POMPA

93

Acknowledgment

The editors wish to thank Dr. David Wheeler, Chair, Department of English, University of Southern Mississippi, for his support for this publication.

Publications of the Mississippi Philological Association

Annual dues include a subscription of POMPA. Subscription rates for libraries--$10.00. Manuscripts are not solicited. Correspondence concerning POMPA should be addressed: POMPA, Department of English, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5037.

Table of Contents

O'Connor, Godwin, and a Memphis Murder 1
Mary Terrell Cargill

Images of Gestation in Scott's *Waverly* 7
Lisa K. Chiang

Kickin' up Dust on the Natchez Trace: Eudora Welty's use of Southwest Humor in *The Robber Bridegroom* 13
Nancy S. Ellis

Women's Voices from Three Cultures: Ba's *So Long a Letter*, Emecheta's *Joys of Motherhood* and Walker's *Color Purple* 22
James Etim

Who Does He Think He Is? 28
Gene C. Fant, Jr.

Swift and the State Religion: The Later Tracts on the Sacramental Test 34
Joao Fores

The Women of Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* 39
Marilyn Gardner

The Emerging Shadow: Character Reversal in Flannery O'Connor's "The Displaced Person 44
Dabney Gray

Thoreau and "The Village": Loss and Being Lost in Walden 50
Theodore Haddin

"Danger deviseth shifts" in Venus and Adonis 58
Marcus Hammack

A View From the Window: Arthur Miller's Art for the Whole Man in *Playing for Time* 67
Jeanne Johnsey

The Marble Faun(s): Hawthorne's Influence on and Parallels with William Faulkner 73
S. Kelly

"Sic a puir silly auld body": Re-evaluating

the Mother of *Waverley* .81
Carol W. Krohn

Faust Revisited: Lawrence Durrell's *An Irish Faustus* .85
Paul H. Lorenz

Haunting Hester .91
Joy-Ellis McLemore

Gender Differences in Utopia: Going Nowhere .96
Josephine A. Mcquail

Names Is What They Had":
The Weight of Names in Recent Fiction 102
Thomas H. Poston

C. S. Lewis's *Till We Have Faces*:
The Thick, the Clear, and the Mythic 109
Edward B. Roper, Jr.

The False Florimell:
The Automation's Legacy in *The Faerie Queene* 113
Sim Shattuck

Travis McGee, Where Are You? MacDonald's *Cape Fear*
and the Failure of the Law 117
Sam Tindall

Myth and the Maze of Individuation: James Joyce's
A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man 122
Joan K. West

Social Criticism and Its Methodology in Cable's
The Grandissimes 128
Rodger Wilson

O'Connor, Godwin, and a Memphis Murder

Mary Terrell Cargill
Christian Brothers University

Two years ago a Memphis woman was murdered by an escaped convict who became enraged when she addressed him as "son." In reading the newspaper account, I was struck by the incident's similarity to the final murder in Flannery O'Connor's "A Good Man Is Hard to Find." While both incidents suggest a violently reflexive denial of sonship, they also suggest a transcendent vision shared by the women. In a terror-filled moment the women acknowledge a relationship with their attackers that transcends blood lines. While their recognition of this transcendent relationship is the primary focus of my essay, I also see in Gail Godwin's "Dream Children" a third significant incident that sheds light on the first two. In Godwin's story an overworked nurse has a momentary vision of our interconnectedness. These three--the victim in the Memphis murder, the grandmother in "A Good Man," and the nurse in "Dream Children"--meet at the intersection of the temporal and the eternal, of art and life, and remind us of the bonds connecting us all.

The May 1991 article I read in the Memphis *Commercial Appeal* described the rape and murder of a 76-year old woman in a medical center parking garage. The confessed assailant was 30-year old Richard Lloyd Odom who had escaped in March from a Simpson County, Mississippi jail. Before his jail escape, Odom had served thirteen years at Parchman and Leakesville for another murder he committed in 1978. The *Commercial Appeal* reported that "between his escape in Mississippi and the [Memphis] slaying . . . , Odom had spent time in the Shelby County Jail under an alias and was released" (Fleming, "Escapee Charged").

After his release from the Shelby County Jail, Odom claimed he had "gone to the [parking] garage several times . . . , robbing Coke machines" (Fleming, "Escapee Charged"). He was hiding in a stairwell when he "heard a car coming into the garage." After seeing that it was an elderly woman alone, Odom rushed up to her intending to grab her purse, but soon realized she wasn't holding a purse. According to the newspaper account, "Odom said that while he was trying to rob [her], she pleaded, 'Son, please don't do this.' Odom said he erupted in anger and shouted at her, 'Shut up, I'm not your son.' Minutes later [she] lay stabbed to death in the back seat of her car" (Fleming, "'Not Your Son'").

Anyone familiar with O'Connor's "A Good Man" must see a striking parallel between Odom's sudden violent response and that of the Misfit when the grandmother calls him "one of her own children."

In what is probably O'Connor's best known short story, the Misfit, an escaped murderer travelling the back roads of Georgia, comes upon a family of six who have just had an accident. The Misfit has his two

companions, Hiram and Bobby Lee, systematically murder the parents and the three children until only the grandmother is left. Carter Martin in *The True Country: Themes in the Fiction of Flannery O'Connor*, points out that

> A particularly chilling detail is the casualness with which Bobby Lee returns from the shooting of Bailey [the grandmother's son] and drags the murdered man's 'yellow shirt with bright blue parrots on it.' The Misfit puts on the shirt with hardly a pause in his running conversation with Bailey's mother. The impact of this action is implicit and not garishly described: its significance lies in the symbolic identity established between Bailey and the Misfit .... (166)

In her sorrow, fear, and confusion, the grandmother pleads for her life and listens as the Misfit, in his suffering, laments his inability to verify whether Jesus raised the dead. As the grandmother sits cross-legged in the ditch where she has sunk down in dizziness, O'Connor writes that

> the grandmother's head cleared for an instant. She saw the man's face twisted close to her own as if he were going to cry and she murmured, 'Why, you're one of my babies. You're one of my own children!' She reached out and touched him on the shoulder. The Misfit sprang back as if a snake had bitten him and shot her three times through the chest .... ("A Good Man" 1161)

As part of her introduction to a reading of "A Good Man" at Hollins College, O'Connor said,

> I often ask myself what makes a story work, and what makes it hold up as a story, and I have decided that it is probably some action, some gesture of a character that is unlike any other in the story, one which indicates where the real heart of the story lies. This would have to be an action or a gesture which was both totally right and totally unexpected; it would have to be one that was both in character and beyond character; it would have to suggest both the world and eternity. The action or gesture I'm talking about would have to be on the anagogical level, that is, the level which has to do with the Divine life and our participation in it. ("The Element of Surprise" 1496)

We see this intersection of the eternal and the temporal in both the Memphis murder and the O'Connor story. Odom, the Misfit, and the two elderly women are all at a crossroad of time and eternity. Both women recognize their transcendent connection with their assailants and reach out to them with words claiming kinship. In a similar situation, who among us would have the ability to see our attacker as another human being, much less as our child? In both cases the women's words are "totally right and totally unexpected." At this crucial moment, each man has an opportunity to accept or deny his sonship, to affirm or deny his link with the woman who claims him for her own. But in this stressful, violent situation, both men murder.

O'Connor said in the Hollins' address,

> in my own stories I have found that violence is strangely capable of returning my characters to reality and preparing them to accept their moment of grace. Their heads are so hard that almost nothing else will do the work. This idea that reality is something to which we must be returned at considerable cost is seldom understood by the casual reader, but it is one which is implicit in the Christian view of the world. ("The Element of Surprise" 1197)

Martin Luther King, Jr., addressed that reality to which we must be returned when he said that "we are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny."

In "A Good Man" the grandmother has suffered the violence of the auto accident, the terror of knowing she's at the mercy of a convicted killer. She has heard the gunshots that methodically take the lives of her son and his family. As she sits in the ditch, "her head [clears] for an instant" and she realizes that she is the mother of this motherless child, that he is one of her own in a sense that her nominal Christianity had never known before. Carter Martin argues that

> the grandmother's recognition of the Misfit as her child is her moment of saving charity, and its consequence is the sudden and violent end to the Misfit's patience and stern gentleness as he shoots her three times and settles back matter-of-factly to clean his glasses. (167)

The grandmother's recognition is an action both "in character and beyond character." It is far more than a simple identification of the Misfit with her son Bailey because the killer dons Bailey's shirt. By her recognition of the Misfit as her child, the grandmother sees beyond the temporal into the eternal, to a relationship that transcends blood lines. This is the transcendent reality to which she awakens, the reality that we are all members of the same human family, that we are all brothers and sisters, mothers and children. The sudden recognition of this reality is the grandmother's moment of grace, and it becomes for the Misfit an opportunity for grace, an opportunity brought on by both his suffering and hers. O'Connor wrote in an April 14, 1960 letter to John Hawkes, "Grace ... can and does use as its medium the imperfect, purely human, and even hypocritical" (*The Habit of Being* 389). Surely, the grandmother fits this

description of "the imperfect, purely human, and even hypocritical" who becomes the medium of grace. O'Connor continues in the same letter,

> Cutting yourself off from Grace is a very decided matter, requiring a real choice, act of will, and affecting the very ground of the soul. The Misfit is touched by the Grace that comes through the old lady when she recognizes him as her child, as she has been touched by the Grace that comes through him in his particular suffering. His shooting her is a recoil, a horror at her humanness . . . ." (*The Habit of Being* 389)

I submit that his horror is also at his own humanness. To accept her words is to accept his sonship, his kinship--his kindship--with her. The Misfit's refusal to be her child, to be anybody's child, his insistence that he is what the Old Testament calls a "ger," a sojourner, a stranger, suggests that he sees himself as neither her child nor God's.

The Memphis murder posits a similar refusal to admit relationship. Odom stated that his angry outburst derived from his 1962 adoption in Jackson, MS:

> I didn't know I was adopted until I was twelve and I didn't know who my real mother was until I was in prison in Mississippi a few years ago. As far as I was concerned, I wasn't anybody's son. I didn't take the news that I was adopted very well. I cried, whether people believe that or not . . . . I've gone around for years asking myself, 'Who the hell am I?' (Fleming, "'Not Your Son'")

There is much to suggest suffering in the childhood of both Odom and the Misfit, but while both may desire a relationship denied to them as children, while both may hunger for love, they appear incapable of accepting it, at least at this moment. A show of affection or love brings about a violent reaction, a denial of that reaching out of others.

Violence and death are a part of both stories, but Godwin's "Dream Children" involves violence and death of a different sort. When the grandmother and the Memphis murder victim express a transcendent relationship with their assailants, they acknowledge a reality that Godwin addresses in her story published twenty-three years after "A Good Man."

Godwin's story focuses on Mrs. McNair, a well-to-do young woman married to a New York television executive who commutes on weekends to their country home. Living alone during the week, Mrs. McNair has established a life for herself and has found ways to cope with a horrendous double loss that is not fully explained until the end of the story.

Here we learn that more than a year before the story opens, Mrs. McNair had been in the hospital to have her first child when something had gone wrong. The pains suddenly stop and the baby practically has to be torn from Mrs. McNair's body without the use of anesthetics. When she learns the baby is dead, the mother is heavily sedated and sleeps deeply all night. Meanwhile the hospital has been undergoing a strike which forces some employees to work long hours. The next morning a nurse who had been on duty for forty-eight hours makes a mistake about rooms and accidentally brings a baby to Mrs. McNair. When Mrs. McNair sees the baby boy being handed to her, she thinks, "with a profound religious relief," that the incident of the past night had been only a terrible nightmare, and she begins breastfeeding the child. Soon the nurse realizes her mistake and comes back into the room to get the baby. Because Mrs. McNair will not release the child, she must be sedated again (511). It is with this wrenching double loss that Mrs. McNair must live.

But an important moment has been left out of the hospital scenario that, for me, makes the other two stories--the stories of murder--clearer. It is a rare moment of human insight that comes to the bone-weary nurse. It is a partial revelation of what Evelyn Underhill calls "the mystery that surrounds us" (101). Godwin writes that when the nurse

> had seen the woman and the baby clinging to each other like that, she had undergone a sort of revelation in her almost hallucinatory exhaustion: the nurse said she saw that all children and mothers were interchangeable . . . . There were only mothers and children . . . . (511)

In this moment of high stress, of near-total fatigue, the nurse recognizes in a fuller sense what the grandmother in "A Good Man" sees in a more limited way. The nurse, standing momentarily outside any relationship, in a state of pristine objectivity, sees Mrs. McNair and the unrelated child to which she clings as emblems of all human relationships. Though her vision has no staying power, the nurse sees in this encapsulated moment "both the world and eternity."

Because the routine of daily life can lull us into a kind of spiritual lethargy, sometimes only extreme circumstances wake us. Underhill writes that "we are obsessed by the ceaseless chain of events, and forget for the most part the mystery that surrounds us" (101). "A Good Man," "Dream Children," and the Memphis murder remind us forcefully of that surrounding mystery. In all three incidents the women acknowledge a relationship that transcends time, space, and blood lines. They remind us of "the Divine life and our participation in it."

Works Cited

Fleming, Mike. "Escapee Charged in Slaying near Hospital." *Commercial Appeal* 15 May 1991: A1.

---."'Not Your Son,' Said Suspect in Killing." *Commercial Appeal* 16 May 1991: B1.

Godwin, Gail. "Dream Children." *Fiction 100.* Ed. James H. Pickering. 6th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1992. 503-12.

Martin, Carter. *The True Country: Themes in the Fiction of Flannery O'Connor.* Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1968.

O'Connor, Flannery. "The Element of Surprise in 'A Good Man Is Hard to Find.'" *The Story and Its Writer.* Ed. Ann Charters. 3rd ed. 1495-97.

—. "A Good Man Is Hard to Find." *Fiction 100.* Ed. James H. Pickering. 6th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1992. 1151-61.

—. *The Habit of Being.* Ed. Sally Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage, 1980.

Underhill, Evelyn. *The House of the Soul and Concerning the Inner Life.* Minneapolis: Seabury, [1984?].

Images of Gestation in Scott's *Waverly*

Lisa K. Chiang
University of Southern Mississippi

During the course of Sir Walter Scott's historical novel *Waverly*, its hero Edward Waverly changes from a highly imaginative youth motivated solely by curiosity and an overly developed desire to experience the unexperienced into a more reasonable, generous and compassionate adult. This transformation occurs as a result of adventures Waverly experiences during a visit to Scotland and is symbolically presented through a series of visits to womb-like places, specifically, a woman's bower, a cave, a wooden bed, and a hovel. It is in these places that the seeds of his maturation are sown and that he is "prepared" for his entrance into the adult world of Hanoverian England, just as a physical womb is the place in which the seed of a new human being is sown and prepared for its entrance into this world. Further supporting this metaphor is the fact that Waverly is placed con sistently "at the disposal of others, without the power of directing his own motions" (186). He is passively floating in the fluid of fancy, guided from one adventure to the next by his insatiable curiosity, and dependent upon others to protect him from the dangers that surround him. Only after developing in the "womb" does Waverly gain the ability to discern reality and the power to act for himself, although for awhile, like a young child, he is still dependent upon the guidance and interference of responsible adults like Col. Talbot.

The first womb atmosphere that Waverly encounters is the small tower apartment of Rose Bradwardine, into which he is escorted by the clergyman Mr. Rubrik and by Rose's father, the Baron of Bradwardine. All the elements necessary for conception are in this apartment. A "perpendicular cork-screw" staircase leads to the apartment; a "projecting gallery" overlooking "the formal garden, with its high bounding walls" (59) connects to the apartment through a "projecting turret" near the windows. These images of things "projecting" represent the male organs of reproduction, while the apartment itself and the perpendicular cork screw by which one enters the apartment represent the female organs of reproduction. The formal garden and Rose's cultivated window plants are the fertility symbols which indicate that the embryo of Waverly's maturity is conceived in this room. This union is blessed by the presence of a clergyman, and since Rose tells the story of Janet Gellatly (61) at this time, the "midwife" who will monitor the development of the gestation is also present.

The significance of this visit to Rose's apartment is not clear until near the end of the novel, when Waverly learns that "to Rose Bradwardine, then, he owed the life which he now thought he could willingly have laid down to serve her" (309). On the surface, these words of Waverly's mean simply

that Rose has rescued him from death and/or imprisonment. However, when his words are linked with the passage describing his visit to Rose's apartment, they convey the idea that Rose is figuratively the mother of Waverly, the mature Waverly who appears by the novel's end. Rose provides the protected atmosphere in which Waverly develops and matures.

Rose is an appropriate surrogate mother for the embryo of Waverly's developing maturity specifically because she has already witnessed firsthand that of which Waverly has only dreamed. Soon after his visit to her apartment, Rose describes the violence and death which resulted during a feud between her father and the Highlanders and her own feelings as a witness of that violence:

> Three of the Highlanders were killed.... I could not sleep for six weeks without starting, and thinking I heard these terrible cries, and saw the bodies lying on the steps, all stiff and swathed up in their bloody tartans. (71)

Instead of learning from her description that violence and death are at the least unpleasant and at most tragic experiences to be avoided as far as humanly possible, Waverly is mildly jealous of Rose's experience and wonders, "what will be my own share in [military and romantic adventures]" (72). Waverly possesses a childlike longing to know the world, to be "adult," but he does not possess an awareness of reality and his own responsibility that mark the presence of maturity.

Because of his overwhelming desire to experience "grownup" adventures, Waverly eagerly accepts the offer from Evan Dhru to visit the cave of Donald Bean Lean. This second womb image serves as a foil for Rose's bower. Notice the descriptions of the environment surrounding the cave:

> . . . The path, which was extremely *steep and rugged*, winded up a *chasm* between two tremendous rocks, following the passage which a *foaming stream*, that *brawled* far below, appeared to have worn for itself in the course of ages. A *few slanting beams of the sun*, which was now *setting*, reached the water in its *darksome* bed, and shewed it partially, *chafed* by an hundred rocks, and *broken* by an hundred falls. The descent from the path to the stream was a mere precipice, with here and there a *projecting fragment* of granite, or a *scathed* tree, which had *warped* its twisted roots into the fissures of the rock. . . . the mountain rose above the path with almost equal *inaccessibility*; but the hill on the opposite side displayed a *shroud* of copsewood, with which some pines were intermingled. (76)(emphasis added)

The underlined words reveal not only the barrenness of the land--its inability to support healthy trees, gentle brooks, and bright sunlight--but they also conjure up the image of an often violated woman, chafed and broken, scathed, warped, and now inaccessible, wearing a shroud. This is the barren womb into which Waverly now descends, and it is indeed an underworld in every sense.

The entrance to this cave cannot be gained except through water, and it is illuminated by a "red, glaring orb . . . [which] resembled the fiery vehicle in which the Evil Genius of an oriental tale traverses land and sea" (79) and guarded by "two figures, who . . . appeared like demons" (79). However, Waverly is so oblivious to the real dangers into which he is falling that he can only enjoy his situation, "give himself up to the full romance of his situation . . . enhanced by the solemn feeling of uncertainty at least, if not danger!" (78) The only obstruction to the flow of his enjoyment is the fact that he entered upon this journey because "the Baron's milk cows" (78) were stolen. Milk cows do not fit Waverly's idea of what constitutes the elements of a romantic adventure, but they emphasize Waverly's "baby-ness" in a quite obvious way.

Waverly's immaturity and passivity are also obvious in Scott's description of his entry to the cave: "Four or five active arms lifted Waverly out of the boat, placed him on his feet, and almost carried him into the recesses of the cave" (79). Of the possible political ramifications to himself, and to his father and uncle, caused by such a visit, he is completely unaware. Even when Bean Lean exhibits his uncanny awareness of the movements of English troops, particularly Waverly's own neglected regiment, Waverly is only mildly alarmed.

Yet it is in this "womb" that the seeds of Waverly's near destruction are sown. Bean Lean steals Waverly's official seal, his patrimony, the instrument which validates all correspondence and which serves as the final proof of one's identity, and with it he nearly seals Waverly's fate as a dangerous traitor. However, Bean Lean is unsuccesssful in this attempt through the combined efforts of Rose and of "the damsel of the cavern" (83), Alice Bean Lean, who serves as a sort of second midwife after Janet Gellatly. Alice is the one who prepares food for Waverly during his visit to the cave and who aids Rose in revealing Waverly's innocence of the crime of treason.

This is partially revealed in the third womb Waverly visits, when he is "restored" to Rose's care. While being transported from Major Melville's house to a more official prison, Waverly is kidnapped or rescued by a band of Highlanders, but he falls under his dying horse in the attempt and "sustain[s] some severe contusions" (177). The Highlanders deposit him in the "small and rudely-constructed hovel [of] . . . an old withered Highland sybil," (178) who is the same Janet Gellatly mentioned in Rose's story. His place of "confinement" (180) is "a large wooden bed, planked, as is usual, all round, and opening by a sliding panel" (178). Here, Waverly is carefully tended by old Janet and an old Highland gentleman. He continuously attempts to open the door of his bed, and his attendants just as continuously close it, until finally "the old gentleman put an end to the contest, by

securing it on the outside with a nail so effectually that the door could not be drawn till this exterior impediment was removed" (179). Metaphorically, Waverly was attempting to be "born" prematurely, and the Highland "doctor" successfully ended that danger.

Waverly does manage to glimpse the figure of a young woman whose identity he cannot determine, but who seems to be concerned with the progress of his recovery. This was Rose, who had bribed Donald Bean Lean to deliver Waverly from the hands of Gilfallin and who had pleaded with Prince Charles Edward for his continued safety. Rose also encouraged Alice Bean Lean to retrieve the letters which revealed Waverly's innocence. While Waverly is recuperating in this "womb," Alice delivers the letters to him (181-2). However, because he is not yet developed enough to fully appreciate their importance or to react to them, Waverly is not allowed to satisfy his curiosity regarding their contents. Indeed, the next day, his portmanteau containing the letters is taken from him temporarily. Thus, his curiosity, which has already landed him in so much trouble, remains unsatisfied at the one time when it could have gotten him out of trouble.

Only after he has witnessed the deaths of Horton and of Capt. G----, as well as the other general violence of the Highlanders' unsuccessful attempt restore a "Stuart" to the English throne, will Waverly be mature enough to appreciate the value of those letters and to act upon that knowledge.

The final preparations for Waverly's entrance into the "real" world occur in a series of painful encounters with dying or captured Hanoverians. These encounters represent the "contractions" that signal the end of Waverly's "gestation" period and the beginning of his birth/rebirth as a mature Englishman.

The first meeting occurs in a hut, yet another image of "womb," where Waverly is reunited with his tenant Houghton, who is now critically wounded and dying. Houghton begs to know: "O! squire, how could you stay from us so long, and let us be tempted by that fiend of the pit Ruffen [a.k.a. Donald Bean Lean]" (217). His death was the first Waverly had ever witnessed, even though he had imagined countless romanticized deaths, and he was deeply impressed by his own responsibility for it. Houghton's story provides the first clue to the identity of the contents of Alice's packet, and Waverly laments for the first time his passive acquiescence to curiosity: "O, indolence and indecision of mind! if not in yourselves vices, to how much exquisite misery do you frequently prepare the way!" (219)

The second encounter occurs during the battle between the Highlanders and the English army. Waverly tries to rescue rather than to kill the English soldiers, symbolically taking on the responsibility of "ending" a battle he feels partially responsible for beginning. He tries unsuccessfully to rescue his regiment leader, Col. G--, who in the moment of death bestows upon Waverly "an upbraiding yet sorrowful look" (226) which would "[recur] to his imagination at the distance of some time" (226).

The third painful encounter is with Col. Talbot, who informs Waverly that his uncle and father are in danger and disgrace because of Waverly's treasonous behavior. The fact that the conversation takes place in a garden establishes the validity of Talbot's information and his feelings about the battle; this garden should remind us of the garden under Rose's windows. Again, Waverly is being nurtured and gradually prepared for his "birth" as a functioning member of a peaceful society.

The conversations with Talbot render Waverly sufficiently mature enough to open his packet of letters; now he is ready to learn the extent to which he is responsible for the sufferings of others and to do something to alleviate that suffering. It is no coincidence that Waverly becomes painfully aware of his own responsibility after learning that Talbot's wife Lady Emily has given birth prematurely, that the baby did not survive, and that Lady Emily herself is in danger of dying (259)--all because of her anxiety on behalf of her husband, who risked his life to find Waverly. That baby's death symbolizes what might have happened to Waverly if he were prematurely made aware of the extent to which others had suffered because of his predilection for romance.

The final womb image in the novel is Janet's hovel, to which Waverly returns and in which he discovers the Baron of Bradwardine. It represents a sort of "birth canal" through which Waverly must pass before he can be "born". Here, Waverly learns the truth of Rose's involvement in his deliverance from danger, and it is in this protective place that the Baron, too, is prepared for his return to society. More particularly, the Baron has been spending the daylight hours sitting in the fetal position in a tiny cave near Janet's hovel: "The cave was very narrow, too low in the roof to admit of his standing, or almost of his sitting up, though he made some awkward attempts at the latter posture" (304). The next day after Waverly's arrival, he receives letters of pardon for himself and for the Baron.

Thus, from this hovel, Waverly emerges into "English" society as a functioning, mature human being, and to symbolize that he is a mature functioning adult, he gets married--to Rose. After a moment of thinking that "he could willingly have laid down [his life] to serve her" (309), his thoughts turn away from the romantic aspects of love to the more practical benefits of marriage with Rose:

> A little reflection convinced him, however, that to live for her sake was more convenient and agreeable, and that being possessed of independence, she might share it with him either in foreign countries or in his own. The pleasure of being allied to a man of the Baron's high worth, and who was so much valued by his uncle Sir Everard, was also an agreeable consideration, had any thing been wanting to recommend the match. (309)

This is quite a contrast to the idealized attraction he felt towards Flora McIvor, and it indicates that Waverly has matured. According to Scott's narrator:

> His absurdities, which had appeared grotesquely ludicrous during his prosperity, seemed, in the sun-set of his fortune, to be harmonized and assimilated with the nobler features of his character, so as to add peculiarity without exciting ridicule. (309)

This is only a brief survey of the processes which lead to Waverly's maturation, but it should be enough to indicate that the novel is more than "merely" historical in nature. Rather, the novel symbolically plays out the transformation of England itself, asking for a movement away from both the wild romanticism of McIvor and the Baron and the prejudiced rigidity of Col. Talbot.

Kickin' up Dust on the Natchez Trace: Eudora Welty's use of Southwest Humor in *The Robber Bridegroom*

Nancy S. Ellis
Mississippi State University

Eudora Welty's 1942 *The Robber Bridegroom* is a delightful contribution to the American comic tradition that relies heavily on incongruities created by pairing the literary and the vernacular.[1] These are at work in *The Robber Bridegroom* as Welty imaginatively reshapes and expands vernacular influences such as fairy tales and folklore into a deceptively simple formal literary language.[2] Amid all the fun of the story, which on the surface seems straightforward, Welty successfully raises abstract questions about identity, the nature of man, the consequences of greed and selfishness, and even the pastoral ideal and the haunted but vanishing wilderness.

The importance of fairy tales, myth, local history, and folklore in Welty's work as a whole and in *The Robber Bridegroom* in particular has been discussed by Jennifer Randisi, Bev Byrne, and Ashley Brown, among others.[3] But another often-mentioned influence, the genre of Southwest humor, has not been examined very closely except in an article by Charles Davis, and even Davis fails to sample the breadth and variety--and the fun--of the influence.[4]

Davis begins his article, entitled "Eudora Welty's *The Robber Bridegroom* and Old Southwest Humor: A Doubleness of Vision," by stating that Welty's themes are complex and her influences many and that he sees her "use of the tradition of the Old Southwest humorists," with its "tension between the comic and the serious," as the influence most important "to her concept of the duality of all things."[5] Davis claims to establish the "relationship between Southwest humor sketches and *The Robber Bridegroom* and the primary significance of that relationship."[6] Yet the only evidences offered are a simple list of "frontier pastimes,"[7] the mention of local color, a single example of "comic exaggerations and comic comparisons" typical of Southwest humorists, and a later labeling of Rosamond's and Mike Fink's stories as "delightful tall tales."[8] Although he does consider the significance of the relationship, his efforts to establish it are far too brief to show just how strong it is.

The primary purpose of this paper is to examine that relationship by showing a few of the specific ways that *The Robber Bridegroom* borrows from the comic heritage of Southwest humor. Welty's setting, events, and characters, and even aspects of her style, reflect the influence of earlier writers such as Mason Locke Weems, Augustus Baldwin Longstreet,

Johnson Jones Hooper, Thomas Bangs Thorpe, and George Washington Harris.

Using a frame device is one of the ways the Southwest humorists created the comic contrast of the literary versus the vernacular. Typically the voice of an educated outsider introduces the situation and a local character who takes over and relates the wild adventure or tall tale in his own dialect. When the local character finishes, the outside narrator concludes the story. The contrast of their language is notable, and in some works, such as those of George Washington Harris, the local character's dialect itself becomes part of the author's literary accomplishment.[9]

Welty does not try to reproduce dialect in this work, but she does create a structural frame by shifting locales and including an outside (and most likely uneducated) character.[10] She separates the heart of the story from Clement Musgrove's planation and Jamie Lockhart's woods by starting the story at Rodney's Landing and ending it in New Orleans, and she further defines this frame by confining Mike Fink and his adventures to the opening and closing sections.[11]

Welty's use of Mike Fink, the legendary keelboatman full of tall tales and comic exaggerations, is frequently cited as evidence of the influence of Southwest humor. Welty adopts Mike in familiar terms, presenting him as the "champion of all the flatboat bullies on the Mississippi River" and "ready for anything" (8). When he speaks of himself, he proudly crows:

"I can pick up a grown man by the neck in each hand and hold him out at arm's length . . . . I eat a whole cow at one time, and follow her up with a live sheep . . . . If I get hungry on a voyage, I jump off my raft and wade across, and take whatever lies in my path on shore." (9)

Not satisfied that his hearers will be sufficiently impressed, Mike extends his immodest self-introduction and throws down a challenge at the same time. Using epithets associated with the Southwest hero, Mike proclaims:

> "I'm an alligator! . . . I'm a he-bull and a he-rattlesnake and a he-alligator all in one! . . . I can outrun, outhop, outjump, throw down, drag out, and lick any man in the country!" (10)

Mike's language echoes images of the "half-horse, half-alligator" figures made familiar in such works as Mason Locke Weems's "Awful History of Young Dred Drake" and Thomas Bangs Thorpe's "The Big Bear of Arkansas." In Weems's tale, a pair of whiskey-filled "big-limbed young boobies" get into a fight at a horse race. They "pitch at each other like bull-dogs" until one is defeated. The victor willingly faces a new challenger who steps forward, bragging "[I'm] HALF HORSE HALF ALLIGATOR, AND WITH A LITTLE TOUCH OF THE SNAPPING TURTLE."[12]

Writing several years after Weems, Thomas Bangs Thorpe uses the same mythic mixture when he catalogs the various passengers aboard a Mississippi steamboat. Among them, Thorpe remarks, is a "'plentiful springling' of the half-horse and half-alligator species of men, who are peculiar to the 'old Mississippi.'"[13]

While Welty saves the animal imagery common to the genre mostly for her narrative voice, she continues the patterns of comic exaggerations and boasts through her own characters who readily avow their own self-assurance. Jamie Lockhart proclaims his identity and threatens all hearers at the same time:

> "I am Jamie Lockhart, the bandit of the woods! . . . Not a man in the world can say I am not who I am and what I am, and live!" (156-57)

Mild-mannered Clement Musgrove, worked up by the need to defend his daughter's honor, voices a threat:

> "Where did the bastard go? . . . for I will follow him and string him to a tree for this!" (54)

But it's not only the males who brag. Welty's female characters also exaggerate their resources. During her first encounter with Jamie the bandit, Rosamond brags of the imaginary prowess of an imaginary family:

> ". . . I have a father who has killed a hundred Indians and twenty bandits as well, and seven brothers that are all in hearty health. They will come after you for this, you may be sure, and hang you to a tree before you are an hour away." (49)

Although Rosamond relies on the strength of others (even imaginary others), Salome, like the men, trusts her own abilities. Defying her Indian captors, Salome delivers "a terrible, long harangue that [makes] them put their fingers in their ears" (160) and dares to command the sun before she dances herself to death:

> "I won't be still! . . . No one is to have power over me! . . . No man, and none of the elements! I am by myself in the world. . . . Sun! Stand where you are!" (160-62) [paragraphing modified]

In addition to the frame device, comic exaggerations, and animal imagery, Welty's use of Mike Fink reflects another aspect of Southwest humor--the tall tale. The rambunctious actions in the novella's frame originate with him. The opening section's drinking contest and fight and the closing section's encounter with a natural creature of mythic proportions are adventures of the type that show up frequently in the pages of the Southwest humorists.

The opening of *The Robber Bridegroom*, when strangers become bedfellows in an inn, is fleetingly reminiscent of *Moby Dick*. But rather than becoming friends as Queequeg and Ishmael do, these bedfellows--Clement

Musgrove, Mike Fink, and Jamie Lockhart--become foes, with bags of gold, reputations, and even life itself at stake.

Mike Fink challenges the others to a nightcap, easily outdrinks them, and boasts of his identity and prowess. Jamie Lockhart counters by expressing doubt about Mike's claims and verbally reduces him to "nothing but an old buffalo" and "an old hoptoad" (10, 11). Mike's response is then to question who Jamie is. Naturally, with manhood and identity at stake, a fight ensues.

The fight proves to be an even match and lasts so long that the two agree to interrupt it to "seize forty winks" (12). Mike plans to murder and rob his bedfellows during the night, but Jamie cunningly saves his and Clement's lives by placing bundles of sugar cane under the bed covers, and while they watch from their hiding place, Mike takes a board from the floor and beats the bundles till "nothing . . . but the juice" is left (17). Thinking they are dead, Mike boasts, "If we have left you one whole bone between you, I'm not the bravest creature in the world" (15-16). Then taking the three bags of gold to himself, Mike returns to sleep.

When he wakes the next morning and sees Clement and Jamie, Mike believes they are ghosts; and, in spite of his bravado so strong at other times, he jumps through a window and flees, not to reappear until the end of the story when Jamie haunts him once again.

But this is not the only tall tale of fighting Welty includes in her story. Another extended fight, this one lasting through the night and actually to the death, is between Jamie and Little Harp.[14] It too occurs over claims and denials of identity and over gold. Welty describes the fury of their fight like this:

> In the next moment out rolled the two men through the door . . . and they tore the turf and leveled whatever tree they fought under. . . .
>
> They fought the whole night through, till the sun came up. At last, just as the Little Harp had his knife point in Jamie's throat, and a drop of blood stood on it, Jamie pulled out his own little dirk and stopped the deed then and there. (158)

The violence seen in these episodes was a reality of the times and is well represented in the tales of the Southwest humorists. The fights in their stories often end in graphic disfigurement or death. Again, Mason Locke Weems's story about death of Dred Drake serves as an example. Whiskey-induced boasting and fighting end only when Dred races his horse into a tree with such force that he lies on the ground "a lifeless lump, and so mangled that no friend on earth could have recognized a feature."[15]

Another example of violent fighting is August Baldwin Longstreet's story of the fight between Billy Stallions and Bob Durham. Their friendship survives their fight even though Bob loses an ear, a hunk of his cheek, and a finger, and manages in turn to bite off part of Billy Stallion's nose.[16]

While Welty's description of the fight between Jamie and Little Harp isn't as graphic as Longstreet's, there are interesting similarities in the two stories. Both writers introduce an instigator-observer as a vital third party to the fights, and both writers carefully describe the appearance and actions of the trouble-makers.

Longstreet describes his troublemaker Ransy Sniffle in Icabod Crane-ish fashion: Ransy's "shoulders were fleshless and elevated; his head large and flat; his neck slim and translucent; and his arms, hands, fingers, and feet were lengthened out of all proportion to the rest of his frame." Continuing the description into a full caricature, Longstreet ends with this explanation: "I have been thus particular in describing him, for the purpose of showing what a great matter a little fire sometimes kindleth."[17]

The "little fire" kindling trouble in Welty's story is Goat, the boy from the Gully. He has matted, carrot-colored hair, "eyes so crossed they looked like one," "two big toes sticking up," and only "every other tooth" (41). Like Ransy, Goat is not notable for his intelligence, but he knows how to cause trouble and then to sit back and watch with great delight.

