



Criterion: A Journal of Literary Criticism

Volume 13
Issue 1 *Winter*

Article 1

4-2020

Full Issue Winter 2020

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/criterion>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

(2020) "Full Issue Winter 2020," *Criterion: A Journal of Literary Criticism*: Vol. 13 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/criterion/vol13/iss1/1>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Criterion: A Journal of Literary Criticism* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

CRITERION

A JOURNAL OF LITERARY CRITICISM

CRITERION

A JOURNAL OF LITERARY CRITICISM

"If you compare several representative passages of the greatest poetry you see how great is the variety of types of combination, and also how completely any semi-ethical criterion of 'sublimity' misses the mark. For it is not the 'greatness,' the intensity, of the emotions, the components, but the intensity of the artistic process, the pressure, so to speak, under which the fusion takes place, that counts."

❖ T. S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent"

Criterion is published by the BYU Department of English. The contents represent the opinions and beliefs of the authors and not necessarily those of the editors, staff, advisors, Brigham Young University, or its sponsoring institution, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. See scholarsarchive.byu.edu/criterion for more information.

© Copyright 2020 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or others, without written permission of the publisher.

Printed by Brigham Young University Press. Provo, Utah, USA.

Cover art by Alexandra Malouf; design by Heather Bergeson.

CRITERION

A JOURNAL OF LITERARY CRITICISM

Staff

Editor-in-Chief

Heather Bergeson

Managing Editors

Abby Clayton

Michela Miller Dickson

Faculty Advisor

Michael Taylor

Editors

Annie Wood

Christian Bowcutt

Abby Christensen

Chayla Cryder

Sariah Fales

Ana Gabriela

Holly Gerber

Holly Harrington

Kelsey Jennings

Ryleigh Jensen

Marlee Jeppsen

Hannah Johnson

Natalie Jones

Ethan McGinty

Chelsea McNeil

Leah Kelson Parks

Kenna Pierce

Angela Ricks

Kristen Schumann

Alex Slansky

Rachel Teixeira

Kristen Tejera

Fay Walker

Contents

- ii Editor's Note
- 5 Ireland in Double Vision
The Allegory of Seamus Heaney's "Come to the Bower"
Janaya Tanner
- 15 Anne Frank in Translation
Emily Cluff
- 27 Clichéd Language and Commonplace Faith
Gavin Wride
- 37 "SHE WAS NEVER PROPERTY"
The Underground Railroad and John Locke's Labor Theory of Property
Samuel Christensen
- 51 Man-maid Merchant
Rebellion and Otherness in Shakespeare's *Othello* and *Merchant of Venice*
Taylor Flickinger
- 61 The Mosaic of Aesthetics
The Manifestation of Clive Bell's and Roger Fry's Aesthetic Theories in
The Waves
Nina Katarina Štular

73

On Waiters and Writers

Views of Authorship in Charles Dickens's "Somebody's Luggage"

Michela Miller Dickson

83

Torn by Tension

Modernism in Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence*

Kathryn Taylor

93

Zitkala-Ša and the Holistic God

Redefining American Spirituality in "The Great Spirit"

Jared Brockbank

103

Curing Beauty's Stockholm Syndrome

Erin Lee

117

Andersen vs. Schaffert

Mermaids as a Symbol for Experience's Relationship to Gender

Krista Butts

127

Peter, Pan, and Persephone

Keepers of the Mythical Wild

Noelle Conder

Editor's Note

I want to take this opportunity to express sincere gratitude for the *Criterion* staff and for the excellent work they have contributed to the development of this issue. *Criterion: A Journal of Literary Criticism* is a student-run journal associated with the English Department at Brigham Young University. As a journal, we give our volunteers hands-on editing experience as we strive to produce quality articles for our readers. I can say with confidence that, through the invaluable efforts of the staff, we have produced a remarkable issue for our readers. *Criterion* functions entirely through the commitment of our volunteer editors, who stepped up to the challenge when COVID-19 forced them to work on this issue remotely. Everyone showed great determination to make sure that this issue was a success. Our staff has worked tirelessly through an extensive editing and design process, and, with that in mind, we are proud to present the Winter 2020 issue of *Criterion*.

The papers included in this issue were selected out of dozens of submissions for their unique themes and impressive conclusions. The forum prompt of this issue is fairytale and folklore adaptations, and the last three articles in this issue came to us in response to that call. Many thanks to our authors, who have devoted so much of their time to the editing process and have allowed us to publish their work. Authors revised rigorously to bring their pieces to this present state, and their intellectual engagement remains the force fueling this critical endeavor. We are truly excited to present a dynamic collection of articles that examine literary works ranging from

Native American literature to the folktales that many of us learned to love as children.

It is difficult to express the full extent of our gratitude to all those affiliated with this issue, but we would especially like to thank our faculty advisor, Dr. Mike Taylor, for his continued interest in and support of *Criterion*. Dr. Taylor has provided formative advice and guidance, and we could not have created such a quality journal without his direction. Finally, we want to thank Brigham Young University and the BYU English Department for their continued support. We sincerely hope you enjoy this issue of *Criterion*.

Heather Bergeson

Ireland in Double Vision

The Allegory of Seamus Heaney's "Come to the Bower"

Janaya Tanner

The world-renowned Irish poet Seamus Heaney (1939–2013), born in Northern Ireland shortly before World War II, deeply infused his poetry with his homeland. Heaney grew up Catholic on a peat farm in Northern Ireland and frequently faced bitter sentiments and prejudices throughout his childhood and adult life. He felt torn between various identities and opinions of himself, his neighbors, and Ireland itself. Heaney said, “Every day on my road to and from school I crossed and recrossed the Sluggan, and every time my sense of living on two sides of a boundary was emphasized. I never felt the certitude of belonging completely in one place” (qtd. in Russell 7). This feeling deepened later in the 1960s when the Irish Troubles broke out. The vicious fighting, which nearly became a civil war, was fought largely between Irish Catholics (who were Nationalists and wanted to separate from Great Britain to join the recently independent Republic of Ireland) and the Protestant Unionists (who desired to remain part of the United Kingdom). Feelings of prejudice and discontent quickly escalated to bombings, the deployment of British troops, and violent terrorist acts that lasted into the early 2000s. Heaney said of this time that “the stakes were being raised to deadlier levels all the time . . . People you knew [were] getting killed either by accident or at random or by deliberate targeting” (Heaney qtd. in Russell 44). With such chaos in his homeland, Heaney turned

to writing about the bog bodies—those upheaved from “the black maw / of the peat”—seeking for a way to respond and understand in the midst of all the violence and chaos (“Come to the Bower” 7–8).

Given Heaney’s childhood and heritage of peat farmers, it is no wonder these bogs became a staple in many of his works as a place of history, horror, heritage, and hope. When Heaney spoke of the bogs of his home, he said, “It is as if I am betrothed to them, and I believe my betrothal happened one summer evening, thirty years ago, when another boy and myself stripped to the whit and bathed in a moss-hole . . . we dressed again and went home in our wet clothes . . . somehow initiated” (*Preoccupations* 19). These experiences prepared Heaney to voice the complexity of the heightening issues that would come to a head in his early adult life. In 1975, Heaney moved his family from Belfast, a city in the thick of the North Ireland Troubles, to the Republic of Ireland, where he published *North*, his most political collection of poetry yet. *North* contains a set of poems often referred to as the “bog poems,” in which Heaney attempts to use the medium of the bog to explore and explain the complicated feelings, perspectives, and motivations clashing in the tense atmosphere of Ireland in the late 20th century. In this particular poem, however, Heaney “see[s] things double” (Hart 388). This double vision refers to the ability to see and express that sight in more than one way or with more than one meaning at one time. In this paper, I will explore how “Come to the Bower,” one of several overlooked bog poems, expresses this double vision through allegory. Heaney is able to tell the story of the ancient Irish tribes while also addressing Irish Republic nationalism and the simmering sentiments of post-colonialism. Each layer of the story washes over the reader, creating an immersive experience with the feelings of the time. In “Come to the Bower,” contradicting ideas coexist: the strong-willed Mother Ireland and the raped victim, the brutal imperial colonizer and the beloved Irish son. Heaney blends these views simultaneously throughout this multi-layered allegory that looks deeply into the complexity of the Irish past and present.

As with all allegories, the poem “Come to the Bower” is, at its simplest layer, a story. It is told in the first person as the speaker makes his way through “sweet briar and tangled vetch” in order to find “the dark-bowered queen” who “is waiting” (Heaney 2, 5, 7). She has been pinned down into the “black maw / of the peat” with “sharpened willow.” When the speaker finds her, he “withdraws gently” her bindings and slowly begins unwrapping her,

observing her skull, her hair, her throat etc. (7–9). Presumably because of the digging the man has done to reach the body a “spring water / starts to rise around her” and the speaker reaches “past / the riverbed’s washed / dream of gold to the bullion / of her Venus bone,” to the prize (Heaney 15–16, 17–20).

This simple, surface-level story has its roots deep in the ancient past of Northern Europe and in the violence of those ancient people. Some time before writing *North*, Heaney discovered *The Bog People: Iron-Age Man Preserved* by P.V. Glob. The book is about a collection of bodies that have been uncannily preserved and then dug up from peat bogs. Glob theorizes about the lives and causes of deaths of these individuals, and his writings inspired many of Heaney’s bog poems. In fact, “Come to the Bower” has its roots in the tale of a body found in 1835 by ditch diggers on the ancient estate of Haraldskjaer in Denmark. The body, pinned down with willow sticks, was declared to be the ancient Norse Queen Gunhild, “the cruel consort of King Erik Bloodaxe” (Glob 74). Though the theory has since been disproved, it strongly influenced Seamus Heaney’s description of the “dark bowered queen” (Heaney, “Come to the Bower” 5–6). When this body was discovered, “it was deduced that the woman had met a violent death and had been pinned down into the bog alive” (Glob 77). About this strange death, a local publication in *Light Reading for the Danish Public* read, “Every countryman will immediately recognize in this corpse the body of someone who when living was regarded as a witch and whom it was intended to prevent from walking again after death” (qtd. in Glob 76).

Despite the violent end and supernatural fear that interred this dark-bowered queen, when the speaker unpins her, the “sharpened willow / withdraws gently” (Heaney, “Come to the Bower” 8–9). We discover a layer of depth in the allegory as the speaker digging through the peat has now dug through time and discovered an object of the past, a person once of great power and fear, a witch in her time, yet only a dead shriveled body in ours. He “unwrap[s] skins,” and there is no tone of fear or apprehension in this discovery; rather, all this is looked past for the greater treasure of “the bullion / of her Venus bone” that is reached for by the speaker (10, 19–20). Though those in the past were terrified of the return of this woman, the poem’s speaker willingly frees her. Heaney approaches the horrors of the past with affection, great care, and reverence. These horrors have been buried in the ground for hundreds of years, and as a pearl forms by being compressed

in an oyster, this ancient body has formed “bullion.” Bullion is defined as “precious metal in the mass,” or more specifically, “solid gold or silver (as opposed to mere show imitations)” (“Bullion”). It is also important to note that this great treasure is attributed to be “of her Venus bone,” evoking imagery of the female genitals through which humans are brought into the world (Heaney, “Come to the Bower” 20). This becomes significant when considering other layers of the dark-bowered queen, such as Mother Ireland. Whoever this woman represents, instead of her “Venus bone” producing life, it has produced a treasure or become a treasure itself from the long years smothered in the earth. Does Heaney intend for this treasure to be indicative of hope for the future of Ireland if they too bury their violence? Or does he mean it to represent a malicious release of a gift from the past, a gift of violence that would then continue the bloody cycle? Here we see evidence of Heaney’s double vision, showing the past as offering both peace and violence, leading us further into the allegory as we seek to immerse ourselves in the complicated story Heaney has woven.

