. Otherwise, why would he make so much of a two-word rubric inserted into an Armenian manuscript of Mark--a rubric he claims was written in AD 989--when several years earlier, the European scholar Josef Smith showed that Lane's rubric was worthless, having been added to the Armenian manuscript in the fifteenth century--nearly 500 years after the manuscript was written? Why else would he cite "a number of the manuscripts of the Ethiopic version" as omitting the traditional ending when, only two years before, Bruce Metzger demonstrated that the Ethiopic manuscripts in question do contain Mark 16:9-20?[9]

Other than Codices Aleph and B, the only complete manuscripts that omit the traditional ending of Mark are a handful of manuscripts of ancient versions: one Old Latin manuscript, the Sinaitic Syriac manuscript, two Old Georgian manuscripts, and some Armenian manuscripts. Because these are not Greek manuscripts, their value as evidence against the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20 is very limited--especially since every other known complete manuscript of Mark in any language or version contains the traditional ending--and except for the Old Latin Codex Bobiensis (or Codex k), none is granted more than passing recognition even by those who cite them as evidence. Codex k replaces the traditional ending with the so-called "shorter ending"--the only manuscript in any language to do so--hardly surprising considering the manuscript's docetic tendencies in the last chapter of Mark. In addition to omitting Mark 16:9-20 and part of 16:8, Codex k inserts between 16:3 and 16:4 material taken from a docetic apocryphal work, the Gospel of Peter (see appendix). Since docetics deny the physical resurrection of Jesus, it is hardly surprising that the docetic scribe of Codex k would replace the traditional ending of the gospel with a shorter ending that contains no references to the resurrection.

Despite the importance sometimes placed on them, various scholia and marginalia in a few manuscripts of Mark

scarcely undermine the authenticity of the traditional ending, representing only scribal opinions on material often a thousand or more years old. Even then, their contents often are exaggerated. None states directly that the traditional ending is inauthentic; most, in fact, state exactly the opposite, defending the traditional ending and noting its occurence in more ancient manuscripts. Only the eighth- or ninth-century manuscript Codex L, described as an "exceedingly vicious" manuscript, contains a negative scholion, and it says simply, "Something to this effect is also met with: . . . But this also is met with after the words, 'For they were afraid:'."[10] Surely such a scholium on one late (and generally untrustworthy) uncial manuscript does not override the testimony of other manuscripts and scholia.

Like scholia and marginalia, the writings of the ancient church fathers are also cited as evidence against the traditional ending of Mark; and like the scholia and marginalia, such patristic writings in no way refute the authenticity of the traditional ending. Only four of the early writers are usually cited to disprove the traditional ending: Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. Clement and Origen can be discarded as witnesses at once because they represent only an argument from silence. In all of their currently known works, neither Clement nor Origen ever mentions the traditional ending; somehow, this "proves" that the traditional ending is a late addition to the gospel because, if it were original to the gospel, both writers "undoubtedly" would have quoted or referred to it. I suppose one also must doubt the authenticity of the thousands of other ancient works which Clement or Origen never quoted.

Jerome also can be discarded because he (like Hesychius of Jerusalem and Victor of Antioch) only quotes Eusebius. Eusebius himself does not say that all copies of Mark or even the "accurate copies" end at 16:8; instead, discussing why some writers reject the gospel's traditional ending, he ambiguously states that "accurate" copies of the gospel "circumscribe the ending" at 16:8. What did Eusebius mean by "circumscribe the ending"? Burgon in 1871 and Farmer in 1974 both argue convincingly that Eusebius meant only that the "accurate copies" of Mark contained in the margin near 16:8 a liturgical sign indicating the end of a scriptural lesson to be read during a worship service--which is exactly the case with manuscripts such as 2386. The liturgical sign used for such a purpose is tau lambda, an abbreviation for

"telos" or "the end,"[11] and according to Burgon and Farmer, Eusebius stated only that some ancient expositors, seeing the word "telos" in the margin of a manuscript, had (erroneously) concluded that the gospel was supposed to end with 16:8 instead of 16:20. Even if Burgon and Farmer are incorrect, Eusebius is a lone voice among the patristic writers, several of whom quote or refer to the traditional ending, including Irenaeus in his Diatessaron (nearly 150 years before Eusebius), Justin Martyr in his Apology (175 years before Eusebius), Tatian (150 years before Eusebius), and Hippolytus (125 years before Eusebius). Codices Aleph and B, by the way, are contemporaries of Eusebius and his negative witness.