Of particular interest for comparison is the way both authors use an extended series to describe the behavior of these troublemakers. Ransy instigates the fight between Billy and Bob by spreading the insults he overheard their wives exchange; and whenever there's a fight, Ransy is known to be in the middle of it, running, peeping, listening, talking, squatting, and getting "trod upon."[18] Goat instigates the fight between Jamie and Little Harp by pretending to be different animals who want to witness a fight. Welty's descriptive series has Goat scuffling like a wood-chuck, grunting like a boar, hissing like a snake, sniffing like a fox, scratching like a bear, howling like a wildcat, and roaring like a lion (153-54).[19] Then, "seeing that the fight had started at last, [Goat butts] out through the door and [sits] on the roof of the hut like an owl" (157-58) and watches Jamie kill Little Harp.

There is plenty of violence in Welty's story--fighting, robbery, rape, captivity, mutilations (severed fingers and heads!), and death. And there's even violence in a struggle to fight violence, as evidenced in Clement's all-night blind encounter with a willow tree (105-06).[20]

In addition to tall tales of men fighting each other, Welty returns to Mike Fink to present another kind of tall adventure--this one of man facing and fighting Nature in the form of a creature of mythic proportions.

The creature Mike encounters is not a "creation bear" as might be expected, but instead is the "grandfather of all alligators" (170). We hear the fantastic tale (at the beginning of the end of the story) when Rosamond, looking for Jamie, gets lost in the woods and stumbles across Mike. This time identifying himself simply as "anonymous mail rider" (169), Mike relates his adventure to Rosamond:

While riding dutifully down the Natchez Trace with the mail, Mike accidentally rides his horse directly into the open mouth of a monstrous alligator--one "as long as anything . . . ever seen come out of the water, ships

and all" (170). Mike just happens to have a persimmon tree in his hands as he rides in, so he uses the tree to prop the alligator's mouth open. Because the persimmons are green, the alligator's mouth puckers up and Mike can't get out.

Mike explains that it's so dark inside the alligator he can see stars outside, even though it is day. So he uses the stars to turn the huge alligator toward the "hot sun" in the East while he builds a fire inside (173). The heat of the sun and the heat of the fire force the persimmons to ripened, the alligator opens his mouth, and out Mike safely rides.

This people-swallowing alligator is a wonderful choice of creature for Welty's tall tale. She takes this natural foe of the wilderness, already appropriated in the "half-horse, half-alligator" imagery, and makes him the size of a dragon of fairy tales. Then by having Mike ride into the creature's mouth, she turns the tale into a kind of dry-land, Southwest-version of Jonah and the whale.

Most of the man-and-animal tall tales of Southwest humor are based on encounters between hunters and bears. Davy Crockett boasts of killing outrageous numbers of bears, some of which fall victim to him in "hand-to-paw" combat.[21] Probably the most famous of the man-and-animal tales is Thorpe's "The Big Bear of Arkansas." In it Jim Doggett brags his way through various bear hunts to his encounter with his ultimate challenge, "the creation bear" who was, in Jim's words, "an unhuntable bear, and died when his time come."[22]

But there is a man-and-animal tall tale from Southwest humor that Welty's monstrous alligator brings to mind, and that tale is part of Simon Suggs's conversion testimony in "The Captain Attends a Camp-Meeting" by Johnson Jones Hooper.[23] The old con artist Captain Suggs works the camp meeting by testifying to a dramatic, original conversion. He compares the weight of his just-lifted load of sin to "a four year old steer, or a big pine log, or somethin' of that sort--" and then tells how he "fell into a trance" and had a spiritual vision which he begins to describe: "'And I seed the biggest, longest, rip-roarenest, blackest, scaliest--'" At that point, someone jumps to finish the sentence with the natural assumption that Suggs has seen a "'Sarpent!'" But Suggs, a master of timing and delivery, surprises them all by announcing he has seen, not a serpent, but an alligator!

> "Well," said the Captain in continuation, "the allegator kept a-comin' and a-coming' to'ards me, with his great long jaws a-gapin' open like a ten-foot pair o' tailors' shears--" . . .
>
> "So I fixed myself jist like I was purfectly willin' for him to take my head . . . and when he come up and was a gwine to *shet down* on it, I jist pitched in a big rock which choked him to death, and that minit I felt the weight slide off, and I had the best feelins . . . any body every had."[24]

Like Mike Fink, Simon Suggs faces one of the most dangerous creatures of the frontier and lives to brag about it.[25]

Indeed it is possible to go on and on showing the relationship between Southwest humor and *The Robber Bridegroom.*

Even in minor things there are similarities. Details such as Welty's whiskey-selling, heavy-drinking priest Father O'Donnell and the gifts Clement brings from New Orleans recalls things from the earlier genre. Father O'Donnell's fleshly weaknesses are reminiscent of those of preachers such as Parson John Bullen from the Sut Lovingood tales by George Washington Harris and of the womanizing, money-hungry preachers at the camp meeting that Captain Suggs scammed. And Clement's gifts from New Orleans which include "needles, [a] paper of pins, [a] length of calico, [and a] pair of combs (36) are like the package of calico and the "tuckin' comb" the philandering sheriff delivers to Mary in Harris's "Rare Ripe Garden-Seed."[26]

In even these few examples, we can see that Southwest humor--as genre and as specific stories--echoes throughout *The Robber Bridegroom.* The framing device, the character of Mike Fink, the comic exaggerations, the animal imagery, the tall tales of men fighting animals as well as fighting each other are all there in the earlier comic genre which itself relied heavily on the incongruities of the vernacular and the literary.

By borrowing from Southwest humor, as well as fairy tale and myth and local history, Welty has enriched the American comic tradition and made a liar out of Mike Fink who, according to Thorpe, "sadly reminisc[ed]": "'Where's the fun, the frolicking, the fighting? Gone! Gone!'"[27]

But, Mike, you're wrong., It's not gone--it's still alive and kickin' up dust on Welty's Natchez Trace!

End Notes

1 Louis Rubin says "the central motif of American humor [is] the contrast, the incongruity between the ideal and the real" which is created when "a common, venacular metaphor is used to put a somewhat abstract statement involving values . . . into a homely context." Such a contrast results, as Rubin further explains, when "two modes of language--the formal, literary language of traditional culture and learning, and the informal, vernacular language of everday life" are set side by side. Louis D. Rubin, Jr., "Introduction: 'The Great American Joke'" in *The Comic Imagination in American Literature* (edited by Rubin), New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1973, p 5.

2 Eudora Welty, *The Robber Bridegroom* (New York: Harvest/HJV, 1970). All quotations are from this edition and are cited in the text.

3 Jennifer Randisi, "Eudora Welty and the Fairy Tale" in *Southern Literary Journal* (Vol. 23, 1990, pp. 30-44. Bev Byrne, "A Return to the Source: Eudora Welty's *The Robber Bridegroom* and *The Optimist's Daughter*" in

Southern Quarterly (Vol. XXIV, No 3, Spring 1986, pp. 74-85. Ashley Brown, "Eudora Welty and the Mythos of Summer" in *Shenandoah* (Vol. XX, No. 3, 1969, pp. 29-35.

[4] Charles Davis, "Eudora Welty's *The Robber Bridegroom* and Old Southwest Humor: A Doubleness of Vision" in *A Still Moment: Essays on the Art of Eudora Welty* (ed. by John F. Desmond, Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1978, pp. 71-81).

[5] Davis, p. 71. Davis defines areas of duality as "man, the wilderness, time, history, and reality."

[6] Davis, p. 74.

[7] One of the few concrete connections Davis does make in his article (p. 72) is the connection between the list of pastimes Goat's mother warns him against--the "wrestling matches, horse races, gander pullings, shooting matches, turkey shoots, [and] cockfights" (Welty, 40)--and the list of frontier subjects Henning Cohen and William Dillingham enumerate in their introduction to *Humor of the Old Southwest* (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1963, p. xvii).

[8] Davis, pp. 72-73.

[9] James M. Cox in "Humor of the Old Southwest" (*The Comic Imagination in American Literature*, ed. by Louis D. Rubin Jr., New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, UP, 1973, pp. 101-12) discusses the language question.

[10] Charles C. Clark in "*The Robber Bridegroom:* Realism and Fantasy on the Natchez Trace" (*Mississippi Quarterly* Vol. XXVI, No 4, Fall 1973, pp. 625-38) does not use the term "frame device" but points out "[t]he novella begins with Clement, as he returns from New Orleans and takes steps to find a suitable husband for his daughter and ends with Clement, as he bestows a blessing on his happily married daughter and her husband and their twins in New Orleans" (p. 627).

[11] Mike Fink is based on a real character who died about 1823. In fact there are 11 versions of his death recorded. His adventures expanded from the realm of oral tales to printed ones about 1829 and he became as famous as Paul Bunyan (*The Oxford Companion to American Literature*, 4th ed., p. 279.

[12] Mason Locke Weems, "Awful History of Young Dread Drake," in *Humor of the Old Southwest*; ed. by Hennig Cohen and William B. Dillingham, 2nd ed. (Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1975, pp. 4-7), pp. 5, 6.

[13] Thomas Bangs Thorpe, "The Big Bear of Arkansas" in *Humor of the Old Southwest* (pp. 268-79, p. 268.

[14] Little Harp and brother Big Harp, who in Welty's story is only a head in a trunk, are based on the Harpe Brothers, a pair of outlaws who terrorized the Natchez Trace.

[15] Weems, p. 7. His description of Dred's facial mutilations is more than a little graphic: "There was not a sign of a nose remaining on his face, the violence of the blow had crushed it flat, miserably battering his mouth and teeth, and completely scalping the right side of his dace and head--the flesh, skin, and ear, torn off to the back of his skull. One of his eyes, meeting a snag of the trunk of tree, was clearly knocked out of its socket; and, held only by a string of skin, there it lay naked on his bloody cheek."

[16] Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, "The Fight" in *Humor of the Old Southwest* (pp. 51-59). Billy and Bob have been backed into fighting because Ransy Sniffle has reported that their wives have insulted each other. Using familiar animal imager, Longstreet philosophizes that "a hundred gamecocks will live in perfect harmony together if you do not put a hen with them" (53).

[17] Longstreet, p. 52.

[18] Longstreet, p. 54. Passage reduced.

[19] Welty's passage reduced.

[20] This episode might be compared to the Longstreet's "Georgia Theatrics" in that for all the rough and tumble there is no victim.

[21] David Crockett's "Bear Hunting in Tennessee" in *Humor of the Old Southwest*, pp. 16-25. In one instance Davy describes how he felt around in the dark and killed a big old bear after they fell into a crack in the ground created by an earthquake.

[22] Thorpe, p. 279.

[23] Johnson Jones Hooper's "The Captain Attends a Camp-Meeting" in *Humor of the Old Southwest*, pp. 233-41.

[24] Hooper, pp. 238-39.

[25] The only other man-and-animal tall tale in *The Robber Bridegroom* is Rosamond's vivid lie about being picked up, shaken, and set down near home by a mother panther who she claims is ten feet long and nine feet high (37-38). But Rosamond's tale is more that of an innocent or an animal-charmer in a fairy tale than that of a robust frontier settler.

[26] George Washington Harris, "Rare Ripe Garden-Seed" in *Humor of the Old Southwest*, pp. 187-96.

[27] Cohen and Dillingham quote this in the introduction to *Humor of the Old Southwest*, p. xxviii.

Women's Voices From Three Cultures: Ba's *So Long a Letter*, Emecheta's *Joys of Motherhood* and Walker's *Color Purple*

James Etim
Mississippi Valley State University

> By God if women had only written stories
> Like wits and scholars in their oratories
> They would have pinned on men more wickedness
> Than the whole breed of Adam can redress ...
> Thus by a scholar no woman can be praised
> Chaucer's Wife of Bath's Prologne and Tale.

Although the wife of Bath may not have been the first to point the discrepancy in the presentation of male and female characters by male authors and critics she makes the point that if females had written stories, the picture may have been different both for the man and the woman. Carolyn G. Heilbrun and Margaret R. Higonnet in the introduction to *The Representation of Women in Fiction* point out that one of the crucial questions for the feminist writer/critic is "what is being represented by the characters of women in literature?." Annis Pratt points out that in the analysis of texts, one of the areas to consider in literature would be "as it reveals men and women in relationship to each other within a socio-economic context" (p.873).

Emecheta speaking about her writing states: "Male writers have been writing from a male point of view ... that is highly political ... I am doing a social history of our time from a woman's point of view." (in Judith Watson, 1987).

Miss Walker has announced that the dogma that informs her novel is "womanist" and defines this term as "a woman who loves other women, sexually/non sexually. Appreciates and prefers women culture, women's emotional flexibility and women's strength." These novelists are therefore concerned about women and the experiences they encounter.

Based on the above, this paper explores a basic question, "What experiences are revealed about black women in three differnt cultures?" Ba, a Senegalese educationist writes from a country influenced by French culture but deeply rooted in the muslim faith. Emecheta, a Nigerian living in Britain writes about the women in a traditional Nigerian society. Walker, an African-American writes about black women experiences especialy those in the deep south. In their novels they show the illtreatment of women by men. This illtreatment can take either or all of the following forms - emotional abuse, financial oppression and physical battery. In Ba's

So Long a Letter, the protagonist, Ramatoulaye is emotionally divastated when her husband of twenty-five years, Moudo Fall, decides to leave her and marry a younger girl, Binetou. Even after years of separation and his eventual death, she still says to her friend, Aissatou, "The truth is that, despite everything, I remained faithful to the love of my youth. Aissatou, I cry for Modou, and I can do nothing about it" (p.56). Aissatou, Ramatoulaye's friend had suffered the same fate three years earlier when her husband, Mawdo Ba, decided to marry the younger Nabou at the behest of his mother. Jacqueline, an Ivorian married to Samba Diack, the Senegalese doctor suffers emotionally when he decides to flirt openly with Senegalese girls. Her emotional strain leads to a nervous breakdown, a series of visits to several doctors and a lot of unwanted medication. Only the timely intervention of the kind, understanding Head of Neurology Department saved her.In a soft , reassuring voice, which itself was balm to this overstrung being, he explained 'you must ... give yourself a reason for living. Take courage. Slowly you will overcome' (p. 45).

In Emecheta's *Joys of Motherhood*, Nnu Ego the protagonist, is physically beaten by her husband Nnaife (p. 105). She is further devastated emotionally when her husband decides to follow tradition and marry his dead brother's wife (Adaku) in total disregard for her and the fact that financially, he cannot afford to do so.

In Walker's *Color Purple*, Celie is raped, beaten and emotionally abused by her husband, Mr. _____ and Mr. _______ even advises his son, Harpo to beat his wife, Sophia:

> ... Wives is like children. You have to let 'em know who got the upper hand. Nothing can do better than a good sound beating (p.37).

Celie is further humiliated when Mr. _____ decides to bring his whore, Shug, into the house (p.57). And when Celie decides to go with Shug to Memphis, he rains down verbal abuses at her:

> ... But what you got? You ugly. You skinny. You shape funny. You too scared to open your mouth to people... Look at you. You black, you pore, you ugly, you are a woman. Goddam, he say, you nothing at all (pp. 212 213).

For the African woman, what irks her about the African male is his polygamous nature. In the muslim faith, four wives are permitted by the Koran if the husband can take care and love all equally. In the traditional society, polygamy was encouraged. That was because the society was agrarian which meant that parents needed children who would help in the farms. Secondly, with little in terms of medical advancement, a lot of children died. This meant that the man had to marry more wives to produce a lot of children so that the chances of perpetuating his line will

be improved. The modern woman is opposing the concept of polygamy by showing the evil consequences of such a dehumanising action which they believe is counter productive to the individual, family and nation.

Arising from the continued dehumanization of women by men (from verbal, emotional, physical and financial abuse), what direction should women take and what overall vision is explored in these three novels? Two areas shall be explored here:

1.Independence /divorce, fighting back in marriage or staying quietly in marriage.

2.The need for women to bond together.

Taking number one above, we find that women are either trying to assert their independence (another aspect of independence shall be discussed in the next section), fighting back at their husbands within the marriage or remaining quietly in the marriage. Aissatau in Ba's *So Long a Letter* refuses to accept her husband taking up a second wife:

> Princes master their feelings to fulfil their duties. Others bend their heads and, in silence, accept a destiny that oppress them... I will not yield to it. I cannot accept what you are offering me today... I am stripping myself of your love, your name. Clothed in my dignity, the only worthy garment, I go my way (pp. 31 -32).

She leaves. Rents a house, buries herself in books, passes the necessary examinations, goes to the School of Interpreters and finally gets appointed to work in Senegalese Embassy in Washington, D.C. She goes away with her two sons, having nothing to do with Mardo again.

Celie also takes leave from Mr. _____ by going with Shug to Memphis, TN. She sees Mr. Albert periodically and he really has no more influence over her life.

Sofia in *Color Purple* reacts to male domination and abuse differently. She fights back within the marriage to assert her identity. Speaking to Celie, she states " I love Harpo, she says. God knows I do. But I'll kill him dead before I let him beat me" (p.42). She uses the opportuntity to show Celie how her character is in direct opposition to her mother's behavior and also advises Celie to be more assertive when she says " you ought to bash Mr. head open, she says. Think about heaven later" (p.44). Infact, Harpo reports that whenever he gets in a fight with Sofia "she black my eyes" (p.66).

In *Joys of Motherhood,* the women rise up against men. They strike by refusing to cook for them. But this is short-lived when they discover that those men whose wives cook for them share their food with men without food. Nnu Ego periodically fights verbally against Nnaife. But eventually she decides to remain in the marriage and channel most of her efforts and emotion to the children.

The woman who remains the most reticent and accepting of the marriage condition is Ramatoulaye. Rejected by her husband who marries

Binetou and squanders all his money on her and her family, she decides to stay:

> Yes, I was well aware of where the right solution lay, the dignified solution. And to my family's great surprise, unanimously disapproved of by my children, who were under Daba's influence, I chose to remain. Modou and Mawdo were surprised, could not understand (p. 45).

The reader may not understand why she decides to stay, suffering through those cold nights alone and single handedly bringing up her children. But Ramatoulaye gives her reason when she says that she remains persuaded of the "inevitable and necessary complimentarity of man and woman" (p.88). Although there may be problems, she sees the family as the basis of the nation and the success of the nation depends inevitably on the family.

The bonding of women takes greater importance in these novels. This fellowship provides avenue to receive advise, companionship, comfort, and sometimes financial support. In *So Long a Letter,* there is Ramatoulaye and Aissatou. Their friendship begins during childhood. They support each other emotionally in going through their failed marriages. When Ramatoulaye writes to her about her suffering in the area of transportation, she quickly sends enough money to enable her buy a Fiat 125. Reminiscing about their lives together she writes:

> Friendship has spendours that love knows not. It grows stronger when crossed, whereas obstacles kill love. Friendship resists time, which wearies and severs couples. It has heights unknown to love (p. 54).

In *Joys of Motherhood,* Iyawo Itsekiri comes to the aid of Nnu Ego when she cooks yam stew for Nnu Ego's child who is starving, malnourished and at the point of death. This helps revive Oshia. Mama Abby seeing the deprived condition that Nnu Ego's children have to grow in takes Oshia out frequently on a trip to Lagos Island. When Nnaife sends Nnu Ego money from Fernando Po, she is the one to take her to the post office to help her change the money. However, Nnu Ego does not extend her hand of fellowship to these women for a long period because of her poverty. At the end, "she told herself that she would have been better off had she had time to cultivate those women who had offered her hands of friendship" (p.219).

For Celie, what helps her to survive is the friendship of Shug and the love of her sister Nettie. Writing about the situation, Packer-Smith states:

> The women in *Purple* build a world of comaraderie around themselves. They share in each other's pain, sorrow, laughter, and

dreams. They applaud each other's achievements. And they come to each other's rescue (p.428).

The next experience women go through in these stories is that they fight daily battles to survive, to move into being fulfilled with or in the absence of a man. Nnu Ego fights desperately to lift herself up from poverty. She takes up sewing and petty trading. Even before the husband left for Fernando Po, the money earned from being a washerman and later a grass cutter was hardly enough. From Fernando Po, he hardly sent money. But they wêre the children to feed, clothe, and send to school. Then he is conscripted into the army and the money sent back is hardly enough. Finally when he comes back, he earns little and with his drinking, not much is left.

Ramatoulaye, left with twelve children fights daily to ensure they are fed, clothed, sent to school and protected. She had to learn to do things for her survival - pay the electricity bills, change locks to doors and replace broken windows, going to the cinema alone and taking public transportation when necessary.

Celie starts very poor but with the help of Shug Avery, she learns to sew, developing this into a large enterprise.

Although not emphasized in the *Color Purple*, the two other novels highlights the central role of the mother. In Nigeria, and indeed in many African cultures, "motherhood defines womanhood" (Davis, p. 243). In *Joys of Motherhood*, Nnu Ego is not happy with her first husband because she does not have a child. She leaves the marriage and almost commits suicide when her first child dies. Speaking to Adaku she said "whereas you choose money and nice clothes, I have chosen my children" (Joys, p.160)

In *So Long a Letter*, motherhood is very important for Aissatou and Ramatoulaye. Writing to Aissatou she said "my love for my children sustained me. They were my pillar: I owed them help and affection" (p. 53).

There is also the issue of equality for women in the areas of education, politics and employment. Ramatoulaye throws the first salvo when she states:

> We have a right, just as you have, to education, which we ought to be able to pursue to the furthest limits of our intellectual capabilities. We have a right to equal well-paid employment, to equal opportunities ... When will we have the first female minister involved in the decisions concerning the development of this country (p.61).

Douda Dieng, a male and feminist sympathizer in agreement states that women should no longer be "decorative accesories."

In Emecheta's *Joys*, the picture is not different. While the young boys have an education, the girls cook, fetch water or go hawking little wares.

They have an inferior education and marry early so as to bring money to the family with the bride price the suitors pay. This situation brings to mind Virginia Woolf's "A Room of One's Own." Imagining Shakespeare and her sister, Judith, she gives a scenario of Shakespeare going to school, nurturing his talents/genuis and finally writing his plays. On the other hand, Judith was not sent to school, had no chance of learning logic and grammer and before she was out of her teens was bethrothed to the son of a wool-stapler. In essence, the woman was not given the opportunity to develop her genuis.

In commenting about the *Color Purple*, (Babb)has pointed out that illiteracy keeps one down while for Celie, literacy provided the escape from sexual exploitation and subjugation.

The experience of black women in three cultures are explored in these three novels. Several similarities abound - women victimized by men, struggling to survive notwithstanding the odds, calling for equality in opportunities - education, employment, and politics. Women also exhort themselves to bond with each other. *Joys of Motherhood* questions the idea of women only choosing motherhood and female children not valued a lot by the father. In an age of women's liberation, black women want to be heard and their situation addressed.

References

Emecheta, Buchi. *Joys of Motherhood* New York: George Braziller, 1979.

Ba, Mariamma. *So Long a Letter* London: Heineman, 1981.

Babb, Valerie. "*The Color Purple*: Writing to Undo What Writing Has Done" *Phylon* XLVII (1986).

Davies, Carole Boyce. "Motherhood in the Works of Male and Female Igbo Writers: Achebe, Emecheta, Mwapa and Nzekwa." Carole Boyce Davies and Anne Adams Graves ed. *Ngambika: Studies of Women in African Literature*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World, 1986.

Heilburn, Carolyn G. and Margaret R. Higonnet, *The Representation of Women in Fiction*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1983.

Parker-Smith, Bettye J. "Alice Walker's Women: In Search of Some Peace of Mind" in *Black Women Writers (1950-1980): A Critical Evaluation* ed. Mari Evans New York: Anchor/Doubleday, 1984.

Pratt, Annie V. "The New Feminist Criticism" *College English* 32 (1971).

Walker, Alice. *The Color Purple*. New York: Pocket Books 1982.

Wilson, Judith. "Buchi Emecheta: Africa from a Woman's View" *Essence* 1987.

Woolf, Virginia, "A Room of One's Own" in *Literature of the Western World* Vol 2 ed. Brian Wilkie and James Hurt. New York: Macmillan 1992.

Who Does He Think He Is?

Gene C. Fant, Jr.
University of Southern Mississippi

Monty Python and the Holy Grail (*MPHG*) uses a twentieth-century filter to retell portions of the Arthurian cycle. The satire which colors the entire film paints broad contrasts with Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*, especially in its handling of the commoner-Arthur relationship. Malory's *Morte* shows few commoners (peasants, serfs, and other non-aristocrats). Of twenty-one Caxtonian divisions, only three provide any glimpse of commoners. Malory's reader has no image of the medieval commoner at the work's conclusion. The viewer of *MPHG* sees commoners throughout the film, as workers, soldiers, hermits, and townspeople. Three scenes focus on verbal interchange between Arthur and commoners. Malory's Arthur holds the obvious center of power, and the commoners accept his obvious right to rule. *MPHG* portrays Arthur as an absurd figure of power, and the commoners as unwilling to accept his right to rule. The reasons for this contrast include audience and economics.

Malory first provides a view of the commoner in Arthur's coronation ceremony. When Arthur makes his claim to power, few believe him, so various occasions provide him with a means to state his case by pulling the sword from the stone. The commoners, at first, do not recognize Arthur as king. They question his claim to power until he provides visual proof of his kingship by dislodging the sword. Malory expresses the commoners' recognition in terms of repentance. Upon the revelation of Arthur's true authority, the commoners realize their pride in having questioned God's sovereign. They cry out with one voice, pleading for "mercy because they had delayed him so long" (20). Arthur's response to their repentance is forgiveness. Malory shows that true aristocracy and power should be self-evident to all persons, including the commoners. Since God establishes kingly authority as both just and proper, then to question such authority is a sin of pride. The king should be readily recognized and accepted by commoners with no hesitation.

Malory provides the next view of the commoner in the knighting of Sir Tor. Aries the cowherd, a commoner, brings his son to Arthur to be knighted. Arthur expresses obvious surprise at such a request from a commoner. Arthur immediately questions Aries, "Whether cometh this of thee or of thy son?" (95). Aries quickly clears himself of any suspicion of pride by placing the desire upon his son, Tor. Furthermore, Aries explains that Tor behaves oddly, refusing to perform labor, while constantly doing things more befitting a young knight-in-training. Arthur becomes piqued with the request, since examining the young man reveals that he is "passingly well-visaged and passingly well made" (95). After knighting Tor,

Arthur asks Merlin about the new knight, and Merlin reveals Tor's true identity as a prince, the lost child of King Pellinor. Malory continues the same theme begun at Arthur's coronation, that true royalty is a self-evident state. This self-evident state has a long medieval tradition; for instance, in the Middle English romance "Havelok the Dane," Havelok, like Tor, becomes separated from his royal heritage. His true nature is revealed by a royal birthmark and a blinding light which proceeds from his mouth and birthmark (197). Such accounts of royalty as self-evident serve an important role in the perpetuation of royal power, and Malory falls in line with his tale of Tor. Merlin's exposure of Tor's true birth helps to explain the curiosity which surrounds Tor's behavior. Aries has failed to realize the import of Tor's differences, which are really elements of royal self-evidence. Aries the commoner fails to recognize royalty and its power, and only belatedly accepts the reality of this power.

Malory's final commoner is the country husbandman who tells Arthur of the giant which is ravaging the countryside around Constantine. This husbandman, who remains nameless, reveals the proper attitude for a commoner. First, he reports the problem which exists in part of Arthur's kingdom. He recognizes that Arthur is the protector of the kingdom and its people. The husbandman appeals to Arthur's noblesse oblige as king, and begs for him to rid the land of the giant (173-4). Second, the husbandman notes that the giant has taken up sexual relations with a noblewoman, the Duchess of Brittany. He appeals that such behavior is unseemly toward a lady of such birth, especially since the woman is the wife of Arthur's cousin Howell, whom the husbandman calls "full nigh of [Arthur's] blood" (174). Third, the husbandman concludes his report with the recognition of Arthur's rightful kingship, and his acceptance thereof: "Now, as thou [art] (sic) a rightful king, have pity on this lady and revenge us all as thou art a noble conqueror" (174). The husbandman shows himself to be a properly behaved commoner, with an acceptance of Arthur's right to rule.

MPHG, like Malory, provides three scenes depicting a commoner-Arthur relationship, but Monty Python does not present the viewer with passive stereotypes. The film opens with Arthur and his trusted servant, Patsy (whose nickname/name indicates Arthur's attitude toward the commoner), riding up to the walls of a castle. Atop the castle walls, several common soldiers stand guard and immediately confront this interloper and his servant. The scene is visually telling: Arthur stands below the castle walls, his white tunic and gold/silver armor and crown against the gray walls and dead grass; Patsy stands ass-like, filthy and grimacing under his load; the guards stand on their watch, Cockney accents blaring and iron-gray armor blending in with the walls. The initial dialogue of the film sets the stage for the exploration of the commoner-Arthur relationship. The film's first words belong, fittingly, to Arthur, but these words strongly reveal his true feelings toward the commoner. Arthur commands his servant, "Woah!" Right away, Arthur reveals his treatment of another

human as a simple beast of burden, a sub-human. The next words come from one of the guards: "Halloa! Who goes there?" The guard neither recognizes Arthur nor admits his right to rule the land. Instead, Arthur has to launch into a long explanation of his identity. The guard's skeptical response is "Prove thee are the one." Arthur can only protest, "I am." The conversation between the guard and Arthur finally degenerates into a ridiculous debate over swallows and coconuts, with a second guard entering into the conversation.

Monty Python's handling of the scene contrasts Malory's treatment of Arthur's coronation. These commoners fail to recognize the king, but with no ultimate recognition and repentance. Instead, these commoners begin to ignore Arthur, who eventually turns and leaves while the guards continue in their debate without even noticing Arthur's departure. Arthur's evident royalty fails to be revealed, with no acceptance of Arthur's rule in any shape or form.

Two scenes later, Monty Python depicts an exchange between Arthur and a commoner. Arthur calls Dennis the Marxist "Old Woman!" and Dennis harshly berates Arthur in a thick, lower class accent. Certainly Dennis would not have had a place in Malory's work! Dennis snarls at Arthur, saying, "What I object to is that you automatically treat me like an inferior." No immediate recognition of Arthur as king occurs. Arthur, in fact, "does especially badly with the workers . . . who are never at a loss for a combative piece of cant" (Gilliatt 116). In this setting, Monty Python explores the divine right of Arthur to rule:

> Arthur: Well, I am king.
> Dennis: Oh, king, eh. Very nice. How'd you get that, eh? By exploiting the worker. By 'anging on to our stated imperialist dogma, which perpetuates the economic and social differences in our society. If there's ever going to be any progress . . .
> (Old Woman enters).
> Old Woman: Oh, how d'you do? . . .
> Arthur: . . . I am Arthur, king of the Britons . . .
> Old Woman: King of the who? Arthur: The Britons.
> Old Woman: Who are the Britons?
> Arthur: Well, we all are. We are all Britons. And I am your king.
> Old Woman: Didn't know we had a king. . . .
> Old Woman: (to Dennis) Who does he think he is?
> Arthur: I am your king!
> Old Woman: Well, I didn't vote for you.
> Arthur: You don't vote for kings.
> Old Woman: Well, how did you become king?
> Arthur: The Lady of the Lake, her arm clad in purest shimmering samite, held Excalibur aloft from bosom of the waters to signify that by Divine Providence, I, Arthur, was to carry Excalibur. That is why I am your king.

> Dennis: Look, strange women lying on their backs in ponds handing over swords, that's no basis for a system of government. . . . You can't expect to wield supreme executive power just because some watery tart threw a sword at you. . . . If I did it, they'd put me away!

While Dennis impunes Arthur's sanity, Arthur, the supposedly self-evident king, can only respond with violence, grabbing Dennis by the collar and shaking him. One critic notes that the "myth of the feudal monarch is here mercilessly deflated with a single stroke" (Burns 95). These commoners shun any notion of divine right or aristocratic basis for government. These are unrepentant commoners. They have heard Arthur's claim to power and they have not only rejected this claim, they have sent this king packing on his way.

MPHG's final portrayal of a commoner-Arthur relationship is in the scene with Roger the Shrubber. Roger, a sort of lower-class entrepreneur, rides up to Arthur and Bedivere, who are yelling "Nee!" at an "old crone." Roger expresses disbelief at their actions and reproves them:

> Oh, what sad times are these when passing ruffians can say 'Nee!' at will to old ladies. There is a pestilence upon this land. Nothing is sacred. Even those who arrange and design shrubberies are under considerable economic stress at this period in history.

Roger fails to recognize Arthur's royalty; he even insults the king and his knight! At no point does Arthur identify himself, perhaps out of embarrassment from his unkingly behavior toward the "old crone." Arthur has no bold assertion of identity, nor is there any sort of self-revelation of Malorian royalty. This king has no power, he can only yell "magic" words at old ladies, and even then he is chastised by a passing gardener. *MPHG*'s Arthur is a pale shadow of Malory's Rex/Imperator Arthur.

A common thread works throughout the film. No one knows who Arthur is except for a few mystics and God. When a man in the plague scene sees Arthur passing through town, he asks his companion, "Who's that there?" The friend replies, "I don't know." When Arthur meets Sir Bedivere at the witch trial, Bedivere asks, "Who are you who are so wise in the ways of science?" The French guard asks, "Who is it?" and upon hearing Arthur's self-identification, calls Arthur a "silly king . . . you so-called Arthur king." Even the old man at the Bridge of Death asks, "What is your name?" No one knows who this Wandering Jew-like king is, and furthermore, no one seems to really care.

Two explanations elucidate the contrast made by *MPHG*. The first explanation is the difference in intended audience. Caxton's postscript to Morte reveals the audience for which Malory writes by appealing to all "gentlemen and gentlewomen that readeth this book of Arthur and his knights from the beginning to the ending" (v. 2, 531). Caxton's stance

toward royalty would be agreeable to such readers, who would be almost exclusively aristocratic monarchists. For these readers, the royal right to rule and the acceptance of this right by the commoners is essential to the stability of the kingdom. Malory's aim is to reinforce this thinking with examples which support such thought. Monty Python's intended audience is much different. It seeks to appeal to a young adult, anti-status-quo group. Blake, one contemporary reviewer of the film, notes a feeling of being out of place in the theater (428). Monty Python's aim for its film differs from Malory's status quo position. Monty Python's irreverent approach to the Arthurian material questions the status-quo which still pervades English society. *MPHG* includes depictions of commoners throughout the film, giving them voice in the presence of Arthur and his aristocratic knights. These voices stand in contrast to Malory's depiction of the commoners' role.

The second explanation for Monty Python's contrast with Malory is economic. Monty Python seems to be making a strong social and economic statement through its depiction of the commoner-Arthur relationship. When the film was made, in 1974, the United Kingdom was in the throes of a severe economic depression. Unemployment soared, inflation grew, and the government was in the midst of several changes. The British pound was severely devalued, and in 1972, the government floated the pound (Hoffman 515). One contemporary reviewer noted surprise that the movie had even been made, given the severe economy. In the face of these times, the aristocracy seemed to be continuing in the status quo, jetting and enjoying travel and luxury, often tax-free while living outside of England. The royal Windsors continued to live on the public dole, tax-free, while the commoners struggled to make ends meet in the meagerest of fashions.

MPHG shows the commoners in all sorts of activities: working, soldiering, trying witches, beating cats, harvesting muck, and grasping at straws on the ground (in the plague scene). The film's view may be medieval, but it is not too far removed from the modern London of Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* and other such works. Lessing portrays London as a rotting, filthy, disease-ridden slough, not too different from the medieval world of *MPHG*. Burns claims that *MPHG* attacks "the whole basis of the feudal system of government . . . through a neo-marxist analysis of Arthur's oppressed subjects and exploited servants" (94). *MPHG*, however, goes further and reveals a similarity between the Middle Ages and the modern times. The commoners must work and live and struggle. The aristocracy quests futilely, oppresses the commoners, and stays somehow unsullied in a world filled with filth. Perhaps this helps to explain the ending of the film. When Arthur arrives at the Grail Castle, the French guards pour chamber pots all over him, and a group of modern bobbies arrest Arthur and Bedivere at the film's conclusion. The commoners have the last say, reducing Arthur to a prisoner in a paddy-wagon. Why should the Monty Python's commoners recognize such a king? He

has no horse, no real power, no connection with everyday life, and he makes no sense to anyone but his aristocratic peers. Malory's Arthur may rule as an obvious, self-evident king, but *MPHG*'s Arthur reigns as an absurd king who deserves no recognition.

Works Cited

Blake, Richard A. "One More Coil of the Python." *America* 31 May 1975: 428-29.