The introduction of the bullion at the end of the story complicates the seemingly benevolent intentions of the speaker. This introduces a new layer of the allegory, shifting from the ancient Norse queen to imperial England, and exploring how the imperialist Speaker interacts with and treats the colonized and the dark-bowered queen: Mother Ireland. In particular, the moment of the “dark-bowered queen” being unwrapped evokes imagery of the imperialist conquerors of England and the common trope of the English rape of Ireland. When read through this lens, the speaker of the poem resembles “the typical conqueror, like Raleigh in ‘Ocean’s Love to Ireland,’ who reaches for sex and gold with the same fist” (Hart 404). Yet, “Heaney speaks for and against the imperial colonizer, whose economic dreams are sexual as well as deadly . . . Heaney sees the difference in their political stances as difference in sexual preferences. One prefers sexual immolation, the other economic and physical rape” (405). In this light, the treatment of the bog body is morally reprehensible, as Heaney describes the relationship of the imperialism and patriarchy England wields over Ireland, who is, in both cases, the victim.

However, in recalling Heaney’s own personal connection to the land and the seemingly gentle nature of the speaker, another layer of the allegory must be considered: Mother Ireland as an active participant and driving force of her unearthing. “My hands come,” rings out the first line of “Come to the

Bower" (Heaney 1). The speaker of the poem describes his hands as "touched / by sweet briar and tangled vetch," already intimately connected with the land and not a foreigner to it (2). These hands are his primary instrument in interacting with the "dark-bowered queen" and other elements of the poem. His hands are "foraging," "to where the dark-bowered queen . . . is waiting" (3, 5, 7). They "unpin", "unwrap", and "reach" confidently and unafraid (7, 10, 17). This view of their relationship is described by Karen Moloney who does not see the "dark-bowered queen," or Mother Ireland, as the victim, but rather, as an active participant and the driving force in her unearthing: "The narrator of 'Come to the Bower' moves slowly, gently: he will undress the body of his loved one in nearly venerative awe, a loving prelude to actual lovemaking. Even the poem's first line signals that what occurs in this bower will be no rape" (117). The interactions between the speaker and the bog queen are mutual and positive. The speaker has accepted the invitation extended to him to "come to the bower," and his show of genuine love to the bog body acts "as a powerful antidote to the arrogance that propelled . . . [English] . . . imperialists" (125). This is an awakening or reviving of Ireland rather than a retelling of its rape and ravaging; "Others before him may have valued the peat for its yield of priceless artifacts, or panned its streams for gold, but this narrator has come here as a lover; the bullion he values is the Venus bone of a woman beloved" (124). Throughout her article, Moloney compares the poem to the tale of Sleeping Beauty and the speaker to "the rescuer of Sleeping Beauty, [who] is . . . given right-of-way by the flowers themselves . . . The gesture suggests that the natural world endorses what transpires here" (119). This view of "Come to the Bower" paints a strong Mother Ireland. She is no longer a helpless victim being violated and robbed. Instead, she is finally ready to arise and be released by the speaker whom she has beckoned to her bower.

Heaney, however, does not content himself with only layering the ancient and imperial pasts. He also laces his story with the allegory of a modern-day revolution. The title "Come to the Bower" relates directly to the similarly titled patriotic Irish song, "Will You Come to the Bower?" This song gained popularity in the early nineteenth century, serving as a call to native Irishmen who had fled to other countries to return home and fight for Irish independence from Great Britain ("Will"). Though such independence did not come until the early twentieth century, when the Republic of Ireland officially formed, both the poem and the song carry strong connotations of

an awakening Irish identity. Heaney himself described “a newfound pride in our own places that flourished suddenly in the late nineteenth century and resulted in a new literature, a revived interest in folklore, a movement to revive the Irish language, and in general a determination to found or refound a native tradition” (*Preoccupations* 134–35). This revival of Irish pride carried with it an undertone of the Irish Republican nationalism that drove many to desire to break from Great Britain and formed a major part of the political attitude during the Irish Troubles. Both the song and the poem invite people to come to their homeland, using the synecdoche of the bower to represent Ireland. Reading the poem with this lens paints the “dark-bowered queen” not as a mere dead body nor an ancient witch of violence, but rather as a personification of Mother Ireland herself. In the song, those being called are asked, “Will you come and awake our dear land from its slumber / And her fetters we’ll break, links that long have encumbered” (Irish Music Daily). These lyrics call for the very action taken by the speaker of the poem: coming to the bower to release and awaken the “dark-bowered queen” from her long slumber. The lyrics also portray similar intimations of violence and nationalistic sentiments as those that lace Heaney’s “Come to the Bower.”

Not surprisingly, Heaney associated all bog bodies and their unknown pasts with an Irish Republican symbolism. When speaking of the religious beliefs that were thought to have led to the sacrificial deaths of the bog people, he said that “in many ways, the fury of Irish republicanism is associated with a religion like this . . . I think that the Republican ethos is a feminine religion, in a way. It seems to me that there are satisfactory imaginative parallels between this religion and time and our own time” (qtd. in Hart 403). In one aspect, this bog queen represents the bogs, or Mother Ireland, beckoning the speaker to come to her bed chamber. However, the symbolism is deeper than a mere invitation to discover and lie with the land; the alluring call also references the ancient goddesses—especially the goddess of fertility—to whom sacrifices were performed during the Iron Age. These ancient religious traditions seemed all too fitting a comparison to modern Ireland; for although the Irish Troubles outwardly focused on political ends, the battle raged mainly along religious and ancestral divides. Ireland had long lived with its own double vision, with people of different nationalities and religions coexisting, and these juxtapositions often brought strife. Heaney himself saw and felt this double vision in his childhood as he crossed the Slughorn. The double vision and simultaneous complexities held as one in

“Come to the Bower” are not a mere literary tool, but rather an attempt by Heaney to more accurately portray the multiple identities of Irish life.

Heaney’s *North*, the collection of poetry that “Come to the Bower” first appeared in, has generated large amounts of critical conversation, with many seeking to identify Heaney’s opinion of the political upheaval of the time. Though critics of Heaney have never fully identified this double vision in “Come to the Bower,” they have sensed the intense contradictions it holds, and many have attempted to settle definitively which side of the political battle Heaney was advocating for. Most critics limit their discussion of “Come to the Bower” to a few horrified or disgusted sentences on the grotesque sexualization and quasi-necrophiliac action of the poem (Alexander, Hart, King). Others note the blatant undertones of Irish Nationalism and accuse Heaney of celebrating the Irish Nationalists and extremists, giving them the same reverence and purpose that are bestowed upon religious sacrifices (Alexander 22, Hart 404). However, while these accuse Heaney of allowing his own Catholic background and personal Republican sentiments to give a very one-sided view and solution, other critics believe that Heaney remains politically neutral. They argue that he seeks to show and discuss violence and religious motives but not give his opinion on what political course of action Ireland ought to take (King 100, Hart 388). These critics can sense the contradiction and complexity of “Come to the Bower,” and some have even directly identified Heaney’s sense of double vision and how this helps “comprehend and convey the underlying causes and nature of the Irish conflict” (Foley, Hart). Notwithstanding, none have sought yet to explore how Heaney uses allegory to convey this double vision, nor explored the many layers of the allegory itself. Instead of having one simple intention or purpose, “Come to the Bower” describes the violence from a neutral perspective while also giving voice to potential causes of the violence and thus displaying the call of action from the feminine republican ethos.

This feminine republican ethos or the “dark-bowered queen”—who is either the revolution’s sacrifice-seeking goddess or the raped Mother Ireland—has been long buried in the ground, and the suffering she has seen has turned her “Venus bone” to gold. The bog is what connected Heaney to Ireland, so it’s no surprise that he used the symbolism of bog bodies frequently to show the horrible violence committed to Ireland and by Irishmen, yet the bogs are a unifying factor for him in this divisive battle occurring in his homeland. They are neutral territory upon which he can

speak and address both sides and express his “double vision.” In “Come to the Bower,” we find a characterization of Heaney’s homeland that gives an in-depth insight into the complicated situation in Ireland. This bower is a place where the victim can be both sacrifice and hero; there is power and powerlessness, rage and hope conveyed in these lines. The simultaneous contradictions of this poem are uncomfortable for many readers, and while most chalk it up to the apparent necrophilia that occurs, the fact is that contradictions are uncomfortable. The use of allegory gives Heaney mobility to address multiple, complex topics with a simple image. It allows the poem to be continually interpreted and applied. Poetry in its fluid ability to convey multiple meanings at once allows for an immersive experience into the emotions and events discussed as Heaney searches for an understanding of or a hope for the eventual end of violence.

As Heaney strives to portray multiple facets of Irish history, from long-buried bog bodies to the Irish Troubles, he stands upon metaphorical ground that seeks to blend the jarring differences found in the real world. Just as in “Come to the Bower,” the events that fill our lives are complex and built off long histories and differing emotions. Often, we see with “double vision,” viewing contradicting sides of an issue, experiencing conflicting emotions, and holding such contradictions simultaneously inside ourselves. In Ireland, such an intense coexistence of contradiction spurred violent actions and reactions. We are left to question if this double vision within our lives represents part of the problem or part of the solution. Does holding opposing views at once inherently bring conflict, or does it represent the beginning of healing and hope? The bogs may be neutral territory for Heaney’s words, but neutral does not mean free of danger. We must remember there are both benefits and dangers to seeing with double vision as we seek our own neutral territories upon which to explore the arising complex issues of our own lives.

Works Cited

- Alexander, Stephanie. "Femme Fatale: The Violent Feminine Pastoral of Seamus Heaney's North." *Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2016, pp 219–235.
- Foley, Andrew. "'Befitting Emblems of Adversity': The Bog Poems of Seamus Heaney." *English Studies in Africa*, 41.1, 1998, 61–75.
- Glob, P. V. *The Bog People: Iron-Age Man Preserved*. New York Review Books, New York, 2004.
- Haffenden, John. "Seamus Heaney and the Feminine Sensibility." *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 17, 1987, pp. 89–116.
- Hakkioglu, Mümin. Parlak, Erdinç. "From Antaeus to the Bog Queen: Mythological Allusions in Seamus Heaney's North." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, vol.17, no. 2, 2013, pp. 105–18.
- Hart, Henry. "History, Myth, and Apocalypse in Seamus Heaney's North". *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1989, 387–411.
- Heaney, Seamus. "Come to the Bower." *North*, Faber and Faber, 1975, p. 24.
- . *Preoccupations: Selected Prose*. Faber and Faber, 1980.
- King, Carla. "Of Bogs, Bodies and Sagas . . ." *Hearing Heaney: The Sixth Seamus Heaney Lectures*, Four Courts Press, 2015, pp. 93–110.
- Meredith, Dianne. "Landscape or Mindscape? Seamus Heaney's Bogs." *Irish Geography*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1999, pp. 126–134. Taylor & Francis Online.
- Moloney, Karen. *Seamus Heaney and the Emblems of Hope*. University of Missouri Press, 2007, pp. 108–25.
- "Bullion." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, 2002. Web.
- Russell, Richard Rankin. *Seamus Heaney: An Introduction*. Edinburgh UP, 2016.
- "Will You Come to the Bower?" Irish Music Daily, 16 Apr. 2015, www.irishmusicdaily.com/will-you-come-to-the-bower.

Anne Frank in Translation

Emily Cluff

The Diary of Anne Frank is arguably one of the best-known Holocaust texts in the world. Since its initial publication in Dutch in 1947 under the title *Het Achterhuis*, the text has been translated into over seventy languages, has sold more than twenty million copies, has been adapted into both film and stage productions, and has been taught in hundreds of schools. Surprisingly, despite its significant cultural presence in the United States, only three complete and published translations of Anne Frank's diary exist in the English language. Barbara Mooyaart-Doubleday first brought it into the English language in 1952, and her translation stood alone for forty-three years before a new translation came forward. In 1995, Susan Massotty translated an expanded version of the text, and the critical edition of the text appeared in English in 2003. However, to call the critical edition its own translation is arguable as Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation is primarily used, Massotty's translation fills in where Mooyaart-Doubleday had not translated, and the translator Arnold J. Pomerans translated only the material that appeared in neither Mooyaart-Doubleday's nor Massotty's translation.