Another argument against the authenticity of the traditional ending of Mark is two supposed alternative endings to the gospel: the "shorter ending" of Codex k and the "Freer Logion" of Codex Washingtonianus, or Codex W (see appendix). To call these passages "other endings" is to stretch things just a bit; rather than alternatives, they are additions to the traditional ending. The Freer Logion, found only in Codex W, is simply an expansion inserted between 16:14 and 16:15. The "shorter ending," found in four Greek manuscripts, Codex k, and a few manuscripts of three African versions, is also an addition to the traditional ending, occurring after 16:20 in some of the manuscripts, but before 16:9 in most. That it is a clumsy addition to the traditional ending--lifted from another source--is apparent from its content. When attached to the gospel after 16:20, it presents the women at the tomb telling Peter and the disciples about the resurrection--long after Jesus had talked to the disciples and ascended to heaven and the disciples had begun preaching the resurrection "every where." When the "shorter ending" occurs before 16:9, the "Amen" at its conclusion is left intact even though the traditional ending follows it. Also left intact are its opening words, "But they reported briefly to Peter and those with him," which are difficult to reconcile with the words immediately preceeding them in 16:8, "neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid." The docetic scribe of Codex k caught this discrepancy and omitted the last half of 16:8 (along with all of 16:9-20) before attaching the shorter ending to his manuscript, but in those other manuscripts containing it, it is left as is. Rather than testimony against the traditional ending, these additions to it and expansions of it bear witness to its authenticity.

One well might wonder why, if it is authentic, the traditional ending of Mark is encountered in so many omitted and expanded forms. Despite any false impressions I may have conveyed above, the vast majority of biblical manuscripts attest to the gospel's traditional ending. Of the several hundred known complete Greek manuscripts of Mark (and several more incomplete manuscripts), only two omit the traditional ending and only five give it in expanded forms. Even when the several thousand manuscripts of numerous versions are also included as witnesses, more than 99% of all complete manuscripts contain the entire traditional ending (with a few minor variations) in its traditional form--without additions, expansions, or omissions.

Even if such were not the case, changes in the ending of Mark in some manuscripts of the Alexandrian family hardly would be conclusive evidence against the traditional ending's authenticity, simply because those same manuscripts similarly tamper with and mutilate the endings of the other three gospels as well. Codex Aleph, one of the two Greek manuscripts which omit the traditional ending, originally omitted the last verse of John's gospel (though another scribe inserted the verse several hundred years after the manuscript's completion),[12] while five Greek manuscripts (and five Old Georgian and nineteen Armenian manuscripts) place the pericope de adultera (John 7:53-8:11) at the end of the gospel, immediately following 21:25. In some Old Georgian manuscripts, the last twelve verses of Mark have been attached as the ending of John, while in one Old Georgian manuscript (the "Tiflish MS" in the Georgian Museum at Tiflis) the last eight verses of John have been omitted and replaced with the "beginning only" of the apocryphal Epistle to Carpianus. Other such tamperings with the ending of John include the omission of "Jesus" in 21:17; various substitutions and additions in 21:18; changes in 21:22, 23 to sanction clerical celibacy; and omission of the last three words of 21:23 ("ti pros se"--"What is that to thee?").

Various Alexandrian and "Western" manuscripts corrupt the ending of Matthew by omitting "the Lord" ("ho kurios") from 28:6; "from the dead" ("apo tou nekron") from 28:7; the first nine words of 28:9 ("hos de eporeuonto apangeilai tois mathetais autou kai idou"--"and as they went to tell his disciples, behold"); the second "him" ("auto") from 28:17; and the last word of 28:20.