Burns, E. Jane. "Nostalgia Isn't What It Used To Be: The Middle Ages in Literature and Film." *Shadows of the Magic Lamp*. Ed. George Slusser and Eric S. Rabkin. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985.

Gilliatt, Penelope. "Film Reviews." *New Yorker* 5 May 1975: 115-17.

"Havelok the Dane." *Medieval English Literature*. Ed. Thomas J. Garbaty. Lexington, Mass: Heath, 1984.

Hoffman, Mark S., ed. *World Almanac and Book of Facts 1991*. New York: Pharos, 1990.

Lessing, Doris. *The Good Terrorist*. New York: Knopf, 1985.

Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte D'Arthur*. 2 vols. Ed. Janet Cowen. New York: Penguin, 1986.

Monty Python and the Holy Grail. Dir. Terry Jones and Terry Gilliam. Python Pictures, 1975.

Swift And The State Religion: The Later Tracts On The Sacramental Test

Joao Fores
University of Southern Mississippi

On August 14, 1731, a letter from Lord Hervey to his friend Stephen Fox reported that the Duke of Dorset had just left London for Dublin, to assume his new office as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.[1] Dorrest and his wife arrived in Dublin on September 11, and soon it was clear that the new Lord Lieutenant's policy would not be particularly appealing to Ireland's most famous figure at the time, Jonathan Swift. Swift had enjoyed the friendship of the outgoing Lord Lieutenant (Lord Carteret) who had been sympathetic to the Irish cause of greater autonomy, to the point of suggesting the withdrawal of Wood's patent during the Drapier's controversy.[2] Actually, Carteret had been a Whig who opposed Walpole's oppressive policies, thus gaining Swift's friendship; but, with Dorset, things would be different. Dorset made clear that employments and preferments would go to those upholding the English interest, which, Swift knew, meant the renewal of a policy aimed at crushing the Irish interest. We can imagine Swift, at that point in his life accustomed to see his ideals of liberty for Ireland being frustrated, did not lose his genius for irony in face of such situation. When Swift first met the new Lord Lieutenant, he assured Dorset that no biting attacks or criticisms against the administration would come from his pen. But Swift's reason for this already tells us the satirist would not easily be quiet. After reassuring Dorset he would be out of any controversy, Swift gave his reason: he looked upon Ireland's condition as "absolutely desperate," and therefore "would not prescribe a dose to the dead."[3] As Ehrenpreis puts it, "how well Swift kept this promise is doubtful."[4] Surely, in the case of the Sacramental Test controversy of the early 1730's, Swift entirely broke the promise.

Swift had already been the champion for the preservation of the Sacramental Test in 1708,[5] the period most often discussed by scholars when it comes to Swift's activities against the repealing of the Test. But, three decades later, with Dorset and a new government, Swift saw the old cause he had fought against being vindicated again. Dorset announced he had "instructions" (probably from Walpole) to have the Test repealed,[6] and that meant people from denominations other than the English Church could not get government employments unless they decided to pledge allegiance to the Anglican Church's tenets. It is important to stress that Swift was not acting against freedom of religion, nor upholding a system which repressed members of other religious denominations. Rather, Swift saw that the Test's removal did not mean Walpole's Whig administration was acting charitably and democratically towards all religious denominations. At first sight, it may look as if Swift is writing against a citizen's right

to civil employments regardless of his/her religion. But Swift looked beyond that. He saw that, by abolishing the Test in Ireland, Walpole hoped both to strengthen his administration's control of the country and to expedite the same change in England.[7] By removing the Test, Walpole would win the Dissenters over (especially the Presbyterians) to his side, thus making sure that a powerful group in Irish society would give its allegiance to the Whig policies. In this way, the danger of having dissenting Protestants grumbling against England would be eliminated, and the result would be that England now would be seen as a source of generous laws, and would have a greater chance of having her dominion over Ireland made more palatable to the Irish, at least to the Irish Dissenters. Walpole knew the political force of the Dissenters, and, shrewd politician that he was, he would not miss an opportunity to make his own image with them as a liberal prime-minister.

This is how Swift saw the picture. That may or may not have been Walpole's real intentions, but Swift certainly had reasons to be convinced they were behind the move for the Test's repeal. It is true that Swift's past experiences, as in Kilroot when he was a solitary Anglican Churchman amidst a hostile majority of Presbyterians, and his grandfather's sufferings under Cromwell's government, made him biased against the Dissenters. But he knew enough of political maneuvers to be able to state that the administration would use religion as a means through which it could keep power in its hands. In 1710, Swift saw Sacheverell's vigorous defense of Episcopacy being used by the Tories to ascend to power as "defenders of the Church." He also saw that the rumors of a French invasion with the aim of restoring Catholicism ("Popery and Slavery") was used by the Whigs to return to power in 1713. Likewise, in the 1730's, Swift saw that the Test's removal was just another show of religious zeal on the government's part, to hide the real intentions of preserving power and giving the Irish a little religious freedom, so that they would overlook the political freedom they did not have. By concentrating on the religious aspect of the affair, the Irish forgot that the Test's removal did not represent political independence from England. Instead, they would still be working for the central government of a neighboring island. And, doubtless, by thinking they were enjoying greater freedom, as far as their religion was concerned, they would not be inclined to question England's right to dictate Ireland's policies.

So, as soon as the move to repeal the Test began, Swift went out to battle, and he did not delay his action. When the repeal was still a rumor, Swift launched his *The Advantages Propos'd by Repealing the Sacramental Test, Impartially Considered*. It was advertised in the *Dublin Journal* on February 8, 1732, and the publication in London took place on March 2.[8] Interestingly enough, only one copy of the Irish edition came down to us, and this is preserved at Cambridge University Library,[9] a small octavo in olive backram with the lower edges uncut.[10] The London edition may be seen at the Library of the University of Pennsylvania, and it differs from its Irish

counterpart in that it was bound with another pamphlet written in answer to a previously published tract showing the advantages of repealing the Test.[11] On reading this, Swift's first tract in the renewed controversy, it is hard not to disagree with Ehrenpreis where he says that the work "seems brooding and bleak." Swift's spirit of irony and satirical genius seems as vigorous as ever in the tract. He weaves his argument in such a way that the reader becomes aware of the fact that the Test's repeal is actually a move to undermine the Established Church in Ireland. Swift revives his old thesis presented in *Argument Against Abolishing Christianity*, where he argued that, even if a new religion was established in the place of Christianity, there would still be divisions among its followers. Likewise, in *The Advantages*, Swift imagines what the situation would be in case the Dissenters assumed power. He pictures a Presbyterian as the Bench's first judge, the second being a Baptist, and the third an Anglican Churchman. The Lord Chancellor would be an Independent, and the Quakers would probably have a few additional places. Swift's forecast of what the result of this mixed administration would be is consistent with his mistrustful attitude towards Man's instincts regarding power:

> It is obvious to imagine, under such a motly Administration of Affairs, what a clashing there will be of Interests and Inclinations: what Pullings and Hawlings backwards and forwards; what a Zeal and Byass in each Religionist, to advance his own Tribe, and depress the others. For, I suppose, nothing will be readier granted, than that how indifferent soever most Men are in Faith and Morals; yet, whether out of Artifice, natural Complexion, or Love of Contradiction, none are more obstinate in maintaining their own Opinions, and worrying all who differ from them, than those who publickly shew the least Sense, either of Religion, or common Honesty.[13]

One can almost see the Yahoos fighting with each other for the food given them by their masters the Houyhnhnms. For Swift, there was no doubt that men who fiercely fought for the supremacy of their own religious views would likewise do anything to have their political views as the predominant ones, suppressing the others.

The next tract is in the curious format of a series of queries relating to the affair. It is entitled *Queries Wrote by Dr. J. Swift*, a half-sheet folio printed on both sides in two columns. The Library of Trinity College, Cambridge has a disbound and uncut copy of it,[14] and it is interesting to see how Swift works to show that the argument of the defenders of the Test's repeal, that the move would strengthen the Protestant interest against the Catholics, is a fallacy. Swift points out that the Catholics have "neither Courage, Leaders, Money, or Inclinations to rebel."[15] In other words, the Catholics were the scapegoat used by the Protestant Dissenters to distract people's attention from the fact that they, not the Catholics, had the power and

means to rebel, as they had done in Cromwell's time. Accordingly, Swift reserved his fire for the most powerful group among the Protestant Dissenters, the Presbyterians, in *The Presbyterians Plea of Merit*, published about November 5, 1733. Actually, Swift wanted it to be ready by October 4, when Parliament would open. The tract's opening paragraph is the most often quoted part of the work, as clearly defining Swift's argument: that the move for the Test's repeal was of a political, not a religious nature. Swift states that the repeal in Ireland is but a way the English Whig government had to strengthen its anti-Episcopalian policies, first with the "inferior" Irish subjects, and later, if the method worked out in Ireland, to apply it in England. Swift does not put the idea this way, but rather, true to his biting style, he states:

> This I take to be a prudent method; like that of a discreet Physician, who first gives a new medicine to a dog, before he prescribes it to a human creature.[16]

We can see here the subtlety of Swift's argument. The real intention was not to give the Irish complete freedom, but to use them, like dogs, to serve the Whig administration's interests which would be strengthened by this image of apparent religious freedom.

Finally, there are two other tracts written by Swift on the subject, also in 1733. *Reasons Humbly Offered to the Parliament of Ireland, for Repealing the Sacramental Test*, in Favour of the Catholicks, and the fragment entitled *Some Few Thoughts Concerning the Repeal of the Test*. The first is one more instance of Swift's talent for impersonation. In the voice of a Catholic, Swift subtly shows that the Catholics were not the ones to be feared, but rather the members of the very denominations then pressing for the Test's repeal as the best way to fight the "common enemy" represented by the "Papists." Swift emphasizes that the Catholics deserve the Monarchy's trust much better than the Protestant Dissenters, for, during Cromwell's Revolution, Catholics remained loyal to the crown, while the "deluded Enthusiasts," the forefathers of those who now wanted the Test's removal, murdered the lawful King and changed the whole form of government.[17]

In the end, Swift's cause prevailed after all. On Tuesday, December 11, 1733, Sir Richard Mead proposed that, since the session was practically over and Christmas was near, the House should find a proper schedule to vote the proposal for the Test's repeal. He then proposed that no consideration of the proposal should take place after Friday, December 14. The supporters of the Test's repeal endeavored to have the House meeting for a longer period (an additional week was suggested), but the Commons decided for Sir Richard Mead's proposal. This was the beginning of the end of the Dissenters' hopes, as they knew there would be no time for the carrying of their proposal until Friday. They needed more time, and seeing this precious time was denied to them, their lobbyists met on Wednesday and Thursday (December 12 and 13) and decided to give it all up.

Probably, one of the most interesting aspects of this affair is that Swift was still as energetic and influential about a decade before his death. He may not have been directly responsible for the defeat of the Test's repeal, but he was certainly one of the major forces behind the opposition to the Dissenters. For the Protestant Dissenters and the Whigs, Swift may not have been the "champion of liberty" mentioned in Swift's own epitaph, but he was surely an adversary to be respected, even as late as the 1730's. And the renewed controversy on the Sacramental Test is a definitive proof of that.

Endnotes

[1] Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age,* III, 713. Hereafter referred to as *Ehrenpreis.*

[2] For Carteret's suggestion that Wood's patent should be withdrawn, see *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis, X, xxv. It will be cited hereafter as PW.

[3] *Ehrenpreis*, III, 714

[4] Ibid.

[5] See PW, II, xxi - xxiv.

[6] Ibid., XII, xl.

[7] *Ehrenpreis*, III, 725.

[8] Ibid., p 724.

[9] See *A Catalogue of Printed Books and Manuscripts by Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1945, P 30).

[10] Hermann Teerink, *A Bibliography of the Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Arthur Scouten (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1963), p 355.

[11] Ibid.

[12] *Ehrenpreis*, III, 725.

[13] PW, XII, 245 - 6.

[14] *The Rothschild Library* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1954), II,577.

[15] PW, XII, 259.

[16] Ibid., p 263.

[17] Ibid., pp 290 - 5.

The Women of Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley*

Marilyn Gardner
University of Southern Mississippi

Sir Walter Scott's historical novel, *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since,* depicts the Romantic hero of an earlier generation from the vantage point of settled history and Victorian safety. Scotland is the primary setting for the story, and the Northern country's gradual loss of autonomy is juxtaposed with the growing power of its imperialistic Southern neighbor, England. Scotland's increasingly dependent position lends it certain feminine qualities within the framework of the novel, elements which are complemented by the characters of Flora Mac-Ivor and Rose Bradwardine. The landscape of Scotland is presented to the reader through the innocent and imaginative eye of the English protagonist, Edward Waverley. The stark countryside originally appeals to Edward's love of the "Romantic" because its wild outlandish beauty holds the fascination of all things Other to his position by birth and temperament. Scotland is a foreign country, yet close at hand, offering Edward the opportunity to investigate his love of the exotic without experiencing undue discomfort. Edward's attachment to the two Scottish women, Flora Mac-Ivor and Rose Bradwardine, initially ensues from the emblematic qualities of the two women posed against the backdrop of their native land. Flora and Rose are instrumental in *Waverley*'s overall design, for each woman illuminates different aspects of the country she symbolizes.

The plot of *Waverley* centers on the adventures of young Edward who journeys north to the Scottish Highlands as an officer in the Hanoverian army. But Edward's politics and love affairs are always easily swayed by emotion and self-interest. Upon his arrival in the Highlands, Edward falls in love with Flora Mac-Ivor and soon espouses the Jacobite cause to which she is devoted. Scotland's vulnerable "feminine" qualities are first represented by the austere grandeur of Flora, then by the domestic virtues of Rose.

Edward's erratic behavior in Scotland has its roots in Edward's childhood. Edward belongs to the Waverley family which includes both Hanoverian and Jacobite factions. Uncle Everard Waverley, a Tory, is "the mildest of human beings" (7) with "a dignified indolence" of manner (9). Richard, Everard's brother and Edward's father, born a Tory, adopts "a political creed more consonant both to reason and his own interest" (6). Both Everard and Richard, poles apart politically, are totally secure and enfranchised within the existing English government (6). All Waverleys, whatever their political inclinations, have a common ability to circumvent any real difficulty in their lives. Edward, the pride of father and of uncle,

has been reared in an atmosphere of secure pastoral serenity where he is indulged by all as heir and general family favorite.

Edward is Richard Waverley's son, and therefore a Hanoverian by birth, yet at an early age he is charmed by his Uncle Everard and Aunt Rachel, both Jacobites. Edward's tastes for the romantic are presented early in the novel; his childish imagination is initially fired by the sight of the ancient Waverley coat of arms on Everard's carriage (10). Edward becomes entwined in his aunt and uncle's affections during the years of his adolescence in a manner that approximates his later relationship with Fergus and Flora Mac-Ivor. His previous inclination for the noble and picturesque re-surfaces upon his arrival in Scotland, and a passion for the Scottish cause is ignited in Edward's mind by a glamorized vision of the politically minded brother and sister. Fergus and Flora, like Everard and Rachel, are zealous Jacobites to whose service Edward is drawn "like a knight of romance" (105).

These two couples, one old and English, the other young and Scottish, enchant Edward's romantic nature by awakening the considerable powers of his imagination. Everard and Fergus fuel Edward's desire for the exotic simply because they do not choose to interfere directly in his life. The dangers of Edward's imagination excite Uncle Everard only to an "affectionate apprehension" (15), and while Fergus wants the wealthy Edward for a brother-in-law, he often finds him just "a very absent and inattentive companion" (210). Two women, Aunt Rachel Waverley and Flora Mac-Ivor, are the only people in the novel who truly seem to understand Edward's limitations and actively try tŏ save him from himself.

Rachel Waverley is the first to intervene in Edward's pursuit of the romantic. Edward's glamorization of Scotland evolves from his tendency to embroider interesting objects which he finds foreign to his privileged position of young, wealthy, male, Hanoverian; Edward's tendency to enhance reality is manifest early in the novel by his attraction to young Sissly Stubbs. Rachel understands Edward's easily swayed nature and seeks to protect him from his growing ardor for the unsuitable daughter of the local Squire. Rachel suggests that Edward be sent away, and is therefore, the inadvertent cause of Edward's military adventure when her general suggestion is acted on. Rachel, who recognizes in her beloved nephew a tendency to fantasize relationships, knows that Edward will easily replace Sissly as the object of his fancy if he is removed from her presence. Rachel comprehends that Edward's imagination provides a shaky foundation for his attachment to Sissly. Edward's attraction to Sissly is an early echo of his later infatuation with Flora Mac-Ivor and her homeland. Edward's easy disregard for Sissly is also indicative of the ease with which he will later abandon his suit for Flora.

Just as Aunt Rachel instinctively intuits Edward's tendency to elaborate objects which momentarily strike his fancy, the narrator, too, points out Edward's ability to "romance" reality:

> A romantic lover is a strange idolater, who sometimes cares not out of what log he frames the object of his adoration; at least, if nature has given that object any passable proportion of personal charms, he can easily play the Jeweler and Dervise in the oriental tale, and supply her richly out of the stores of his own imagination with supernatural beauty, and all the properties of intellectual wealth. (19)

Uncle Everard, however, is not alarmed by Edward's imagination, for he feels Edward will eventually outgrow his romantic tendencies and settle for the quiet orderly life to which he was born. Everard is proved right by the end of the novel, but only because Rachel moves to protect Edward through the period of his willful fancy. She is the only member of Edward's family who appears to realize that the influence of Edward's imagination is dangerous enough to ruin his future happiness if it is allowed to reign unchecked.

The narrator's statement of what a "romantic" nature means defines not only Edward's relationship with Sissly Stubbs, but is a vital clue to Edward's eventual espousal of the Jacobite cause. Because the narrator explains what is meant in the context of *Waverley* by the term "romantic," the reader knows that whatever Edward finds romantic will prove to be false; for Edward's idea of romance arises from his dislike for simple truths found in unembellished reality.

Edward sees the Mac-Ivors as heroic figures, larger-than-life. Their ambitions for Scotland appear noble and grand when viewed through the sentimental veil which Edward's able imagination easily provides. Edward, an English soldier, longs to embroil himself with Fergus in the battle for Scotland. Flora Mac-Ivor, however, like Rachel Waverley before her, understands the basic weakness of Edward's character and notes "high and perilous enterprise is not Waverley's forte" (250). Flora knows that Edward's romantic visions are useless against the problems of the "real" Scotland with which she and Fergus are concerned. Edward, Flora realizes, would be better off in an indolent and elegant environment where he could "write verses, and rear temples, and dig grottoes" (250).

Aunt Rachel and Flora Mac-Ivor act in turn to save Edward from his eager and ill-advised enthusiasms. They both sense that Edward lacks the sticking power to carry his infatuations through to the finish. Edward would not have been happy with the reality of Miss Sissly Stubbs or with the actuality of Flora's war-ravished Scotland had he paused to inspect either romanticized object more closely.

Edward's vacillating character is revealed in his inconstant behavior to the Squire's daughter. Edward is easily deflected from his passion for Sissly by Rachel's adroit manipulations to separate the two, for, "alas! hoop, patches, frizzled locks, and a new mantua of genuine French silk, were lost upon a young officer of dragoons, who wore for the first time his gold-laced hat, boots, and a broad sword" (23).

Edward, we are shown, is willingly swayed from the objects of his infatuation; for his conscience, like that of his father, sometimes invokes a sense of reason which often best serves to protect his comfort. Edward's interior voice is heard quite early in the novel:

> Reason asked, was it worth while to disturb a government so long settled and established, and to plunge a kingdom into all the miseries of civil war, to replace upon the throne the descendants of a monarch by whom it had been wilfully forfeited? (140-1)

Edward's reasoning is sound, but his actions are always based on either imagination or comfort, not motivated by intellectual justifications. Edward's admiration for the paraphernalia of war fades as quickly as his fascination for Sissly; for he soon sees the charms of battle as illusory and uncomfortable, regardless of which side one fights upon. The protective "voice of reason" is recalled when Edward tells Colonel Talbot: "I am heartily tired of the trade of war. The plumed troops and the big war used to enchant me in poetry, but the night marches, vigils, couches under the winter sky, are not at all to my taste in practice (290).

Flora had already sensed Edward's inability to truly understand the rigors of battle; for when Edward is momentarily inflamed with the Jacobite cause and professes his love for her and her politics, she calls his affections "lukewarm," and the Waverleys a family where the rights which she holds "most sacred" will be "subjected to cold discussion, and only deemed worthy of support when they shall appear on the point of triumphing without it!" (136). Flora is aware of Edward's romantic yet basically dilatory nature and tries to protect him from embracing a cause for which he is unsuited.

The truth of Flora's assessment of Edward's character is proved when he later rides from Scotland back to the comfortable environment of his ancestral home. In his own country he feels again the delights of peace and prosperity. Edward, his enchantment for Scotland laid to rest by the bitter realities of battle, feels "for the first time since leaving Edinburgh," the comfortable pleasures of his native "verdant, populous, and highly-cultivated country" far from "scenes of waste, desolation, or of solitary and melancholy grandeur" (329). Self-protection is a paramount feature of Edward's family, and personal comfort always wins the Waverley political war.

Flora's wild Scotland which appeals to Edward's imagination proves too uncomfortable in reality, but Rose Bradwardine's tamed Scotland is reduced to a safe, colorful abstraction. The gentle Scottish Rose grants Edward an English sense of satisfaction at the prospect of her acquisition. Rose also provides Edward with an aspect of victory necessary to support his "romantic" image of himself. His feelings of homecoming to England are therefore doubly enhanced when he re-enters the domain so long

possessed by his fore-fathers with thoughts of "what delight he should introduce Rose to all his favourite haunts" (329).

Flora Mac-Ivor is more symbol than woman, an avatar of the ancient, inviolate Scottish Highlands. Edward is granted one unforgettable vision of her poised significantly on the "pass of peril" atop a "trembling structure" near a "romantic" waterfall (105). Her long hair is worn unbound, held in place only by a "crown" of diamonds, an ornament which she later passes to the use of Rose (323). Flora is constant and adamant in all that she does; Rose is amiable and acquiescent in every way and has "never a will but her old father's" (316). Flora ignites Edward's imagination because she is totally Other from his vacillating personality, but Rose's promise of domestic comfort ultimately wins Edward's affection, just as the luxury and ease of Waverley-Honour and England eventually regain Edward's loyalty.

Rose Bradwardine as accessible Other is the perfect mate for Edward in a way that the determined, self-contained Flora could not be. Rose is malleable, able to conform to Edward's changing fancy by changing herself to fit his emotional needs. She admires Edward and is willing, even eager, to be a part of his culture. Just as the dangerous and unattainable Flora symbolizes the old Scotland which chooses exile before assimilation, the tractable character of Rose represents the new, dependent Scotland reduced to a charming ethnic ornament to adorn the house of Waverley and, by implication, to enhance the English Empire. In Rose, Edward and England find a way to domesticate and incorporate the most advantageous qualities of the alien and desirable Other that is Scotland.

Work Cited

Scott, Sir Walter. *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since.* Claire LaMont. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

The Emerging Shadow: Character Reversal in Flannery O'Connor's "The Displaced Person"

Dabney Gray
Mississippi University for Women

Flannery O'Connor possesses the gift of revealing the universal by showing the specific. Her fiction has an undeniable Christian bias, but it is Christianity with an empirical basis. O'Connor investigates man's spirituality and reports her discoveries in fiction, but never does she lose a sense of wonder, a fascination for the infinite mysteries of mankind. O'Connor reveals those mysteries by focusing upon the finite and the grotesque. In relation to this, Sister Kathleen Feeley applauds O'Connor's ability to create a situation and then extend its meaning, calling O'Connor "the Prophet of reality" (172). And, as Margaret Meaders notes, the role of writer as prophet was addressed by O'Connor herself when she explained that the writer's gaze has to extend beyond the surface, beyond mere problems, until it touches that realm of mystery which is the concern of prophets. True prophecy, in the novelist's case, is a matter of seeing near things with their extensions of meanings and thus of seeing far things close up. (384)

In her long short story, "The Displaced Person," O'Connor fulfills this obligation to see "far things close up." She explores the universal problem of human displacement by contrasting a Polish family's physical immigration with the spiritual disjunction of the story's other major characters. O'Connor's tale reveals how ignorance and prejudice in the rural South lead to the death of a Polish immigrant, Mr. Guizac, who has fled his homeland to escape the expanding Hitler regime and how that same ignorance and prejudice function in a more insidious way to destroy those who are the agents of that hatred. Guizac and his family come to the southeastern United States seeking a life free from the bloodshed in Europe. Instead of a sanctuary, they find misunderstanding and resentment which are more subtle, but just as lethal as Nazi bullets. Although Mrs. McIntyre who owns the farm on which these displaced persons settle is at first very satisfied with her new employee, Mrs. Shortley, the wife of the farm's dairyman, mistrusts Guizac and views him as the devil's instrument. After Mrs. Shortley's unexpected death, Mrs. McIntyre begins to regard Guizac in much the same way as the late Mrs. Shortley had. Eventually, she not only has an unreasoned hatred for Guizac, but becomes a passive accessory to his murder. Robert Fitzgerald hints at this change in Mrs. McIntyre's personality but does not expand upon the point, suggesting only that "After Mrs. Shortley's death, her role as the giant wife of the countryside devolves upon Mrs. McIntyre . . . " (389). But the change in Mrs. McIntyre's personality is a bit more dramatic than a mere devolution because it is

accompanied by a corresponding physical deterioration. These changes in Mrs. McIntyre's personality coupled with her physical maladies might best be explained by the Jungian term "enantiodromia."

"Enantiodromia," as defined by Carl Jung, is "a conversion of something into its opposite" (*Symbols* 375). These opposites are manifestations of what Jung calls the shadow--"the inferior side of the personality" (*Symbols* 183). This shadow side exists in most individuals below the surface of the conscious mind or ego. Jung explains that the shadow is visible

> where adaptation is weakest--a degree of inferiority and existence of a lower level of personality. On this level with its uncontrolled emotions one behaves more or less like a primitive who is not only the passive victim of his affects, but also singularly incapable of judgement. (*Aion* 9)

This lower level of personality becomes dominate in Mrs. McIntyre's consciousness after Mrs. Shortley's death and renders her incapable of maintaining a reasonable perspective in her opinion of Guizac. Mrs. McIntyre's subsequent physical deterioration results from the destructive struggle between her newly dominate shadow side and her now repressed positive qualities.

The first part of "The Displaced Person" concerns the Guizacs's arrival at the farm and the reactions of the ignorant Mrs. Shortley to them and to the Catholic priest who has made the arrangements for Guizac's job. The hostility Mrs. Shortley feels for Guizac, based on her own ignorance and insecurity, adumbrates Mrs. McIntyre's forthcoming role reversal and initiates a mood of mistrust and suspicion that later leads directly to her own death and to the death of Guizac. Because she has seen newsreel accounts of the German atrocities taking place in Poland, Mrs. Shortley equates the victims with the perpetrators. She compares the Guizacs to "rats with typhoid fleas" who have carried "all those murderous ways over the water with them directly to this place" (196). In addition to mistrusting the Guizacs because they are foreign, Mrs. Shortley feels she has another valid reason for her prejudices--the Guizacs are Catholic. Catholicism, she believes, is "unreformed," and its practitioners are not to be trusted. Mrs. Shortley's negative opinions, though totally groundless, nevertheless influence her husband and Mrs. McIntyre to such an extent that they, along with Sulk, a black employee, eventually share complicity in Guizac's "accidental" death.

In sharp contrast to Mrs. Shortley's attitude in the early stages of the story, Mrs. McIntyre is elated to have Guizac on her place. She calls him her "salvation," to which Mrs. Shortley curtly replies, "I would suspicion salvation got from the devil" (203). Mrs. Shortley's growing antipathy toward Guizac is partly because his intense efficiency is the antithesis of her husband's work habits. As Mrs. McIntyre grows more satisfied with Guizac, Mrs. Shortley begins to feel threatened by his presence. She per-

ceives him as inhuman, a visible symbol of the devil's power on the farm, and, together with the priest and the Catholic Church, as a co-conspirator in an attempt to bring the evils of Europe to America. We are told that "every time Mr. Guizac smiled, Europe stretched out in Mrs. Shortley's imagination, mysterious and evil, the devil's experiment station" (205). Her fears come to fruition when Mrs. Shortley overhears Mrs. McIntyre confiding to the priest that she soon will have to fire Mr. Shortley in order to pay Guizac more. The strain of this news is too much for the obese Mrs. Shortley who has a stroke and dies in the car as the family is departing the McIntyre farm.

The death of Mrs. Shortley ends the first part of the three part story, and the last two sections focus on Mrs. McIntyre, who, up to this point, has had nothing but praise for Guizac's work. To her he is "a kind of miracle that she had seen happen and that she talked about but that she still didn't believe" (219). Mrs. McIntyre's attitude changes dramatically, however, when she finds that Guizac has promised his niece in marriage to the Negro Sulk if the latter will pay half of the expenses for bringing the girl to America. Mrs. McIntyre's violent reaction to the proposed marriage is the turning point of the story and triggers the beginning of the "enantiodromia"--the role reversal--exhibited both in her changing personality and in her physical decline that results from it.

Prior to Mrs. Shortley's departure from the story, Mrs. McIntyre has no need to vocalize her shadow side. Her unconscious, negative attitudes toward Guizac find surrogate release through the views expressed by Mrs. Shortley. In a sense, Mrs. Shortley, taking on the role of the shadow, completes Mrs. McIntyre's personality. By suppressing her own negative feelings and allowing Mrs. Shortley to vocalize them, Mrs. McIntyre has avoided confronting her unconscious prejudices and maintained the appearance and belief of her own liberality. After Mrs. Shortley leaves, however, Mrs. McIntyre's shadow is forced to seek another means of expression. Her shadow side, finding an initial release into the conscious mind of Mrs. McIntyre because of her more open prejudice against a white girl's marrying her colored field hand, gradually increases in power, eventually manifesting itself in her consciousness and controlling her ego. At that point she has, in spirit at least, become Mrs. Shortley. Describing the shadow, Jung writes:

> closer examination of the dark characteristics--that is the inferiorties constituting the shadow--reveals that they have an emotional nature, a kind of autonomy, and accordingly an obsessive, or, better, possessive quality. (*Aion* 8)

It is this possessive quality that now shows itself in Mrs. McIntyre, who from this point forward seems driven by an unseen, unreasoning force. Though we are told of Guizac's faithfulness and efficiency, Mrs. McIntyre's reaction to him becomes one of inexplicable hostility:

> Mrs. McIntyre saw jobs done in a short time that she had thought would never get done at all. Still she was resolved to get rid of him [Guizac]. The sight of his small stiff figure moving here and there had come to be the most irritating sight on the place for her. (228)

Mrs. McIntyre's irrational hatred for Guizac, despite overwhelming evidence that he is a valuable employee, indicates that she is seeing in Guizac parts of her own shadow that have previously been lived out and expressed by Mrs. Shortley. With Mrs. Shortley gone, however, Mrs. McIntyre experiences the possibility of confronting the evil within herself for the first time. To avoid this confrontation, Mrs. McIntyre projects onto Guizac the evil she denies in herself. Jung calls this process of unconscious denial of personal evil "shadow projection." To the individual projecting her shadow tendencies, as is Mrs. McIntyre, the evil appears totally within the individual on to whom those tendencies are projected, rather than where they actually originate, which is in the unconscious mind of she who projects them (*Aion* 9).

Jung's description of shadow projection is clearly applicable to "The Displaced Person":

> The meeting with ourselves belongs to the more unpleasant things that may be avoided as long as we possess living symbol-figures in which all that is inner and unknown is projected. The figure of the devil, in particular, is a most valuable and acceptable psychic possession, for as long as he goes about outside in the form of a roaring lion, we know where the evil lurks. . . . With the rise of consciousness since the Middle Ages, to be sure, he has been considerably reduced in stature. But to take his place there are human beings to whom we gratefully resign our shadows. (*Integration* 69)

In this story, first for Mrs. Shortley, and later for Mrs. McIntyre, Guizac is the one to whom they resign their shadow sides. He becomes their exterior devil. In him they see mirrored the evil they cannot recognize in themsel-ves.

Although Mrs. McIntyre's shadow projections indicate that her personality has changed, they are not the only evidence pointing to her assumption of Mrs. Shortley's role in the story. The "enantiodromia" begins in Part Two, but the most obvious indication of the spiritual connection between the two women occurs at the beginning of Part Three, when Mr. Shortley, unable to find work elsewhere, returns to the McIntyre farm to ask for his old job back. As Mrs. McIntyre, who at this point is unaware of Mrs. Shortley's death, watches the Shortley's car moving slowly up the road toward her house, her thoughts reflect what is happening to her personality. We are told that at that moment, Mrs. McIntyre has the feeling that "she was the one returning, after a long miserable trip, to

her own place. She realized all at once that it was Mrs. Shortley she had been missing" (226). Later, attempting to understand her own grief at the loss of Mrs. Shortley and the strange new feelings which have begun to control her, Mrs. McIntyre tells herself that the way she is acting "anyone would have thought they [Mrs. McIntyre and Mrs. Shortley] were kin" (227). And in a sense they have become related, one taken spiritually into the other.

Likewise, as the story progresses, Mrs. McIntyre's attitudes on numerous issues take on the cast of those previously expressed by Mrs. Shortley. She becomes suspicious of the priest and of his Catholic doctrines, and she begins to express doubts that Guizac will remain on the place after he makes enough money to buy a used car. When Mrs. Shortley had broached this subject earlier, Mrs. McIntyre appeared to regard it as unnecessary speculation; however, she now uses that same argument trying to convince the priest that Guizac is unsatisfactory. Mrs. McIntyre soon reaches the point that she can no longer view Guizac with any kind of objectivity. Her thoughts become mere restatements of Mrs. Shortley's ignorant assumptions and unreasoned hatred.

Just prior to his death, Mrs. McIntyre will not even yell a warning that could have allowed the unsuspecting Guizac to avoid a tractor rolling down a hill toward him, a warning that would have saved the man's life. By then she has become totally controlled by her shadow. This part of the "enantiodromia" is complete. Her shadow has succeeded in remaining dominate and in repressing her positive qualities.

Mrs. McIntyre's physical decline, which has slowly progressed throughout the story, now accelerates because when Guizac dies, her shadow has eliminated the only hope for her recovery. Guizac's death removes the object onto which she had projected her shadow. Mrs. McIntyre's shadow side, denied first a surrogate release with the death of Mrs. Shortly, and later an exterior devil onto which to project its evil with the elimination of Guizac, now turns its full destructive power against its own host consciousness.

At the story's conclusion, the fury of Mrs. McIntyre's unrestrained shadow side has decimated her body. She is bed-ridden and cannot speak-the victim of a devil whose face is her own.

Works Cited

Feeley, Sister Kathleen. *Flannery O'Connor: Voice of the Peacock.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1972.

Fitzgerald, Robert. "The Countryside and the True Country." *Sewanee Review* 70 (1962): 380-94.

Jung, C. G. *Aion.* Trans. R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970.

—. *The Integration of Personality.* Trans. Stanley M. Dell. New York: Farrar, 1939.

—. *Psyche and Symbol.* Ed. Violet S. deLaszlo. Garden City: Doubleday, 1958.

—. *Symbols of Transformation.* Trans. R. F. C. Hull. New York: Pantheon, 1956.

Meaders, Margeret Inman. "Flannery O'Connor: 'Literary Witch'." *The Colorado Quarterly* 10 (1962-1963) : 377- 86.

O'Connor, Flannery. *The Complete Stories.* New York: Farrar, 1969.

Thoreau and "The Village": Loss and Being Lost in Walden

Theodore Haddin
The University of Alabama at Birmingham

In Walden critics have generally overlooked the significance of Thoreau's chapter "The Village." Of all writing in the book this brief chapter obviously provided Thoreau an opportunity to address the issue of his relationship with his fellow townsmen, an issue that had been in the back of his mind ever since his remark in his first chapter "Economy," that he "had travelled a good deal in Concord; and everywhere, in shops, and offices, and fields, the inhabitants have appeared to [him] to be doing penance in a thousand remarkable ways" (4). Such a charge, from the beginning, should have alerted the reader that Thoreau meant to confront his neighbors, "right fronting" and "face to face" as he says of "a fact"near the end of his second chapter (98). But whether, in the confrontation, they, too, would feel the fact "as if it were a cimeter...dividing [them] through the heart and marrow" to "happily conclude {their} mortal career[s]" was another thing, indeed, one of the great things of the book he was writing about life. To catch up with Thoreau, his neighbors and the reader would have to understand the paradox of confrontation.[1] They would have to understand that doing so would mean giving up everything excessive in a material life for the pursuit of a greater, immortal one, sincere and simple. Not merely reducing materiality but a change of attitude would be required to conclude their mortal careers.