These translations each have their own rich histories, praises, and criticisms, and many scholars have debated the editorial choices made in each regarding the translator's choice of "original" text material from which to translate. In recent years, critics have attacked Mooyaart-Doubleday's

translation for not being an accurate portrayal of the diary. However, despite this criticism, few critics have gone beyond the editorial choices to analyze the translations of the text themselves. What they have said focuses more on the potential of the diary's story to appeal to broad audiences in translation rather than on any direct comparison between the source text and the translated text. This paper seeks to rectify this oversight by analyzing the original publication of *Het Achterhuis* and Mooyart-Doubleday's translation of it in her 1952 publication of *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl*. In doing so, I will show that the question of the source text is not the most important issue at hand when analyzing Mooyart-Doubleday's translation because the problems of the translation extend beyond the choice of source text to the translation itself —particularly due to the ways in which the text has been used since its publication. However, despite the problematic nature of the text, I additionally argue that the translation has particular strengths, especially for the time period in which it was published, and that these strengths have been positively vital for the perpetuation and longevity of the text in both national and worldwide spheres.

The success of this argument depends upon a firm understanding of the complex issues regarding the publication and translation of the text; therefore, this paper will begin with a discussion of the cultural and historical issues at play in the translation of Anne's writings in light of Karen Emmerich's ideas regarding the instability of an original. Afterwards, it will engage with the critical conversation regarding the text by conducting a direct text-to-text comparison of key passages in order to analyze both the weaknesses and strengths of Mooyart-Doubleday's translation. Finally, it will engage with André Lefevere's theory of refraction in order to culminate with an argument for the necessity of Mooyart-Doubleday's translation, despite the translation's problematic nature.

In the translation of *Anne Frank*, the question of what constitutes the original is a complicated one because three versions of the so-called original exist in Dutch. However, to set any of the texts as the hierarchical original is both unnecessary and unhelpful. Translation scholar Karen Emmerich makes the following claims about the instability of the original when translating from a source text:

When it comes to translation, we often revert to rhetoric that suggests that the changes supposedly wrought by translation are inflicted upon an otherwise stable source . . . but the "source," the presumed object of

translation, is not a stable ideal, not an inert gas but a volatile compound that experiences continual textual reconfigurations . . . The textual condition is one of variance, not stability. (2)

This instability proves particularly true in the case of Anne Frank's writings, a complicated issue which I will discuss in greater detail below. However, as Emmerich suggests, to take any version as an authoritative "original" is to ignore the variable nature of the text. Both the author and editors of the various versions of Anne Frank's writing created each version of the text with a different purpose in mind and in a variable set of circumstances with which the text naturally reacted. With this in mind, I will lay out the circumstances and purposes surrounding each individual version in order to demonstrate the instability of the original and to lay a foundation for a discussion of Mooyart-Doubleday's translation choices.

The first version of Anne Frank's diary was never intended as a literary work or a novel written for an audience, making the question of its authority as a potential original more difficult. Perhaps the most frequently told story of Anne Frank's diary is that on June 12, 1942, Anne received a diary with a red and white checkered cover for her birthday, and on that day, she began to write. This story is true, and in fact, she wrote enough to fill that initial diary along with two more exercise books; however, those who read the "diary of Anne Frank" and assume that they are reading the writings found in those books are likely incorrect. Historians and critics now refer to these writings, or the actual diary of Anne Frank, as the *a* text.¹ This edition appears in English only in the revised critical edition of the text, a text which compares the *a*, *b*, and *c* texts critically rather than attempting a literary translation. No translator has ever brought the *a* text—arguably the most valuable as a historical document—into the English language as its own published text.

Although the *a* text represents Anne's initial writings, the *b* text presents another viable option for a source text. On March 29, 1944, Anne records in her diary that she heard a newscaster say that "they ought to make a collection of diaries and letters after the war" (*Critical Edition* 600).² Upon hearing this announcement, Anne began to imagine her diary as a larger literary project. By May of that year, Anne "had begun reworking her earlier entries, now

¹ Although certain critics and historians assign various names to the three text, this paper follows the lead of the general scholarship in referring to the texts as *a*, *b*, and *c*.

² All quotations taken from the diary for historical purposes rather than an analysis of translation are taken from the *a* text found in the revised critical edition.

writing on loose sheets of paper. In fact, Anne had already transformed some of her entries into literary pieces” (Shandler 28). This draft of her “diary” was no longer mere journal accounts of her daily life—she had become an editor of her own life story, revising in the interest of a more engaging plot, refining her style for a cohesive feel throughout the entries, and striving to give her work historical and literary merit. As part of this literary project, she also wrote short fiction pieces about her life in the annex. Assembled together, Anne gave her literary work the title *Het Achterhuis*.³ Due to her imprisonment and subsequent death, she never fully completed her literary revisions. Historians refer to this edited edition as the *b* text. While the *a* text was written first, the *b* text is a potential original in its own right as it represents the original form of Anne’s literary project as opposed to a simple journal. Susan Massotty drew primarily from this text in her translation, and hers is the only translation of it found in English, as the revised critical edition relied on her translation of the text.

The first publication of Anne Frank’s writing in both Dutch and English came from the *c* text, and this is the text from which Barbara Mooyaart-Doubleday translated. After Anne’s death, her father, Otto Frank, gathered her writings and eventually sought to publish them. In doing so, he integrated entries from both the original *a* text and the revised *b* text into a single work. Furthermore, he “incorporated some of Anne’s short prose pieces inspired by her life in hiding that were not part of either diary manuscript,” and he famously removed material that he deemed “either extraneous or offensive to the memories of the others who had hidden in the Annex” (Shandler 30). He published the book in 1947 under Anne’s chosen literary title, *Het Achterhuis*, but the English translation, published five years later, was released under the title *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl*. Although English readers for years took this translation of the *c* text as the authoritative diary of Anne Frank, it is a highly edited text—first by Anne, later by Otto, and, for readers who do not read Dutch, finally by a translator.

This understanding of the three potential “original” texts is important because much of the debate regarding translations and publications of Anne Frank’s writings centers around the necessity of choosing the “correct” original. The question is not simple. If historical accuracy is the goal (and schools for years have taught Anne Frank’s diary as a historical text), then

³ The most literal translation of the title is *The House Behind*; however, translators have consistently translated it more loosely as *The Secret Annex*.

the *a* text is likely the most factually accurate as it is the only unrevised text. However, Anne wrote the *b* text with the intent of creating something of historical and literary merit for future generations, thus the history is at times better explained, and it is the most accurate representation of Anne's own wishes in regards to her work. Of the three texts, the *c* text is the most widely published, yet critics have raised the most attacks against this text, arguing everything from the dangers of editing history to what they find the problematic presence of positive themes in a Holocaust text. However, as Emmerich argues, no source text is truly stable, thus debating which text should rightly be taken as a source text is ultimately an exercise in the irresolvable. I acknowledge the problems of the *c* text—problems made more controversial by the fact that it is now regarded as an authoritative version. However, rather than bemoan that fact and seek for an imaginary “true original,” I seek instead to evaluate the text on its own terms.

As a whole, Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation must be evaluated in light of her own goals as a translator, and by this standard, her translation performs well. Mooyaart-Doubleday was not trained as a translator, and she had never translated anything before taking on the Anne Frank project (van der Linde 1). Due to this lack of background and training, she did not have any theoretical praxis for her translation; in fact, she gave no stated *skopos* of her own for her translation project. She was hired based off a writing sample that demonstrated what Otto Frank called “haar levendige, frisse stijl, die volgens hem het beste paste bij Anne” [her lively, fresh style that, according to him, best matched Anne] (van der Linde 1).⁴ He and the publishers hoped that Mooyaart-Doubleday would carry this tone throughout and thereby produce a sellable text that would accurately represent Anne's style. No critics have debated whether or not Mooyaart-Doubleday accomplishes this praxis, perhaps partly because one cannot argue with the fact that she produced a sellable text, nor can one argue with the fact that numerous schools have deemed her tone and story appropriate for school children.

Questions of source text aside, Mooyaart-Doubleday succeeds quite well in her goal of capturing a lively tone, even in difficult situations. At times, Anne Frank playfully comments on the imperfect Dutch of the adults she was hiding with. In doing so, she both intersperses German words in their dialogue and adjusts the spelling of the Dutch to indicate an accent

⁴ Unless otherwise noted, all back translations are my own.

or pronunciation mistakes. Critic Simone Schroth notes that these “affected passages can be described as a challenge regardless of the target language” and further adds that many translators “do not attempt to represent the effect at all” (239). In one example of this, Anne changes the spelling of *uitstekend* [outstanding] to “oitschtekent” to indicate the incorrect vowel pronunciation and the insertion of a guttural where none should occur in Dutch (*Achterhuis* 148). Mooyaart-Doubleday imitates this accent by changing ‘outstanding’ to “outschtanding” (*Diary* 188). This translation captures the effect of Anne’s playfulness and a very similar kind of mispronunciation while keeping the meaning clear. Schroth argues that Mooyaart-Doubleday’s translation is problematic because “some word of explanation still seems needed” (239); however, I argue that it is the lack of explanation that captures her tone so well. In this playful passage, Anne is not seeking to produce an explanation of why they speak differently or what that implies—she is making a joke typical of her adolescence. By imitating that joke without explanation, Mooyaart-Doubleday mimics Anne’s youthful, playful tone and maintains the feeling of adolescence. Overall, Mooyaart-Doubleday succeeds within the minimal *skopos* of her translation, and it is important to acknowledge this success outside of any issues with her chosen source text.

Despite Mooyaart-Doubleday’s success in creating a tone that captures the liveliness of the source text, certain elements of her translation still prove problematic as they significantly change the ways in which readers read the text. The arguably most significant problem is the title itself. Emmerich presents “translating and editing as mutually implicated processes” (13). Mooyaart-Doubleday’s work with the title certainly represents a translingual edition more than a strict translation. As previously mentioned, the published title in Dutch is *Het Achterhuis*, meaning the secret annex or the house behind. Mooyaart-Doubleday’s title of *Diary of a Young Girl* is a complete departure from the Dutch title. As Emmerich states, translation and editing go hand-in-hand, and there is nothing inherently good or bad about a decision to dramatically depart from a strict translation. However, in this case, Mooyaart-Doubleday’s choice dramatically affects how readers read and perceive the text. As earlier explained, the *c* text is not merely the diary entries of Anne Frank (or the *a* text); rather, it is a highly edited text that contains both nonfictional diary entries and fictional works. This is far more apparent in the Dutch text, as readers encounter the text under a title that suggests a literary work. When Dutch readers arrive at the entry

in which Anne writes about the conception of her literary project, they read: “Stel je eens voor hoe interessant het zou zijn, als ik een roman van *het Achterhuis* zou uitgeven. Aan de title alleen zouden de mensen denken, dat het een detectiveroman was” [Imagine how interesting it would be, if I were to publish a novel about the secret annex. From the title alone people would think it was a detective novel] (*Achterhuis* 162; emphasis added). For a Dutch reader, this feels like a private joke, as Anne writes what it would be like to publish a book about the secret annex, all while the reader understands that they are reading that very novel, published under that very title. They become acutely aware that they are holding a fulfilment of Anne’s literary dreams rather than any strictly historical document. The English translation states, “Just imagine how interesting it would be if I were to publish a romance of the ‘Secret Annex.’ The title alone would be enough to make people think it was a detective story” (*Diary* 205). While the literal translation here is perfectly adequate, there is no thrill of realization for English readers that Anne’s dreams are in their hands because the titles do not match. Instead, it feels like an unrealized dream because the book in the readers’ hands has been presented as a diary rather than as the literary work she proposed. Additionally, the translation of the Dutch word *roman* [novel], to the word romance further serves to alienate her proposed work from the published work in which her proposition appears. Beyond the missed emotional reaction to that particular entry, however, the title changes the way readers read the text as a whole in a problematic way.