Aside from Mark, the gospel whose ending has been most abused is Luke's. Codex Bezae (or Codex D), Codex 0124, and

some versions add interpolated material after 24:1 and omit "Lord" ("kurion") in 24:3. Various Alexandrian manuscripts omit the first five words of 24:6 ("ouk estin ode all' egerthe"--"He is not here, but is risen"); the words "from the tomb" ("apo tou mnemeion") in 24:9; and the opening words of 24:10. Codices S and V add material to 24:18, while Codices D and B and p^{75} omit words from 24:32. Codex D (and all modern bibles) omits 24:40 entirely, while several Alexandrian manuscripts omit the last four words of 24:42; "of Jerusalem" in 24:49; most of 24:51; the opening of 24:52; and three words from 24:53. Though none of these corruptions individually is as severe as the omission of a block of twelve verses in Mark, collectively they amount to much, representing, it would seem, a docetic/gnostic tendency to remove from each of the gospels those passages and portions of passages which suggest too strongly such docetically distasteful concepts as a physical resurrection of Jesus from the dead and a physical ascension to heaven.

The evidence favoring the authenticity of the traditional ending of Mark is greater than usually acknowledged--certainly greater than any evidence against it. It is found in all complete Greek manuscripts of the gospel except two and in the vast majority of other complete manuscripts; it is attested to by patristic writers as early as AD 150; the vocabulary and style in half its verses are "distinctly Marcan." Nevertheless, despite the generally weak or even fabricated evidence against it and despite more than a century in which no one has adequately refuted or even attempted to refute Dean Burgon's defense of it, the traditional ending of Mark's gospel is still held in disregard in most circles today. Exactly why this should be is puzzling--perhaps as puzzling as why Mark 16:9-20 ever fell into dispute in the first place.

APPENDIX

THE TRADITIONAL ENDING OF MARK (16:9-20, Authorized Version)

Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them.

Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.** And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, he shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

**The "Freer Logion" is inserted after this verse in Codex W.

THE "SHORTER ENDING" OF CODEX BOBIENSIS (Metzger, Textual Commentary, pp. 123f)

But they reported briefly to Peter and those with him all that they had been told. And after this Jesus himself sent out by means of them, from east to west, the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation.

THE "FREER LOGION" OF CODEX WASHINGTONIANUS (Metzger, Commentary, p. 124)

And they excused themselves, saying, 'This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who does not allow the truth and power of God to prevail over the unclean things of the spirits [or, does not allow what lies under the unclean spirits to understand the truth and power of God]. Therefore reveal thy righteousness now'--thus they spoke to Christ. And Christ replied to them, 'The term of years of Satan's power has been fulfilled, but other

terrible things draw near. And for those who have sinned I was delivered over to death, that they may return to the truth and sin no more, in order that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven.'

THE DOCETIC INTERPOLATION IN CODEX BOBIENSIS, FOLLOWING MARK 16:3 (James, Apocryphal New Testament, pp. 33-34)

But suddenly at the third hour of the day [or by day] there came darkness throughout all the globe of the earth; and angels came down from the heavens, and rising in the glory [brightness] of the living God they went up together with him, and immediately there was light. Then the women drew near to the sepulchre and saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great.

NOTES

[1]New Testament textual critic F. J. A. Hort first suggested this. See Sir Frederick Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 4th ed. (1939; rpt. London, 1951), p. 150, n.

[2]Kenyon, p. 150, n.

[3]St. Mark (Baltimore, 1963), p. 440.

[4]An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament (London, 1856), p. 256.

[5]H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (London, 1938), p. 9.

[6]Milne and Skeat, pp. 10, 11.

[7]The Gospel According to Mark (Grand Rapids, MI, 1974), p. 603. For the dates of MSS 304 and 2386, see Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London, 1975), p. 122, n.

[8]Textual Commentary, p. 122, n.

[9]Josef Smith, The Regensburg New Testament: The Gospel

According to Mark, trans. and ed. Kevin Condon (Staten Island, NY, 1968), p. 305. Metzger cites his own work in his Textual Commentary, p. 123, n.

[10]Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of Saint Mark (Oxford and London, 1871), pp. 122-125.

[11]Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 122, n.

[12]Milne and Skeat, pp. 12, 13; also The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus (London, 1955), pp. 28, 29.