Of course, few in Concord, few even in the world, would be willing to do this. So Thoreau employs a paradoxical stance to goad his neighbors and readers into a new way of perceiving reality by making them see a person, sometimes a hunting man who, thinking he hears the sound of approaching ducks, is suddenly jarred by the booming and cracking Walden ice; or a woman who, selling clothing to a particular buyer, has to confront the insanity of her own repetition, "They do not make them any more" (25). Or perhaps the unconscious penance of his neighbors, compared with the conscious, holy and divine penance of the Brahmin, will be seen for the astonishing thing that it is (4). Throughout this book neighbors and readers on the alert (the "poor students" of his opening remarks) may perceive through Thoreau's paradoxical dynamic the being (Thoreau) whose grasp on the world is no grasp at all, but a releasing from it in order to know what Joan Burbick calls an "alternative," or "uncivil history," that includes nature, readers, and neighbors altogether (1, 5, 56). Perhaps between the paradoxical poles of birth and death, winter and spring, neighbor and outsider, farmer and artist, city and country, the alert reader

could be inspired to erase the negative image to find a third, and new resolution for himself.

Thus, halfway through *Walden*, Thoreau meets his neighbors half way, though they will have to account for more than the other half. The chapter "The Ponds" is usually taken as the turning point in the middle of the book, but "The Village" is actually its pivotal chapter. What critics have brought to it is scant, and the reading in it by Richard Bridgman of a paranoic Thoreau simply omits its employment of paradox and is reminiscent of earlier criticism where Thoreau seems a crank or failure.[2] To get at this chapter's meaning we will have to understand how the experience of loss underlies its writing and how Thoreau's statement about "losing the world" functions in it.[3]

Thoreau apparently experienced loss from two directions, a generalized one in which Stanley Cavell lists childhood, a nation and a God of the fathers, Walden as Paradise,--in short, "everything there is to lose" (52); while Richard LeBeaux focuses on the actual record of Thoreau's personal losses: The death of his brother John in 1842, the loss of 300 acres of woods to which he and Edward Hoar had accidentally set fire in 1844, his night in jail in July, 1846, his failure of his first book, *A Week* in 1849, a serious disagreement with Emerson about this time, and the death of Margaret Fuller Ossoli in 1850.[4] Neither record can be ignored, and though I have dealt with the episode of the fire as an aesthetic issue elsewhere,[5] it would be oversimplifying these losses to say that thoreau had not been profoundly affected by them. By the time he published *Walden* in 1854 he was not the somewhat inexperienced person he was in 1841 when he announced in his *Journal* that he wanted "to go soon and live away by the pond" (I.299). The fact that he attempted to assimilate and learn from these losses--whatever "events come out of God," according to Mary Elkins Moller, enlarged the scope of his appreciation of loss (141). Thoreau knew where the object of faith "is to be found, in the true acceptance of loss, the refusal of any substitute for true recovery" (Cavell 52). In his writing, and particularly in "The Village," some of these losses reappear as the transformed, assimilated thought applied in a discourse ostensibly about himself and his townsmen, and as we shall see, that thought carried far more significance for the possible transformation of attitude by his neighbors and readers than has been recognized.

With the losses, then, and faced with the opprobrium of that woods fire, Thoreau had good reason himself to "lose the world." Beyond the middle of the chapter he writes:

> Not till we are completely lost, or turned around,--for a man needs only to be turned round once with his eyes shut in this world to be lost,--do we appreciate the vastness and strangeness of nature. Every man has to learn the points of compass again as often as he awakes, whether from sleep or any abstraction. Not till we are lost, in other words not till we have lost the world, do we begin to find

ourselves, and realize where we are and the infinite extent of our relations. (171)

The connection here with the well-known verses in Matthew is evident (16: 24-26), and for precisely this reason Thoreau turns his neighbors around for the possibility of the new vision which they may find. For Jesus, any man who would seek a divine life must deny himself and become a follower of Jesus. But if a man desires only to save his own life he will lose it, and find it if he loses it for Jesus' sake. Then come the lines: "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" (v.26).

Thoreau's words in "The Village" invert the lines from Matthew: To find ourselves (our soul) we must lose the world, but in doing so we "realize...the infinite extent of our relations" (171). It is a vision of the unlimited perception of nature and the universe, and essentially a turning of his neighbors around in order to appreciate Thoreau's own assumption, that like Jesus, he is in the world, but less and less of it. Matter, and ourselves, are only there as part of those "infinite relations" still to be discovered. Thoreau's neighbors must lose their interest in materiality (where they are already "lost"), for new aesthetic and spiritual possibilities in themselves. The inversion here is typical of Thoreau's turning things upside-down or providing an extreme perspective, a paradoxical point of view, to save the soul.[6] It is a long way to come from being a guilty woodsburner and a damned rascal, no longer damned. Nor will his neighbors be damned if they can "lose the world" (which also means for them, losing their worldly epithets, like "damned rascal").

In "The Village" Thoreau meant to confront his townsmen and his readers who reads about them, with a choice, if they were alert enough to take the hint about the society's running "amok" against him, "it being the desperate party" (171). They would have to run against his meaning, which is hard to obtain if we read his opening remarks about gossip and animals as negative and misanthropic instead of as a statement that juxtaposes Thoreau, his readers, and his neighbors in a natural setting (the village) where they may participate with one another (rhetorically):

> Every day or two I strolled to the village to hear some of the gossip which is incessantly going on there, circulating either from mouth to mouth, or from newspaper to newspaper, and which, taken in homeopathic doses, was really as refreshing in its was as the rustle of leaves and the peeping of frogs. As I walked in the woods to see the birds and squirrels, so I walked in the village to see the men and boys; instead of the wind among the pines I heard the carts rattle. In one direction from my house there was a colony of muskrats in the river meadows; under the grove of elms and buttonwoods in the other horizon was a village of busy men, as

> curious to me as if they had been prairies dogs, each sitting at the mouth of its burrow, or running to a neighbor's to gossip (167).

Thoreau's assertion that his neighbors resemble "prairie dogs" (an image that has bothered critics) confronts the reader with a ridiculous image of their gossiping, but this also places the neighbors in the larger context of Thoreau's "uncivil history," a larger relationship with nature. As such their gossiping is a form of safety, to protect themselves as a community, though they may be ignorant of the larger community of the world and the universe, subjects Thoreau has been on the track of since his lost hound, bay horse, and turtledove of chapter one. Thoreau's transcendental "gossip" is not heard by them. Unlike his transcendental wind of nature, they only hear local news. But he encourages them in this chapter. Perhaps the "prairie dogs," by their smallness and quickness, provide humor.

Thoreau says, "Instead of the wind among the pines I heard the carts rattle" (167), just the opposite of the transcendental possibilities Thoreau usually hears, and which tendency for hearing he brings with him to town because he is a traveler or rambler who is already a superior listener ("Sounds"). In the lines following, the village as a "great news room" (the world?) some of the inhabitants have "such a vast appetite for the news that though Thoreau does not say it, like the Brahmin or poet "they sit forever in public avenues without stirring, and let it simmer and whisper through them like the Etesian winds"--"or as if inhaling ether, it only producing numbness and insensibility--otherwise it would often be painful to hear--without affecting the consciousness" (167). It is wind, but not a divine wind.

Casting this contrary image of listeners up to his reader, Thoreau then deftly links them with himself as an outdoorsman, but for the wrong reason, of course: "They, being commonly out of doors, heard whatever was in the wind" (168). The irony in this shows Thoreau's townsmen potentially capable of a poetic or divine life like his, but unaware of this fact. Perhaps, in his words, they do act out a kind of poetry.

Next, when Thoreau mentions that passing through the town's gossips is like going through a gauntlet, the confrontation, if we think of the gauntlet, had already been set in the word itself, an apt term; for, like the imagery of nature that runs through the chapter, and that is older than the town and the townsmen, the "gauntlet" is an Indian form of justice older than any in Concord, and in the confrontation they do not see how they act out an older custom in which they are now as much besieged as Thoreau, when they attempt to strike him. Actually, this gauntlet is more trying than it is for Thoreau, for those near its head, "where they could most see and be seen," (168), "paid the highest prices for their places" (for they would no doubt be seen by the traveler), and those on the outskirts "paid a very slight ground or window tax" (168).

Obviously, when he mentions later that he was put in jail because he failed to pay a poll tax to a State that supports slavery, something is to be

said for the person who paid no tax at all. This is one of the significant things his townsmen do not see, and whatever sense of loss Thoreau may have felt by being put in jail has not been transformed into keenest argument. The cimeter like the word of God in Hebrews 4:12 "*is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents" that go off, in this case of the no-tax, in the mind of the reader. This no-tax shows the man who runs about town with no tax, anyway. It now seems odd that he should be required to pay, and even more odd, that one of his townsmen, as we learn, should pay it for him. The last ideal for Thoreau would be that the townsman, would, like Thoreau, not pay it either.

If Thoreau intended to nudge his readers by implying the world is upside-down, in fact according to the gossips, "whether the world was likely to hold together much longer" (169), and only the reader can right it or find it new, by changing his attitude--his description in the chapter of his journeying home at night is meant to accomplish even more out of his experience and that of his neighbors. If Thoreau can be their guide, perhaps they can erase their old methods of seeing. He casts his journey as if sailing, with "a bag of rye or Indian meal" on his shoulder, emblem again of an older time, "with a merry crew of thoughts," as of the unconscious, "leaving my outer man at the helm" (169). He will head for "the cabin fire" where he would have "many a genial thought" as he sailed, by implication, far from that woods fire he had set in 1844 (169). Even in the dark, passing between two pines "not more than eighteen inches apart" the reader is again reminded of that dividing through and through, where the thought moves with surety in the dark of the unconscious. His coming home sometimes, "dreaming and absentminded all the way, until [he] was aroused by having to raise [his] hand to life the latch" and not being able to "recall a single step of [his] walk signals the reader--if he will be alert, of the extraordinary passage to come in "The Ponds" where Thoreau tells about paddling his boat on Walden:

> I have spent many an hour, when I was younger, floating over the surface as the zephyr willed, having paddled my boat to the middle, and lying on my back across the seats, in a summer forenoon, dreaming awake, until I was aroused by the boat touching the sand, and I arose to see what shore my fates had impelled me to; days when idleness was the most attractive and productive industry" (191).

Here Thoreau opens himself directly to the reader (and to his neighbors), and at some risk he offers the townsmen a chance again, to connect, or erase the former image for the new one that is "most productive" (191).

If Thoreau harbored any guilt about that woodsfire (which I have noted earlier,--if he thought his neighbors hated him because of it, probably few passages in the book so carefully created a kindly image of the speaker, Thoreau, than the one he turns to when a visitor stayed the evening into

the dark night and Thoreau "was obliged to conduct him to the cart-path in the rear of the house, and then point out to him the direction he was to pursue, and in keeping which he was to be guided rather by his feet than his eyes" (170). Not only does this show that Thoreau knew what he was doing, that he could indeed be relied upon for his knowledge of the woods instead of burning them up, but momentarily assumes something more than guide by pointing him "the direction he was to pursue" as though it were a life course and Thoreau were a teacher or wise man. His song, says Thoreau in *A Week*, "is a vital function like breathing . . . not the overflowing of life but of its subsistence rather, and is drawn from under the feet of the poet" (91).

Thoreau mentions further "two young men" who, living "about a mile off through the woods" (*Walden* 170) and being directed by him on their way, nonetheless got lost in the night, and did not get home until early morning. Thoreau obviously comes off as a sympathetic figure who might have equally as well assisted two young men who had become "lost" over their part in burning up the woods. Contrarily, these boys were drenched to the skin. But Thoreau says, "I have heard of many going astray even in the village streets" (170). Some on the outskirts have to put up for the night, it is so dark; some men and women making a call "have gone half a mile out of their way, feeling the sidewalk only with their feet" (170). Thoreau will give them leeway. These are as lost as Thoreau ever was, though they have not yet discovered the value of "the unconscious of God, the end of the world" (*Journal* I.119).

In "The Bean-Field," the chapter immediately preceding "The Village," Thoreau says that in another summer, "if the seed is not lost" he would plant "sincerity, truth, simplicity, faith, [and] innocence" (164); but the summers have gone by, and he confesses, "To you, Reader [his emphasis], that the seeds which I planted, if indeed they *were* the seeds of those virtues, were wormeaten or had lost their vitality, and so did not come up" (164). The impression here is of failure; but presently Thoreau states, "I saw an old man the other day, to my astonishment, making the holes with a hoe for the seventieth time at least, and not for himself to lie down it" (164). The stunner comes when he asks a few lines later, "Why concern ourselves so much about our beans for seed, and not be concerned at all about a new generation of men?" (164).

If men must plant for a new generation, they must plant together. Whatever Thoreau was to his neighbors and critics--a skulker, a woodsburner, a failure, a dammed rascal--his paradoxical truth is importantly with us. In this pivotal chapter these negative images collide with the kind, thoughtful, and generous person who aids people in the dark to become those seekers he mentions in his opening myth about a lost hound, bay horse, and turtledove--self-losses that are only the symbol of those losses people must learn to seek for themselves. More than the path in the woods at night or the dark path of the unconscious concerns Thoreau. It is we his readers and fellow townsmen in the darkness of the mystical way,

that we must get turned around to discover, that needs losing the world to know. By losing the world we can find the way to "infinite relations"–by apparently trivial a first step as returning to the woods ourselves for the huckleberry Thoreau mentions at the beginning of his next chapter "The Ponds," where the huckleberry is the pure, simple metonym of Thoreau's own self, so significantly connected to the chapter's meaning.

Notes

[1] Joseph Adamson's "The Trials of Thoreau" (1990) complements Moldenhauer's seminal article (1964) on Thoreau's paradoxical style and superbly advances the thought of Walter Benn Michaels, Paul Lauter, Cavell, Ronald B. Schwartz, and Malini Schueller who have strong interests in Thoreau's rhetoric. Adamson treats Biblical sources and reader-involvement, the latter of which is essential in Henry Golemba's masterful recent study *Thoreau's Wild Rhetoric* that I draw upon here, 164-73, 185-90, 196-99.

[2] Bridgman 98-101; besides noting Thoreau's "paranoic description" of his relation to his townsmen, says Thoreau "staunchly asserted the value of being lost" but does not pursue further implications of Thoreau's meaning. Erwin (1981), echoing Thoreau criticism of the 30s and 40s, sees Thoreau only as a writer of maxims and aphorisms, "an awful person and his books exceedingly contrived" (57).

[3] Cavell 50-51, draws attention not only to Thoreau's losing us and losing the world but to "the writer [who] comes to us from a sense of loss . . . not things he has lost, but a connection with things, the track of desire itself." Cavell considers everything Thoreau lists in *Walden* a "record of losses."

[4] LeBeaux 4-5, 76, 118-25.

[5] South Atlantic Review 41 May, (1976) 78-89.

[6] Moldenhauer 134-35, "Habitually aware of the 'common sense,' the dulled perception that common life produces, he could turn the world of his audience upside down by rhetorical means."

Works Cited

Adamson, Joseph. "The Trials of Thoreau." *Emerson Society Quarterly* 36.2 (1990): 137-172.

Bridgman, Richard. *Dark Thoreau*. Lincoln: U of NE P, 1982.

Burbick, Joan. *Thoreau's Alternative History: Changing Perspectives on Nature, Culture, and Language*. Philadelphia: U of PA P, 1987.

Cavell, Stanley. *The Senses of Walden, An Expanded Text*. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1981.

Erwin, Robert. "Thoreau." Reputations Reconsidered" in *Harvard Magazine*. Nov.-Dec (1981): 57-60.

Golemba, Henry. *Thoreau's Wild Rhetoric*. New York: Columbia UP, 1990.

LeBeaux, Richard. *Thoreau's Seasons*. Amherst: U of MA P, 1984.

Moldenhauer, Joseph J. "The Extra-vagant Maneuver: Paradox in *Walden*." *The Graduate Journal*. 6 Winter (1964) 132-146.

Moller, Mary Elkins. *Thoreau in the Human Community*. Amherst: U of MA P, 1980.

Thoreau, Henry David. *Walden*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1971.

----. *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1980.

"Danger deviseth shifts" in *Venus and Adonis*

Marcus Hammack
Mississippi State University

Prevalent thought recognizes two characters in *Venus and Adonis*, but actually there are three: Venus, Adonis, and Wat the Hare. This distinction becomes important when Venus tells Wat's story of running from the hunters (lines 673-708), and Venus not only gives him a name but also delves deep into Wat's emotions and motivation, thus revealing his character. Within his character, Wat's motivation parallels Venus's and Adonis's: danger drives all three characters. Danger not only motivates the characters but also works within the greater theme of this work. Many critics allude to the presence of danger in *Venus and Adonis*, but they have not fully explored the nature of danger, both in the word itself and in the implied idea of danger. The poem first sets up a sexually-reversed romantic dilemma, in which Adonis fears Venus's advances and Venus fears rejection. Then, the boar enters, and Venus alters, to a degree, her danger and pursuit of Adonis, which leads to an altering (or a revealing) of Adonis's danger. Adonis fears that love will steal life while Venus fears that death will steal beauty, and both devise shifts to avoid their dangers; thereafter, death steals Venus's love, instead of beauty itself, while death also steals life from Adonis, instead of the love he feared.

In the first part of the poem (1-588), Adonis fears Venus. His attempts to avoid her and escape from her show his fear which she comments on and which the narrator observes. Adonis appears to be about to give her the one small kiss which she says will "pay this comptless debt" (84), but he "winks, and turns his lips another way" (90). He scowls, "Fie no more of love! / The sun doth burn my face, I must remove" (185-6), wanting to use the sun as a reason to leave Venus. Many other lines imply his attempts to avoid her. For instance, Venus says, "What seest thou in the ground? hold up thy head" (118). Also, instead of just trying to avoid eye contact, Adonis is paraphrased by the narrator as "chiding" her for her apparently lustful actions, and the narrator describes Adonis as being one "unapt to toy" (34) and "frosty in desire" (36). All his actions, actual or implied, show him trying to escape or at least avoid Venus. He upsets her by not giving in to her charms, so she says, "What am I that thou shouldst contemn me this? [sic] / Or what great danger dwells upon my suit?" (205-6; italics mine). Venus implies that Adonis fears her proposals. Venus's last question in these two lines introduces "the possibility that she poses a danger to those she entices" (Fienberg 22). The narrator also speaks of Venus's approaches to Adonis as endangering Adonis, for the narrator speaks of their courtship as "combat," even saying, when Venus holds his hand, "so

white a friend engirts so white a foe" (364). Adonis is the "foe," or rather the "besieged," who must protect himself from his enemy, Venus.

Venus, seeing Adonis's fear, devises shifts to convince him that his danger lies elsewhere. She tells him to "make use of time, let not advantage slip" (129) because his beauty will waste away and die with him. In effect, Venus hits Adonis where it hurts most--his mortality. Venus's message in this passage suits well her argument that he should reproduce because he will die; Venus wants Adonis to see time as a danger, that time will steal his life and beauty. Furthermore, she tells him that she is not his danger; she is his protector. When she hems him within her arms, her ivory pale, she calls herself a park where "no dog shall rouse thee, though a thousand bark" (240). Within her park, her domain, he need fear no danger, those unspecified thousand "dogs," because she will protect him from those numerous, yet unspecified, other "dangers."

When she tells Adonis of the wonderful banquet he is to her senses, she encourages him to "bid Suspicion [i.e., watchfulness against danger] double-lock the door, / Lest Jealousy, that sour unwelcome guest, / Should by his stealing in disturb the feast" (448-50). According to Venus, Adonis's danger is Jealousy, which will sour their "banquet." When Adonis objects that love "is a life in death" (413), Venus ironically answers his objection by faking death. He manages to awaken her with his kisses, and she says, "Do I delight to die, or life desire? / But now I liv'd, and life was death's annoy, / But now I died, and death was lively joy" (496-98). She seems to say even death was more enjoyable with love than life without love, so if love has killed her, she says, "kill me once again" (499). (Of course, she can "die" twice or thrice, but Adonis can't.) In each of these attempts to allay Adonis's fear, Venus's ulterior motive is clear: she is less concerned about saving Adonis from danger than she is about getting him into the woods (where the horses are).

Adonis, however, apparently disagrees with her about where his danger lies; he still sees Venus as his danger. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, he specifically and pointedly says that *love* "is a life in death, / That laughs and weeps, and all but with a breath" (413-4). He clearly says that he fears love, for it brings death. Venus does dispute this reasoning; nonetheless, Adonis calmly devises a shift, using his youth as his main defense. He says that he is not ready for love, that he is not mature yet; if he were to become involved with love now, he argues he would "wither in [his] prime, prove nothing worth" (418), or at the very least, he would be "sour to taste" (528). With each devised excuse, Adonis linguistically shifts the danger of Venus's sophistry away from him.

Adonis seems to say his danger is clearly Venus, but Venus's danger in this first part of the poem alternates between a fear of rejection and ironically a fear of time. When she tells Adonis to fear time stealing his life, she seems also to fear that time will steal Adonis's beauty--or, more to the point, absolute, abstract Beauty; since he is mortal, he will die and take Beauty away from her, and "Beauty within itself should not be wasted. /

Fair flowers that are not gath'red in their prime / Rot, and consume themselves in little time" (128-32). In addition to this fear, she seems also to fear rejection. No matter how Adonis responds, "she cannot choose but love" (79), for

> Foul words and frowns must not repel a lover;
> What though the rose have prickles, yet 'tis pluck'd!
> Were beauty under twenty locks kept fast,
> Yet love breaks through, and picks them all at last. (573-6)

The narrator accurately describes Venus's situation: because she believes Adonis is Beauty (despite the fact that he is just a handsome man), she, as Love, must pursue him until she can break through and "pick"--or possess-Beauty, which for her means Adonis. Yet Venus seems to fear that she will not break through if Adonis is correct when he says, "Remove your siege from my unyielding heart, / To love's alarms it will not ope the gate" (423-4); if Adonis remains steadfast, then Venus will truly be the "Poor queen of love, in [her] own law forlorn, / To love a cheek that smiles at [her] in scorn!" (251-2), and Love will die in the tomb of Adonis's dimples. However, Venus hopes that tomorrow Adonis will give in to her desires.

When Adonis says he will hunt the boar, the poem enters its second of three parts (589-811), and in this part, Shakespeare reveals how Venus and Adonis redefine danger by means of linguistic shifts. Concerning physical shifts, both Venus and Adonis clearly parallel Wat, for whom "Danger deviseth shifts, wit waits on fear" (690). On the one hand, Venus, by tracing out and then retracing her arguments, seems to parallel Wat, for she, like the hare, does all she can to avoid her danger. Later in the third part, she hears the sounds of a hunt nearby,

> And as she runs, the bushes in the way,
> Some catch her by the neck, some kiss her face,
> Some twin'd about her thigh to make her stay.
> She wildly breaketh from their strict embrace. (871-4)

In her running about, she again resembles Wat, who "turn[s] and return[s], indenting with the way; / each envious brier his weary legs do scratch" (704-5); likewise, for Venus "a thousand spleens bear her a thousand ways, / She treads the path that she untreads again" (907-8). In contrast to Venus, Adonis's likeness to Wat is less obvious, but it shows itself in his two attempts to run away from Venus--his second attempt succeeds. Now, in the second part, just as the hunters' "loud alarums" (700) renew Wat's danger, the entrance of the boar renews their dangers.

Venus's danger to Adonis renews itself when she takes on the dual roles of mother and temptress: roles which influence the direction of her linguistic shifts. When Adonis mentions the boar, Venus fears losing her hope of getting her desires the next day, and her danger seems to change from

simply getting what she desires to protecting Adonis from the boar; at this point in the poem, she almost takes on the role of the mother who fears that the boar will destroy her son. I say "almost" because her motives are not purely maternal. She still seems to desire to go into the woods with Adonis, for her immediate reaction to this hunt is to pull Adonis on top of her; granted, her act seems to convey motherly protection by preventing him from running off directly and hunting the boar, but it also pulls Adonis into the position that she was trying to get him into at the poem's opening. Yet, though her motives may be less than pure, at least her desire has become less focused on lust and focuses more on a love that seeks Adonis's protection (even though this protection is mainly to keep Adonis alive until she can seduce him). Later in the poem's third part (812-1194), when she hears the sounds of the hunt (signifying that Adonis still lives), she runs "Like a milch doe, whose swelling dugs do ache, / Hasting to feed her fawn hid in some brake" (875-6), and when she hears some huntsman shout, the narrator says "A nurse's song ne'er pleas'd her babe so well" (974). These images of the mother suggest her desire to see Adonis safe.

As a mother figure, she seeks to protect Adonis from physical destruction; as temptress, she wants to destroy him spiritually. When Adonis tries in the first part of the poem to chide Venus, "she murthers with a kiss" (54) his objections, and after this kiss, she begins, "as an empty eagle" (55) to "devour" Adonis with her lustful kisses. She also speaks of Adonis as fruit, saying he is "unripe; yet mayst thou well be tasted" (128). These metaphors point toward a relationship in which if Adonis gives in to her desires, she will absorb his identity spiritually as meat and fruit are absorbed physically. This temptress danger to Adonis continues in the second part. When the danger of the boar enters the poem, Venus takes on a duality, becoming both the mother trying to protect Adonis from the boar's danger and the temptress still trying to convince Adonis to accept her mortal-consuming "love."

Similar to devising physical "shifts," like Wat, Venus devises linguistic shifts to redefine her danger. In the poem's first part, Jealousy (similar to our current definition) was a "sour unwelcome guest" to keep outside, but in the second part, Jealousy (which means "fear of loss") is a sentinel giving false alarms, "Distemp'ring gentle Love in his desire, / As air and water do abate the fire" (649-54). Fear of losing Adonis has quenched her lustful desires, says Venus, and now this new Jealousy "Knocks at my heart, and whispers in mine ear, / That if I love thee, I thy death should fear" (659-60). She fears his death, but it is ambiguous whether this fear is for his sake or hers. Venus's redefinition of "jealousy" indicates the change in her motive and shows her devising linguistic shifts in her pursuit of Adonis, thus illustrating her roles as mother and temptress.

In addition to redefining jealousy, Venus is also affected by jealousy, for in all her shifts she desperately tries to avoid her danger of losing Adonis to the boar. When Adonis reveals his hunting plans, she grabs him and refuses to release him, saying that he could have gone before he had told

her that he was going to hunt the boar, but now she again refuses to let him leave. As Gordon Williams accurately notes, her sexual jealousy is very evident here, and becomes increasingly explicit. She warns how the boar 'Would root these beauties as he roots the mead' (l. 636). The current bawdy sense is little more than a century old, but that the force of the image is in the same direction is entirely clear without the support of such parallels as Dekker's 'rooting other mens [sic] pasture' (773). She would rather "root these beauties" herself, so she is jealous of the boar because he may get the first, and perhaps the last, shot.

Therefore, Venus devises linguistic shifts to get Adonis to fear the boar also; accordingly, in this protective effort she reveals the impurity of her motives. She pleads to Adonis to hunt not the boar, to "come not within his danger by thy will" (639). Venus's phrase "within his danger"places her plea and Adonis's choice of dangers in a social and economic context. The *OED* tells us that danger can involve the power of a lord or master, involving jurisdiction, dominion, and the power to dispose of or to hurt or harm, specifically at times in his debt or under obligation to him. Venus, therefore, speaks to Adonis in the old feudal terms he favors, presenting the boar as a competing claimant to the dominance of Adonis. She would dominate him and keep him "within her danger," through physical, economic, and epistemological claims. (Fienberg 28-29)

As Fienberg correctly observes, Venus (rather than try to save Adonis from the boar's danger) wants to convince him *linguistically* to chose her danger over the boar's. However, it seems that despite this impure motivation in Venus, if Adonis would have listened to her, he would be alive (at least physically). Once again, in her shifts concerning the boar, she reveals her duality in this maternal argument tainted with the desires of a temptress.

Seeing that her tainted maternal arguments are not working (715-19), Venus, allowed by her dual character, shifts her tactics to an approach which reminds one of her temptress character in the first part of the poem. Her maternal attempts have failed to get him to avoid the boar, so she falls back on her old temptress tricks from the first part and devises shifts to convince him that his danger is something other than she, so he should pick her because she does not endanger him. She tells Adonis that Nature is his danger, for "The earth, in love with thee, thy footing trips, / And all is but to rob thee of a kiss," and that Adonis's lips sadden Diana, goddess of the moon, "Lest she should steal a kiss and die forsworn" (722-6). Because Adonis shames Diana with his beauty, she "brib'd the Destinies / To cross the curious workmanship of Nature, / To mingle beauty with infirmities" (733-5), according to Venus. Because of Cynthia's bribery, Venus says that Adonis should fear disease, an agent of death, which "in one minute's fight brings beauty under" (746). Venus's argument from nature fits in well with her attempt to get Adonis to avoid the boar, for if the boar equals death, as many critics rightly claim, then she once again tries to get Adonis to see death (before in the boar but now in Nature), not love (her danger to him,

as he defines it), as his danger. Venus says, "Therefore, despite of fruitless chastity, / . . . Be prodigal: the lamp that burns by night / Dries up his oil to lend the world his light," for "What is thy body but a swallowing grave" (751-7). Venus here argues that Adonis should fear death in the limitations of physical nature, masking (redefining) her earlier argument about time and mortality under the guise of flawed physical nature. By devising shifts to get him to fear danger in nature, she is trying to get him to fear death, but Adonis doesn't fear physical death; he fears her--the equivalent of spiritual death.

Despite all Venus's shifts and wit, Adonis still fears her. In fact, her maternal motives, caused by the boar, require him to devise new linguistic shifts to avoid her. He can surely see that Venus's motives have changed, that she has become more concerned with his actual welfare, even if she still wants to save him to take advantage of him later. Yet, he accuses her of falling again "into [her] idle over-handled theme" (770). His accusation denies her new motives and concentrates solely on her methods' similarity with those she employed in the first part to try to get him to redefine his danger. He sees her language itself as his danger. Adonis seems to voice this danger when he says, "my heart stands armed in mine ear" (779), for he must keep Venus's deceptive language from entering and disturbing his "little heart" and stealing his heart's peace. Indeed, Adonis emphasizes this danger when he says, "The path is smooth that leadeth on to danger" (788), and then he condemns Lust and defends Love. Adonis presents a rather weak argument to avoid Venus. In fact, logically it would have fit better earlier in the poem, when Venus's motives were clearly lustful; instead, in the first part, he mildly chastises her by appealing to his youth, while here, when Venus's motives have actually improved, he harshly berates her, condemning her actions as lustful. Adonis's inconsistency here shows his true reason for denying Venus's desires in the second part: she upsets him by trying to redefine his danger. He is unwilling to admit that Venus is partly right, that he should make the boar his danger. He wants to define his own danger, and since he has defined Venus as his danger in the first part, he will not change it to the boar, even though there is a grain of truth to Venus's impurely motivated redefinition. In this sense, at least from Adonis's point of view, Venus is his real danger, threatening him in this second part with the possibility of actually causing him to change his danger. This is why he becomes so abusive in his retort in the second part, and this is why he leaves so suddenly--if he lets her speak much more, she might actually convince him to redefine his danger. Nevertheless, he has devised a shift to avoid it.

When Adonis leaves Venus, the poem begins its third part, and his running becomes part of the general running about in this section. Adonis's pride compels him to hunt the boar rather than Venus; thus it happens that "the poem's central irony has him running from lust in the shape of Venus only to embrace it in the form of the boar" (Williams 773). Replacing "lust" with "danger" in this quote shows that once again Adonis

resembles Wat in his running from danger, except that Adonis runs from one danger (Venus) to another (the boar). Venus also resembles Wat in this part, but again the resemblance only partly works, for Wat runs from danger; Venus runs to it.

However, both Wat and Venus are similarly motivated by fear: it is implicit in Wat's situation but explicit in Venus's case. She runs after Adonis when he leaves because the beauty that Venus has found threatens to be lost. After Adonis "glides . . . in the night from Venus' eye" (816), she meditates upon his absence, "Even so confounded in the dark she lay, / Having lost the fair discovery of her way" (827-8). She fears losing Adonis, and significantly "fear" appears seven times in the two hundred and fifteen lines that mark Adonis's departure to when Venus discovers Adonis's dead body. When she hears the hounds at bay, she "starts like one that spies an adder / . . . The fear whereof doth make him shake and shudder" (877-80). The dogs sound fearful of their prey, and

> This dismal cry rings sadly in her ear,
> Through which it enters to surprise her heart,
> Who overcome by doubt, and bloodless fear,
> With cold-pale weakness numbs each feeling part.
> (889-93)

She calms herself after a while and tells her senses that "'tis a causeless fantasy, / And childish error that they are afraid; / Bids them leave quaking, bids them fear no more" (987-9). Then she sees the bloody boar, and "a second fear through all her sinews spread / which madly hurries her she knows not whither; / This way she runs, and now she will no further" (903-5). Her fear of Adonis's death causes her to chide Death, but when she hears a huntsman shout, she asks Death to "pardon me, I felt a kind of fear. . . . I rail'd on thee, fearing my love's decesse" (998-1002). She first blames the boar for her fear; then she blames "love, thou art as full of fear / As one with treasure laden, hemm'd with thieves" (1021-2). She speaks true; she feels the danger of losing her treasure in Adonis, which causes her fear. In all of these lines, she struggles with the fear of losing beauty in Adonis if the boar kills him, and she demonstrates her joy when she receives any slight hope that Adonis lives. At one point, she chides Death, saying, "Grim-grinning ghost, earth's worm, what dost thou mean / To stifle beauty, and to steal his breath?" (933-4). Earlier in part two, she feared losing Adonis to the boar, but in part three she seems to fear losing beauty itself, "for he being dead, with him is beauty slain, / And beauty dead, black chaos comes again" (1019-20).

When the danger of Adonis being slain comes true, Venus fears not just his death but the death of absolute beauty. When she first sees Adonis's dead body, she says, "The flowers are sweet, their colors fresh and trim, / But true sweet beauty liv'd and died with him" (1079-80). Even though she makes this claim, her words belie the danger she perceives, the idea that

death ends beauty, for she says, "Wonder of time . . . this is my spite, / That thou being dead, the day should yet be light" (1133-5). Black chaos does not come when Adonis dies; the sun still shines; beauty still lives in nature after Adonis's death. Instead of being perplexed by this fact, Venus realizes her true danger, the death of love: she feared the loss of Adonis, and then she feared the loss of beauty, but she lost her chance to love. Her prophecy about discordant love comes immediately after line 1135: since her love has been unfruitful, all love will lack reward.

More importantly, Venus's prophecy show Venus's language at its best. She has realized her true danger and changes her language with her prophecy to accommodate it. Adonis refuses redefinition; Venus uses it. She herself does not change; she only masks her old self behind a new language, using it to redefine her situation while also allowing herself to remain the same.

Nevertheless, she does not stop with her interpretation of what will happen; she goes on to attempt to say what could have happened (if Adonis had listened to her). Nevertheless, she does not stop with her diatribe on love's danger, for she still devises shifts to redefine Adonis's danger even after his death because she must protect her identity from the reality of his death: her language allows her to redefine his experience so that she can stay the same. She seems to concede, for the sake of argument, Adonis's belief that love steals life, but she points out that now death has stolen his life. Continuing her dual role of mother/temptress, she picks the flower that grows in Adonis's place, figuratively killing him again, and she tells the flower that "it is as good / To wither in my breast as in his blood" (1181-2), metaphorically obtaining her possessive desires and "protecting" Adonis. As the narrator said earlier, the foul words and frowns Adonis gave Venus do not repel the lover; love still picks the flower; Venus's love still obtains its possessive desires. Adonis metaphorically faces his danger of love again. If the flower represents Adonis, then love, Venus, plucks (kills) the flower and places it within her breast, where Adonis would have laid and died if he would have accepted her love. Nevertheless, if Adonis would have accepted love, "a life in death," he would still be alive physically (but not spiritually), avoiding both the boar and death stealing his life. Adonis has only two choices in the poem: stay with Venus and live a life in death or hunt the boar and die. Adonis should fear physical death, not love's death, according to Venus. He defined his danger as love, but she defines his danger as death, which he faces when he runs from love. (But either way he runs, he dies.)