The title change encourages readers to read a literary, and sometimes fictional, text as a nonfiction work. Throughout the *c* text, some of Anne’s fictional tales appear intermingled with the diary entries. At times, these entries are prefaced with a disclaimer that Anne has written a tale; however, at other times, they are written as journal entries. For example, on July 13, 1943, she tells a tale of a heated argument amongst those hiding in the annex. The tale is fictional, but it begins with “Dear Kitty, Yesterday afternoon, with Daddy’s permission” and concludes with “Yours, Anne” just like any other entry (*Diary* 98). She tells several other fictional stories in a similar manner—mixed in indistinguishably with the more accurate entries. In both the Dutch and English editions, there are often no markers to indicate when the fiction begins and ends, which may certainly be criticized in and of itself as a problematic editorial choice. As I have shown, however, readers who encounter the text in Dutch are already aware that they are reading a

work that is edited and not entirely factual. Nothing in the English version hints at this—it suggests quite plainly that these are all diary entries. The simple translingual editorial choice of the title significantly impacts readers' understanding of the text, and Mooyaart-Doubleday's choice set a precedent which has been faithfully followed by all other English translators and publishers, as well as many in other languages. This change significantly affects not just Anne's text, but the conception of Anne Frank at large.

As I have shown, many scholars find the *c* text itself problematic, and certain elements of its translation make it even more so; however, despite its problematic nature, the 1952 English translation gained a popularity and longevity in translation that the original Dutch and subsequent European translations did not enjoy. When *Het Achterhuis* was initially published in the Netherlands in 1947, it was relatively successful and was initially printed five times following its publication. Within three years, however, the reissues had come to a halt as interest in the book waned (Vanderwal Taylor 5). In 1950, translators brought the book into both French and German, but in France it was "read by a relatively small audience" while the German translation "had no resonance" amongst readers (Gilman 45). Among the Dutch and other European audiences, the text did not appear destined for success. In fact, if early reception is any indication, one may argue that the text was destined to fade into anonymity. Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation into English was vital to the afterlife of Anne Frank's text because it brought the text from lukewarm European audiences to a new, wider, and highly receptive audience, sparking a resurgence of interest in the text.

Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation ignited a rapid spread of engagement with Anne Frank's text that spread to a world-wide audience. Laura Quinn argues that "the historical significance of works of art becomes less attributable to their original moment than to their afterlife that continues to represent the quality of translatability as fame" (48). Certainly, in the case of Anne Frank's diary, its original moment contributed little to its historical significance in comparison with the afterlife that Mooyaart-Doubleday enabled through her translation. American audiences quickly embraced the translation of the diary. Many of the elements of the translation that led Americans to initially embrace it are now the same elements that scholars criticize. Some of the heaviest criticism leveled against the *c* text lately is well-represented in Victoria Stewart's argument that the *c* text rewriting was published in such a way as to "mask its fragmentariness" giving "a

false sense of spontaneity or completeness" (111). She further criticizes the ways in which Otto Frank's editing and promotion of the book emphasized its "humanitarian and broadly speaking optimistic content" (112). These criticisms attack what translation scholar André Lefevere calls refractions of the text. Although many scholars criticize these refractions, the changes in the text facilitated world-wide engagement with the text and may be what allowed the text to survive.

In spite of the many critics who view refractions as flaws, Lefevere argues that refractions, such as the ones that Mooyart-Doubleday employs, are not inherently bad and can, in fact, be beneficial. He defines a refraction as "the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work" (203). When Otto Frank gained an audience for Anne's diary, he refracted it to reflect the way he hoped it would influence that audience. As Victoria Stewart's comments demonstrate, scholars criticize these refractions now; however, some of the very things the diary is now criticized for—such as its universal nature and the pleasantness of the war narrative—are what audiences initially praised it for. One early review published in *The New York Times* states, "Anne Frank's diary simply bubbles with amusement, love, discovery . . . it is so wondrously alive, so near, that one feels overwhelmingly the universalities of human nature" (Meyer). While critics later deemed these elements problematic results of Otto Frank's editing of the *c* text, these very elements initially popularized it. Some critics may not appreciate refraction, but Mooyart-Doubleday's translation played an important role in allowing Anne Frank's text to survive and to spread.

Americans popularly embraced Mooyart-Doubleday's translation in its traditional written form, but the translation also enabled increased engagement with the Anne Frank story in other artistic and educational spheres. People's engagement with the text did not end at reading; they quickly dramatized it into a stage production, which later led to more stage productions and a movie. Additionally, it became largely integrated into school curriculum by 1960 through a grassroots movement by educators, which led to it being required reading in schools throughout the United States (Shandon 160). Its presence in the education system proved long-lasting, and a survey done in 1996 showed that "50 percent of American high school students had read *The Diary of Anne Frank* as a classroom assignment" (Prose 253–54). Perhaps most interesting, however, was the

English translation's effect on the Netherlands. The film, play, and overall success of Anne Frank's text both in the United States and on a more global scale stimulated the sale of the book in the Netherlands. While all reprintings had stopped after 1950, with the 1952 release of the English translation, three new editions arrived in Dutch in 1955, three more in 1956, and still nine more in 1957 (van der Stroom 74). Although the text initially appeared to be headed towards obscurity, the English translation facilitated a long afterlife for it in the United States, in its Dutch home, and in the world at large.

Beyond reviving interest in the "original" Dutch text, Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation, in many ways, became an original. Emmerich theorizes that "each translator creates her own original" and that "so-called originals are not given but made, and translators are often party to that making" (Emmerich 13). Mooyaart-Doubleday made the *c* text original when she took it as her source text, and many scholars take issue with that, but what these scholars often overlook are the ways in which her text became an original in its own right. First, as the diary made its way into many aspects of American life and consciousness, translators also began to bring it from English into what would eventually be sixty-seven additional languages. Of those translations, over fifty of the translators took Mooyaart-Doubleday's English translation as their source text (van der Linde). Thus, for most international readers of Anne Frank's writings, Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation was the source text. According to Emmerich, this means that other translators made the English text their original. Additionally, in reframing the text through her unique title, Mooyaart-Doubleday made an original text of Anne Frank that presented itself as nonfiction—an original which has come to be widely taught and accepted. Finally, simply in the act of translation, Mooyaart-Doubleday created an original because, as Emmerich quips, in a translation, "*all* the words are added; *all* the words are different" (3). Thus, the debate surrounding Mooyaart-Doubleday's chosen "original" is somewhat ironic because, through her translation, she creates her own original.

The question of an "original" Anne Frank story to translate from is complex and ultimately less important than the question of how the translation meets the needs of its audience. Mooyaart-Doubleday did not merely choose a source text as an original—she created an original Anne Frank story. Despite the criticisms leveled against it and its admittedly problematic elements, her translation met the needs of the time. Lefevere theorizes that the degree to which a writer is accepted in a system is "determined by the

need that native system has of him in a certain phase of its evolution" (206). The refractions created by Otto Frank's editing and Barbara Mooyaart-Doubleday's translingual editing came into the American literary sphere at a time in which readers were ready to accept it. The Dutch, French, and German versions may not have met with much success in their spheres, but the refractions in the English language allowed for an original that resonated with America's post-war moment, Americans' desire for universally human stories, and a desire to bring such stories into theatrical, cinematic, and educational spheres. It was what the system needed, and thus it succeeded where other versions had not. Without Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation, and particularly without the refractions, the legacy of Anne Frank may never have even come to a place where it could be looked at critically. It is important to continue to look critically at the text—particularly the ways in which its translation affects how it is taught and perceived—but in doing so, we must acknowledge the value of the translation. Although Mooyaart-Doubleday's translation was not perfect, the afterlife that it enabled allowed for other editors and translators to work with the text and for critics to engage with it. It made Anne Frank a worldwide presence and paved the way for the critical conversation still going on today.

Works Cited

- Emmerich, Karen. *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2017.
- Frank, Anne. *The Diary of Anne Frank: The Revised Critical Edition*. Edited by David Barnouw and Gerrold van der Stroom. Translated by Arnold J. Pomerans et al., Doubleday, 2003.
- Lefevere, André. "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2012, pp. 203–19.
- Meyer, L. "The Child Behind the Secret Door." Review of Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl. *New York Times*, 15 Jun. 1952, p. BR1.
- Prose, Francine. *Anne Frank: The Book, the Life, the Afterlife*. HarperCollins, 2009.
- Quinn, Laura L. "The Afterlife of Anne Frank: A Space for Translation in the Anne Frank House." *Parallax*, vol. 5, no. 3 [12], July 1999, pp. 47–57, doi:10.1080/135346499249597.
- Schroth, Simone. "Translating Anne Frank's *Het Achterhuis*." *Translation & Literature*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2014, pp. 235–43, doi:10.3366/tal.2014.0153.
- Shandler, Jeffrey, and Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. *Anne Frank Unbound: Media, Imagination, Memory*. Indiana UP, 2012.
- Stewart, Victoria. "Anne Frank and the Uncanny." *Paragraph: A Journal of Modern Critical Theory*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2001, pp. 99–113, doi:10.3366/para.2001.24.1.99.
- Van der Linde, Irene. "Barbara Mooyaart-Doubleday 11 Maart 1919–31 Juli 2017." *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 9 Aug. 2017.
- Van der Stroom, Gerrold. "The Diaries, *Het Achterhuis*, and the Translations." *The Diary of Anne Frank: The Revised Critical Edition*, edited by David Barnouw and Gerrold Van der Stroom, by Anne Frank, Doubleday, 2003, pp. 59–77.
- Vanderwal Taylor, J. A Family Occupation. *Children of the War and the Memory of World War II in Dutch Literature of the 1980s*, Amsterdam UP, 1997.

Clichéd Language and Commonplace Faith

Gavin Wride

Flannery O'Connor's short stories were bred through the clichés of life in the American South where platitudes and idiomatic phrases played a pedestrian role in interactions. These overused dialogical instances and tropes work together to create a southern mythos within the realm of the Southern Gothic. O'Connor crafts her stories meticulously, caring for every detail. The inclusion of dialogical clichés in such conscientious writing begs further observation because overused language in such careful storytelling seems almost flagrant when mistakes in O'Connor's work verge on non-existent.

Carole Harris and Fred Thiemann have proposed studies of the language used by the characters in O'Connor's "Good Country People." Both place an emphasis on the repetitive, superficial language used by Mrs. Hopewell specifically, as well as the language of all characters in the piece. In his essay "Usurping the Logos: Clichés in O'Connor's 'Good Country People,'" Fred Thiemann claims that the Hopewell family's reliance on dialogical cliché derives from their desire to manipulate the world in which they live. He asserts that Mrs. Hopewell's total reliance upon cliché bars her from redemption due to the excessive pride involved in her desire for social control. Carole Harris, in her essay "The Echoing Afterlife of Clichés in Flannery O'Connor's 'Good Country People,'" makes a subtler claim that O'Connor's

use of cliché in “Good Country People” introduces a social game for Mrs. Hopewell and allows for familial cohesion. She proposes that a study of the context surrounding the use of cliché in the text induces a deeper study of the characters’ relationships.

While both of these claims merit further analysis, I contend that O’Connor’s use of dialogical cliché presents the shallowness of the characters, depicting them as simple in social interaction. O’Connor creates rigid, obtuse characters, as shown by their dialogical cliché, but she uses naming within the story to present the inflexible societal and social roles in which the characters live. These literary tools amplify the ideals of the grotesqueness of the Southern Gothic in order to condemn pride and hypocrisy. O’Connor’s display of obstinate characters ultimately conveys her idea that piercing through the fog of cliché—especially the greatest cliché of nihilism—allows for a moment of grace where revelation may catalyze a change of heart.

“Good Country People” tells the story of a mother, Mrs. Hopewell, who views her nihilist daughter with a prosthetic leg, Hulga, as an individual incapable of enacting any good. In an attempt at rebellion against her mother and Christianity, Hulga endeavors to seduce a Bible salesman who ends up subverting the Hopewell family’s judgments by expressing his own nihilistic beliefs, thus flipping Hulga’s worldview upside down. Fred Thiemann’s criticism of the piece aligns with O’Connor’s Christian writing and themes of sin and redemption. He claims that Mrs. Hopewell and Hulga’s use of clichés in their speech is “a form of the sin of pride, a usurpation of the divine *logos*, which alone can embody absolute meaning” (Thiemann 46). It is with this abuse of language that the mother and daughter strive to control their surroundings. Thiemann argues that Mrs. Hopewell’s clichés coincide with her categorizing the world into “good country people” and “trash.” The creation of such a hierarchy of people is one way in which she, as Thiemann puts it, attempts “self-deification” (49).