Venus and Adonis fear the danger of love. Adonis runs from the danger of love and dies, while Venus runs to the danger of love, but the object of her possessive love, Adonis, dies. Adonis can accept love and let it steal his life, or he can deny love and let death steal his life, as Venus points out in the end. The difference lies in the individual response: Adonis refuses redefinition of his danger while Venus uses it. Both use shifts to achieve their goal; Adonis's shifts allow him to avoid the redefinition that Venus

threatens him with in the second part, while Venus's shifts allow her linguistically to use each new situation in her pursuit of Adonis. From my pursuit of danger's working within this poem, it seems to be the paradox, or part of a larger paradox, which could possibly be the central theme within this work or possibly lead to a discovery of an actual, larger theme. It definitely should be considered on any further work on *Venus and Adonis.*

Works Cited

Fienberg, Nona. "Thematics of Value in *Venus and Adonis.*" *Criticism* 31 (1989): 21-32.

Shakespeare, William. *Venus and Adonis. TheRiverside Shakespeare.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974: 1705-1718.

Williams, Gordon. "The Coming of Age of Shakespeare's *Adonis.*" *Modern Language Review* 78 (1983): 769-76.

A View From the Window:Arthur Miller's Art for the Whole Man in *Playing for Time*

Jeanne Johnsey
University of Southern Mississippi

In W. B. Yeats' poem "Sailing to Byzantium," the poet talks about his longing to leave behind the world of what is "begotten, born, and dies" (6) and go to the eternal world of art. But once there he finds that he must turn back to that world of living and dying for the material from which to make his art. This is the paradox of the artist.

A group of artists in Arthur Miller's teleplay *Playing for Time* are in a situation such as Yeats imagines in his poem. They are the women prisoners who make up an orchestra in a Nazi concentration camp. Because they can play music, they live in a separate barracks where they are insulated, but never completely sheltered, from the constant life and death struggle that surrounds them. The musicians are safe for only as long as their music pleases their Nazi captors. It is a tentative arrangement at best because, as their conductor says, "they [are] so changeable toward us, you see" (27).

For this space of time then, the women's orchestra barracks is a special place set apart for creation of art. To the other prisoners, the musicians are part of the Nazi's machinery; to the Nazis they are prisoners. and thus they occupy that position of alienation that both traps and enable the artist and provides a double perspective of involvement and detachment.

Miller is aware of the artist's conflicting perspectives. He has said of his own work, "I wrote not only to find a way into the world but to hold it away from me so that it would not devour me" (Bigsby 246).

A way into the world that threatens to devour the women of the orchestra is represented by the window of their barracks through which they may witness the brutality of life in the rest of the camp. As various characters respond to the violent world outside the window that threatens to engulf them they reveal the strategies they have developed for coping with their situation. Exploration of these strategies allows Miller to articulate his own answers to questions about the relationship of art to lived experience and to comment about the degree to which art and life are permeable and inseparable.

For Miller, the playwright, it is artistic necessity that forces the connection because, as he sees it, "Where drama will not engage its relevancy for the [human] race, it will [prevent] pathos" (*Essays* 194). Miller associates his concept of a poetic theater with the Greek tradition which seeks as its dramatic goal "the relations of man as a social animal, rather than his definition as a separated entity" (*Essays* 51). He explains that, "The social

drama, then . . . as I have always conceived it--is drama of the whole man . . . and is only incidentally an arraignment of society." (*Essays* 57).

In *After the Fall* and his later teleplay *Playing for Time*, his choice of the concentration camp as metaphor illustrates the importance of a Miller character's connection to his world or lack of it. As he explains it:

> I have always felt that concentration camps . . . are . . . the logical conclusion of contemporary life. If you complain of people being shot down in the streets, of the rise of everyday violence which people have become accustomed to, and the dehumanization of feelings, then the ultimate development on an organized social level is the concentration camp. . . . The concentration camp is the final expression of human separateness and its ultimate consequence. It is organized abandonment. (*Essays* 289)

The dramatic situation of women's orchestra in *Playing for Time* forces confrontation with these issues of connection and separation. The two main characters Fania and Alma are most divided by their willingness or unwillingness to look out the window, and thereby place themselves and their art in historical context.

Miller uses this confrontation to demonstrate through his characters a range of possible responses for the artist who must, like Fania and Alma, create and observe art within the demands and restrictions of human society. For this brief study, I will touch on three kinds of responses that are limited by disconnections of various kinds: the sentimental, the political, and the purely aesthetic. And I'll offer the one example that embodies Miller's ideal of art for the whole man.

The sentimental response of the Nazis, who cry for Madame Butterfly while they daily murder hundreds of mothers and babies, is embodied in Mandel the camp's female matron. Mandel is unable to distinguish between her human and aesthetic emotions because the two are so thoroughly disconnected from each other. Her Nazi ideology allows her to feel moved by music but not by human suffering. The mechanism that disconnects feelings when they intrude on her Nazi agenda enables Mandel to adopt and later abandon a prisoner's child. She has no thought for the little boy's mother who is on her way to be killed when Mandel takes him.

After Mandel abandons the child to his death, she goes to the orchestra barracks seeking comfort in a duet from Madame Butterfly. The stage direction says that, "An air of dissociation comes over her face" as she says, "The greatness of a people depends on the sacrifices they are willing to make . . . I gave him back." And as she listens to the music, Miller's script says, "Mandel is stunned by the music and lyrics but, through her sentimental tears, her fanatic stupidity is emerging" (81). Obviously, Mandel's own humanity is one of the sacrifices that has been made. Her pity for Madame Butterfly cannot find connection to the real life counterparts of Madame Butterfly that she daily encounters but cannot recognize.

The same kind of separation of sensibilities blinds Esther. For Esther, playing in the orchestra is a means to survive for her political/religious ideals. She tells Fania, "To see Palestine, that's why you have to live" (*Playing* 42). Esther's passion for the idea of Palestine distorts her perceptions so that she can't recognize the physical beauty or the humanity of Mandel. The disconnection also blinds Esther to the fact that her image of Palestine, which is her idea of putting the world back in order, is built on the same model of separation into "us and them" that the Nazis have used to imprison her. When a fellow prisoner sees Mandel's adopting the little boy as a sign that "she's human after all." Esther is outraged. She demands, "What's happening here? . . . One kid she saves and suddenly she's human?" (*Playing 71).*

Esther's inability to see the Nazis as human and therefore connected to her, suggests that the world she would create would have the same basic flaw as the one created by the Nazis. In this sense, she is spiritually, morally, and psychologically trapped inside her own distorted vision as surely as she is inside the Nazi concentration camp. Esther cannot distinguish between the intrinsic qualities of a thing and its moral associations.

Alma Rose, the orchestra's conductor is the most purely aesthetic character. She denies any moral associations by willfully ignoring any connection between the brutality she witnesses and the music she makes. Miller describes her as "full of joyful tension and pride" while she is rehearsing to play for doomed hospital patients in one of Dr. Menegle's experiments. "She waves her arms, snaps her head in rhythm and hums the tune loudly, oblivious to everything else." (*Playing* 61)

At times Alma seems capable of clear vision. She tells Fania, "there is life or death in this place. There is no room for anything else whatever" (*Playing* 35). But she willfully blinds herself to reality when it threatens to intrude on the self-contained world of her music. In much the same way, Mandel has blocked her response to Madame Butterfly from connection with the mothers in the camp. And Esther has blocked her definition of humanity from extension to the Nazis.

When Fania tries to explain her feelings about what she sees outside the window, Alma cries, "That is why I have told you not to look out there! You seem to think I can't see. I refuse to see!" (*Playing* 48). Alma urges Fania to do the same. "In this place, Fania," she tells her, "you will have to be an artist, and only an artist. You have to concentrate on one thing only. . . to create all the beauty you are capable of" (*Playing* 49).

The singleness of Alma's focus is obvious when Fania expresses horror at the idea of trying to please the Nazis. Alma tells her, "But you must wish to please them, and with all your heart. You are an artist Fania . . . you can't purposely do less than your best" (48).

It is true that Alma's determination to create quality music has kept the women in the orchestra alive for a time. However, it also seems evident that, to some extent, Alma sees that the women serve the music rather than the other way around. Fania learns that Mandel had offered to provide

extra food for the women, who are weak from starvation, before they play a concert. But Alma has refused the food because she feels that it should be reserved as a reward until they are able to play a "single piece without mistakes." Fania is shocked and cries, "Am I to destroy all human feeling?" (*Playing* 58).

Christopher Bigsby has pointed out that in *Playing for Time*, Fania "is forced to accept that there is nothing incompatible between total cruelty and love of art" (Bigsby 231). Indeed, Alma loves art. Bigsby also points out that the play "for the most part . . . avoids sentimentality; indeed it sees sentimentality, particularly among the German characters as an evasion of human commitment" (Bigsby 231). Mandel has certainly been able to evade human commitment by placing her capacity for sympathy within the realm of sentimental response to art.

For the main characters in the play, Bigsby concludes, "The single-minded drive to survive is intimately connected to moments of surrender and even betrayal" (Bigsby 231). Indeed when Fania asks Alma what will be left of her if she, too, refuses to look out the window, Alma replies, "Why . . . yourself, the artist will be left" (*Playing* 49). It is obvious that for Alma the self is the artist, while for Fania the self must somehow incorporate the human being. To discard her humanity, even for those moments when she is playing music would be both surrender and betrayal for Fania.She cannot forget that the music provides comfort for the Nazis while they are about the business of killing.

Bigsby's comments taken together with a study of the characters in this play suggest that Miller's idea of the uncorrupted artist is the one who will not have to turn a blind eye to the world in order to create art--but will also not be blinded by his/her own perspective.

Fania demonstrates that she is this kind of uncorrupted artist in a scene with Esther. When a fellow prisoner comments on Mandel's beauty, Esther says to her, "If you had an ounce of Jewish pride, you couldn't call that monster beautiful." Fania attempts to explain to her. "Don't try to make her ugly, Esther. She's beautiful and human. What disgusts me is that a woman so beautiful can do what she is doing. We are the same species and that is what's so hopeless about this whole thing" (*Playing* 49). In this speech, Fania articulates a central tenant of Miller's overall view: that we must recognize the potential for evil in ourselves if we are to deal with it effectively.

The attitudes portrayed through his characters are consistent with Millers stated ideas, and with his own critical response to a production of the stage play based on *The Diary of Anne Frank*. What upset him about the Anne Frank play was triggered by the audience response. The problem he sees is that,"There is something dramatically wrong . . . when an audience can see a play about the Nazi treatment of [its victims] and come away feeling the kind of--I can only call it gratification, which the audiences felt after seeing *The Diary of Anne Frank*" (*Essays* 187). "It puzzled me," he says,

"why it was all so basically reassuring to watch what must have been the most harrowing kind of suffering in real life" (*Essays* 187).

Miller's answer to this puzzle is that the play--told from the viewpoint of an adolescent provides a poignant, but nevertheless limited view. Because we see no Nazis in the play, Miller says, the Nazis become something like "an approaching childhood demon." The play thus lacks a kind of "spread vision" that would have opened a dimension "revealing us to ourselves" and breaking the hold of reassurance by "illuminate[ing] not merely the cruelty of Nazism, but something even more terrible . . . that we should see the bestiality in our own hearts"

Miller explains that with this kind of illumination "our terror would then be not for these others but for ourselves. . . . The issue would not be then "why the Nazis were so cruel, but why human beings--ourselves, us--are so cruel." And this is important for Miller dramatically because, "The pathetic is the refusal or inability to discover and face ultimate relevance for the race; it is therefore a shield against ultimate dramatic effect" (188).

He theorizes, "If our stage does not come to pierce through affects to an evaluation of the world it will contract to a lesser psychiatry. . . We shall be confined to writing an Oedipus without the pestilence, an Oedipus whose catastrophe is private and unrelated to the survival of his people" (*Essays* 187).

Fania is aware of her connection to her world, and so is able to pierce through affects for evaluation. But this gives her a problem, the problem of the artist. She must reconcile her inner life with the outer world in which she lives. Like Alma, she loves her music. When she sits at the piano, the stage directions say, "In Fania's face and voice . . . are the longings for the music's life-giving loveliness." Yet she keeps her ability to respond as a human being, for, after she performs for the Nazis, Fania is described as "[staring] at her ultimate horror--their love of her music" (*Playing* 40).

Neil Carson has suggested that because Fania cannot separate art and life she is "shown to be rather a victim of forces beyond herself" and the weaker of the two main characters (Carson 145). But, given Miller's views, I see this absence of separation as an ability rather than an inability. When Fania insists, in the face of having to please the Nazis, that "still one wants to hold something in reserve" (48), she demonstrates her choice, which is just the opposite of Alma's choice. Alma refuses to see. Fania refuses to stop seeing.

Most of the characters in *Playing for Time* lack the kind of spread vision that Miller found missing in the Anne Frank play, But Fania has it. And, through her, so does the audience. It is Fania who has the clarity of vision to distinguish between her identities as an artist and as a human being, to connect the two without distorting either, to look out the window and see herself.

Works Cited

Bigsby, C. W. E. *A Critical Introduction To Twentieth-Century American Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Carson, Neil. *Arthur Miller*. New York: Grove Press, 1982.

Martin, Robert A. ed. *The Theater Essays of Author Miller*. New York: Penquin Books, 1978.

Miller, Arthur *Playing for Time* (stage play adapted from the teleplay) Woodstock, Illinois: Dramatic Publishing, MCMLXXXV.

Yeats, William Butler. "Sailing to Byzantium." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Gen. ed. M. H. Abrams et al.Vol. 2. 5th ed. New York: Norton, 1986. 1951-52.

The Marble Faun(s): Hawthorne's Influences on and Parallels with William Faulkner

S. Kelly
UK University

William Faulkner is not recognized as a poet, yet his first published volume, *The Marble Faun*, was of poetry. As William Boozer has observed, "Very little has been written about Faulkner's first book in scholarly journals, the scholars concentrating as they do largely on the early to middle novels and short stories, and the Yoknapatawpha saga" (10). The limited critical writings recognize Keats, Shelley, Tennyson and Swinburne as having significant influence on Faulkner's verse, but I contend that it was Nathaniel Hawthorne who had the greatest influence on Faulkner's first published work.

The title, *The Marble Faun*, Faulkner's first published work is also the title of Hawthorne's last published novel. At the time of his book's publication, Faulkner denied any knowledge of Hawthorne's novel. His response, when questioned about his use of Hawthorne's title, was "Who's Hawthorne? The title is original with me" (Blotner *Biography* 379). That Faulkner qualified his statement by saying "original with me" should not be overlooked. Though the title was not original, it *was* original with him. However, a careful reading of the two presents too many similarities to be ignored. Considering Faulkner's knowledge of literature, it is highly unlikely that he would have been unfamiliar with an author of Hawthorne's stature.

In a conversation with J. D. Thames, who had expressed concern that anyone who asked for *The Marble Faun* in a bookstore would get Hawthorne's, both Faulkner and Phil Stone said they had simply forgotten the other title (Blotner *Biography* 379). I may be overconfident in stating that Hawthorne had as much influence on the naming of Faulkner's *The Marble Faun* as did Shakespeare on the naming of *The Sound and the Fury*, but there is evidence to support this contention.

Joseph Blotner's catalogue of Faulkner's library holdings reveals that he did not have a copy of *The Marble Faun*, but he did have *The Blithedale Romance* and a copy of *The Portable Hawthorne*, which has one section from *The Marble Faun*. Although the date of publication of this book was 1948, twenty-four years after Faulkner published his book, Joseph Blotner reminds us that "one should remember that he [Faulkner] obviously read many books--throughout his life but particularly during his literary apprenticeship--of which this catalogue gives no indication" (Blotner *Catalogue* 8).

The evidence of his acquaintance with Hawthorne's work and the influence of Hawthorne on his work lies partially with statements which Faulkner made at various times. In lectures, letters and conversations

years after he became famous, Faulkner openly admitted admiration for Hawthorne and displayed an understanding of Hawthorne's work. During an interview with a Japanese student and again with Mr. Takagi and the editor of *Bungei*, Faulkner was asked about any influences of former American authors. He felt that "Hawthorne, the other, they were Europeans, they were not Americans" (Meriwether 101). By this statement Faulkner meant they were not indigenous American writers produced by a completely American culture; thus, he displayed an understanding of Hawthorne's writing (Meriwether 168). Other evidence of his deep understanding of Hawthorne comes from a letter Faulkner wrote to Malcolm Cowley concerning the introduction to *The Portable Faulkner*, wherein he mentioned that the style "was further complicated by an inherited regional or geographical (Hawthorne would say, racial) curse" (Blotner *Letters* 215-216).

In a speech to the English Club at the University of Virginia in 1958, Faulkner mentioned Hawthorne as being among the masters from whom young writers learn their craft (Gwynn 243). During a question and answer session at the University, he did not deny being influenced by Hawthorne when asked if he consciously or unconsciously paralleled *As I Lay Dying* with *The Scarlet Letter*. Faulkner observed that a writer:

> [doesn't] have to consciously parallel because he robs and steals from everything he ever wrote on or read or saw. I was simply writing a *tour de force* and as every writer does, I took whatever I needed wherever I could find it, without any compunction and with no sense of violating any ethics or hurting anyone's feelings because any writer feels that anyone after him is perfectly welcome to take any trick he has learned or any plot that he has used. Of course we don't know just who Hawthorne took his from. Which he probably did because there are so few plots to write about. (Gwynn 115)

While he was not asked specifically about *The Marble Faun*, it seems safe to assume this same dialectic applies to much of Faulkner's work, especially at the beginning of his career when he had limited personal experience from which to draw.

More convincing evidence of the influence of Hawthorne on Faulkner is apparent from a comparison of their two works. The Faun of Praxiteles, a famous Grecian statue in the Capitoline sculpture gallery in Rome, was the original marble model for Hawthorne's Faun and, indirectly, for Faulkner's Faun. Hawthorne's Faun is represented in Donatello, a young Italian bearing a remarkable resemblance to the Faun of Praxiteles. He undergoes a transformation at the hands of an artist during the course of the novel. Faulkner's Faun, the persona from whose consciousness the poem originates, is a marble statue set in an unidentified formal garden. In this garden he feels himself to be "imprisoned by a mold carved out for

him by another artist" (Sensibar 13). Thus both fauns are imprisoned in a mold cast for them by an artist. Both fauns exist "in a middle state, between the human and the fully divine" just as they both struggle as if in oscillation between the desire for knowledge and innocence. In Faulkner's Faun this oscillation is "symbolized at one point by the statue in a snow-filled garden, and the yearning for vitality that sends the faun racing through spring and summer landscapes...but the faun discovers he cannot exist in both at once." Likewise Hawthorne's faun finds it impossible to simultaneously exist in his own two states (Stronum 49).

Hawthorne's story begins with the gathering of three Americans and the young Italian, Donatello. This young Italian not only has a "vivid likeness" to the ancient marble Faun of Praxiteles, but also he possesses the happy characteristics of the original fauns of the Golden Ages (7, ch. 1). Near the end of the novel the four friends are together again at the Carnival. Approximately a year has passed. Although change has taken place, it ends essentially as it began. Even the first and last chapters have the same title, ("Miriam, Hilda, Kenyon, Donatello").

In the conclusion of the novel, Donatello is in prison. This, metaphorically, is where Faulkner's poem begins. It introduces the depressed marble faun observing the poplars "Dreaming not of winter snows/That soon will shake their maiden rows" (*The Marble Faun* Prologue 11). He is sad and discontented in his "marble bonds." The pastoral nineteen-piece poem moves in a cycle through the four seasons, indicating a year in the passage of time, and ends essentially where it begins. Nothing is resolved. Nothing is accomplished. The faun is still a sad, bound prisoner as was Donatello in the century before.

In spite of the recursive content of both novel and poem, the overall narrative structure of the novel is unmistakably linear, just as Judith Sensibar observes the poem as having "a recognizably linear narrative structure" (xix). The novel traces a series of events chronologically as they happen to the characters, while the poem traces a series of observations of nature as they present themselves. Each work takes up about a year in the span of time covered. In the novel, Hawthorne uses an event, the Carnival, to indicate the passage of a year, whereas Faulkner uses the passage of all four seasons in his poem.

There are also thematic similarities between the two works. The two marble fauns are works of art which have been created to represent life. In his novel Hawthorne alludes the "Thorvaldsen's threefold analogy--the clay model, the Life; the plaster cast, the Death; and the sculptured marble, the Resurrection" (380, ch. 41). Art reflects life, yet imperfectly, as is evident in the difficulty Kenyon, the sculptor, confronts in forming the bust of Donatello (ch. 30). To Faulkner the discontinuance of movement in art signifies a withdrawal from life. Art immobilizes. In his poem "it is the inferiority of art to life that is stressed" (Brooks 5). Both authors' works of art are contrasted to mirror images, with Pan being the original of each faun. While Hawthorne's mirror image for Donatello's bust is "human and

very fallible, the opposite [is true] of the statue that he describes as a perfect work of art. Faulkner makes Pan the ideal image and his statue a mere imitation" (Sensibar 11). Donatello left his ordered, perfect garden thereby losing the powers of Pan while Faulkner's Faun wants to leave the garden to possess the powers of Pan. In his poem, Faulkner retrieves Pan from the original state from which the imitation marble was inspired and positions Pan in the place to which the imitation marble faun aspires, thus attempting to complete the cycle of faun to marble to faun again. It is as if Faulkner takes Hawthorne's nineteenth-century faun, places him in a twentieth-century garden and takes up where Hawthorne leaves off with him.

With the resurrection of his faun, Faulkner allows the reader to see the beauty of the garden. Although the faun is "marble bound," the reader is not. Hope is expressed in the recurring statement--"The dying day gives all who sorrow/The boon no king may give: a morrow (*TMF* VIII 32). Man must reconcile himself to his lot, "but Pan keeps on being reborn" (Lawrence 23).

Both Faulkner and Hawthorne use the metaphor of the mirror. Mirrors, like art, are used to reflect and imitate life. They are used in both prose and poetry to represent self-realization and the struggle to achieve identity, but because they reverse the real image they fail to give a true rendering of reality. Each glance in a mirror gives only an episodic rendering, not the whole parameters of truth. Donatello, watching Kenyon form his likeness in the plaster, sees his own life reflected. At one point, when this likeness reflects the horror in his face for having committed a terrible crime, Donatello yells out, "For that reason, let it remain" to serve as a reminder to him of his crime (272, ch. 30).

Where Hawthorne uses the bust of Donatello to mirror what is presumed to be reality, Faulkner uses the pool in the garden. This faun can see nature only as it exists inside the walls of the garden and in the reflection in the pool. Both fauns make use of these available reflections in their struggles toward self-realization--a theme that runs parallel in both novel and poem.

Central to the novel and to the poem is the motif of the Adamic garden with its thematic components of the Choice, the Fall, and the efforts toward reconciliation. Both novel and poem contain gardens which are representative of the Garden of Eden and the Arcadian wood. The natural, happy state of the garden is first seen in Hawthorne's novel with the "Faun and the Nymph" and "The Sylvan Dance" (ch. 9-10). Donatello urges Marian to dance with him in the sylvan scenery. "Here, as it seemed, had the Golden Age come back again within the precincts of this sunny glade, thawing mankind out of their cold formalities, releasing them from irksome restraint" (88, ch. 10). This wood, so symbolic of the Garden of Eden, is filled with all the natural beauty "gone rampant out of all human control" (242, ch. 27). It even has a fig tree. Amid this natural Paradise, where Pan is expected at any moment to spring from the trees blowing a

tune on his reed, Donatello plays happily as a child, and is one with this natural garden.

Unlike Donatello, Faulkner's faun is unable to move from his established position in the walled garden. As much as he desires to leave this position, he has no hope of ever doing so, because he is one "Who marble-bound must ever be" (*TMF* Prologue 12). He must stand and observe the scenes from his paradoxical Paradise. He is not, and can never be, a part of the nature he observes. Being forced to reconcile himself to his separation from nature, he is also forced to witness the changes that come with each season, the sunsets, the flights of birds, the changes in weather, and the beauty of his surroundings. The recurring statement throughout the poem "For things I know, yet cannot know" indicates a knowledge obtained from his past observation in the garden. The marble faun knows because these things have all happened in the past, but he cannot truly know because changing, they recur in the future. This sense of the inevitability of the coming and passing of all things, even evil, is also reflected by Hawthorne's, "and Paradise...is lost again" (204, ch. 23).

A careful reading of Faulkner's faun points to other themes which echo those found in Hawthorne's. One is man's choice between good and evil. Donatello makes his choice while he stands with Mariam at the edge of the precipice. In response to Mariam's eyes, Donatello flings her tormentor over the edge to his death. His actions are hasty and without deliberation; "there was short time to weigh the matter" (173, ch. 20). The rest of the novel is concerned with the consequences of Donatello's choice of evil on himself and the other three major characters of the novel.

With Faulkner's faun the choice between good and evil is represented in symbolic terms. Pan, the ancient god of flocks, represents the free and natural world, therefore the good. Pan invites and tempts the faun to come with him:

> --Follow where I lead,
> For all the world springs to my reed
> Woven up and woven down,
> Thrilling all the sky and ground
> With shivering heat and quivering cold;
> Shrilling in each waiting brake:
> Come, ye living, stir and wake (*TMF* I 13-14)

But the faun, like Donatello, is presented with another choice. His is the choice of evil represented by the snake. While the faun is stationary in his marble bonds, he envies the snake's freedom and would like to go where he goes: "That quick keen snake/Is free to come and go, while I/Am prisoner to dream and sigh" (*TMF* 12). Later in the poem, the faun is rudely awakened by a loud group of dancers. Aside from being distraught at having been disturbed in his sleep by their paper lanterns and noise, he considers them "unclean" and "Debauching the unarmed spring" (*TMF* XVI

46). The symbol of the snake is further equated with evil as he likens the departure of the dancers to that of a snake: "And the clean face of the day/Drives them *slinkingly* [emphasis added] away" (*TMF* XVI 47).

Seen more explicitly in Hawthorne's novel than in Faulkner's poem is the theme of the fall of man. Donatello, at the beginning of the novel, has not yet experienced the Fall. He is in his state of innocence, on good terms with nature, and resides in his happy carefree world. It is not until his friendship with the three Americans that Donatello is presented an opportunity for the Fall. He, like Adam, is tempted and yields to the wishes of the woman he loves. In pushing Miriam's tormentor over the edge of the precipice he accomplishes the Fall and gains knowledge.

Before this time Donatello is portrayed as being almost childlike--"a creature in a state of development less than what mankind has attained, yet the more perfect within itself for that very deficiency" (78, ch. 9). Miriam observes that "no faun in Arcadia was ever a greater simpleton than Donatello. He has hardly a man's share of wit" (7, ch. 1). He does not even know his own age and is spoken of as simple, often compared to animals. He is "as gentle and docile as a pet spaniel" (43, ch. 5). As a child he had "plunged into the deep pools of the streamlets . . . and had clambered to the topmost branches of tall trees" without ever having any harm come to him (236-237, ch. 26). In his youth his friends had been the animals in a way that may "have been the original voice and utterance of the natural man, before the sophistication of the human intellect formed what we now call language" (248, ch. 27).

All of this simple innocence and oneness with nature is lost as "Adam falls anew, and Paradise, heretofore in unfaded bloom, is lost again" (204, ch. 23). Donatello is changed. The animals of the wood no longer come to him when he calls them. He shows a deeper new intelligence in place of his former simplicity and instead of the carefree contentment to feel anguish and remorse. Even his physical appearance is changed so drastically that Kenyon, his close American friend, now views him as having little resemblance to the Faun of Praxiteles. Donatello has experienced the Fall and now possessed knowledge and the separation from nature that comes with it. Both he and Faulkner's faun are no longer one with nature. They both must take what life issues them and can only reflect on the happy times before the Fall. They can only dream that: "once there was peace/Calm handed where the roses blow" and of the "surging noise in dreams of peace/That it once thought could never cease" (*TMF* XVI 47).

The Fall is accomplished with Donatello's act, but Faulkner's Faun must lament the past, and he is forced to look toward the future while Donatello fades into the past. For Faulkner's faun the greatest burden is his awareness. He has already experienced the Fall, thus has gained knowledge with makes him aware of his separation from nature (Garrett 126). This awareness aligns him spiritually with the fallen Donatello. Faulkner's faun is unable to experience the carefree innocence that is Pan's. Without his knowledge he would be content to stand in the garden to witness the

changing beauty of nature. As Sally Page observes, "It is the marble faun's vision of the potential of life that is embodied in the natural process that makes his sense of frustration and alienation particularly acute" (Wolf 105). In sleep he escapes this awareness, using sleep to drug his "prisoned woe" (*TMF* XVI 46). His preference to remain in a state of sleep is witnessed in the lines: "Why cannot we always be/Left steeped in this immensity/Of softly stirring peaceful gray/That follows on the dying day?" (*TMF* XVI 46). Again in: "And in the earth I shall sleep/To never wake, to never weep," the faun voices his desire for the oblivion offered in sleep as opposed to the wakeful knowledge and pain of his inability to participate in the activities that surround him (*TMF* XVII 49).

This isolation is still another thematic parallel that is equally apparent in both the poem and in the novel. The novel introduces four characters who isolate themselves from society by forming their own exclusive circle of friendship. Though they are friends, each deems himself very much isolated from the other. Donatello, however, exemplifies more isolation than any of the other characters. After his Fall he removes himself from the people he knows in order to return to his ancestral home. Here he has no friends and is the last living member of his family. Even during childhood Donatello played alone in the wood of Monte Beni having only the animals as friends. When he comes to Rome his friends become the three Americans, not people from his own country. Further isolation occurs with his return to Monte Beni as the animals of the woods reject him, and his sense of isolation from nature is expressed in his statement: "They know it! . . . They shun me! All nature shrinks from me and shudders at me! . . . No innocent thing can come near me" (249, ch. 27). Resuming residence in his home, Donatello resigns himself to this isolation by spending hours, even sleeping, in the tower observing the nature of which he is no longer a part.

Faulkner's faun must also observe the nature of which he is not a part. He is isolated by resignation as well as by his physical situation. Even in his imagination he chooses to be alone. Through his imagination the Faun leaves his pedestal to "flow/Quickly along each row,/Breathing in their fragrant breath/And that of the earth beneath," but he goes alone taking no one and seeing no one (*TMF* XVII 49).

The purpose of this paper has been to explore the possibility that Hawthorne had a major influence on Faulkner's early work, and that this influence is reflected in the thematic parallels and similarities appearing in each author's work of the same title. Twenty-five years after Faulkner's death there is no dispositive proof of this possibility and much is left to conjecture. Nevertheless, with these thematic parallels, and other similarities found in both novel and poem, the probable influence of Hawthorne on Faulkner cannot be ignored.

It is possible that Faulkner had a slight smile on his face when he wrote the line of the sixth eclogue "Upon a wood's dim shaded edge/Stands a

dust *hawthorn* [emphasis added] hedge" (*TMF* VI 25). Perhaps Faulkner had more in mind than the thorny shrub.

Works Cited

Blotner, Joseph. *Faulkner: A Biography*. New York: Random, 1974.

Blotner, Joseph. *Selected Letters of William Faulkner*. New York: Random, 1977.

Blotner, Joseph, Comp. *William Faulkner's Library: A Catalogue*. Charlottesville: Up of Virginia, 1965.

Boozer, William. *William Faulkner's First Book The Marble Faun: 50 Years Later*. Memphis: Pigeon Roost, 1975.

Brooks, Cleanth. *William Faulkner: Toward Yoknapatawpha and Beyond*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978.

Faulkner, William. *The Marble Faun*. Boston: Four Seas, 1924.

Garrett, George P., Jr. "An Examination of the Poetry of William Faulkner." *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 8 (1957) 124.

Gwynn, Frederick L., and Joseph L. Blotner, eds. *Faulkner in the University*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 1959.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Marble Faun: Or, The Romance of Monte Beni*. Columbus: Ohio State UP.

Lawrence, D. H. "Pan of America." *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers*. Ed. E. D. McDonald. New York: Viking, 1936.

Meriwether, James B., and Michael Milgate. *Lion in the Garden: Interviews with William Faulkner 1926-1962*. New York: Random, 1968.

Sensibar, Judith L. *The Origins of Faulkner's Art*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1984.

Stonum, Gary Lee. *Faulkner's Career: An Internal Literary History*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1979.

Wolfe, George H., ed. *Faulkner: Fifty Years After the Marble Faun*. University: U of Alabama P, 1976.

"Sic a puir silly auld body": Re-evaluating the Mother of *Waverley*

Carol W. Krohn
University of Southern Mississippi

Janet Gellatly might be viewed as only a minor character within the plot of *Waverley*, but she is surrounded by ironies that invite particular attention. In a novel disproportionately populated by motherless children and barren women, she is unique as the mother of an apparently fatherless family. We might question the value of motherhood within this highly patriarchal society, and certainly Janet's role is devalued by the villagers who consider her sons to be a curse. Yet Janet serves as surrogate mother to other characters at crucial points in the novel. Scott seems to ask his readers to reevaluate Janet's motherly role, to avoid making the villagers' mistake of accepting surface appearances as truth.

We first learn of Janet as a supposed witch, as Rose relates the story of Janet's trial to Waverley. Rose explains that Janet "was suspected to be a witch, on the infallible grounds that she was very old, very ugly, very poor, and had two sons, one of whom was a poet, and the other a fool, which visitation, all the neighborhood agreed, had come upon her for the sin of witchcraft" (61). Clearly the author is ridiculing those prejudices which oppress the old, the ugly, and the poor. Yet he also stretches the irony further, showing himself, as poet, linked to the fool; apparently the villagers see the two roles as equally undesirable.

Some of the novel's characters might well use the words "poet" and "fool" interchangeably: Bradwardine seems to express that opinion when he speaks of the "vain and unprofitable art of poem-making" (57), and Fergus disparages poetry and is said to like none "but what is humorous" (108). Waverley, Rose, and Flora share a poetic appreciation which seems to set them on a higher plane than Bradwardine and Fergus, who are linked by their disdain for poets to the ignorant, superstitious villagers who accused Janet. As readers, we are drawn to Waverley's view and compelled to question the villagers' judgement of Janet's sons and of Janet herself.

The Gellatly family structure attracts particular attention because of its juxtaposition against the almost complete lack of mothers in the novel. Rose, Flora and Fergus, and even Waverley himself are presented as motherless children. By eventually entering a convent, Flora joins Aunt Rachael and Emily Talbot in the ranks of the novel's childless women. The role of the mother within this patriarchal society is vital but short-lived. Mothers are necessary for the production of heirs, and we cannot help but remember that the political struggle of the Stuarts is based on their belief

that England's throne was given to the wrong heir, the offspring of the wrong mother. But mothers are limited to this one function, serving as the vessels through which the patriarchy may be extended. A woman who has fulfilled this childbearing role, or who will not be able to do so, is removed from the narrative. Other aspects of "mothering"--those involving nurturing, guidance, deliberate action--might appear insignificant.

But Scott's portrayal of Janet Gellatly makes it impossible for us to wholly accept this view. Against the novel's pattern of motherless children and barren women, Janet's status is elevated by her uniqueness. Despite the novel's subjugation of mothering, Janet is important for precisely that role; moreover, she is in many ways more important to the story than are her children.

Janet's sons serve to strengthen the ties between her and the Bradwardine family. Her eldest son, the poet, apparently died of disappointment after having his ambitions of a career within the Presbyterian church stymied by his family's ties to the Jacobite, Episcopalian Bradwardines. Thus Janet might be said to have lost a son because of that family's political and religious beliefs, a foreshadowing of the devastation those beliefs were to bring upon the Bradwardines and their allies. Her other son, Davie, adds a further twist to the Gellatlys' relationship with the lord of the manor by saving Rose from a neighbor's bull. He thus earns the fervent gratitude of the Bradwardines, mixed perhaps with guilt: Davie saved the Baron's daughter, but the Baron was unable to save Janet's son.

Janet increases this debt when she serves temporarily as a "mother" to Waverley, caring for him during his illness and hiding him from the British troops. By sheltering Waverley, Janet helps both him and the Bradwardines; she is protecting the man Rose loves, the man who will make Rose a mother and thus enable the continuation of the Bradwardine line. Janet further serves Rose by giving her counsel, warning her of the danger in leaving such a wealthy and politically valuable person as Waverley in a position where he would be highly vulnerable to the greed of the outlaw Donald Bean.

In the course of this episode, Janet outwits the English soldiers, Bean, and even Waverley himself. Waverley doesn't know whom she represents or even whether he is a guest or a prisoner. Janet withholds from him both her understanding of his situation and her ability to communicate, so that he is surprised to hear her speak "in good Lowland Scotch" (182), having never previously heard her utter anything but Gaelic. Waverley has considered Janet to be distanced from himself, a part of the past, believing her to speak only that foreign and dying language.

In many ways he regards her as a child might a parent, eventually viewing "any risk which he might incur in the attempt (to escape) preferable to the stupefying and intolerable uniformity of Janet's retirement" (181). And like any good mother, Janet keeps Waverley from "knowing" their young female visitor too soon. Janet controls the knowledge Waverley seeks as he peeps from the hole in his bed-cupboard, and she

assumes godlike stature with the narrator's statement that "since the days of our grandmother Eve, the gratification of inordinate curiosity has generally borne its penalty in disappointment" (181). Janet reveals "the whole mystery" to Waverley only when she believes the time to be right, giving him "the clue . . . to other mazes of the labyrinth, in which he had been engaged," the labyrinth leading to Rose (309).

Later, Janet again serves in a motherly role, this time to the lord of the manor himself. She hides Bradwardine as she did Waverley and outwits the English soldiers who spot him one morning leaving her cottage for the woods. Janet flies at the soldiers when they shoot at Bradwardine, and she insists that what they saw was actually her son. With Davie's help, she is so successful at this ruse that the soldiers pay her not to tell anyone of their "mistake." In a sense, Janet makes herself the matriarch of the Bradwardines by "mothering" both the Baron and his future son-in-law.

Janet ostensibly serves to emphasize the plot's notions of feudal responsibility; Bradwardine attends her trial "to see fair play between the witch and the clergy; for the witch had been born on his estate" (61). Janet is exceedingly loyal to the Baron, asking:

> . . . how can we do eneugh for his Honour, when we and ours have lived on his ground this twa hundred years; and when he keeped my puir Jamie at school and college, and even at the Ha'-house, till he gaed to a better place; and when he saved me frae being ta'en to Perth as a witch--Lord forgie them that would touch sic a puir silly auld body -- and has maintained puir Davie at heck and manger maist feck o' his life? (301)

Yet this feudal ideal is undercut both by Janet's position as a matriarch within the patriarchy of the feudal system and by the fact that Bradwardine actually seems to owe more to Janet than she does to him. As previously noted, his politics played a role in the death of "puir Jamie," and his housing of Davie is in repayment for the saving of Rose's life. Even in Janet's witch trial Bradwardine seems to have played only a minor role; Janet herself scared away her accusers with her cry that the devil was in their midst. (And we must wonder whether that outcry was more hallucination or inspiration on Janet's part.)

The villagers have clearly misjudged this woman, making her an outcast in the community because of her "reputation of being a witch" (302). Even Waverley, although he of all people should appreciate and value Janet, seems briefly to see her again through the villagers' eyes after he has heard Baillie MacWheeble speaking of his own superstitions. Waverley thinks that her hut "resembled exactly the description of Spenser" (314), but the quotation recalled is highly ironic. Spenser's witch chooses

> solitary to abide
> Far from all neighbors, that her devilish deeds,

And hellish arts, from people she might hide,
and hurt far off, unknown, whomever she espied. (315)

Yet Janet apparently lives apart from her neighbors simply because of the fear they feel for her, and she makes use of that isolation to help, not hurt, others. This isolation and her reputation are in fact precisely the factors that make her hut an ideal hiding place for both Waverley and Bradwardine.

Throughout the novel, Waverley is plagued by his inability to see things as they really are. Janet serves as an example of someone who is victimized by that sort of inability. She is brave and compassionate; she offers shelter and protection to those who need it; she is devoted in her service to her feudal lord; she offers shrewd advice to her friends. Yet she is an outcast because of the failure of most of those around her to see beyond her appearance, to appreciate her true value. They are afraid of her "powers" as a witch, but they fail to recognize or value her true power as a mother.

In this she shares something with other women both of "Sixty Years Since" and of Scott's time, women who contributed motherly nurturing to societies that placed higher value on prowess in battles, both military and political. Clearly Janet serves as a reminder of the folly of judging an individual on surface appearances; she seems to compel a reevaluation of broader assumptions about the value of a person's role in society as well.

Faust Revisited: Lawrence Durrell's *An Irish Faustus*

Paul H. Lorenz
University of Arkansas-Pine Bluff

When the renowned German actor Gustav GrGndgens, who had been instrumental in staging the German productions of his earlier plays, *Sappho* and *Acte*, asked Lawrence Durrell if he could create a new kind of Faust, one who "could be played light-heartedly without betraying Goethe" (*Irish* 5), Durrell readily accepted the challenge. He moved the action of the play to Ireland and, building on the mythic world of Yeats (Carruthers 131), created a Faust who is reluctant to exercise the power available to him and who has little use for material luxuries. Instead, he is a benign figure of repose, a true alchemist who is searching for a kind of Taoist harmony with the rhythms of the universe.

Since the publication of *The Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus*, in Germany, in 1587, the myth of Faust has been used to investigate the moral choices of "proud and aspiring minds," of scholars and artists whose curiosity has challenged the limits of the established moral code (Hollander 847). This, too, is the focus of Durrell's play. Like Marlowe's protagonist (I:6-7), Durrell's Faustus is bored by the constraints of Aristotle's *Analytics* (11), though he does not foolishly sell his soul to Mephisto for money, women or the power to perform a variety of malicious parlor tricks. Unlike Goethe's Faust, whom the Lord allows to be tempted by Mephistopheles (c.f. *Matthew* 4.1-11) to determine if "a good man with his groping intuitions still knows the path that is true and fit" (16), Durrell's Faustus tests his own metal, for Durrell makes it clear in the *Dramatis Personae* that Mephisto is both the double and the tempter of Faustus (9). Like Goethe's Faust or the Faust of Gounod's opera (Hamilton 122), Durrell's Faustus is interested in feminine beauty, but he has no sexual designs on the beautiful Margaret (or Gretchen, or Marguerite) and does not cause her ruin as Goethe's and Gunoud's protagonists do. Durrell's Faustus is a true alchemist, an adept, not a "Puffer" seeking to transform base materials into gold for materialistic reasons. He is seeking to understand the "secret doctrine" of the alchemists, to understand how knowledge of the Great Work, faith, silence, and the performance of good works will finally reveal reality prime, the philosopher's stone (*c.f.* de Givry 349).

The word "alchemist" usually conjures up a vision of a bearded scholar, with a skull, a candle, and an open book on his table, who, motivated by cupidity or a desire to possess supernatural power, is desperately trying to find the formula that will control the spirits and turn base material into gold. In fact, the alchemical doctrine was designed to provide insight into the mystery of life as well as into the formation of inanimate substances.

According to Grillot de Givry, alchemy possessed a "secret doctrine" reserved only for those who were intellectually and morally worthy of understanding it. Surrounding the "secret doctrine" was a great body of lore full of deceit, error, and falsehood designed to trick the unworthy into wasting their time, assets, and mental energy chasing rainbows. In 1609, Heinrich Khunrath illustrated this perception of alchemy in a drawing entitled "The Alchemic Citadel." Khunrath's citadel is surrounded by a moat with a huge wall on its outside bank. The wall is surrounded by twenty-one rooms. Twenty of these rooms represent the false paths that alchemists might pursue, *e.g.* changing silver or mercury into gold. These rooms do not provide access into the citadel, but they do interconnect so that the amateur alchemist (or Puffer) will be able to wander from room to room, thinking that he progresses while he remains outside the outer wall of the alchemical fortress. The smallest room, the twenty-first, is the true path. It leads to a gate in the outside wall with a light drawbridge allowing passage over the moat. To cross the drawbridge, the adept must prove that he knows the Great Work, "the name by which the result of the great alchemic operation of transmutation into gold was designated," and that he knows how to prepare the material of the Great Work. Then he must demonstrate that he has sufficient faith, understands the value of silence, and has performed enough good works to be worthy of admittance to the citadel of the dragon. Khunrath's illustration shows several future adepts who, like Durrell's Faustus at the beginning of the play, have managed to climb to the top of the wall surrounding the moat, who know quite well the secrets of the alchemic citadel, but who, because they lack certain requisite virtues, have not yet earned entrance into the inner sanctum. Once across the drawbridge, the adept is advised to "pray theosophically and work physico-chemically." He then must traverse the seven transmutative operations (dissolution, purification, introduction to the fiery furnace, putrefaction, multiplication, fermentation, and projection -- steps which Durrell's Faustus embarks on but does not complete during the course of the play) before he reaches the philosopher's stone which is guarded by a huge dragon who will yield it only to the most worthy (de Givry 347-349). It is clear that the alchemist's transmutation of gold did not involve merely a physical transformation but also an accompanying moral or spiritual transmutation. The alchemists taught that one could not attain the secret of gold unless one had an upright and honest soul; it was not available to the greedy or the power hungry.

Durrell's nine scene drama begins in Faustus' study in the castle of Queen Kathleen of Galway. Faustus, tall, grave and dressed in black, is delighted at the progress that his protigie, the young and beautiful Princess Margaret (the Queen's neice), is making in understanding the paradoxical inter-relationship between magic and science: the alchemical vision. When he tells her that the purpose of science is to domesticate magic and that the acceptance of scientific rule is magic or leads to magic, Margaret is adept enough to realize that he means that rational knowledge cannot, in itself,

bring about transcendence. Rather, she reasons, both spiritual and physical transcendence require vision, a process of dreaming which refines the soul by negatives until nature, which abhors a vacuum, rushes in to expel all the outmoded categories of mind (12). This introduction to alchemical doctrine, the process of spiritual transmutation through the refinement of negatives, which Faustus can teach but has not yet internalized defines the coin which gains passage across the drawbridge into the alchemical citadel. Though the scene begins with a few minutes of this erudite intellectual discussion, the action begins and the play becomes more accessible when Margaret mentions a transmuted gold ring -- now in Faust's possession -- which had been made by Faustus' mentor, Tremethius, at the command of Fergus the Red, the husband of Queen Kathleen, who had wanted to control the spirits of darkness (13, 36). As soon as he had possession of the ring, Fergus burned Tremethius at the stake and then promptly and mysteriously disappeared (48). The mention of the ring infuriates Faustus. He is angry because he thinks his pupil is inclined to greed and that she is in danger of becoming a Puffer who practices alchemy for the wrong reasons. He thinks she doesn't understand that although the gold was real enough, its primary importance was as a metaphor for a higher truth, but Margaret reveals that she does understand the power of the ring when she mentions its rumored power over vampires (14). Before the scene ends, the audience learns that Queen Kathleen wants the ring in order to rejoin and control her dead husband who has become a vampire and that she is "blackmailing" Margaret into helping her to gain possession of it (19).

Scene II introduces the comic side of this complex drama when Faustus pays a friendly visit to the market stall of Martin the Pardoner. Martin is a Pardoner in true Chaucerian fashion: he sells pardons of his own manufacture, ostensibly produced in Jerusalem and signed by the Pope. After a pleasant conversation in which Martin boasts that he has always had a pardon available for every sin, Faustus asks him if he has a pardon to sell for the sin of Intellectual Pride, but Martin has none available (26). Apparently the practitioners of this Faustian sin, unlike those who commit crimes of the flesh, seldom recognize the evil effects, the sinfulness, of their behavior.

In scene III, in the company of his assistant Paul, Faustus discovers that the gold ring which he had kept hidden for years has been stolen (30). He dismisses Paul in order to think and dream about what to do next but his contemplation is disrupted when Mephisto appears to him, unsummoned. Mephisto claims to be a friend, a blood brother, a sort of second self whom, if he did not already exist, Faustus would have had to invent (34). Mephisto brings Faustus the news that Queen Kathleen has coerced Paul into stealing the ring and Margaret into stealing the relevant passages from his alchemical books (39). Mephisto, the "agent of choice," (41) castigates Faustus for refusing to use his mental abilities, for hiding the ring instead of using or destroying it (42). He has appeared in order to make Faustus aware that he overvalues silence, that his alchemical knowledge and his possession of

the power of the ring have encumbered him with responsibilities which cannot be evaded. Mephisto disappears when Anselm, the palace priest, arrives to tell Faustus that Queen Kathleen has tried to conjure with the ring. Though she had succeeded in raising her husband, Fergus the Red, the vampire has taken the ring and left her alone in a profound state of madness (44).

In scene IV, Faustus visits the mad Queen Kathleen who tells him of her plan to remarry Fergus. Deciding that the only way to recover the ring is to find the resting place of Fergus, Faustus frees Kathleen from her restraints and waits to see where she goes. Scene V follows Kathleen into the forests of the night to the gravesite of Fergus. Faustus has a stake is driven into the heart of the vampire and recovers the ring (53). Then the ghost of Tremethius appears to advise Faustus to destroy the ring rather than use it and Anselm offers Faustus a crucifix made out of the "True Cross" to help him through the dangerous process.

In scene VI, Mephisto and Faustus share a convivial glass of wine as Mephisto tries to convince Faustus to use the power of the ring to his own advantage rather than destroy it. Faustus enjoys the wine, but as Mephisto protests, he begins the ceremony which will destroy the ring, the recitation of the alchemical Great Formula (67). When scene VII begins, the ceremony is over. Faustus, who feels "twenty centuries older" and "younger than Merlin" (70) tells Anselm about his descent into the fiery furnace of dissolution where Anselm's cross -- he had bought it from Martin the Pardoner (80) -- was the first thing to be reduced to ashes (70). This experience has had a profound effect on Faustus for it has allowed him to fully understand the alchemical mysteries for the first time. He tells Anselm:

> Down there in the pit,
> I . . . felt the very heart of process beating;
> All time, the annals of our history were spread
> As if in section on a huge chart before me. . . .
> It sounds mad, no? Luxuriant panoramas of human destiny,
> The contingencies of human desires and wills. . . .
> Like all time smoldering away in the dark glare
> Of furnaces such as no alchemist has seen or dreamed of!
> There all matter is undifferentiated, burns itself away
> In an ecstasy of disappointment. I knew it all as terrible
> Yet absolutely necessary -- for without it we
> Would have no idea of Paradise. I saw
> The whole Universe, this great mine of forms
> For what it is -- simply a great hint. . . .
> Yes, I saw it all so clearly for the first time from There.
> Perhaps one must go There in order to see it? I don't know.
> (71-72)

After this experience of enlightenment in the alchemical furnace, Faustus decides to embark on a new phase of his life. He is aided in this decision when Queen Kathleen, restored to sanity, admits to him that she is grateful to him for her restored senses, but that her gratefulness will never overcome the hatred she feels toward him for thwarting her desire to reunite with her husband Fergus (74). Ordered out of the Kingdom, Faustus takes the time to say goodbye to Margaret, to reassure her of his continued affection, and to leave her all of his alchemical books and supplies.

Scene VIII finds Faustus in the woods on his way out of Galway sharing a meal and wine with his friend Martin the Pardoner. They discuss the fictitious nature of Martin's pardons and how the pardons, though the purchasers know they are invalid, serve a real human need in the community. Just as Mephisto, by tempting Faust to use the ring, actually becomes the force which pushes Faustus to destroy it, Martin's pardons also take a negative path toward the accomplishment of positive good: they allow people to put the past behind them and get on with their lives. Faustus agrees to take a job writing pardons for Martin and they set off together into the mountains to visit their mutual friend, Matthew the Hermit, who, with Faust, had also been a student of the alchemist Tremethius.

The final scene takes place in Matthew's stone cabin in the mountains. When Faustus arrives at the cabin, Matthew greets him with congratulations on his enlightenment (85). After a bit of conversation, Matthew announces that he will soon be moving on, for it is his time to enter the alchemical citadel and to become the dragon, the protector of the philosopher's stone. He further predicts that Faustus will eventually come to take his place as the dragon and that Margaret will follow Faustus (87). When Martin arrives with Mephisto, they sit down to share wine and to play a friendly game of Fortune with Hearts as trump (89). This is significant, for in the game of Fortune, the Hearts stand for Love, Spades for Death, Clubs for Force, and Diamonds for Wealth (Fraser 99). The choice of Hearts represents the enlightened moral perspectives of those adepts who, though they have taken the negative path to enlightenment, have earned passage into citadel of the dragon. Thus, the play ends appropriately with Mephisto cutting the cards and commenting "off we go again" as the next cycle of the game of Fortune, of the Faust legend, of the battle for the transmutation of intellectual pride begins (90).

In 1968, G. S. Fraser called *An Irish Faustus* "a small masterpiece, and the most coherent expression Durrell has given of his most central beliefs" (99). The play is certainly characteristic of Durrell's deep interest in the power and practice of Love -- a central theme of the *Alexandria Quartet* -- as well as his fascination with those who take the negative path to enlightenment: the Gnostics, Templars, Lovers, Artists, and Obsessed of the five Avignon novels which crown his career. But perhaps the most coherent expression Durrell has given to his most central beliefs can be found in a little book of nonfiction entitled *A Smile in the Mind's Eye* that he published in 1982.

There he tells how he himself learned the lesson Faustus learned in the great alchemical furnace when he discovered the writings of the man he calls "the Chinese Heraclitus," in the *Tao-te Ching* of Lao Tzu (8). Durrell explains:

> In my own case I find that with every kind of belief one must exercise a certain caution -- for it hardens into dogma if it becomes absolute rather than provisional. The word Tao, on the other hand, suggests to me different stances (all truth being relative) -- a state of total *disponibility*, total availability, a total and comprehensive and wholehearted awareness of that instant where certainty breaks the surface like a hooked fish. Only at this point is the spirit fully tuned in to the great metaphor of the world as Tao. Reality is then prime, independent of the hampering conceptual apparatus of conscious thought. It is the flashpoint where the mind joins itself to the nature of all created things. That poetry is Tao. (7-8)

Durrell's characters all search for reality prime, the philosophers stone, physical and intellectual fulfillment. Those who find it, the true lovers like Faustus, discover that, to paraphrase the last line of the *Avignon Quincunx*, when reality prime is achieved, as we saw in *An Irish Faustus*, the totally unpredictable begins to take place (*Quinx* 201).

Works Cited

Carruthers, Virginia. Rev. of Delos edition of *An Irish Faustus*. *Deus Loci* NS1 (1992). 130-131.

de Givry, Grillot. *Witchcraft, Magic & Alchemy*. Tr. J. Courtenay Locke. (1931). New York: Dover, 1971.

Durrell, Lawrence. *An Irish Faustus*. (1963). Second Edition. Birmingham: Delos, 1987.

—. *A Smile in the Mind's Eye*. New York: Universe, 1982.

—. *Quinx, or The Ripper's Tale*. New York: Viking, 1985.

Fraser, G. S. *Lawrence Durrell: A Study*. London: Faber,1968.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust*. (1808, 1832). Tr. Louis MacNeice. New York: Oxford, 1951.

Hamilton, David, ed. *The Metropolitan Opera Encyclopedia*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.

Hollander, John and Frank Kermode, eds. *The Oxford Anthology of English Literature I*. New York: Oxford, 1973.

MacNiven, Ian, ed. *The Durrell - Miller Letters, 1935-80*. New York: New Directions,1988.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*. In *The Oxford Anthology of English Literature I* ed. by Hollander and Kermode. New York: Oxford, 1973. 848-899.

Haunting Hester

Joy-Ellis McLemore
University of Texas at Tyler

Everybody in this room knows that *Scarlet Letter* falls short by twentieth-century standards as a showplace for in-depth characters. Yet Hawthorne created a woman who continues to mystify us all, as though she holds the root of that "sweet moral blossom" he mentions at the close of the first chapter. Hester and her imperfectly perfect Pearl somehow merge with the "wild rosebush" juxtaposed between the prison portal and the "stern old wilderness." Clearly the author reveres womanhood, even though he leaves us guessing about its ideal state. A century and a half later we're still guessing, but Hawthorne offers some clues to a larger-than-19th-century definition of feminine essence.

Two historically important women help in deciphering the author's puzzle. The first, Ann Hutchinson, specifically appears twice in the novel, and Hawthorne labels her "sainted" and suggests that the heroine of *Scarlet Letter* follows in the earlier outcast's footsteps. Hutchinson reappears in chapter 13, the earlier seventeenth-century reject from Massachusetts Bay also inspires our sympathy. Hester and Hutchinson walk "hand in hand" as Hawthorne suggests that a historical Hester might have "found[ed] a religious sect" had not "little Pearl come to her from the spiritual world."

It's old news that this country suffered a dearth of heroines during its infancy, at least *reported* heroines. Bradford and others cannot decide whether to sanctify or vilify Hutchinson. Those "rulers...[those] wise and learned men of the community" after all shared prejudices "fortified in themselves by an iron framework of reasoning" (ch. 13). To be sure, Massachusetts Bay extended little charity to Roger Williams and other such outcasts--unless, of course, we are to believe the good gossips at early Boston's marketplace, according to Hawthorne, who believe that such outcasts have been granted charity in being allowed even to live.

The extremes of the romantic revolution, as well as of the Puritan structure would have perplexed Hawthorne, never in any way an extremist. Indeed, *balance*--the old Golden Mean--appears to be his goal: balance between the wilderness and community, freedom of the individual and constraints of church and state, darkness and light, and finally, between man and woman and what each represents to the classical mindset which Hawthorne had hardly abandoned. An earlier of Hawthorne's stories helps.

The 1837 story titled "Endicott and the Red Cross" anticipates Hawthorne's greatest work and shows his fascination with seventeenth-century Salem's moral complexity. In the opening, the governor of Massachusetts Bay, who also appears in "Maypole of Merry Mount," has given

orders in support of a "bigoted and haughty primate . . . Archbishop of Canterbury," orders which according to Hawthorne and Roger Williams "might have wrought the utter ruin of the two Puritan colonies,"--i.e., Boston and Plymouth. In this decade-earlier tale another adulteress appears, beautiful and doomed. Hawthorne suggests here that her "A," in scarlet cloth, might be thought to mean Admirable and that anyone crossing those controlling the noonday public punishments might well consider suicide a logical alternative.

In this earlier story Hawthorne dismisses any notion that ancestral policy or infamy differs greatly from human behavior two centuries later. Where Ann Hutchinson wears the label "sainted," Endicott wears the label"valiant." For into the governor's "iron-breasted company" appears "a pilgrim heightened by an apostolic dignity" who turns out to be none other than the historic Roger Williams, then minister of Salem congregation and not yet at odds with Governor Winthrop. The "bubbling fountain which gushed into the sunshine" and all other diction of the passage indicates Hawthorne's respect for this rebel, the masculine counterpart, historically, of his contemporary Ann Hutchinson. The author acknowledges the necessity for rebels.

As far as anybody can tell, these two latecomers to Boston--at least, they weren't in the 1630 fleet--displayed more of what was to become the American spirit than did the pillars of the community with which the rebels were at odds. Hutchinson, like Hester Prynne, nursed the sick in her home. She held what sounds like prayer meetings without the explicit consent, or blessing of her fledgling community's masculine leaders and, of course, got herself into a heap of trouble. Hawthorne knew, and so do we, that a later era would regard Hutchinson's heresy in a different light. But that light had to follow an enlightenment which the world, and certainly a barely beginning Boston, had yet to experience.

Evidence of his genius is that Hawthorne could create a "wicked" woman who gained credibility in this dark setting so surrounded by *wilderness* and the dichotomies its wildness suggests. A savage group of "Good-wives" appear at the marketplace in the novel's second chapter, and their leader announces that Hester's gotten off far too easily at the men's hands; a hot-iron brand on Hester's face would suit the "mature" ladies better. Interestingly, only one young wife protests against these old biddies, and she dies a few chapters later. Not just any woman, obviously, can serve as our heroine.

Why does Hester survive?

Hawthorne compares Hester Prynne to an even more important historical and feminine figure than Hutchinson, none other than Elizabeth I. This comparison, which occurs only once and early in *Scarlet Letter*, distinguishes Hester from her later Victorian counterparts:

> Morally . . . there was a coarser fibre in those wives and maidens of old English birth and breeding than in their fair descendants, separated from them by a series of six or seven generations; for, throughout that chain of ancestry, every successive mother has transmitted to her child a fainter bloom, a more delicate and briefer beauty, and a slightly physical frame, if not character of less force and solidity, than her own. The women now standing about the prison door stood within less than half a century of the period when the manlike Elizabeth had been the altogether suitable representative of the sex. They were her countrywomen; and the beef and ale of their native land, with a moral diet not a whit more refined, entered largely into their composition. The bright morning sun, therefore, shone on broad shoulders and well-developed busts and on round and ruddy cheeks that had ripened in the faroff island, and had hardly yet grown paler or thinner in the atmosphere of New England. (58)

Hawthorne obviously admires this "manlike" offspring of the father of the English Reformation. However Hawthorne felt about Henry VIII, Elizabeth's religious sentiments were closely akin to Endicott's as he rent the red cross from New England's first flag. The author, an idealist, consistently shows himself to be intolerant of intolerance.

That idealism contains feminine overtones as well as mixed respect for the state from the start. The "manlike Elizabeth" had given her blessing to at least the first Virginia colony, and Hawthorne admires this "suitable representative of her sex" whom Hester so resembles. Hawthorne shows our androgynous heritage, in Hester, a synthesis of the best in both Ann Hutchinson and Elizabeth the First and embellishes that character with traditionally masculine traits as well.

Strong, independent, broad-shouldered, ruddy-complexioned--Hester is far more Elizabethan than a nineteenth-century audience might have expected. Physically she embodies an ideal woman whom the twentieth century can respect while taking us all the way back to phallic primitive forces of penetrating sunshine interwoven with the passive fertility of earth. Living according to the Protestant work ethic, yet in the solitude of a purely romantic maverick and political outcast, Hester prospers. Everybody from Socrates to Freud can revere Hawthorne's masterpiece because Hester knows herself and accepts what she knows. Supported by only her talent as a seamstress, her child's need for a strong mother, and her love for Arthur Dimmesdale, Hester becomes ultimately an existential heroine.

From the moment Hester appears at the market place with her natural dignity," "force of character," "her own free will," "burning blush," and "haughty smile" we know what Hawthorne thinks of his creation. He continues in chapter two to describe her as "a figure of perfect elegance on a large scale," utterly "lady like, too, after the manner of the feminine gentility of those days"--and then to elaborate once more on how much she contrasts with the nineteenth-century heroines of the novels his audience

knew well. It is inconceivable that Hester might suffer an attack of the Victorian vapors, yet eventually quite conceivable that her minister has fathered her child.

Even my graduate students of recent years apparently fail to acknowledge the destructive power of sin, or even its nature, in not only Puritan eyes, but Hawthorne's vision as well. If nothing else, a catholic view of adultery and questions of heir legitimacy wreaked havoc on a social order while serving as a catalyst for the Protestant Reformation in England. And Hawthorne respected social order, up to a point. Sinners--i.e., rebels against that order--had to be punished. Just as the great queen remained unmarried and barren, and Hutchinson outcast, Hester can never fit her Boston world. She must suffer in silence, friendlessness, and separation from her love. But issues of morality never appear black and white in Hawthorne's wilderness of the heart. Greys abound in the "civilized" community which forges mankind forward, and the sage of Salem respects this community even as he attacks its vision and limited heart. Not an easy puzzle.

Chapter 13 becomes the structural center of *Scarlet Letter* as we look into Hester's penetrating black eyes for the dozenth time and see a woman for whom "the scarlet letter had the effect of the cross on a nun's bosom . . . impart[ing] to the wearer a kind of sacredness which enabled her to walk securely amid all peril." Despite the symbolic and literal strength the letter imparts, we find Hester "withered up by this red." Then Hawthorne digresses into some observations concerning the feminine spirit which has faded in the community's victim of many years. Hawthorne ponders, through Hester and "the whole race of womanhood" whether life be worth living when its "ethereal essence, wherein she has her truest life, will be found to have evaporated." The author refers to the separate claims of society and sexuality. Hester's dilemma is that never again will she be able to satisfy both needs. As she contemplates terminating both her own and Pearl's existence, Hawthorne tells us in a splendid one-line paragraph: "The scarlet letter had not done its office."

So where are we when the letter *has* done its office? According to Marx, when Hawthorne in February 1850 read the story's conclusion to his wife, "It broke her heart and sent her to bed with a grievous headache." And her reaction delighted the author, who turns out to be, much to my students' chagrin, a Victorian after all. It's as though he's telling a world where the romantic revolution has had all too great a victory, "No, you can't have it all. Mess with the existing order, and you will pay the price."

Yet rebels must exist in order that old, imperfect orders may evolve toward perfection. What, then, does Hawthorne ask of the ideal rebels? There's no mystery here regarding the moral blossom promised by the tapestry weaver at the beginning of the story: "Be true! Be true! Be true! Show freely to the world, if not your worst, yet some trait whereby the worst may be inferred."

Hester *is* true. And she returns after years "of her own free will [to] resume the symbol of which we have related so dark a tale." Moreover, when Pearl at last kisses her father on the scaffold:

> "A spell is broken. The great scene of grief which the wild infant bore a part, had developed all her sympathies; and as her tears fell upon her father's cheek, they were the pledge that she would grow up amid human joy and sorrow, nor forever do battle with the world, but be a woman in it."

Hawthorne has insisted that human imperfection may lead to life and love as well as death and gloom. We must embrace humanity, warts and all.

Hester, not so willingly at first but ever so boldly in time, pays the price. And she lives. She assures those who approach her during her wisdom of autumnal years that

> at some brighter period when the world shall have grown ripe for it, in Heaven's own time, a new truth would be revealed in order to establish the whole relation between man and woman on a surer ground of mutual happiness.

One wonders if, in that world of Eden next, man and woman will not have sinned. Hawthorne, ever aware of civilization's embryonic state and the valid claim of the wilderness upon our hearts, has used this penetrating story to suggest an eventual merging of Mother Earth and Father God that the world has yet to witness. And Hawthorne insists in conclusion that "the angel and apostle of the coming revelation must be a woman, "perhaps because when all the communities, churches, states, and civilizations created by men have foundered--that eternal *feminine*, traditionally embodied in the earth-wilderness and reason-defying heart, will still be waiting with its inarticulable answers.

Works Cited

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. "Endicott and the Red Cross" from *Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Rpt. from 1837 ed. *Twice told Tales*. New York: Doubleday, 1959. 204-209.

The Scarlet Letter. ed. George McMichael, et al, in *Anthology of American Literature*, vol. 1: *Colonial through Romantic*, third edition. New York: Macmillan, 1985 rpt. from 1850 pub.1219-1327.

Marx, Leo. Foreward and Preface to the Second Edition of *The Scarlet Letter*. New York: New American Library, 1959. vii-xiv.

Gender Differences in Utopia: Going Nowhere

Josephine A. Mcquail

Much as *Ecotopia* seems to be a utopia shaped on modern ideals, Ernest Callenbach's novel shares commonalities with other utopian fiction. The name of its protagonist, William Weston, resembles that of Julian West in Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward,* although given the location of Ecotopia, the former states of California, Oregon and Washington, his name is also an early indication that he will find himself akin to the new country. Like *Herland* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, the society of Ecotopia is matriarchal and Callenbach's vision of an ideal place depends on conjectures about gender differences.

In Ecotopia, women rule the state after having seized and retained power in the Western United States following their succession from the union. The government of Ecotopia operates by consensus. Here, perhaps, Callenbach is trying to show that females are suited to the task of governing, that the social skills which are supposed to be typically female strengths are put to good use. In contrast, in Gilman's Herland, the three men who wander in to the isolated country to view the curiosity of an all-female society cannot at first believe that an exclusively female society can be run without the women wasting time in constant bickering. In Herland, one of the men, Terry O. Nicholson, continually portrayed as more aggressive than the others and physically violent, serves to represent the recalcitrance of some males. In Ecotopia, men play war games to vent aggressive impulses. These concessions on the part of Gilman and Callenbach about what male and female nature are make them shape their fictional worlds in what they perceive to be an ideal mode, but how viable are these utopias from a feminist point of view?

In Ecotopia, women are excluded from--mere spectators of--the war games in which the men participate. The account of the rituals which Weston takes part in reads like a description of one of Robert Bly's men's movement-type bonding rituals, except there is real blood shed in the Ecotopian version. It is during this event that Weston, the United States visitor to Ecotopia, is symbolically initiated into what will be his own culture. He goes from talking about "us" observers to becoming an inadvertent participant. He even finds himself hating "his" team's opponents. However, it is hard to avoid thinking of the chilling ritual execution in Shirley Jackson's "The Lottery" when reading the description of these ritual war games:

> *...I had watched our men practice in the garden with their spears, but the actual weapon seemed heavy and awkward. I was afraid my inexperience would endanger my brothers. But their eyes flashed companionably and*

> *we all rushed onward together, and began with our enemies the fearful dance I had dreaded and dreamed of. Their first charge horrified me. I had never seen such open looks of murderous malice in another man's eyes, and it was hard not to break and run and cry for mercy. But we rallied, regrouped, pushed back against their advance with a compact front of many spears; and they could see that if they pushed further, one of them would be mortally exposed . . . At this, or so I seem to recall, I or someone near me uttered a bestial kind of triumphant growl, a truly blood-curdling noise. At any rate, I have never felt anything quite like that moment. The dread of their advance was replaced by an unutterable feeling of strength which we all shared, and knew we shared. Making feints and jabs with our spears, and threatening cries, we spread out occasionally ganging up to single out one of their men and try to cut him off.*
>
> On one of these surges I must have gotten carried away by my enthusiasm and misjudged the distance. . . . At any rate, I must have stepped a pace or two too far, or too much to the left or right. The enemy suddenly counterattacked in a way that isolated me on my left . . . a spear pierced my side just above the waist. (Callenbach, 148-9) [Weston's journal entries are typed in italics, his newspaper articles are in regular type.]

It is after this ritual wounding that Weston decides to stay in Ecotopia. Here he is properly initiated into the feminine world of Ecotopia. He becomes a member of the society by participating in the male-bonding ritual, but the description of his wounding is a symbolic deflowering. He becomes a part of the womanly world of Ecotopia through his excess of male violence, but, as in many utopian novels, like *Looking Backward* and *The Kin of Ata Are Waiting for You* by Dorothy Bryant, William Weston is symbolically reborn after his injury, transformed into a helpless invalid nursed back to a reformed capability by the agreeable nurse Linda who satisfies all his needs.

Despite the agreeable aspects of the matriarchal society of Ecotopia, this willingness to indulge male sexual desire on the part of obliging Ecotopian women is an irritating aspect of Callenbach's novel and points out a basic contradiction in his apparently feminist attitude. The women of Ecotopia are sexually "liberated"--or are they? They are willing to have sex with the stranger Weston on most occasions (except one woman who walks away because Weston is not acknowledging that he just wants sex and not a pleasant conversation with a stranger on the street) and are even downright aggressive, like the nurse, and, before her Marissa, who seduces William on first meeting. Weston fulfills his longstanding fantasy to sleep with two women in Ecotopia:

> *I guess it's a result of my Puritan heritage that I've never been with two women at once (though I have often wished I had the nerve to try it). These girls were*

absolutely cool and matter of fact about it, which made it easier. Sometimes they would both concentrate on me, sometimes I would share one with the other. They seemed to regard sex the same way we'd regard eating, or maybe walking--a pleasant biological function, but without any heavy emotional expectations. Very relaxing . . . (Callenbach, 96-7)

One thing that could be said in Callenbach's defense, however, is that he reveals himself as a Romantic in his philosophy, and the Ecotopians are consequently portrayed as totally unrepressed. They believe in an excess of feeling, whether on the job, as with the cook who responds to a customer's fit of dissatisfaction with a tirade of her own, although in terms of love relationships, exclusivity, possessiveness and jealousy are discouraged and practically nonexistent, though emotions may be noisily expressed, as in the breakup Weston overhears and observes in the hotel he stays at upon arrival in Ecotopia. Lack of sexual repression goes along with Romantic values expressed in other aspects of the book, for instance its very form, with the personal journal entries of Weston in italics which contrast with the more formal news stories he writes to send back home. The very form of the book displays a Romantic distrust for reason, since Weston is finally swayed by his feelings to stay in Ecotopia and accept the country he was so critical of at first.

But there is another disturbing aspect of Callenbach's novel that is evident in *Herland* as well. This is the fact that maternity is a concept which is extremely valued at the same time that depopulation is a goal, and an answering response of paternal dedication on the part of males is not really evident.