Mrs. Hopewell, far from displaying a godlike superiority complex, uses dialogical clichés out of simplicity of character rather than attempting “a usurpation of the divine *logos*,” as Thiemann argues (46). The inclusion of divinity in this claim seems misguided when considering the implications behind using language—especially repetitive, overused language—to control others and consequently exalt oneself to the status of a god. Thiemann does make the point that it is simply the desire for godhood through manipulation that introduces the sin of pride, but the text itself points to the naiveté behind

Mrs. Hopewell's tired speech. She spews platitudes and clichés like "nothing is perfect," "that is life!" "everybody is different," and "well other people have their opinions too" (O'Connor 272-73). After having delivered her longest tirade of clichés to Manley Pointer, the Bible salesman, she goes to check on dinner and speaks with Hulga who says she should get rid of him. Mrs. Hopewell replies saying, "I can't be rude to anybody" (279). She then goes back to the room with the Bible salesman and invites him to stay for dinner. Allen Tate in his book *Platitudes and Protestants* describes Manley Pointer as "a moral monster without human motivation" (67). Anyone who falls prey to such a person simply out of not wanting to be rude cannot stand on the same niveau as one who attempts to usurp the divine *logos*. This piece of the story exemplifies the simplicity of Mrs. Hopewell's interactions with those around her. She does not attempt "self-deification;" rather, she represents the foolish whose faith is ungrounded, living in a world of tired speech where platitudes and purported piety create a film of hypocrisy. Ultimately, Mrs. Hopewell's dialogical cliché reveals her own hypocritical faith rather than any grand motives such as manipulation.

O'Connor shapes her characters into clichéd roles in order to allow for such a reversal as Hulga experienced. Hulga had a PhD in philosophy and acted exactly in a cliché and stereotypical way in order to fit her character. Mrs. Hopewell grew up Christian in the American South and acted exactly how one would expect. Even Mrs. Freeman, practically absent from any supporting role in the story, acts as would a poor farmhand mother of two in the South. The characters' functions within the story are strengthened through O'Connor giving them dialogue riddled with clichés. She proposes that impotent, shallow language leads to a deadened faith. Mrs. Hopewell, the character most deeply situated within the sinuous quagmire of clichéd language and lifestyle, illustrates this connection between empty words and desolate fate when O'Connor writes Mrs. Hopewell's response about where she keeps her Bible. "I keep my Bible by my bedside.' This was not the truth. It was in the attic somewhere" (278). Mrs. Hopewell speaks as if she lives the stereotypical conduct of a woman in the South. O'Connor strives to relay Mrs. Hopewell's lack of faith by showing she doesn't live her religion actively; she only professes to do so.

The dialogical cliché in the story represents the simplicity of the characters rather than any sort of emotional attachment as argued by Carole Harris. Her essay references the conversations between Mrs. Hopewell and

Mrs. Freeman as a “call-and-response pattern, [which creates] a sense of intimacy over time” (Harris 61). She claims that the use of such platitudes and simple speech endears one to another. It is Manley Pointer, Harris argues, that exploits the emotionally charged clichés when he sees “the dialogic nature and echoing afterlife of clichés” (61). Harris contends that Manley’s understanding of clichés allows for his seduction of Hulga, triggering those intimate emotions and guiding them toward himself. She goes so far as to say that Pointer’s use of cliché presents his “defensive emotions” and makes him sound “uncharacteristically out of control of his language” (Harris 62).

This concept remains flawed, however, due to Hulga realizing the nature of cliché and how it makes one appear foolish. Manley Pointer confronts Hulga with a cliché indicating the most serious portion of his seduction had begun. He said, “[Your leg’s] what makes you different. You ain’t like anybody else” (O’Connor 288). This cliché should, according to Harris’s argument, produce an intimate emotion within Hulga that would lead to her loving him, but all that comes of it is Hulga realizing she was “face to face with real innocence” (289). This idea of innocence equates to what Hulga would consider naivety, ignorance, and simplicity. She sees her mother as possessing these same qualities. Her nihilistic behavior and physical disabilities represent “her emotional detachment—an inability to love anyone or anything” (Oliver 224). Because of these inhibitions, she keeps herself steeled against emotions and therefore free of the emotional manipulation Harris claims lies within Pointer’s use of cliché.

We can see then, that O’Connor’s use of dialogical cliché holds the purpose of having certain characters fill their respective roles. The dialogue promotes the theme of inflexibility in the characters. Mrs. Hopewell especially exemplifies this attribute by her “loyal use of and reliance on clichés” (Steed 307). This rigidity of the characters does not mean that complexity eludes O’Connor’s characters. It rather demonstrates that O’Connor’s writings rely on symbolism and plot to convey her Catholic themes as opposed to detailing the inner struggles within her characters. This style of writing with its emphasis on plot over character is reminiscent of the “Southern Gothic” genre in which O’Connor participated. Strafford, in *Modern Fiction Stories vol. 28*, describes the gothic as presenting “a world beyond the understandings of metaphor, a world of mysterious inhuman forces that cannot adequately be explained by the metaphors of psychology or sociology or well-meaning humanism” (478). O’Connor works within the realm of the grotesque, a

term now synonymous with gothic, and uses her characters to explore this southern world and explore the harshness of life. The people themselves fall prey to the world rather than acting as agents able to interact with the world around them. Thus, O'Connor's pieces defy "well-meaning humanism" (478); they transcend into a sickly form of realism.

O'Connor's stories contradict the norm of gothic texts by introducing morality as a theme during the climax of the story. Shaddix explains her outlier morals within the genre by saying that "O'Connor's [grotesque] is representative of an archaic sort of realism. It creates the possibility for an awareness of the self as essentially deluding by underscoring the comic element of an inevitably errant human will" (6). This "awareness of the self" often accompanies the nucleus of the text. When O'Connor's characters come to their awareness, they also confront redemption, grace, or a revelation of their inhumanity, and thus they sidestep the delusion. Christian authors—even those as dark and post-modern as Flannery O'Connor—must be concerned with morality, or the lack thereof, in the stories they write. When the awareness of self is met with Christian grace, the "deluding" possibility fades into an opportunity for change, a crossroads within the story. O'Connor constructs her stories to convey morality to the reader; in this case, the immoral way of life consists of hypocritical faith, declaring piety while living in opposition to one's words.

O'Connor uses the grotesque scene with Manley and Hulga to promote the connection between revelation and redemption. Hulga became aware of a nihilism that outweighed her own which caused the world as she understood it to become reversed. Manley Pointer existed in a world where nothing mattered because he had "been believing in nothing ever since [he] was born" (O'Connor 291). O'Connor could only achieve the depth of this scene because of the foundation of dialogical cliché she constructed throughout the story's introduction. I agree with Harris's analysis that Pointer understood clichés and was able to manipulate people accordingly, but he did not do so on the basis of emotion. Pointer understood that these country people had compartmentalized others into societal boxes. He also noticed that they did not stray from the compartments they built around themselves.

"Good Country People," in addition to dialogical cliché, fortifies the characters' inflexibility through naming. A few of the names within the story simply become titles that indicate the character's role, though an underlying symbolism adds complexity to some of them. Mrs. Hopewell's

name is clearly emblematic of her personality. She has an outlook on life that involves the existence of “good country people” in the face of O’Connor’s realism in which she displays no semblance of such people. Mrs. Hopewell’s name dictates that she hopes life goes well. Mrs. Freeman bears a common name that many farmers in the 1940s and 50s had. Her role is simply to let Mrs. Hopewell bounce clichés back and forth and to offer an understanding of the principles that a “good country” person might embody.

Joy Hopewell, who changes her name to Hulga, offers the greatest insight into O’Connor’s brilliant use of naming due to the nuance and irony introduced. Joy Hopewell has a heart condition (279), an artificial leg (274), and is “bloated, rude, and squint-eyed” (276). These attributes comprise a character who—Mrs. Hopewell might argue because of her PhD in philosophy—was holistically unhappy, contrary to what her name might suggest. Her developing nihilism and disparaging relationship with her mother led Joy to change her name to Hulga, of which Mrs. Hopewell “was certain that she had thought and thought until she had hit upon the ugliest name in any language” (274). Edmondson, in his book *Return to Good & Evil*, said of Hulga’s name that it was “the proud symbol of her own nihilistic creativity” (81). She likely chose the name because of its repulsive sound in the English language, believing that if nothing mattered, she might as well have that ugliness reflected in her name. O’Connor’s choice in the name, however, reflects her ironic humor and interest in minute details.

Far from simply sounding ugly, O’Connor introduces an ironic twist through the roots of the name “Hulga.” Ruth Holsen offers a linguistic analysis of O’Connor’s choice of the name “Hulga” in her essay “O’Connor’s Good Country People” by discussing the origin of the name. Holsen argues that Hulga likely knew the name’s foreign meaning and ironically took it upon herself. “Hulga” is a name based off of the Norwegian name “Helga” of the root “hellig,” which means “holy,” or as a noun, “saint.” Holsen argues that the holiness she picks, however, comes not from the same Christianity of her mother. Hulga believes that “we are all damned . . . but some of us have taken off our blindfolds and see that there is nothing to see. It’s a kind of salvation” (O’Connor 288). I agree that Hulga sees herself as a saint of nihilism and seeks a certain holiness in that belief, but I do not subscribe to the idea that she knew the origins of the name. I argue that this knowledge escaped the understanding of the character Hulga, but O’Connor’s awareness and attention to detail led her to pick this title for that very reason. Hulga,

whose “remarks were usually so ugly and her face so glum” (274), cared only to shock her believing mother to give her a glance at how devoid life is of meaning. She wished to tote that same ugliness as her title. O’Connor uses the name Hulga, deeply entwined in the hidden fabric of the story, to set up the character for her moment of grace and Christian redemption in the end.

Manley Pointer’s name becomes arbitrary because we learn at the end of the story that it’s simply a disguise, but his role in the story represents an evil that profits from a nefarious abuse of others’ stereotypes. Edmondson notes that “Pointer’s uncanny knack for identifying himself with little known and intimate family secrets implies that he possesses an unearthly nature and, by this and other characterizations, O’Connor hints that Manley Pointer is something more than human” (76). He represents a wickedness in “Good Country People” that proffers the other characters a chance at redemption. Manley uses clichés in order to gain access to the Hopewell household. He recognized the safety found in saying little and speaking the same dead language which helped him seem inconspicuous. It was his appearance, however, that originally provided an entrance into the world that the Hopewells lived in: one of superficiality where looks and words mean everything. The disguise of a Bible salesman offered Pointer the unassuming countenance on which he could capitalize. He hides his nihilism in the commonplace faith found in the American South which parallels the same lack of faith within the other characters in the story.

A study of cliché in “Good Country People” aids the reader in his or her understanding of why Hulga needed redemption and how the grotesque triggered this response. As discussed, Mrs. Hopewell had encapsulated herself into a world of cliché and, in doing so, diluted her faith. Hulga, having grown up in such an environment, suffered from the same pride of cliché through her repetitive desire to speak ugliness. Mrs. Hopewell and Hulga ensnared themselves within the trap of dead language and thereby killed off their faith; Hulga simply did so more openly. Manley Pointer embodies the pride of cliché and personifies its entire lack of liveliness. In the epitomizing incident of the story, when Manley Pointer seduces Hulga, she not only becomes shocked to a realization of a greater nihilism, but she recognizes the deadness of her own language. This understanding brings about the first step to an actual faith. Hulga proclaimed, “You’re a fine Christian! You’re just like them all—say one thing and do another” (O’Connor 290). She then

recognizes the deceptiveness in cliché, the dead faith of her mother, and, more poignantly, the deadness of her nihilism.