> "The only thing they can think of about a man is *Fatherhood*!" said Terry in high scorn. "*Fatherhood*! As if a man was always wanting to be a father!" (Gilman, 124)

Maternity is really a religion in Herland. Vandyck, the narrator of the novel, describes the missionary zeal of the girls of Herland:

> These girls--to each of whom motherhood was a lodestar, and that motherhood exalted above a mere personal function, looked forward to as the highest social service, as the sacrament of a lifetime --were now confronted with an opportunity to make the great step of changing their whole status . . . (Gilman, 88)

Even though women in Herland have no men to father their children they manage anyway. Through an unexplained process of parthenogenesis, they procreate and successfully bear children. They worship Maaia, Goddess of Motherhood, and Vandyck describes their mission:

> All mothers in that land were holy. To them, for long ages, the approach to motherhood has been by the most intense and exquisite love and longing, by the Supreme Desire, the overmastering demand for a child. Every thought they held in connection with the processes of maternity was open to the day, simple yet sacred. Every woman of them placed motherhood not only higher than other duties, but so far higher that there were no other duties, one might almost say. All their wide mutual love, all the subtle interplay of mutual friendship and service, the urge of progressive thought invention, the deepest religious emotion, every feeling and every act was related to this great central Power, to the River of Life pouring through them, which made them bearers of the very Spirit of God. (Gilman, 140)

In Ecotopia, abortion and birth control are readily available, but birth control devices and methods for women. However, there is the same assumption as in *Herland*, that women are designed to be the primary caretakers of children:

> The fact that they also exercise absolute control over their own bodies means that they openly exert a power which in other societies is covert or nonexistent: the right to select the fathers of their children. "No Ecotopian woman ever bears a child by a man she has not freely chosen, I was told sternly. And in the nurturing of children while they are under two, women continue this dominance; men participate extensively in the care and upbringing of the very young, but in cases of conflict the mothers have the final say, and mince no words about it. The fathers, odd though it appears to me, acquiesce in this situation as if it were perfectly natural; they evidently feel that their time of greater influence on the young will come later. (Callenbach, 70)

In the end of the novel, Marissa won't tell William whether or not she is ovulating or using birth control when they have a celebratory tryst after Weston has decided to stay in Ecotopia.

> . . . *she wouldn't tell me whether she was in her fertile period, or whether she still had her loop in. "It's my body," was all she would say. Knowing the kind of commitment she feels to family and the continuity of generations, the idea was profoundly scary--yet I seem to be ready for it.* (Callenbach, 179-80)

Both novels implicitly compare their new world heroines with old world neurotics. In *Ecotopia*, Weston often thinks of his lover Francine and compares her to Marissa.

I used to particularly enjoy going into a fancy restaurant or a cocktail party with Francine. It was like displaying a prize won in some contest. And she makes the most of it--breasts always seeming about to burst her dress; that special ambiguous look from me to the others, inviting competition and comparisons and flirtations. With Marissa, coming into the place was just coming into the place. We will relegate to the people there individually or together, intimately or not at all, as it happens to go. Most people find Marissa attractive--she grows on you, subtly--but she never presents herself as an object to be struggled over, and she never pretends to feelings she doesn't have. And yet she expects a great emotional commitment from me--we have had terrible scenes because she felt I was not living up to our relationship. (Callenbach, 117)

Similarly, in *Herland* Vandyck compares the women of Herland to women from his own society:

> You see, with us, women are kept as different as possible and as feminine as possible. We men have our own world, with only men in it; we get tired of our ultra-maleness and turn gladly to the ultra-femaleness. Also, in keeping our women as feminine as possible, we see to it that when we turn to them we find the thing we want always in evidence. Well, the atmosphere of this place was anything but seductive. The very numbers of these women, always in human relation, made them anything but alluring. When, in spite of this, my hereditary instinct and race-traditions made me long for the feminine response in Ellador [his native Herlandish wife], instead of withdrawing so that I should want her more, she deliberately gave me a little too much of her society. (Gilman, 130)

Herland is an implicit satire of Gilman's contemporary America, while *Ecotopia* is far more of a prescription for change. Callenbach's intentions are good, but Marissa as earth mother/goddess presents an image that only perpetuates myths about women. Weston might be a reformed American at the end of the novel, but he is not a reformed sexist, while Vandyck is.

Despite the shortcomings of these utopias evident to the modern feminist eye, they both may be credited with another important goal for the Romantics: reforming the abuses of society which lead to the oppression of people. In both cases, the authors recognize that for a truly healthy society present gender relations must be radically changed.

Works Cited

Bellamy, Edward. *Looking Backward: 2000 - 1887.* New York: The Modern Library, 1982.

Bryant, Dorothy. *The Kin of Ata Are Waiting for You* New York: Moon Books, 1976.

Callenbach, Ernest. *Ecotopia:The Notebook and Reports of William Weston.* New York: Bantam, 1975.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. *Herland.* New York: Pantheon, 1979.

"Names Is What They Had": The Weight of Names in Recent Fiction

Thomas H. Poston
The Mississippi School for Mathematics and Science

No one appreciates a happy instance of serendipity more than teachers of literature, who are so used to seeing their best-laid schemes gang aft a-gley. Asked to teach, for gifted secondary students, a high school version of my college course in contemporary fiction, I reduced the number of assigned novels to five, chosen for diversity of style, theme, and genre. The discovery that these works, selected for their variety, shared thematic commonalities surprised me as well as the students.

The most striking of these shared themes involved the importance of names -not that the authors had given their characters symbolic or allegorical names to provide a game for the clever reader to decipher as a sort of literary entertainment but that various names had an organic significance within the context of the novels. Names, it turned out, do not merely identify but define, carrying weight within the structure of the text and influencing the relationships and interactions of the characters and affecting the direction of the plots–force fields from which lines of influence gravitate. One's name is less an appendage which one drags around as a matter of social convenience than it is a dynamic energy which shapes its bearer's identity. After all, *nomen* ("name") is related etymologically to *numen* ("soul" or "self").

The Clan of the Cave Bear, the first novel in Jean Auel's enormously popular "Earth's Children Series ," is an excellent choice to begin a course in contemporary fiction: it is highly readable, has an exciting plot, and presents a pantheon of characters both engaging and despicable. It is also an especially appropriate selection to introduce the students to the thematic importance of names.

But like most readers who are preoccupied with an action-packed plot and the sometimes heavy-handed (as well as politically correct) theme of prehistoric feminism, the students overlooked this more subtle theme. As part of a lecture on the linguistic dimensions of the novel, especially the language conventions of the Clan as these are constructed by the author, I challenged the students to decipher the patterns governing the names of characters. Names are among the few vocal components of the Clan's language, which consists mostly of gestures and signs(38). Because their vocal apparatus has not evolved to allow an auditory language, the Clan

have compensated with an elaborate visual language. So the few spoken words, such as names, take on additional prominence. Because they embody the bearers' identity, names are not chosen casually by a child's mother but are assigned by the magician, the mog-ur, whose decision is inspired by the spirits.

Since much of the plot is propelled by the inflexible distinctions between men and women, solidified by long tradition, it is not surprising that the rigidity of the gender–specific roles is reflected in the equally rigid naming conventions which differentiate male names from female ones. In the extraordinary ceremony which transforms her into the "Woman Who Hunts" (301), Ayla is surprised when the ancient, protective spirits invoked by Creb are female (since she has always believed that such spirits were only male).

Since it is only their names which allow Ayla to draw this conclusion, the alert reader also experiences a revelation--that names are readily identifiable by gender. The novel contains 14 female names and 19 male names. Listing the two sets shows readily the commonalities the names on each list share with one another as well as the differences with those on the other list.

Female names (e.g., Aba, Ebra, Iza, Oga) are invariably bisyllabic, beginning and ending with a vowel and having a consonant or consonant combination separating the vowels. Although the initial letter may be any vowel (a, e, i, o, u)--and each vowel is represented by at least one name - the terminal vowel is necessarily an /a/. All medial sounds consist of stops or near-stops made when the air flow is restricted in the mouth, either by the lips or by the tongue on the teeth or alveolar ridge or against the palate.

Male names, by contrast, are always monosyllabic and both begin and end with consonants (or combinations of consonants). The medial vowel may be a single vowel or an apparent diphthong. A variety of both consonants and vowels are used–Brun, Broud, Creb, Vorn.

The precision with which these formulae are contrived and the consistency with which they are applied add a degree of convincing realism to the primordial setting Auel has created. The phenomenon of name--taboo is also introduced cleverly into the story to reinforce the weight of names. As the students became aware of these factors, their appreciation for the writer's achievement increased, and so too did their involvement with the theme of names and their willingness to scrutinize subsequent texts for the same theme.

Names are also a conspicuous theme in Thomas Berger's *Little Big Man*. Among the native Americans into whose culture Jack Crabb is adopted, names are a complex issue–and a mercurial one, since a single character is likely to have a variety of names. Crabb's adoptive father, for example, carries a pantheon of names, Old Lodge Skins being only the most familiar to the readers; to white men he is known by the descriptive cognomen Scar Belly or "Skar-gut," derived from a distinctive abdominal battle scar; and to his own people he bears the additional names of Mohk-se-a-nis, Painted

Thunder, and Wohk-pe-nu-numa. "And," Crabb reflects, "I never did know his real name, which among Indians is a secret" (7). Crabb goes on to explain the need for such secrecy: "if you find [this real name] out and call him by it he will at the least be terribly insulted and at the worst have ten years of bad luck" (7). Later Crabb remarks on the depth of the feud between Old Lodge Skins and the jackrabbits, whom the old Indian has offended by once turning aside a prairie fire from his camp to the rabbits' homes instead, by noting that the rabbits would invoke this superstition and "call him by his real name, which is as malicious as you can get" (23).

During his disjointed (and frequently interrupted) career as an Indian, Jack Crabb also accumulates more than one name. At first he is "Little Antelope," which, he shrugs, "had no undue importance since I got several more in time but was a start" (31). Since it furnishes him with a Cheyenne identity, however, and therefore a foothold in his new world, it has more significance than he acknowledges. But because, among the Cheyenne, names are not always bestowed so casually but are acquired by behavioral traits or earned by actions, Crabb becomes for a time "Antelope Girl" to the other boys for his willingness to associate with the little girls of the camp (41). This derisive appellation is soon replaced, of course, by the prestigious "Little Big Man" when he kills a Crow warrior, saving a companion's life in the process (72). In the novel's last chapter, Crabb carelessly refers to himself by this name, and Old Lodge Skins gently reprimands him for divulging his name aloud: "Ah . . . a person should never speak his own name. A devil might steal it, leaving the poor person nameless" (434).

By contrast, in the white man's world, revelation of one's name may also carry consequences but of a very different sort. This phenomenon is demonstrated most dramatically in the case of the notorious gunfighter Wild Bill Hickok. When Crabb and Hickok are challenged at a dancehall, trouble seems certain until Crabb's comrade is introduced by name. The bouncer, whose professional abilities Crabb can certify, might be a match for the man, "but soon as he heard that magic name, he was beat so far as facing the individual who owned it" (289). Another similar episode of name recognition involves a pugilistic encounter between Calamity Jane and Crabb's Amazonian sister Caroline, who, coveting the celebrity of the name, has been impersonating the famous heroine of the Old West. After she has been soundly bested by the object of her envy, Caroline dejectedly explains her actions:

> Now I'll tell you, what people recall about her is that name, it ain't her personal self, and "Calamity" ain't her real name nohow, which is Jane Canary, but just let a bunch in some saloon hear "Calam," and they don't care who it is, they'll joke you and buy you drinks and you are real popular. (344)

Jack reflects on both the personal and the theoretical facets of the situation: "There was something real pathetic about Caroline. But I knowed what she meant about names: it was certainly true" (344).

The most sinister application of this theme occurs in Margaret Atwood's chilling novel *The Handmaid's Tale* in which the manipulation of names has become an instrument of social engineering for the futuristic Republic of Gilead. Such a device is a response both to conditions created by the environmental and social disasters that produced the instability leading to the overthrow of the government and to the scriptural imperatives motivating all biblical theocrats.

One version of this manipulation is the contrived confusion of names and roles: Rita and Cora are "Marthas," a proper name which has been appropriated to designate servitude; Lydia, Sara, and Elizabeth are "Aunts," a familial title for the malevolent role of drill instructor/warden. Yet even these names are not genuine but, if the reader is to believe Professor Pieixoto in the "Historical Notes" appendix, are derived from commercial products available to women in the immediate pre-Gilead period, and thus familiar and reassuring to them - the names of cosmetic lines, cake mixes, frozen desserts, and even medicinal remedies (391).

Confusion exists even among those permitted to keep their own names. The Commander's Wife, whose original name, the narrator's remembers, had been "Pam," took the name "Serena Joy" (60) to formalize her pre-Gileadian metamorphosis into the televangelizing champion of traditional values. But at least the choice at this time was hers. The situation, however, is palimpsestic, and another layer of complexity is added by Pieixoto's speculation that both *Pam* and *Serena Joy* are pseudonymous concoctions of the narrator, the latter being "a somewhat malicious invention" for an historical character actually named "Bambi Mae" or "Thelma" (391).

Deprived of her own name, Atwood's protagonist reflects on the story she is living and telling; when the teller of the tale has no identity, neither does the audience: "*Dear You*, I'll say. Just *you* without a name. Attaching a name attaches *you* to the world of fact, which is riskier, more hazardous; who knows what the chances are out there, of survival, yours?" (53) The risk lies in the fact that one cannot then comfort herself with the pretense of a pleasant fiction, the unsatisfying parts of which can be erased and rewritten more agreeably. Hazard is inescapable in that most unmanageable of all things--reality. Still, she hungers for this reality--and for an identity in it.

The absence of a name does more than confer anonymity, however. Because a name legitimizes selfhood, divesting someone of her name deprives her of a personal identity and renders her immaterial so that she can be re-defined by her role. In Gilead, Handmaids' names are formulaic --Ofglen, Ofwarren, Ofwayne, Offred--patronymics, as Pieixoto explains in his presentation to the Twelfth Symposium on Gileadean Studies (387); specifying only the Commander she presently serves and changing with

her re-assignment, a Handmaid's title provides no stable identity but demotes her grammatically to a modifying phrase.

The novel's heroine knows the difference, though:

> My name isn't Offred, I have another name, which nobody uses now because it's forbidden. I tell myself it doesn't matter, your name is like your telephone number, useful only to others; but what I tell myself is wrong, it does matter. (108)

Among the zealots of Gilead, the life of a Handmaid may be nightmarish, but the narrator is not so fragile that she succumbs to despair. Rather, she maintains--defiantly but secretly--a measure of dignity by recalling her actual name; "my shining name," she calls it. "I keep the knowledge of this name like something hidden, some treasure I'll come back to dig up, one day. I think of this name as buried" (108). But *buried* is not *destroyed*. And *degraded* is not *defeated*. As her name protects her, so too does she protect it, even from the prying 22nd century scholarship of Professor Pieixoto, who grumbles that his subject "does not see fit to supply us with her original name" (387). The Handmaid from the future knows well Old Lodge Skin's lesson from the past: that revealing one's name carelessly makes it susceptible to devils--or at least zealots and professors--eager to pilfer it.

Their recognition that Auel's, Berger's, and Atwood's novels shared such a powerful theme clearly impressed the students. Sensitized by this point in the course to the game of the name, they were quick to discern its presence even in the texts where it was much less prominent.

Written in the wake of Sputnik and during those urgent early years of the U.S. space program which Kurt Vonnegut calls the "Nightmare Ages" (8), *The Sirens of Titan* focuses on the improbable hope that "out there" somewhere is "the answer," which needs only an appropriate messenger to deliver it to us.

Vonnegut's protagonist, Malachi Constant, feels himself appointed to this role: he "pined for just one thing--a single message that was sufficiently dignified and important to merit his carrying it humbly between two points" (17). In fact, he is so obsessed with this concern, which will give meaning to his life, otherwise jaded by too much wealth and too little purpose, that he designs his own crest emblazoning it with the motto *The Messenger Awaits* (17). He believes his task is at hand when Winston Niles Rumfoord, by virtue of his chrono-synclastic-infundibulated condition, predicts Constant's journey from Earth to Mars, then to Mercury, back to Earth, and ultimately to Titan. "Well," enthuses Constant, "it looks like the messenger is finally going to be used." In response to Rumfoord's befuddlement, Constant explains, "My name [Malachi Constant] - it means *faithful messenger*" (35). Because he has lived in anticipation of the fulfillment of his name, he feels betrayed by it when Runfoord apologizes, "Sorry . . . I know nothing about any message" (35). The story's true messenger,

of course, is the Tralfamadorian Salo, commissioned by his culture to transport its message across the vastness of space to the rim of the universe. Although Constant eventually abandons his desire to define himself through his name, his unpremeditated complicity in the accomplishment of Salo's mission does justify that name, at least indirectly.

The least developed use of names occurs in *The Last Unicorn*, Peter Beagle's delightful fantasy, in which names may have some significance for the reader because they insinuate some defining qualities of the characters, e.g. King Haggard or Schmendrick (a Yiddish word suggesting clumsiness or incompetence) but in which there is little suggestion of the weight of names for the characters themselves. Nevertheless, even here the point is made, forcefully, during the quest. The unicorn, vain and lacking in sympathy for human beings anyway, tolerates her human companions uncomfortably because she feels "herself bending under the heaviness of knowing their names" (92). To know someone's name establishes a bond and imposes an obligation.

If, as Nietzsche proclaimed, there are no facts but only interpretations, we understand how it is that names (inseparable from reputations) distort the recording of events, interpreting them so as to promote or demote those involved. Jack Crabb is able to outwit and even best James Butler Hickok in a gunfight, but because Crabb is only "Jack" Crabb while Hickok is "Wild Bill Hickok" and because history distributes credit according to name recognition, it buries the event and aggrandizes the name. And so Jack Crabb, whose *name* the pompous Ralph Fielding Snell notes in his epilogue "is missing from every index, every roster, every dossier" of Old Western lore, fades into the anonymity of the past. Though he is no philosopher, Crabb is not without insight: he is fully cognizant of the principle that names enlarge some and similarly familiar with the equal but opposite truth that they diminish others. In fact, it is appropriate that Crabb, in his simple eloquence, have the last word. Musing on his sister's jealosy of Calamity Jane's name and notoriety, Crabb states the undeniable and crystallizes the theme:

> Take me, and look at the colorful, dangerous life I have led in participating in some of the most remarkable events of the history of this country. I'll wager to say you never heard of me before now. Then think of Wild Bill Hickok, George Armstrong Custer, Wyatt Earp--names is what they had. Wild Jack Crabb, Crabb's Last Stand--it just don't sound the same. (344)

Works Cited

All of the references are to the most recent paperback editions, which are readily available in most bookstores.

Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale.* New York: Ballantine, 1987.
Auel, Jean M. *The Clan of the Cave Bear.* Toronto: Bantam, 1981.
Beagle, Peter S. *The Last Unicorn.* New York: Ballantine, 1968.
Berger, Thomas. *Little Big Man.* 25th Anniversary Edition. New York: Dell, 1989.
Vonnegut, Kurt, Jr. *The Sirens of Titan.* New York:

C. S. Lewis's *Till We Have Faces*: The Thick, the Clear, and the Mythic

Edward B. Roper, Jr.
Auburn University

C.S. Lewis's conception of the "thick" and the "clear" describe two complementary but dialectically opposed aspects of religion. As Lewis explains in his article "Christian Apologetics" (202-03), the "thick," or primal elements in religion are those dark cultic rituals, ceremonies, places, and actions that have a visceral, intuitive ethos, an ethos that as frequently repels as attracts. Sacrifice, magic, taboo, and sacrament are all in some degree or other "thick" religion. The "clear," or intellectual elements in religion are those illuminated, publicly-accessible systems of belief that have a cerebral and rational ethos, an ethos that appeals to the need for clarity and mental order, but that lacks the immediate gut appeal of the "thick." Theology, exegesis, and homiletics are examples of "clear" religion. Each of these kinds of religion requires the complementary balance of the other if religion is to remain whole and vital. The "thick" if uncomplemented, degenerates into more superstition and humbug. The "clear," if not braced by the "thick," tends to veer off into rationalism and skepticism. Each side of the dialectic is necessary to the other and to the whole.

Both the "thick" and the "clear" are well-represented in C. S. Lewis's treatment of religion in his fiction. In his late novel *Till We Have Faces*, subtitled *A Myth Retold*, Lewis presents both aspects at their most powerful and most powerfully opposed, bringing them into a harmonious resolution by means of the key imaginative vehicle of all his fiction: myth.

The worship of the goddess Ungit in Lewis's fictional ancient kingdom of Glome is archetypally "thick" religion. The temple of Ungit is a dark, lozenge-shaped hovel, home to the high priest, the junior priest, several temple prostitutes, and the goddess herself. No clear differentiation is made between the goddess herself and her representation, a black, shapeless, faceless lump of stone that remains in the darkest recess of the temple. The temple, as well as the priest, is permeated with what Princess Orual of Glome calls "the Ungit smell": a composite of smoke, tallow, wine, and incense. The smell has a quality that Orual describes as being terrifyingly old.

"Clear" religion, on the other hand, finds a strong expression through the teachings of Orual's tutor, the Greek slave Lysias, called "the Fox." The Fox makes occasional prayers and libations to Zeus, but these are clearly perfunctory. His real religion is a Stoically-tinged belief in what he calls "the Divine Nature." The Fox denies any manifestations of the supernatural in human experience, and he effectively denies the existence of the gods as beings. His conception of divinity is so clear as to seem almost

insubstantial to the priest of Ungit; the priest's conception of divinity is so thick as to appear impenetrable to the intellect of the Fox.

These two forms of religion,the priest's thick and the Fox's clear, reach their sharpest opposition in the old priest's visit to the palace to declare the forthcoming sacrifice of the young princess Istra (Psyche in Greek) to the god of the Grey Mountain. At each point, the Fox disputes the priest's shadow, not a monster; the priest is unclear about whether the Brute was an animal, god, goddess, or all three; the victim was to be both the best and worst in the land, etc. The priest replies to the Fox's rational remarks with a tightly packed discourse on holy (or thick) wisdom:

> 'We are hearing much Greek wisdom this morning, King,' said the Priest. 'And I have heard most of it before. I did not need a slave to teach it to me. It is very subtle. But it brings no rain and grows no corn; sacrifice does both. It does not even give them boldness to die. That Greek there is your slave because in some battle he threw down his arms and let them bind his hands and lead him away and sell him, rather than take a spear-thrust in his heart. Much less does it give them understanding of old things. They demand to see such things clearly, as if the gods were no more than letters written in a book. I King, have dealt with the gods for more than three generations of men, and I know that they dazzle our eyes and flow in and out of one another like eddies on a river, and nothing that is said clearly can be said truly about them. Holy places are dark places. It is life and strength, not knowledge and words, that we get in them. Holy wisdom is not clear and thin like water, but thick and dark like blood' (49-50).

Both the thick religion of the priest of Ungit and the clear religion of the Fox have serious defects. The cult of Ungit, as practiced by the priest, tends to sink into magic, superstition, and the horror not so much of the holy as of the demonic. The priest's religion is centered upon ritual, not doctrine and not myth. Ritual is the re-enactment of myth; if the connection between a ritual and the myth it embodies becomes strained, the ritual takes on a character in which holiness gradually becomes perverted into its opposite. The re-enactment of myth by ritual gives to the worshipper a power of participating in the myth so that the movement of the story, in its re-enactment, takes the worshipper up into the world of the myth. The priest has the feel of the holy in his soul, but he has little sense of participation in a myth. Holy places are dark places--dark to the light of reason, to be sure; but also, perhaps to him, dark to the power of myth. Nevertheless, his limited ritualistic approach to religion contains more of the power of the mythic than does the watery Stoicism of the Fox.

The Fox's attitude towards the ancient myths that he loves to hear and tell, despite himself, reveals a rationalism so severe and skepticism so militant that he seems deliberately to miss the point of the myths:

> "Not that this has ever really happened," the Fox said in haste. "It's only lies of poets, lies of poets, child. Not in accordance with nature" (8)

The Fox is echoing the attitude of many moderns towards myth, including, at one time. C.S. Lewis himself. On the night of September 19, 1931, Lewis was walking toward Magdalene College, Oxford, with Hugo Dyson and J. R. R. Tolkien. When Lewis opined that myths were beautiful lies, Tolkien said firmly, "No. They are not lies." At that moment, a gust of wind swept through the trees, scattering leaves in great abundance. Tolkien remarked that this, a natural occurrence for a rationalist such as Lewis, was laden with mythic meaning for pre-rationalistic peoples, who could express the inner essence of the experience in story. Indeed, for the, the entire cosmos was "myth-woven." Hence, the mythic explanation of the wind in the trees expressed a more fundamental truth than the merely factual or rationalistic (Carpenter 42-42).

Lewis, convinced by the arguments of Tolkien, Dyson, and Owen Barfield, changed his mind about the truth of myth, eventually developing the view that he expressed in his essay "Myth Became Fact." Myth unites concrete experience and abstract thought, yet goes *beyond* them to some truth so basic and yet so broad that it cannot be understood as abstraction or objectified as experience. The truth of myth must be *felt* as story (65-67). Hence the blood-thick rituals of the Ungit cult, though they touch a chord deep within the human soul, cannot subsist as vital religion without being taken up into myth and transformed by their participation in living myth. Neither can the abstractions of the Fox have religious depth and life in isolation from that which gave them and all abstractions birth.

In *Till We Have Faces*, the myth is enacted for the remainder of Princess Orual's life, which includes her reign as Queen of Glome. Istra (Psyche) is left to be the bride of the god of the Grey Mountain, who is the son of Ungit. Orual journeys to the mountain and finds Psyche, who claims to be married to the god and living in his palace--a palace that only Psyche can see. Orual returns to Glome, and, convinced by the Fox that Psyche is deranged and being kept by an outlaw, resolves to rescue her sister. Orual makes another trip to the Grey Mountain and, by threatening suicide, persuades Psyche to spy on her husbands identity. Psyche does so, and the god reveals himself to Orual. He declares Psyche's exile, and promising that Orual will become Psyche, disappears from the mountain. Orual nurses her resentment against the god until, as an old woman, she discovers that Psyche has become a goddess and has a cult offering her worship based on the mythical story of what actually occurred. Orual, now Queen of Glome, has a vision in which the Fox guides her through the underworld. In this vision, Orual beholds the many tasks that Aphrodite (Ungit's Greek counterpart) set for Psyche to perform as her route to deification. At last, Orual takes

off the veil that she has long worn to conceal her ugliness to discover that she has been transformed into the beautiful Psyche.

In this vision, the Fox and Ungit, the thick and the clear, are taken up and transformed into something more powerful and more lucid than either could be alone. The re-told myth of Cupid and Psyche adds life to the dead bones of rationalism and power to the holiness of dark places, paradoxically by flooding them with light--not the light of reason alone, but the clear, thick, and holy light of myth. Dark places may be holy, but the dazzling light of myth is holier still.

Works Cited

Carpenter, Humphrey. *The Inklings: C.S. Lewis, J.R.R. Tolkien, Charles Williams, and Their Friends.* Boston: Houghton, 1979.

Lewis, C.S. "Christian Apologetics." *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics by C.S. Lewis.* Ed. Walter Hoop. Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1970. 89-103.

"Myth Became Fact." *God in the Dock.* 63-67.

Till We Have Faces: A Myth Retold. New York: Harcourt, 1957.

The False Florimell: The Automaton's Legacy in *The Faerie Queene*

Sim Shattuck
Louisiana Tech University

A common Classical precedent exists for the creation of the False Florimell in Book III of *The Faerie Queene*--that of Pygmalion and Galatea, wherein Venus gives life to a humaniform statue in order to punish the woman-hating sculptor Pygmalion. Venus knows the very thing that will bring Pygmalion literally and figuratively to his knees, and there is a happy poetic justice in having Pygmalion punished by the very activity that allows him surcease from thoughts of love and women. Coldness itself is not enraging to Venus; she understands indifference in men, to some extent. But what makes Venus angry in the Pygmalion story is that, as a mortal, the sculptor has overstepped his bounds. He not only rejects love quietly; he overtly brags about it, and as every Niobe or Arachne has found out, one does not bray about one's superiority over or indifference to the gods, for fear that the Olympians' punishment will be swift and terrible, which it inevitably is. Pygmalion has abused the normal course and uses of love here, and Venus punishes him with the very craft which, to us at least, tends to justify or forgive his loveless human existence.

The creation of the False Florimell is just such another subverter of the normal courses of human affection. The Witch who makes this statue-like automaton (Greek, "self-moving thing") for her son occupies a place in literary and psychological annals that extends forward obviously to the explosion of twentieth-century scientific-fiction (which can easily be seen in the character "Data" in the new *Star Trek* series), but as we have seen, it has an older life as well.

Another automaton is Frankenstein's monster, a reanimated corpse which Mary Shelley concocted from whole-cloth *integumenta*, by means of well-known scientific material spanning in time from Paracelsus to Cuvier. Once again, as with the Witch's son, the interest of *Frankenstein*, strangely enough, revolves around the notion of love or its deprivation. First, the Witch in *The Faerie Queene* creates the False Florimell from snow and the element mercury in order to create a lover for her son, a kind of gelid "love doll" for him to have to console himself for the loss of the real Florimell. Similarly, Pygmalion seeks love through the creation of Galatea, but when he is almost at the threshold of death from lack of love, Venus extricates him by turning his cold statue into a real woman. Finally, Mary Shelley's contribution is no different from the other two. Frankenstein's Monster meets his end when he blackmails the doctor into making him a female companion--only with Frankenstein's monster, we feel a certain shudder when we consider that the Monster and his mate might contain

within their bodies the ability to reproduce their own kind. Even the tale of Pinocchio the marionette is in essence no different, except that Gepetto the shoemaker wishes that he had a son instead of a lover. In any case, it is true that each of these characters are looking for love of one kind or another.

The desire for love but the need to circumvent normal means of creating humans is the whole point here. The parallels with the Witch's son and that of the circumstances of the escaped Frankenstein's Monster are noteworthy: the Monster escapes to a rural setting where he is accepted by a young girl whom he merely wishes to be with and talk to, such being the need for sentient beings of any kind to feel and express love. The Witch's son also lives in a forest, and his wooing of Florimell is hopeless both because of his oafish homeliness and also because he is not a man of Florimell's station in life. There is no means for him to have real access to her, just as there is no way that Frankenstein's Monster can inject himself into the loving household of the peasant girl. Thus the creation of a substitute love object--a kind of *fetish*, indeed, since it is a lifeless but unsatisfying representation of a real sex object--becomes necessary.

Pygmalion is given no alternative by an angry Venus. He is trapped by his very creation, a creation that is perforce both love object and a fetish at the same time. Pygmalion's love problem is thus a self-referencing metaphor: he hates and loves what he can have and yet not have. In both of these cases, the existence of the fetish is the outcome of a nonstandard view of sexuality and its ends, according to traditional values, such as those Spenser evidently entertained. There is a projected "perversity" behind the ontology of these beings which is also reflected in the creation of the False Florimell.

At the risk of sounding neo-Freudian, I think that the False Florimell has little to do with Florimell (insofar as the Son is concerned), but is instead a kind of fetishistic referrant to mother-son incest. The son is a mature male but he is kept by the wiles and machinations of his mother who, although she does not want to give up her son to another woman, must at least pay lip service to his sexual desire for another human being who is not the mother herself. To accommodate this need, the Witch undercuts any chance of his pursuit of the real Florimell by offering him a female-shaped pacifier, a homunculus (perhaps a better term would be "femencula"?) who will keep him at home but not undermine the mother's power or influence over him. Since the Witch has control of the spirit world, she can invest the automaton with any controllable "spright" she wishes, and it is significant that the demon in the False Florimell is male while her exterior is female. The False Florimell is not going to stay where the Witch's son wants her to stay. She has a mobility denied to most real women but not to *male* beings, and in a way this automatic creature is reminiscent of the hideous "monster" which the Witch creates to chase the real Florimell. There is a thoughtlessness and automatic quality to the Monster that shows the craftswomanship of a fairly poor sorceress. False Florimell, however,

is not evil, as such; she is merely without a human soul, and her "frigidity" here is not a convenient metaphor from everyday speech. She really is made of snow--and a poison, mercury.

Spenser describes the Witch's son as lazy, vitiated, as if by his mother's malignant influence: he is called "the comfort of her age and weary dayes" (Canto 7 st. 12) and is compared to a slug for his languid lassitude. There is no reason why his lassitude cannot be compared with Verdant's in the Bower of Bliss, a kind of ruining seduction that robs a male of his strength and self-esteem.

Perhaps the Son's "sleep" is the sleep of the mother, the sleep of the unemerged male personality, that which must differentiate itself from its female parent in order to make its way in the world--at least as this idea is developed by Freud, Jung, Eliade, and Campbell.

If this is the case, then the Son is the victim of a Terrible Mother, a castrating being who not only creates but also destroys, and who takes back into herself--into her matrix--that which she creates. In any case, for whatever reason, the Son takes an interest in Florimell and even asks his mother what Florimell is, as if he has never seen any other woman before:

> Softly at last he gan his mother aske,
> What mister wight that was, and whence deriued,
> That in so straunge disguizement there did maske,
> And by what accident she there arrived . . .(st. 14).

When Florimell recovers enough to reject the Son, the rage that he feels is similar to the rage of Frankenstein's Monster, who kills the family he at one time wishes to join but knows he cannot. The Witch's monster is an extension of her son's rage against the poor Florimell, who merely wishes to escape from the confines of the witch's house and the fulsome attentions of the loutish Son.

This violence is yet another aspect of the interaction between the usual automaton and the human being. Since nothing but a real person can give a human being the love that he or she needs, the automaton must necessarily eventually fail in its appointed task and be either the object of violence or the cause of violence. Pygmalion rages against the goddess Venus, he curses her and swears against her; Frankenstein's Monster goes on a murderous European rampage; the Witch sends a monster after Florimell before coming up with the solution of creating a woman for her son, who had flown into a violent and vengeful rage against the real Florimell.

The destruction of the automaton thus inevitably follows after its creation. Pygmalion's statue turns into a real woman through the kind intercession of the now-forgiving Venus. On the other hand, Frankenstein's Monster is sought out--ironically like a Terrible Mother seeking to destroy what it created--by Dr. Frankenstein himself, a kind of

Terrible Father. Victor Frankenstein also destroys the female monster he began to create.

The False Florimell survives and even prospers until Book V when she is exposed by Artegall–a dispenser of justice–and when she meets her human Doppelgnger, the real Florimell's reality causes the False Florimell to melt into the evanescence and heap of deception that she truly was.

Sources

Rose, A. J. *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. New York: Dutton, 1959.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein*. New York: Bantam, 1991.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A. C. Hamilton. New York: Longman, 1989.

Travis McGee, Where Are You? MacDonald's *Cape Fear* and the Failure of the Law

Sam Tindall
Duquesne University

In the American formula of crime fiction which emerged in the 1920s and 1930s and, generally speaking, obtains today, the hard-boiled detective took on the characteristics of "crudeness, excessive violence, and alienation from the respectable morality of society"; he substituted for conventional values "a personal code of ethics"; he became the archetypal figure John Cawelti labels the Enforcer (Cawelti 61, 59, 67). Notable manifestations of this figure are Harry Callahan (the Clint Eastwood character of the several *Dirty Harry* movies of 1971 and following) and Harry Kersey (played by Charles Bronson in the four *Death Wish* motion pictures of the 1970s and 1980s). But before these two Harrys came John D. MacDonald's Travis McGee, hero of twenty-one novels and several motion pictures, who is spoken of by Cawelti as "the Enforcer against a world of almost total corruption and amorality" (72). What is most interesting about McGee is that MacDonald affords the reader the opportunity to trace his evolution, to watch in the course of a single novel the fall from innocence of this prototype. In *Cape Fear* (alternate title: *The Executioners*), MacDonald in effect writes a history of modern American detective fiction; the novel traces the development (in the context one hesitates to say decline) of an officer of the court, through successive disillusionments regarding the effectiveness of the law, into the Enforcer.

Soon after the publication of MacDonald's first novel, *The Brass Cupcake*, in 1950, his editors at Fawcett Publications suggested that he consider writing a series of detective stories centering on a single character, but though tempted he refused, fearing that such an arrangement would seriously curtail his options. Not until he had demonstrated his versatility and established himself as one of the most popular authors in America throught the writing of forty-two novels did he finally agree to work on the detective series his publishers wanted (Geherin 43).