Such an analysis of O'Connor's works allows the reader to understand more fully how language relates to salvation from O'Connor's view. She implicitly condemns those who live a life of hypocrisy regarding *how* they live and how they *say* they live. O'Connor likely noticed the destructive nature of absent language in relationships and saw how it begins the path to pride. She uses elements of the gothic form because she blamed "the modern championing of sentimental compassion for dulling the reader's sensibility to deeper kinds of realism" (Shaddix 18). Everyone speaks with cliché and O'Connor seeks to shock the reader out of this way of living through realism in the dialogue and the gothic grotesque to show its folly. O'Connor's idea of grace can then be defined by revelation that unveils good and evil, allowing for clear decisions to be made. For Hulga, the revelation came when she was left with only one leg to stand on, an implicit cliché that, in context, shows that support does not come from artificiality but from truth.

O'Connor constructs her characters to fit a mold and to function solely within that role. She builds the structure for the characters through their conversations and names. When we study their dialogue, we observe that most of their platitudes or idle speech hold little meaning. The chosen names for the characters also set them into their respective positions, but Hulga is set apart from the beginning once the reader learns she changed her name. This modification to the character dictates that in the face of rigid, inflexible characters, she would not remain static. Revelation comes to her as she begins to understand the hypocrisy and pride that clichés had previously composed her life. Her character, unrightly named something as sentimental and trite as Joy, ironically names herself a saint in rebellion only to later receive the opportunity to become one. To O'Connor, dead language and dead faith, even the clichéd death that comes from nihilism, can be overcome through grotesque circumstances and ultimately through grace.

Works Cited

- Edmondson, Henry T. *Return to Good and Evil: Flannery O'Connor's Response to Nihilism*. Lexington Books, 2002.
- Harris, Carole K. "The Echoing Afterlife of clichés in Flannery O'Connor's 'Good Country People.'" *Flannery O'Connor Review*, vol. 5, 2007, pp. 56–66.
- Holsen, Ruth M. "O'Connor's Good Country People." *The Explicator*, vol. 42, no. 3, 1984, pp. 59, doi:10.1080/00144940.1984.11483777.
- O'Connor, Flannery. "Good Country People." *Flannery O'Connor: The Complete Stories*. Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1972, pp. 271–91.
- Oliver, Kate. "O'Connor's Good Country People." *The Explicator*, vol. 62, no. 4, 2004, pp. 233–36, doi:10.1080/00144940409597232.
- Shaddix, M. K. *Church Without the Church: Desert Orthodoxy in Flannery O'Connor's Dear Old Dirty Southland*. Mercer University Press, 2015.
- Steed, J. P. "'through our Laughter we are Involved': Bergsonian Humor in Flannery O'Connor's Fiction." *The Midwest Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 3, 2005, pp. 299–313, 218..
- Strafford, William T. "Women Writers of the American South." *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 28, 1982.
- Tate, Allen. "Platitudes and Protestants." *Critical Essays on Flannery O'Connor*, G.K. Hall, 1985, pp. 65–68.
- Thiemann, Fred R. "Usurping the Logos: Clichés in O'Connor's 'Good Country People.'" *The Flannery O'Connor Bulletin*, vol. 24, 1995, pp. 46–56.

"SHE WAS NEVER PROPERTY"

The Underground Railroad and John Locke's Labor Theory of Property

Samuel Christensen

Born in 1632, John Locke was one of the preeminent philosophers during the Enlightenment period. He contributed significantly to this influential epoch by developing classical liberalism, reviving classical republicanism, and instituting the social contract. Individual sovereignty, the foundation for many of the arguments propositioned by Locke, resonated with many in the burgeoning American colonies. In fact, Thomas Jefferson and other Founding Fathers drew extensively from Locke; he was, perhaps, the most influential philosopher to the creation of America and the American ideal (Huyler 223). This is evident in Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, which claims that "all men are created equal . . . [and] are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" ("Declaration"), nearly reiterating word for word Locke's theories from over a century earlier about man's right to life, liberty, and property (Huyler 221). An early draft of Jefferson's Declaration contained a paragraph decrying the evils of the slave trade in Great Britain but was removed by the American Continental Congress so as not to appear hypocritical and blatantly betray the moral high ground Americans sought (Jefferson). Understanding the rough draft

of the Declaration of Independence beyond its historical value, and instead viewing it philosophically, leads to an analysis of the myriad postulations espoused by Jefferson, including “how equality may be the foundation of rights” (Ginsberg 40)—a foundation that encounters a host of complexities when considering the history of slavery in America, a practice which flagrantly violated these ideals.

In his 2016 novel, *The Underground Railroad*, Colson Whitehead confronts the contradicting philosophies of American ideals and slavery head-on. He makes it clear that Antebellum America, as a whole, has failed to live up to its noble founding and has fundamentally misunderstood the country’s foundational doctrines. This is most clearly evidenced by Cora who, on her “spatial” journey north, peels back the psychological veneer obstructing her vision of her Lockean rights to life, liberty, and self-ownership as guaranteed protection by the Declaration of Independence. She comes to view her labor and actions as indisputably her own, which builds in her a correct knowledge of her inherent human value and of a beautiful, proud heritage—a heritage from which all Americans can derive righteous pride and motivation to engage in honest labor, irrespective of race or creed.

As seen in Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence, John Locke’s philosophies undergird much of the political and moral principles of the founding documents of the United States. Locke’s *Second Treatise of Government* set forth the complex relationship of individual human rights to the authority of government, and Chapter Five, “Of Property,” bolsters many of the arguments Locke made in support of the individual and limited power of government. These high-minded ideas on property, however, become convoluted when applied to African American slavery in the nineteenth century. Locke believed that property was a basic human right, along with the inalienable rights of life and liberty, and that human beings were both responsible for, and privileged to, their own individual labor.

Locke’s emphasis on the individual recasts the very dynamic of property as a relationship between an individual and nature, instead of an individual and government. Property, Locke argues, existed before civil government and, as such, is not beholden to it (qtd. in Locke xiii). While the earth in its natural state provides sustenance for its inhabitants, it is incumbent upon inhabitants to gather the sustenance for themselves. In doing so, the goods of the earth pass from “common” property to “individual” property (Locke 17);

that is, when a person expends energy—or labor—to harness substance for gain, that substance becomes the right and property of the expender.

A person's property comes not only as a result of collecting something that nature created, but in conjunction with work enacted on other parts of nature. Lockean theory dictates that the world was to be used by the "industrious and rational," and that labor was a man's right to the world (Locke 20). Industriousness, according to Locke, was a mandate from Heaven: "God and his reason commanded [mankind] to subdue the earth, i.e., improve it for the benefit of life, and therein lay out something upon it that was his own, his labor" (20). So, Locke argues, nature, when mixed with labor, becomes improved and more valuable than it had been or otherwise would be, for "it is labor indeed that put the difference of value on everything" (24). Mankind, then, is not simply granted the right to the product of his labor, but entitled to it—it is undeniably his property by virtue of his work (23). This property "could not be taken from him wherever he had fixed it" (21). Most important, perhaps, is the knowledge that man was "master of himself and proprietor of his own person and the actions or labor of it." Man's property "was perfectly his own and did not belong in common to others" (27). From this, it becomes evident that labor and property have an important effect on individualism and identity.

In his book, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Michel de Certeau explains in "Spatial Stories" how actions transform places into spaces, and why owning property conveys heritage and value to a person or object. First, Certeau outlines the difference between mere "places" and "spaces," saying that a "place" is a stable, inert thing or location whereas a "space" is an "ensemble of movement" performed by someone or something within a given dimension (117). A space is in a constant state of modification while a place is, essentially, "dead" (118). Applying this knowledge to the framework of property, then, land and possessions take the form of place, while labor—movement and operations—takes the form of space. Certeau's theories are almost exclusively applied to land, but may just as well apply to human slaves, who were regarded by slave owners as property as much as any given plot of land.

Certeau argues that the very basis of all stories comes from the transformation from place to space or, the reverse, space to place (118). Cora's story in *The Underground Railroad* shows her transformation from incorrectly viewing herself as a "place"—as property—to learning that she is, in fact, a "space." Through her experiences, Cora learns that the actions she performs

in space—which comprise her labor—found, build, and become her story, history, and, thus, heritage. The function of this created story establishes and legitimizes the claim to the Latin “*fās*,” or divine law, “without which all forms of conduct that are enjoined or authorized by [human law], and . . . all human conduct, are doubtful, perilous, and even fatal” (qtd. in Certeau 124). Understanding that stories found and establish *fās* promotes a recognition of inalienable rights and a sense of a certain divine heritage for the individual. In the text, Cora notes the gulf between the “slave part” of her versus the “human part” of her (Whitehead 34), which could easily be interpreted as the dead “place part” versus the living “space part.” These two ends present a starting point, an ending point, and a sort of internal trajectory implied between the two that makes up Cora’s own spatial story. On Cora’s journey to “space,” her enemies try to ignore, delegitimize, and discredit her rightful claim to her individual human rights by attempting to erase her story and failing to recognize her actions and labor as contributing to an ever-growing body of heritage.

Understanding both Certeau’s theory of spatial stories and Locke’s property theory is essential to uncovering the internal journey Cora takes and its application to American history. The unprecedented success America has experienced since its eighteenth-century founding may, in part, be explained by the large number of Americans who have consciously or subconsciously embraced Locke’s theory on property. Cora likely did not know Locke’s property theory directly, but came to subconsciously embrace it, which, in turn, aided her psychological story journey from “place” to “space” and made her the master of her own actions and heritage. To better understand Cora’s journey, it is instructive to first view the source from which her knowledge about American and human rights sprung: white southerners. A brief analysis of Ridgeway, the most prominent white character in the novel, reveals a flawed perception of America and of Locke’s property theory that was foisted upon Cora and other slaves.

Ridgeway’s job was simple and he was excellent at it: find and return lost property to its proper owners. According to the novel, “Ridgeway gathered renown with his facility for ensuring that property remained property” (Whitehead 82). Throughout the text, Ridgeway continually attempts to discredit Cora’s actions and labor as illegitimate evidence of intrinsic, divine rights. He may have believed that in doing this, Cora would continue to view

herself as less than what she truly was—she would continue to view herself as dead property with no claim to freedom over her own actions.

In performing the requirements of a slave catcher, Ridgeway reveals that his nefarious actions are guided by his personal philosophical interpretations rather than by the philosophy intended by America's founders. Largely, his philosophy is derived from the American concept of "Manifest Destiny" and an erroneous comprehension of the spirit of United States law. Manifest Destiny was a sacrosanct belief that advocated for and justified the expansion of the U.S. throughout the American continents. Ridgeway interpreted Manifest Destiny as the reason for his white skin and as a moral justification for the egregious damage he and others inflicted upon America's "others" during this time. He reveals this justification explicitly in Tennessee by defining Manifest Destiny to Cora as "taking what is yours, your property, whatever you deem it to be" with others allowing you to take it "so that we can have what's rightfully ours" (Whitehead 225). Here, it is clear to readers that Ridgeway subjectively defines personhood and property, often violating a person's right to rule over themselves. Ridgeway mistakenly believed that the "Great Spirit" of America was "if you can keep it, it is yours. Your property, slave or continent. The American imperative" (82). He does not see universal human value and instead adheres to the view that white men were destined to own American land simply because they did own it and were not in chains (82). Lockean property theory can approve the doctrine of Manifest Destiny because it encourages people to make use of natural land through labor. But, Ridgeway and evil whites violate the Lockean justification of Manifest Destiny by offending the core values of life and liberty in pursuit of property, a result that would have in no way been approved by Locke.

Ridgeway's understanding of Manifest Destiny as subjectively defined property waiting to be reclaimed by its proper owner contributed to an overall misunderstanding and misapplication of the law. He fails to adhere to the belief held by Locke and Jefferson that, ultimately, mankind is the property of God and, as such, is endowed with immutable rights, such as the right to life, liberty, and property (Huyler 221). Instead, Ridgeway believes that the "same laws governed garbage and people" (Whitehead 82)—particularly poor people or people of other races—a detestable and inherently false conclusion. Yet, Ridgeway seems to fully believe this. Inalienable rights, if existent at all to Ridgeway, are different or distributed differently among people.