And so after an uncommonly long gestation period, Travis McGee was born, appearing for the first time in the simultaneously published *The Deep Blue Good-by* and *Nightmare in Pink* in 1964 and continuing for twenty-one years, until the death of MacDonald after the twenty-first novel of the series put an end to the detective's adventures. But in fact for several years before his first appearance, the personality of McGee, his outlook on life, his code of conduct, and the nature of his profession had been taking shape in other novels. These preliminary works had prepared the way for "salvage consultant" Travis McGee (for so his business card reads), whose work begins where the law leaves off, who will accept a case only after all

legal recourses have been exhausted. He is aware that one must sometimes take the law into his own hands to achieve justice; and his vigilantism is infallible: evil is clearly evil; villains have no redeeming qualities; and there is no fall-out: no innocent bystanders are hit by McGee's stray bullets.

In MacDonald's pre-McGee novels centering in crime--about half his output of the 1950's and early 1960's--a note of dissatisfaction with the law is heard with increasing frequency and intensity. The private citizen has begun to discover that, in his particular case, legal measures fall short, leaving him no option except to look outside the law. Any number of the novels of this period might be cited to illustrate the point. One might, for example, show how *A Flash of Green* (1962) depicts a group of civic-minded citizens forced by the law's corruption and general ineffectuality to take matters into their own hands as they try to block the "legal theft" (MacDonald's phrase) of a beautiful, unsoiled bay by a syndicate of developers and politicians. Ultimately, the efforts of the group fail: the filling-in of the bay moves ahead as planned, to the immense profit of a few greedy men.

But even more insistently than *A Flash of Green*, *The Executioners* (retitled *Cape Fear* to capitalize on the popularity of the 1962 and 1991 film versions of the work, both entitled *Cape Fear*) dwells upon the theme of the law's failure and the need to look elsewhere for justice. As this novel begins, middle-aged attorney Sam Bowden, is presented as an idealist regarding the law: his senior--and more cynical--law partner Bill Stetch calls him the "most avid worshiper" of "that old girl holding the scales." "A lot of kids feel that way about it," Stetch continues, "but it's a damn rare man that can . . . continue the infatuation" (*Executioners* 81). Stetch displays a grudging admiration for Bowden's idealism: "You are a very rare article. You are a good man who believes in himself and what he is doing" (82).

And so when a ghost from Bowden's past appears in his small home town of New Essex, Florida, in the form of Max Cady and sets into action a program of terrorism against the Bowden family, the young attorney's first thought is, quite naturally, of the law. Fourteen years before, as a young Army lieutenant, he testified as the only eyewitness against Sergeant Cady in a rape case, with the result that Cady was sentenced to life imprisonment. There is in the novel no question of wrongdoing on the part of Bowden, as there is in the 1991 film, in which he is guilty of withholding exculpatory evidence; rather, the novel presents an open-and-shut case of Cady's brutal rape of a fourteen-year-old girl, with Bowden merely doing his duty by testifying. A review of the case having freed Cady, he is now stalking the Bowden family: Sam, his wife Carol, two young sons, a fourteen-year-old-daughter Nancy, and a dog. But Cady, though probably a psychopath, is very clever: his threats are veiled, implicit, nothing the police can take official notice of. When Carol suggests that their nemesis be thrown in jail, Bowden replies sarcastically, "My God, it would be nice if you could do that, wouldn't it? An entirely new legal system. Jail people for what they might do. New Essex goes totalitarian." He goes on rather

sententiously: ". . . I believe in the law. It's a creaking, shambling, infuriating structure. . . . But at its base, it's an ethical structure. It is based on the inviolability of the freedom of every citizen." The conclusion of his speech has an ominous ring: "If the law can't protect us, then I'm dedicated to a myth, and I better wake up" (17).

And Cady's first overt act of violence is Bowden's wake-up call. One afternoon as the school bus arrives, someone throws a chunk of arsenic-laced beef into the yard so that the Bowden children arrive just in time to see their lovable old dog suffer an agonizing death. Surely now the police can arrest the man, Carol believes. But Bowden demurs: "We haven't any proof it was Cady" (43).

"Listen to me," Carol indignantly responds; "I have proof it was Cady. . . . It's not the kind of proof you would like. No evidence. No testimony. Nothing legalistic. I just *know*" (43).

But gut feelings amounting to moral certainties are not good enough for the attorney. Nor are they sufficient for the police, whose attitude throughout the novel is represented by this exchange between Bowden and local police captain Mark Dutton:

> to the officer's question whether Bowden has any proof about the poisoning of the dog, the lawyer responds, "No. But after talking to him, I'm certain." After a moment of thought, Dutton replies, "That's outside our boundaries, of course. . . . If you're genuinely alarmed about this, I suggest you pack your family off somewhere" (80-81).

But the Bowdens remain in New Essex, and Cady's next move finally begins to erode the legal shell encasing the attorney. The ex-convict confronts Bowden, implies his own guilt in the poisoning of the dog, and explains how he dealt with the infidelity of his own wife, who divorced him and remarried during his imprisonment: he abducted her, took her to a motel, brutalized her, then released her, naked, at a roadhouse where she could, in his words, "work her way home." And now he has a second score to settle: in prison, he says to Bowden, "I thought about her and I thought about you."

"Are you threatening me?" "I'm not threatening you, Lieutenant. Like I said, we started pretty near even. Now you're a wife and three kids ahead of me." Then, ogling Bowden's daughter, Cady says, "There's a real stacked kid,Lieutenant. Almost as juicy as your wife." Finally galvanized into action, Bowden takes a swing at Cady, who catches the punch in a palm, grins, waves, his cigar at Nancy, and says, "See you around, beautiful" (62-63).

Bowden at last wakes up to the need for action, but is filled with Hamlet-like hesitations. He says to his daughter, "I wish I could be one of your hundred per cent heroes about it. I wish I didn't have a mind full of reservations and rationalizations" (65). In spite of these, however, he screws up his courage sufficiently to approach a shady private eye, Sievers,

about hiring professional muscle to warn Cady off; and Sievers agrees to engage three men to work the stalker over with "a couple of pieces of pipe and a bicycle chain." "No more talk about the legal way?" he asks. Bowden replies, "I've had enough of that kind of talk to last me quite a while" (84-85).

As he waits for word on the beating, he continues to cavil: "It makes the world sound like a jungle. There's supposed to be law and order." "Darling," Carol responds, "maybe it is a jungle. And we know there's an animal in the jungle." I can't make myself clear," he says. "If this *is* the right way to handle it, then the foundations of my life are pretty creaky" (86).

And he walks about the house, unable to sleep, trying to come to grips with the meaning of the legal system and his present relationship to it. He thinks uneasily of the law as "a vast, top-heavy superstructure built on the basic idea of the group enforcing the punishment of the nonconformist. It was a tribal rite, with white wigs, robes, and oaths. It just did not happen to apply to his own situation" (87). Eventually, he formulates a justification of his questionable behavior that may or may not be ironic: "So this action was a supplement to the law. Thus it was right" (87).

Right or wrong in theory, in practice the plan goes sour: Cady--who spent his thirteen years in prison preparing himself for moments like this--sends two of the three hired thugs to the hospital, the other saving himself by running away.

At this point, Bowden could use the help of Travis McGee, the series hero who had not yet been created. In fact, it is at a juncture such as this that a McGee novel generally begins, with the client desperately in need of a "supplement to the law," and McGee on hand to give such assistance. With McGee unavailable, Bowden must now begin to play both parts; and the old adage applies: whether lawyer or detective, one who represents himself has a fool for a client. Travis McGee, to whom distance and detachment are axions, is never seriously troubled by emotional involvement, whereas such a complication, as we will see, nearly costs the life of Carol Bowden.

During the respite of the thirty-day jail sentence Cady receives for his part in the abortive beating, Bowden moves further away from his idealism, all the while berating himself for what he is becoming. He bar-hops in sleazy sectiions of town, looking on his own for more capable hit men. Slightly drunk after failing to find anyone to do the job, he becomes maudlin: ". . . little Sammy Bowden. . . . Ah, how he's slipped. Now he goes forth to hire assassins. . . . Law and Order Bowden we all called him around the office. He would never compromise with his honor. And what a pitiful sight he is these days" (113).

When Cady is released, in quick succession he makes two attempts on the lives of Bowden's family, whom Sam is desperately trying to keep hidden away: a slug from a rifle grazes the arm of the older son Jamie; and loosened lug nuts cause Carol's car to lose a wheel and overturn, injuring her and younger son Bucky. By this time Sam has armed himself with a pistol and ironically assumes the argot of a hardboiled private eye: "You

see, Tootsie, I go around killing the bad guys. The guys that got connections so the law can't touch them, see. . . . I eliminate 'em like those knight guys used to get rid of the dragons they had hanging around with blazing halitosis" (118). Both the self-mocking tone and the imagery of knight and dragon would become Hallmarks of Travis McGee.

Throwing all caution to the winds, Bowden lays a trap, using his wife as bait, with the police providing minimal and eventually useless back-up. Cady, having been led to believe Carol is alone, attacks her; Bowden, hearing her pre-arranged signal, panics, falls from the loft where he is hiding, sprains an ankle, and hobbles painfully to the rescue, almost too late. He manages to get off five shots as Cady disappears into the woods, leaving a trail of blood. Somewhat implausibly, Carol has emerged without serious injury.

The next morning, Bowden is told that Cady has been found dead, having bled to death from a gunshot from Bowden's pistol--a resolution distinctly different from, and more satisfying than, that of that of the 1962 film, in which Bowden, rather than shooting Cady, captures him and turns him over to the law, apparently in satisfaction of the prevailing Hollywood code of morality. The Bowden of the novel reflects: "He had killed this man. He had turned this elemental and merciless force into clay, into dissolution. He searched through himself, looking for guilt and for a sense of shame."

But he found "only a sense of savage satisfaction, a feeling of strong and primitive fulfillment. All the neat and careful layers of civilized instincts and behavior were peeled back to reveal an intense exultation over the death of an enemy." Bowden "wanted to throw his head back and yell at the sky, . . . wanted to dance around the body and chant of the defeat of the enemy" (186).

Bowden has come a long way. His worship at the altar of the law has become a paean to an eye-for-an-eye kind of justice--like Cady's own. He has provided his supplement to the law and found it satisfying in every way. MacDonald will not have to search his imagination very deeply when he undertakes, a few years later, to create a series character; he will only have to change the name of Sam Bowden, as he appears at the end of *The Executioners*, to Travis McGee.

Works Cited

Cawelti, John G. *Adventure, Mystery, and Romance*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1976.

Geherin, David. *John D. MacDonald*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1982.

MacDonald, John D. *The Executioners*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958.

—. *A Flash of Green*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett, 1962.

Myth and the Maze of Individuation James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*

Joan K. West
Mississippi State University

James Joyce uses an archetype, the quest myth, in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* to move Stephen Dedalus toward individuation. Stephen encounters three areas of concern – religion, family, and country – that represent the maze that he must find his way through as he attempts to answer questions of "Who Am I?" "What Am I?" and Where Am I Going?" According to Carl G. Jung, a psychoanalytic critic, the archetype manifests itself in myth and in the finished art of cultures in the form of symbols. He argues that the archetype, as a mythological figure, is a primordial image "that constantly recurs in the course of history and appears wherever creative fantasy is freely expressed. They present a picture of psychic life in the average, divided up and projected into the manifold of figures of the mythological pantheon" (*Relation*, 664). These figures must be translated into an understandable language. Jung also points out that "the impact of an archetype, whether it takes the form of immediate experience or is expressed through the spoken word, stirs us because it summons up a voice that is stronger than our own. . . " (*Relation*, 637).

Northrop Frye indicates in his essay, "Archetypes in Literature," that "patterns of imagery are oracular in origin and derive from the epiphianic moment, the flash of instantaneous comprehension with no direct reference to time" (677). As the central informing power, the myth gives "archetypal significance to the ritual and archetypal narrative to the oracle" (685).

Stephen Dedalus, the protagonist in *Portrait* on his journey to personal identity, is introduced in Chapter I through the consciousness of a small child with the moocow story. Using stream of consciousness and interior monologue, Joyce manipulates the audience to experience maturation with Stephen and to individually participate in the quest for personal individuation.

Stephen reacts in much the same fashion as we do when we are asked 'Who Are You?". We, like Stephen, immediately respond with the names our parents have chosen for us. Family tradition dictates names for some people. Others are named according to the rhythm the names produce. And yet others are named according to a particular meaning of the name. In Stephen's case, his name appears to have mythological significance (St. Stephen the Martyr; Daedalus (Dedalus), the maze maker (the artist) in Greek mythology). Throughout *Portrait*, Stephen appears as the martyr as he labors through the maze toward individuation.

The importance of names as equated with one's identity is something that Joyce wants us to focus on. Nasty Roach, another character in *Portrait* whose name conjures up a very vivid impression of physical and mental attributes, asks the question that becomes the catalyst of Stephen's trek toward personal identity.

> --What is your name?
> Stephen had answered:
> --Stephen Dedalus.
> Then Nasty Roach had said:
> --What kind of name is that?
> And when Stephen had not been able to answer, Nasty Roach had asked:
> --What is your father?
> Stephen had answered:
> --A gentleman....(9)

When Nasty Roach did not secure the answer he expected, he asked the next most natural question: What is your father? He is merely doing what we do, equating one's name with position in life. Joseph Campbell seems to think that Stephen's inability to answer Nasty's first question is because Stephen feels related to his family only "in the mystical kinship of fosterage, fosterchild and fosterbrother" (140). This becomes evident as later Stephen again questions his identity as it relates to his relationship with his father.

> --I am Stephen Dedalus. I am walking beside my father whose name is Simon Dedalus. We are in Cork, in Ireland. Cork is a city. Our room is in the Victoria Hotel. Victoria and Stephen and Simon. Simon and Stephen and Victoria. Names. . . . (91-92)

Identity must be found by searching inside oneself. Jung defends this statement as he points out that "self-knowledge, as well as being highly unpopular, seems to be an unpleasantly idealistic goal, reeks of morality, and is preoccupied with the psychological shadow, which is normally denied whenever possible or at least not spoken of" (*Man*, 93).

Stephen considers if name and chosen vocation serve concurrently to determine personal identity. He questions his parent's decision that he become a priest. He knows that the priesthood is what his parents have planned for him, yet he begins to rebel against the notion that he must fulfill someone else's wishes for his life. He has studied, prayed, fasted, and confessed diligently, but all of these prayers and supplications have not given him peace of mind and joy of the spirit that he feels he should have if the priesthood were his true vocation. He wrestles with his feelings as he realizes that "to merge his life in the common tide of other lives [would be] harder for him than any fasting or prayers, and it [would be] his

constant failure to do this to his own satisfaction which [would cause] in his soul at last a sensation of spiritual dryness together with a growth of doubts and scruples" (151).

For Stephen, religion resembles a labyrinth. The rituals of the religion do not bring the individual joy and peace. Praying, fasting, and confessing of his sins will not make him the "holy" individual he sees himself as in the priesthood. He questions, then, the importance placed upon the rituals instead of on the things that matter most in a religion--the communion with a Supreme Being and the salvation that comes with unquestioned faith.

Until now, Stephen has believed that the priesthood should give his life purpose, yet he is beginning to feel that his proposed vocation is a noose about his neck, strangling the life out of him. He is beginning to weigh the pros (power) and the cons (impotency and sterility) of the priesthood. Called to the Director's office, he "listened in reverent silence . . . to the priest's appeal and through the words he heard even more distantly a voice bidding him approach, offering him secret knowledge and secret power" (159). However, as he departs from the director's office, he feels the shadow of the college life pass over his consciousness and begins to think of his life as a priest. He equates the odors of the corridors of Clongowes with a sterile and impotent life. He is repelled by the thought. Diagnosing these thoughts, he begins to weigh these deprivations against the power and the privileges that the priesthood would bring:

> The Reverend Stephen Dedalus, S. J.
> His name in that new life leaped into characters before his eyes and to it there followed a mental sensation of an undefined face or colour of a face. The colour faded and became strong like a changing glow of pallid brick red. Was it the raw reddish glow he had so often seen on wintry mornings of the shaven gills of the priests? The face was eyeless and sour-favoured and devout, shot with pink tinges of suffocated anger. . . . (162)

Joyce forces the audience to self-reflection. Many times we have wielded the stick merely because of the power of the position associated with it. Many times we have made decisions even though we know that our parents would not approve and may even censor us. Many times we have committed to a project only for the chance to be praised for it. Stephen is doing the same thing. Like us, Stephen wants a life that will afford him the opportunities to create. Consequently, he decides against the priesthood because, to him, becoming a priest disallows creativity. At this point in his life, temporal blessings outweigh the importance of prestige.

As he confronts his parents with his decision, he is not cognizant of the true impact his decision will have on them:

> --his mother was hostile to the idea, as he had read from her listless silence. Yet, her mistrust pricked him more keenly than his father's

> pride and he thought coldly how he had watched the faith which was fading down in his soul again and strengthening in her eyes. A dim antagonism gathered force within him and darkened his mind as a cloud against her disloyalty: and when it passed, cloud-like, leaving his mind serene and dutiful towards her again, he was made dimly and without regret of a first noiseless sundering of their lives. . . . (164 & 165)

Stephen realizes that he will no longer have that umbilical cord that has sustained him with inspirations and wise counsel that only an understanding mother can give. He understands that the cord has been cut. However, Stephen seems relieved in his decision to travel the "unseen path . . . [that] beckoned to him once more and a new adventure was about to be opened to him" (165).

Even though Stephen is elated about his decisions, his elation turns to trepidation as doubt momentarily creeps into his mind:

> --The pride of that dim image brought back to his mind the dignity of the office he had refused. All through his boyhood he had mused upon that which he had so often thought to be his destiny and when the moment had come for him to obey the call he had turned aside, obeying a wayward instinct. . . . He had refused. Why? (165)

Closer to the goal of individuation, Stephen wonders if he will ever have the peace of mind and spirit that comes with the knowledge that he has chosen wisely. He realizes that his logic and reasoning is sound, and to fulfill his destiny in life, he must follow the dictates of his conscience. Joyce forces the audience to become a part of Stephen's individuation process. The audience recalls decisions they have made toward attaining personal desires and the consequences of those decisions. Stephen desires to combine the real with the ideal, stating that "[t]he artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails". . . (215).

Stephen's epiphaniac moment occurs with the "bird-girl scene," the mythological situation, characterized by a peculiar emotional intensity which gives Stephen a "visionary revelation of his vocation as a poet" (Radford, 262):

> --A girl stood before him in midstream, alone and still, gazing out to sea. She seemed like one whom magic had changed into the likeness of a strange and beautiful seabird.
> --She was alone and still, gazing out to sea; and when she felt his presence and the worship of his eyes, her eyes turned to him in quiet sufferance of his gaze, without shame or wantonness. Long, long she suffered his gaze and then quietly withdrew her eyes from

his and bent them towards the stream, gently stirring the water with her foot hither and thither. The first faint noise of gently moving water broke the silence, low and faint and whispering, faint as the bells of sleep; hither and thither, hither and thither: and a faint flame trembled on her cheek,

--Heavenly God! cried Stephen's soul, in a outburst of profane joy.

--He turned away from her suddenly and set off across the strand. His cheeks were aflame; his body was aglow; his limbs were trembling. On and on and on and on he strode, far out over the sands, singling wildly to the sea, crying to greet the advent of the life that had cried to him.... To live, to err, to fall, to triumph, to recreate life out of life! ... (171-172)

Deborah Pope defends Joyce's choice of creating Stephen's epiphianic moment by arguing that he "commonly uses the language of spirituality and conventional theology to expand and redirect the nature of the emotion intensity occasioned by a secular epiphany" (113).

Stephen asserts that he will "fly by" the nets of nationality, language, and religion" (203) meaning that he believes his decision has been sanctioned. Stephen has left religious and familial territories, the first two concerns in the labyrinth of individuation. Now he faces the third concern: leaving Ireland, his country of birth. He knows that he must leave it "to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience" (253).

Cranley, a commrade of Stephen's in England, continually questions him at every turn about his commitment to his decisions. Stephen echoes Jung's comment that "happiness and contentment, equilibrium of soul and meaningfulness of life--these can be experienced only by the individual" (*Undiscovered*, 112). Stephen becomes angry with Cranley's badgering and strikes out at him:

--Look here Cranley, he said. You have asked me what I would do and what I would not do. I will tell you what I will do and what I will not do. I will not serve that in which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland or my church: and I will try to express myself in some mode of life or art as freely as I can and as wholly as I can, using for my defence the only arms I allow myself to use--silence, exile, and cunning....--And you made me confess to you... the fears that I have. But I will tell you also what I do not fear. I do not fear to be alone or to be spurned for another or to leave whatever I have to leave. And I am not afraid to make a mistake, even a great mistake, a lifelong mistake and perhaps as long as eternity too. (246 & 247)

The audience has participated in Stephen's quest for personal identity. He has decided to reject the call to the priesthood, his family, and even his country to be himself--a poet. He is even willing to deal with the consequences of those decisions. Joyce has spoken in the primordial images, that voice from somewhere that lifted the idea of the individual, and made Stephen's quest for individuation our quest, too. Jung indicates that "a work of art, as well as being symbolic, has its source not in the personal unconsciousness of the poet, but in a sphere of unconscious mythology whose primordial images are the common heritage of mankind (*Man*, 664). What other common heritage does mankind share that transcends time, race, gender, or religion than the search for self-knowledge, individuation?

Works Cited

Campbell, Joseph. "Mythological themes in Creative Literature and Art." *Myths, Dreams & Religion*. Dallas: Spring Publishers, 1970.

Frye, Northrop. *"The Archetypes of Literature." The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 677-685.

Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1985.

Jung, , Carl G. *The Undiscovered Self*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1957.

Jung, Carl G. *Man and His Symbols*. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Jung, Carl G. "On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry." *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 656-676.

Pope, Deborah. "The Misprision of Vision: *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*'." *Modern Critical Views: James Joyce*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986.

Social Criticism and Its Methodology in Cable's *The Grandissimes*

Rodger Wilson
Jackson State University

T*he Grandissimes,* George W. Cable's 1879 novel, embodies two seemingly conflicting traditions. In setting, mood, and treatment of character it functions as an historical romance. But in its portrayal of the human condition as a function of socio-historical and environmental circumstances, *The Grandissimes* veers toward regional and realistic sociology. It derives from Scott; it also springs from Dickens. Its evoking of gallant deeds and lovely ladies, stately mansions and aristocratic mores, the old ideals of chivalry and honor, family and place exemplifies the Cavalier tradition of Southern romance, the school of John Esten Cooke and Thomas Nelson Page. Yet, in his study of New Orleans in 1803-04, significantly at the time of the cession of Louisiana to the United States, Cable attempts also to portray a set of social and civil distinctions based on class, caste, and color, a pattern of arbitrarily defined and rigidly ingrained habits of thought, a codified network of social sentiments, values, and prejudices, all of which relates him to contemporary regional realists, to Mark Twain, Hamlin Garlin, and Joel Chandler Harris, and to his fellow novelist of manners, William Dean Howells. In short, *The Grandissimes* is historical romance and it is also regional and realistic sociology. No study can wholly escape from the book's dualistic structure. The present essay, however, will discuss the latter dimension of the novel, focusing upon Cable's analysis and critique of early nineteenth-century Creole society.

The action of the narrative revolves about two central foci: the long-standing feud inherited from the past between rival families of the Grandissimes and the De Grapions; and, secondly, the relationship between the Grandissimes, "the little Creole capital's proudest and best" (1), and the enslaved race or, more accurately, the quadroon class, those "free in form but slaves in spirit" (196). Cable's basic social critique, therefore, is essentially two-fold: an attack upon the narrow and egotistic concept of honor, that refined pride which tends to perpetuate itself in violence and social discord, that sensitive and excessively self-conscious notion of decorum or propriety which underlies the feuds and rivalries existing among the leading Creole families; and, secondly, an attack upon the whole shibboleth of caste and class. The prevailing emotions presented as motivating much of the novel's action are, therefore, family pride and communal or social guilt.

Cable's instrument for social analysis is the conventional one of the outsider, here the Yankee immigrant, the apothecary Joseph Frowenfeld who, in his "perusal of this newly-found book, the Community of New Orleans" (103), possesses the advantages of detachment and relative objectivity and yet must initially "gasp in an atmosphere of hints, allusions, faint unspoken admissions, ill-concealed antipathies unfinished speeches, mistaken identities, and whisperings of hidden strife" (96). Joseph Frowenfeld is the innocent from abroad who like the Biblical Joseph has entered the land of bondage; his quest of discovery, his moral education is basically an initiation into social awareness. He serves as the conscience of the book, "one who proposed to make no conscious compromise with any sort of evil" (113-14); indeed, from him there emanates with almost rhythmic monotony a perpetual moral throb. He is the "transcendental" apothecary transplanted to the tropics, to a fever-ridden and potentially sinister clime.

One might say that the basic dialectic of the book arises from the tension between Frowenfeld, the man of principles and theories who is inevitably aloft from the existing social scene, and the stratified society which he encounters. This society is essentially personified in Agricola Fusilier: pompous, boastful, arrogant beyond belief, forever asserting as though it were a confession of faith the superiority of Creole culture and society. He is the very incarnation of that narrow and self-defensive concept of honor underlying relations between the privileged families: he desires more than anything to "stand before all creation--the Creator did not make so much difference--in the most exquisitely proper light" (32). Further Agricola functions as the "aged high-priest of a doomed civilization (324), intoning ritualistically the "bottomless iniquity of the doctrine of equal rights (326).

Oscillating between these two poles is Honore Grandissime, the "uttermost flower on the topmost branch of the tallest family tree ever transplanted from France to Louisiana" (82). Honore is the sensitive young man of conscience who is also "so striking an exponent of a unique land and people" (39). It is Honore who is torn between loyalty to family, clan, and community and, on the other hand, recognition of the basic rightness of Frowenfeld's principles, of the essential wrong and injustice upon which his society is founded. He is the enlightened Southerner who while having internalized the principles and propositions of his society yet senses in his inmost heart the basic fallacy that underlies them. Honore's ultimate resolution of this moral dilemma constitutes an essential part of the novel's crisis.

That I have approached Creole social reality through character juxtaposition is due primarily to Cable's own method of presenting and evaluating society. In *The Grandissimes,* while an evaluation of the presented society is at the very center of its purpose, the specifically social scenes of the novel are few and generally unimportant. Society is not so much enacted as it is described; it is more sensed than seen ; it is more discussed than dramatized. Consequently, we are confronted with social reality predominantly through private conversations, particularly through those of the three personages introduced above. It is through the articulation of their thoughts and convictions that the author presents, analyzes, and ultimately condemns the injustices of the existing social order.

Perhaps the most essential series of conversations in *The Grandissimes* insofar as they illustrate social reality, are those between Honore Grandissime and Joseph Frowenfeld. I wish here, for purposes of illustration, briefly to consider two of these discussions.

In the first selected conversation we sense Frowenfeld's moral earnestness and Honore's qualms of conscience. honore informs Joseph that one may, as he does himself, disagree with the tone and manner of a society in theory but one ought not to do so too much in practice:

> "... You cannot afford to be *entirely* different to the community in which you live.... You must get acclimated... in mind--in taste--in conversation--and in convictions too." (37)

To Joseph's protestations Honore adds that his society's convictions do not necessarily have his approval. And Joseph, revealing his youthful naivete and moral seriousness, comments that they ought, indeed, to have his condemnation. Honore replies:

> "... It is not to condemn that you want; you want to succeed.... Your principle is the best, I cannot dispute that. . . . One can condemn--too cautiously--by a kind of--elevated cowardice (I have that fault); but one can only condemn too rashly. . . ." (38)

Yet before parting, in this first interview Honore, in answer to Joseph's moral qualms, acknowledges:

> "I know; you want to say you cannot accept my philosophy and I cannot appreciate yours; but I appreciate it more than you think." (39)

The second conversation between Honore and Joseph is equally crucial in that it reveals both the narrow egotism of Creole pride and the injustice of racial and caste relations. The austerity of Joseph's principles has somewhat alienated from the community, has branded him as an interloper and invader; yet to Honore's statement that Joseph is not "what we call a Louisianian" (151), Joseph replies that his Creole exclusionary "we" does much damage. Honore calmly admits this but the apothecary bitterly responds that the immigrant to be accepted must "surrender himself to the errors and crimes of the community as he finds it" and is "welcome only when he leaves his peculiar opinions behind him" (152). Smiling, Honore tells him that his cousins complain of Joseph's advocating "measures fatal to the prevailing order of society" (152). Joseph, no longer able to restrain himself, erupts:

> "Here is a structure of society defective, dangerous, erected on views of human relations which the world is abandoning as false; yet the immigrant's welcome is modified with the warning not to touch those false foundations with one of his fingers!" (152)

The gentleness of Honore's rebukes reminds Frowenfeld of his own asperity and he suddenly feels humiliated. It is then that Honore leads the apothecary to the crux of the discussion. He states that he assumes Frowenfeld has found the blemishes in the social strata primarily attributable to one major defect. Frowenfeld replies affirmatively, stating that that defect is slavery or more particularly caste (154). Honore agrees, only to confess with an unpleasant laugh the nature of his dilemma:

> "I am but a *dilettante*, whether in politics, in philosophy, morals, or religion. I am afraid to go deeply into anything, lest it should make ruin in my name, my family, my property." (154)

Frowenfeld, the abstract idealist, replies that one ought (ought seeming to be his favorite word) not to neglect a duty (his second favorite) either for "family, property, or society" (154). To this Honore responds but coldly, realizing, as he states elsewhere, that while Joseph has the "easy part--the theorizing" (221), he would have the difficult part of acting and doing.

But this basic presentation of society largely through conversation, and that not in a truly social context, while indeed conveying Cable's essential social criticism emerges ultimately as the major weakness of the book. Too often we do not sufficiently sense or feel the injustice of class and caste distinctions; more frequently we are led only to apprehend them intellectually. We are presented not with situations but with sermons, while the multifarious social details of human intercourse and relations are enshrouded in a didactic mist of abstractions.

This method also, of course, weakens the substantiality, the authenticity of the characters themselves. Frowenfeld, as somewhat indicated in the above conversations, becomes little more than the moral ideals, the social theories of which he is a mouthpiece. Even in visiting the parlor of the charming Nancanou ladies it is not long before we see him once more mounting his hobby horse:

> "But there is a slavery that no legislation can abolish--the slavery of caste.... And what a bondage it is which compels a community, in order to preserve its established tyrannies, to walk behind the rest of the intelligent world! What a bondage is that which incites a people to adopt a system of social and civil distinctions, possessing all the enormities and none of the advantages of those systems which Europe is learning to despise! This system, moreover, is only dept up by a flourish of weapons. We have here what you may call an armed aristocracy." (143)

Admittedly this is quite heavy philosophy for the petite dimensions of a lady's parlor.

Frowenfeld becomes, in short an abstraction himself. His very ideas, his very outlook upon society not only alienate him from that society but actually threaten to sever him from life itself. Frowenfeld never actually does escape from his intellectualizations, from his ivory tower of theories and ideals. Cable, perhaps unwittingly, has Frowenfeld blush eleven times in the course of the novel: he literally stifles in his acute self-consciousness and never really is presented as responding genuinely, passionately to another human being.

If Frowenfeld is reduced to his moral ideals, Agricola Fusilier can equally be reduced to his prejudices. While Frowenfeld is valuable only insofar as he negates the existing social realm, Agricola's validity lies only in his affirming it. But, as would be expected, he affirms or exemplifies it not primarily in deeds but in words. It is interesting that those deeds attributed to him such as his duel with Aurore De Grapion's husband over a point of honor or his harsh treatment of the enslaved African king, Bras Coupe, or his contemptuous and dehumanizing attitude toward the quadroon class are all placed in the past before the story's present action actually begins. We repeatedly hear Agricola expound the virtues and advantages of the system and caste:

> *The--man--makes--the--crime!* The wisdom of mankind never brought forth a maxim of more gigantic beauty. If the different grades of race and society did not have corresponding moral and civil liberties, varying in degree as they vary--h-why! *this* community, at least, would go to pieces!" (227)

And again:

> "Beware, my son, of the doctrine of equal rights--a bottomless iniquity. Master and man--arch and pier--arch above--pier below." (326)

In short, Cable's presentation of principle precedes and ultimately usurps his portrayal of personality; we are made aware of the blemishes of society without however sensing its life. In *The Grandissimes* character is used to reveal society but not to manifest or embody it.

That Honore functions as a principal exception of this is natural: he neither wholly personifies social reality (its ideals and prejudices) nor absolutely negates it. That Honore embodies a curious admixture of principle and prejudice, that he can perceive no course that combines justice with expediency, that he indeed acts, as he admits, with "no strength of will; no clearness of purpose; no emphatic decision" (248) tends to redeem him from both exotic romanticism and realistic sociology, tends to invest him with life and humanity. Unlike Frowenfeld, Honore is in

society; unlike Agricola, he is not absolutely of it. And unlike both of them, he ultimately acts. His restitution of the Faure plantation to the De Grapion ladies, ending the age-long rivalry between the two families, and his elevation of his quadroon half-brother to co-partnership in his merchant house, recognizing thereby the latter's humanity and their essential common brotherhood, mark the crises of the book. In short, Honore emerges as the most substantial white character in *The Grandissimes.*

But what primarily tends to redeem or at least to lessen the author's basic failings in characterization is his portrayal of Palmyre Philosophe, the quadroon woman who is inspired by a hopeless love for Honore and an equally obsessive hatred for Agricola. She alone in the novel emerges as a unique personage, a flesh and blood reality, and yet personifies also her particular social caste, those who, as Frowenfeld states, "are the saddest slaves of all," those who "for a paltry bait of sham freedom have consented to endure a tyrannous contumely which flattens them into the dirt like grass under a slab" (195-96). She as an individual defines her caste as her caste invests her with individuality. Palmyre is the dark-haired passionate lady of romance who "had stood all her life with dagger drawn, on the defensive against what certainly was to her an unmerciful world" (135), secretly harboring thoughts of vengeance and insurrection towards an "exalted race, three-fourths of whose blood bequeathed her none of its prerogatives" (135). Analogously, he caste, long held in abeyance, despised yet also feared, is a veritable "monument of the shame of two races" (134). Indeed, Cable seems on occasion somewhat unnerved in his having imagined a woman such as she:

> That barbaric beauty which had begun to bud twenty years before was not in perfect bloom. The united grace and pride of her movement was inspiring but--what shall we say?--feline? It was a femininity without humanity,--something that made her with all her superbness, a creature that one would want to find chained. (71)

Yet if Palmyre is not quite humane, it is her very animality which nonetheless renders her human. Socially, Palmyre embodies in her earthiness that "shadow of the Ethiopian" (156) which darkens Creole society and constitutes the essence of its social and moral mistake. Individually, her earthiness is antithetical not only to Agricola's defense mechanisms and the basic ethereality of the white Nancanou ladies, but to Frowenfeld's abstractions as well. Indeed, pleading deeply with Joseph to make Honore love her, Palmyre comes closer than any to plunging Frowenfeld out of his transcendental tower into the tormenting experiential dilemmas of the social order upon which he so cleverly expounds:

> However harmless or healthful Joseph's touch might be to the Philosophe, he felt now that hers, to him, was poisonous. He dared

> encounter her eyes, her touch, her voice, no longer. The better man in him was suffocating. He scarce had power left to liberate his right hand with his left, to seize his hat and go. (201)

Had Joseph responded with more positive feeling to Palmyre's sensuality, to the warm yet suppressed blood-life her caste represents, one might be able to sympathize more immediately with his ideals and platitudes; rather, his compassion, his sympathy is purely intellectual, "transcendental." Indeed, it is Palmyre's earthiness and warmth that embody and thus illuminate, more than Frowenfeld's ideals, more perhaps than even Honore's actions, the basic injustice of the society of *The Grandissimes*, namely, the fallacy of the ruling class's defensive, narrowly egotistic, hyper-sensitive concept of honor and the wickedness of its system of caste and class.

In summary, by suggesting the socio-historical reality operative in *The Grandissimes* I have basically concentrated upon Cable's own analysis and critique of early nineteenth century Creole society, his conversation-centered yet virtually asocial mode of presenting that critique, and the serious flaw which seems consequently to attend it, both in individual characterization and in his characterization of the social matrix itself. That flaw, as has been seen, is that society is abstracted or etherealized, is detached from those multitudinous details that constitute its life and being; and worse still, character, while serving to reveal a society which the author should have permitted to reveal itself, inclines too frequently toward stereotype or abstraction.

Work Cited

Cable, George W. *The Grandissimes*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1957.