Particular mention is made of Michael, a slave who was overworked and murdered on the Hog plantation because he could recite passages from the Declaration of Independence. Michael could, in fact, recite long passages from the Declaration of Independence, but did so at the behest of his master who found it entertaining (Whitehead 32). To Michael's master, this was nothing more than a cheap parlor trick—nothing in this act reflected the high ideals inscribed in the founding document. The slave owner forcing his slave to memorize and recite passages from the Declaration of Independence only served to cheapen and discard the philosophies of the document. In fact, uneducated Cora understands the meaning that lay in the words of the Declaration better than the majority of white men mentioned in the novel. She recognizes the hypocrisy that “the ideals [white men] held up for themselves, they denied others . . . created equal was not lost on her. The white men who wrote [the Declaration] didn't understand it either, if all men did not truly mean all men” (119). The repeated injustices and violations of the spirit of the founding committed by whites against black slaves evidence this. Indeed, it seems as though whites operate under a fundamentally different law than the laws to which America claimed subscription. Royal identifies the hypocrisy of “white law” and intelligently suggests “there are other ones” (231)—other laws besides “white law.”

The southern misunderstanding of law and the philosophical founding of America, of which Ridgeway is merely an example of the group at large, had a particularly damning effect on Cora, who was inflicted with trauma and indoctrinated with this damaging falsehood since childhood. Cora, at one point, reaches the understanding that “slavery is a sin when whites were put to the yoke, but not the African. All men are created equal, unless we decide you are not a man” (186). This clear subversion of the doctrine of humanity upon which America was built exhibits the subjective comprehension and application of that doctrine—a doctrine that claims virtue specifically because of its objectivity.

Cora's journey from place to space can only begin with a discussion about Ajarry, who exhibited many aspects of “place” and several sparks of “space.” For the repeated references in the novel to the three-yard plot of land that first belonged to Ajarry (Whitehead 13), there is no mention of the plot in the “Ajarry” section, the first of the book. In this section, Ajarry's value, more than anything, is shown to be only exchange value, with Whitehead using a variety of transactional terms in regard to Ajarry, like

“sold,” “appraised,” “swapped,” “price,” “asset,” and “market” (3, 5, 6, 8). These financial words reinforce the notion that Ajarry was fundamentally property, and, as property, “her price fluctuated” (6). As Cora understood it, “Each thing had a value . . . [i]n America the quirk was that people were things . . . If you were a thing—a cart or a horse or a slave—your value determined your possibilities” (6–7). Prices for assets and “things” do fluctuate and have always fluctuated as a principle of economic theory; the incorrect and insidious assumption made by the white slave owners and communicated, in turn, to black slaves was that “price” was equivalent to inherent human value. This mode of understanding leads Ajarry to devalue her own worth and self-limit her rightful access to human rights. Ajarry understands “liberty” to be “reserved for other people.” Thinking otherwise “was to escape the fundamental principles of your existence: impossible” (8). According to Locke and the founding principles of the United States, this simply is not true. Inherent human value is endowed by God, infinite, and inalienable; it does not fluctuate. Violating the assumption of value serves only to sever the divine bonds of humanity. The view that human value is not absolute, subject to the whims of the economic marketplace, was the view that Cora inherited and internalized from Ajarry and white slave owners.

Despite not explicitly mentioning the plot of land in the “Ajarry” section, Whitehead makes it clear that Cora inherited the land from Mabel and Ajarry. The land did not become family property simply through its own existence or because the law decreed it. Instead, in the beginning, the paltry plot was nothing more than “a rumble of dirt and scrub behind [Ajarry’s] cabin” (13). But Cora understood that “the dirt at her feet had a story” (13)—a mention like this hearkens back to Certeau’s theory wherein land is saturated with significance and tells a distinct story. The story of the plot, then, is its transformation from dead, “inert” (Certeau 118) place to living, active space made possible through the labor exerted upon and mixed with the land by Ajarry, Mabel, and Cora. A “space” plot boasted value and a proud heritage that a “place” plot did not. Among the myriad actions perhaps taken on the land by Ajarry, Mabel, and Cora to transform the plot into a space, Whitehead includes, tying a goat, building a chicken coop, growing food (13), and fighting for it (15). Whitehead asks, “Why should [Old Anthony] and everyone else respect this little girl’s claim just because her grandmother had kicked the dirt over once?” (17). In response, Old Anthony should respect this little girl’s claim because Cora’s grandmother kicked the once-worthless

dirt over, expended her labor upon it, and made it productive; so did Cora's mother, and Cora, likewise, continued in this tradition.

While on the Hob, Cora valued her plot of land highly, but after escaping the plantation, she thinks back to the plot—the land itself—and recognizes it as an almost trivial form of property. This garden that she once “cherished,” she “now saw it for the joke it was—a tiny square of dirt that had convinced her she owned something” (Whitehead 184). This revelation comes to Cora on the second stop of her journey in North Carolina, where she begins to see that simple material goods or land do not alone constitute true property; rather, labor—the willing actions taken by an individual—upon an object or in pursuit of an objective forms the basis for true property. According to an interview with Whitehead, the garden was the one thing on the plantation Cora could call her own. It was a place where, “in the midst of a complete lack of agency,” she could “be creative” (“Conversation”). More than its economic value as a physical object or location, however, the land itself had redemptive value precisely because it permitted Cora to act and labor for her own self, thus generating property that was uniquely her own. While Cora is beginning to understand this important distinction, this conclusion is not immediately recognized as she is in the process of her own internalized, psychological “spatial story” moving toward understanding. In North Carolina, “her plot was a shadow of something that lived elsewhere, out of sight” just as “the Declaration of Independence was an echo of something that existed elsewhere” (Whitehead 184; emphasis added). “Something,” in this context, almost certainly refers to the promise of equal rights unearthed to her knowledge through the expenditure of her individual labor.

Throughout the novel, Cora labors for herself and finds satisfaction in her labor; however, Cora's labor did not merely satisfy, it instructed her, over time, about the inherent right to herself. For example, in the Sunday hours at Hob when she was not forced to perform regular slave duties, Cora engaged in various forms of labor that encouraged her discovery that “she owned herself” (Whitehead 12). Labor here includes “tug[ging] weeds, pluck[ing] caterpillars, thin[n]g out the sour greens, and glar[ing] at anyone planning incursions on her territory” (12). Each of these acts constitute a form of labor for Cora—an act voluntarily performed upon an object—and is similar to Locke's own theory of mixing labor with nature. Interestingly for Cora, even the simple act of “glaring” was an act of individual labor that convinced her of her own property and right to existence, and she engaged in this behavior

again while at the museum in South Carolina. In time, Cora's actions added up to a knowledge of her ability to interpret the actions and labor she chose to engage in as belonging to her and her only. Other acts and labors Cora engages in to build the knowledge of herself as her own property include the effort she put forth into reading and writing. In South Carolina, where reading and writing classes were taught to black laborers, Cora diligently consumed the "nourishing" education (98)—even while others did not—and was proud of what she was learning to accomplish through her work.

Other examples of instructive labor along Cora's journey toward defining her own existence as rightful and valuable include running away, working to a purpose at the Valentine Farm, and learning from the examples of others, like Sam and Royal. In running away, Cora necessarily subjected herself to strenuous acts of labor at each stop along the way. On the Valentine Farm, Cora learned that "work needn't be suffering, it could unite folks" (Whitehead 277) and anyone could be anything they wanted to as a result of their labor, including the rightful owners of themselves: "Freedom was a community laboring for something lovely and rare" (278, emphasis added). Sam instructs Cora on the ephemeral value of material possessions by losing all his possessions and shows that his greatest "property" was his actions: the relationships he had labored to build. Royal, too, assists Cora's understanding by rebutting her claim that "Land is property. Tools is property. . . . I'm still property, even in Indiana" (277) and firmly reminding her that she was free (277). Cora's experiences, taken as a whole, make up a unique story of labor—a story that was her own. Like the inalienable rights granted by God to all people and supposedly protected by the United States government, this story was Cora's property, and it could not be taken from her. She owned it and began to unlock the philosophical significance it held for her. In this new story, all Americans worked for themselves and were the rightful recipients of the fruits of their labors, both the physical fruits and the psychological fruits that came from accomplishing tasks and making meaningful contributions to a community. They began to create their own legacies through labor.

The first time Cora sees the underground railroad station, she is overwhelmed by its grandeur but always wonders who constructed the railroad. Cora thought the railroad "was a marvel to be proud of" (70), "appreciated the labor that had gone into its construction" (68), and "wondered if those who had built this thing had received their proper reward" (70). The

labor in constructing an edifice like this was a fundamentally different type of labor than the slave labor she was accustomed to, for “not one of [the slaves] could be prideful of their labor” (70) on the plantation because slave labor stripped them of real property. Cora questions who built the railroad, and, by implication, who ought to receive the pride associated with its magnificent construction (262). She never receives a clear answer and is told only that the “sheer industry that had made such a project possible” took more years to construct than she knew (68).

In coming to a knowledge of Locke’s property theory and its direct effects on her sense of value, heritage, and inherent rights, Cora increasingly values the labor put into the construction of the railroad by those unnamed actors who took something and made it their own unique, magnificent property. Astute readers will note the postmodernist element of the text and realize that Cora is, in fact, valuing the vast and magnificent network of the intangible, true underground railroad that led as many as 100,000 slaves to freedom (Hillstrom xiii). She is sensing those “who stood with all those other souls who took runaways into their homes, fed them, carried them north on their backs, died from them” (Whitehead 310). And yet, Royal tells Cora, she is more than just an observer of the railroad or a passenger on its route: “The underground railroad is bigger than its operators—it’s all of you, too” (272). Cora learns that she is, in fact, a contributor to that labor she had marveled at for so long. Her actions throughout the book coalesce with the actions of her ancestors, predecessors, and others who gave their time, effort, will, and labor to the noble work of digging the tunnel, making it something they could, without any degree of hesitation, call their own property. Cora finally accessed the knowledge that the worth, value, and ownership she felt as a contributor to the railroad was, in reality, present in her being the entire time.

This revelation of the absolute and inalienable right to self-ownership through labor is vital for modern times. For a book that hints about troubled race relations in the twenty-first century, *The Underground Railroad* encourages all Americans—blacks, whites, and every other intersectional group in the United States—to embrace the history, heritage, and legacy of their American ancestors who labored to produce goodness and deliver it to later generations. Blacks and whites alike may continue to note the sufferings of slaves during and after the time of slavery, but they must also recognize the persistence and willpower required of slaves and white abolitionists to fight against a profoundly immoral and malevolent system. This corrupt system, now long

defunct, blatantly violated the rights of man set forth by God and enjoined into the American founding by inspired contributors.

In the novel, Royal tells Cora, “we got this tunnel right here, running beneath us, and no one knows where it leads” (272). The irony is that surely someone must know where it leads, otherwise it could not have been built at all. This simple statement conveys the important truth that Cora, or any other passenger and laborer on the railroad, was in control of her own destiny. She could determine the course her life would take and what she would choose to make of her life through her actions. The day before she escaped the plantation, Cora “furiously hacked into the earth as if digging a tunnel” that would lead to her salvation (54). Knowing fully the true nature of labor and property at the end of the book, Cora enters “into the tunnel that no one had made, that led nowhere” (309) and forged her own pathway to freedom—physical freedom and freedom from the destructive and traumatic psychological bonds she thought would always hold her hostage. Cora stopped allowing others to define her existence for her, and she traveled north through the tunnel. But, as she traveled, a central question came into her mind: “was she traveling through the tunnel or digging it?” As Cora pumped the lever on the railcar to move it forward, she realized that “each time she brought her arms down on the lever, she drove a pickax into the rock, swung a sledge onto a railroad spike.” She was building the railroad, and laboring in the construction of something this “magnificent” was transformative: “On one end there was who you were before you went underground, and on the other end a new person steps out into the light” (309–10). Cora finally completed her philosophical journey from inert place to active space by realizing her labors were valuable, meaningful, and beautiful. She attained knowledge that the true value of a person is not found in skin color or outward appearance or what is on top; the “miracle” is beneath and found in the actions a person takes and in that for which they labor. It is “the miracle you made with your sweat and blood. The secret triumph you keep in your heart” (310).

Cora “was never property” (304). Americans have a responsibility and duty to uphold the promises made by America’s Founding Fathers in documents like the Declaration of Independence to ensure that no man or woman will ever again be property of anyone but themselves. The lofty philosophical establishments of America must not only be ideals from which America sprung, but living truths for which good Americans strive

every single day. Americans must always fight for equal rights and equal protections of those rights under United States law; they must retain in memory the honest labor of their ancestors, which reaffirms the right to own oneself and one's labor; they must strive to build their own futures and legacies through diligent labor, because they can—because their worth is endowed by God and should never again be regarded as inert property subject to the discriminatory whims or follies of mankind.

Works Cited

- Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- “Conversation with Colson Whitehead, author of ‘The Underground Railroad.’” YouTube, uploaded by Audible, 11 Nov. 2016, <https://youtu.be/AtKGs1LQgL0>.
- “Declaration of Independence: A Transcription.” National Archives and Records Administration, www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript.
- Ginsberg, Robert. “Suppose that Jefferson's Rough Draft of the Declaration of Independence is a Work of Political Philosophy.” *Eighteenth Century: Theory & Interpretation*. Texas Tech University Press, vol. 25, no. 1, 1984, pp. 25–43.
- Hillstrom, Laurie Collier. *The Underground Railroad*. Omnigraphics, Inc., 2015.
- Huyler, Jerome. Locke in America: *The Moral Philosophy of the Founding Era*. University Press of Kansas, 1995.
- Jefferson, Thomas. “Jefferson's ‘original Rough draught’ of the Declaration of Independence.” *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Edited by Barbara Oberg, vol. 1: 1760–1776, Princeton University Press, 2008, pp. 423–28.
- Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government 1632–1704*. Edited by Thomas P. Peardon, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1952.

Man-maid Merchant

Rebellion and Otherness in Shakespeare's Othello and Merchant of Venice

Taylor Flickinger

Shakespeare wrote at a time of tacitly accepted hierarchy. Issues of gender, race, ethnicity, and religion were determined by the Crown, which claimed to be acting on God's own authority. Assumptions about the Other, then, were considered absolute, rather than social, truth: women were *objectively* inferior to men, while Jews were objectively evil. Yet, in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, Shakespeare complicates issues of Elizabethan Otherness, presenting it as an arbitrary social construct used mostly to secure the dominant culture's identity. However, he argues that totally ignoring social conventions is radically dangerous, primarily because it would be another form of social absolutism that Shakespeare finds so distasteful. He presents characters like Desdemona, Portia, and Nerissa as "blessed hermaphrodites," or characters who subvert social norms even while embracing them. Conversely, Shylock represents a total rejection of social norms, and his resulting ostracization contrasts him strongly with Othello, who is mostly accepted in his society because he accepts most of that society's customs. Shylock's ostracization, then, is both a result of his own stubbornness and the unrealistic expectations of the society that rejected him. Yet Shakespeare was aware that while Shylock and Portia were both oppressed, their "otherness" was essentially different. By comparing the ways Shakespeare treats gender and racial Otherness, we can better

understand the solution that he offers to modern xenophobia, a solution that is grounded in empathy, art, and experiences that radically decenter us from our imaginary universes.

Stephen Greenblatt, the editor for the *Norton Shakespeare*, emphasizes that Shakespeare's world was an absolutist one. Shakespeare was raised in a religiously dominated culture that emphasized, among other things, absolute divine freedom, unbound divine love, and faith alone. Moreover, these religious absolutes were intentionally conflated with political and social powers. "He heard," Greenblatt says, "in the social and political theories that mirrored religious concepts, comparably extravagant claims for the authority of kings over their subjects, fathers over wives and children, the old over the young, the gentle over the base-born" (*Shakespeare's Freedom* 3). The Elizabethans, then, functioned on a system of assumptions and absolutes. Yet Shakespeare's work is "allergic to the absolutist strain so prevalent in his world, from the metaphysical to the mundane" (*Shakespeare's Freedom* 3). His characters are unusually complex, and Shakespeare always complicates social assumptions even while admitting their validity. "Shakespeare understood his art to be dependent upon a social agreement, but he did not simply submit to the norms of his age. . . . He at once embraced those norms and subverted them, finding an unexpected, paradoxical beauty in the smudges, marks, stains, scars, and wrinkles that had figured only as signs of ugliness and difference" (*Shakespeare's Freedom* 15). Even though he was writing in a world of absolutes, Shakespeare paradoxically admits the validity of social customs while simultaneously subverting them.

Shakespeare, then, presents a breakthrough into rich individuality with his characters' achievements of "individuation through their distance from conventional expectations. They are memorable, distinctive, and alluring not despite but precisely because of their failure to conform to the code of ideal featurelessness to which Shakespeare and his contemporaries subscribed . . . indeed the forms of beauty in which Shakespeare seems most interested veer perilously close to what his culture characterized as ugliness" (*Shakespeare's Freedom* 4–5). This is especially true, Greenblatt argues, of Shakespeare's exploration of the Elizabethan concept of the Other, an Otherness that ostracized Shylock from his Christian peers and that set Iago on Othello. Both characters (and especially the women in both plays) present a kind of argument against cultural xenophobia—that fear of what I will argue is the Arbitrary Other—mostly through the playwright's presentation

of traditionally oppressed characters as strikingly and energetically human. Speaking of *Merchant*, Greenblatt points out that Shakespeare's treatment of Shylock proves that he "had no patience with walls, real or imaginary, and, even in a play consumed with religious and ethnic animosity, he tore them down" ("Shakespeare's Cure"). In other words, Shakespeare presents his audience with a cultural complication of the Other.

Stephen Orgel similarly examines the ways that Shakespeare simultaneously embraces and subverts the Other. However, while Greenblatt focuses his argument mostly on religious and cultural absolutism, examining the way characters like Shylock and Othello complicate Elizabethan social theory, Orgel focuses on the ways that women in Elizabethan theater were seen in English Renaissance plays "as 'them' rather than 'us,' as the Other" (12). More specifically, he examines Renaissance theatrical cross-dressing and what that reveals about Elizabethan gender roles. If "the interchangeability of the sexes is, on both the fictive and the material level, an assumption of this theatre . . . what then is the difference between the sexes?" (Orgel 18). More pointedly, Orgel asks, "What is our God-given essence, that it can be transformed by the clothes we wear?" (26) and thereby implies that gender is a necessarily social construct, one that the Early Moderns believed could literally change one's genitals (20–23).

Merchant of Venice and *Othello* interact with several different types of Otherness, and it is therefore necessary to differentiate between them. The obvious Other in both plays are those characters who are external to the dominant culture, namely Shylock and Othello. But Shakespeare's female characters—Portia, Nerissa, Desdemona, Jessica, etc.—are discriminated against even though they are an accepted part of their respective communities. Orgel and Greenblatt separately consider these issues of the Other: Orgel defines the Other as "as much foreign as female" (12) while Greenblatt focuses on the hatred of the ethnically or racially foreign. Neither, however, consider the implications of both forms of "Othering," of the ways that Shakespeare's characters impose limits on both the foreign and the female and how those limits are essentially different. Shakespeare presents his female characters as a kind of "familiar Other," or as a group that is discriminated against but still generally accepted in the community. Shylock and Othello (but especially Shylock) then become a kind of "other Other," a minority group that has no real accepted place in Shakespeare's social realms. Shakespeare explores

the different ways each kind of Other subverts and embraces their culturally assigned roles, a scrutiny he embodies in his social hermaphrodites.

Shakespeare presents Desdemona as *Othello's* blessed hermaphrodite: she subverts socially established gender roles (the familiar-Otherness) while still willingly submitting to the larger patriarchal society. In other words, she finds ways to rise *within* society without radically breaking gender norms. Shakespeare primarily shows this through her conversational cross-dressing: "That I love the Moor to live with him," she tells the assembled Duke and Senators at the beginning of the play, "My downright violence and storm of fortunes / May trumpet to the world . . . if I be left behind / A moth of peace, and he go to the war, / The rites for why I love him are bereft me" (1.3.245–54). Desdemona adopts the language of the men around her (her "natural superiors") in order to beg that she be allowed to go with Othello to war. She speaks of "violence and storm of fortunes," trumpets, and the rites of both love *and war*, assuming a language which was usually reserved for men. In this sense she appropriates the role of a man.

Significantly, though, Desdemona submits to the general patriarchy even while she's subverting it: she initially asks the duke to lend his "prosperous ear, / And let me find a charter in your voice / T'assist my simpleness" (1.3.242–44). "Simpleness" here means both a poor or lowly condition and an absence of pride, ostentation, or pretentiousness ("Simpleness"). Desdemona asks for help from the Duke, the male authority figure in the room, thereby simultaneously acknowledging her perceived inferiority and that she's going to attempt to overcome it. At the same time, she necessarily asserts that she is not upsetting the patriarchy. Desdemona masterfully maneuvers herself to a position where she can safely use the language and rhetoric of men while still conforming to the established gender roles.

Merchant, contrastingly, presents Shylock as a kind of counterpart to Desdemona's blessedness. Though he's male and rich (and class in Elizabethan society usually trumped all other issues, which is why Othello was so respected by his peers), he's still a radical social outcast, the other Other that is almost irreparably alienated. His values clash vehemently with the "Christian" values that the Venetian society values so, and he would have been considered an outcast from religiously homogenous England, which had banned Judaism entirely. It would be easy, then, for Shakespeare to write Shylock as a caricature, a simplistic and exaggerated antagonist who fills the role of the Jewish villain. Yet Shylock's character demonstrates a challenging

amount of depth. He cares deeply for his past wife, Leah, and is heartbroken when he learns that Jessica sold his ring for a monkey. "I would not have given it for a wilderness of monkeys" (3.1.101–2) he says, showing an emotional side that he usually hides from Antonio and the others. More importantly, he first offers Antonio friendship before suggesting the gruesome collateral of a pound of flesh: "I would be friends with you and have your love, / Forget the shames that you have stained me with, / Supply your present wants and take no doit / Of usance for moneys—and you'll not hear me" (1.3.131–33). Far from being needlessly cruel, Shylock initially offers friendship, an offer that goes rejected.

Shylock's rejected offer of friendship is the olive branch before the pound of flesh: it shows Shylock's desire to coexist, however warily, with his Christian neighbors. He's accused of actively seeking others' destruction: "It is the most impenetrable cur / That ever kept with men" (3.4.18–19), Solanio says of Shylock, refusing to even acknowledge him as a person, instead referring to Shylock as "it." Yet, despite all their mutual hatred (Shylock warns that he will bite when they kick at him), Shylock attempts to make amends with his Christian enemies. It's not quite an attempt at integration, per se: had he had his own way, Shylock would always have been a Jew. But his attempts at friendship demonstrate a vitally important desire to bury the proverbial hatchet somewhere other than in Antonio's back. It's only *after* his rejected offer of peaceful coexistence that Shylock becomes obsessed with Antonio's demise.

Moreover, Shylock's humanity is repeatedly denied, both by the Christian community and in the various versions of *Merchant*. The speech prefixes used for Shylock in the first quarto (Q1) vary; sometimes he is "Shylock," elsewhere he is merely referred to as "Jew." These are especially prevalent "at points in the play in which the action resonates with traditional anti-Semitic stereotypes" (Norton 279). Q2 changes many of these prefixes to "Shylock," while F follows Q1. The printing process was at best imperfect: printers made many errors and emendations to the text, either for readability or ease of printing. It is possible, then, that Q1's sometimes anti-Semitic speech prefixes were a result of the printer's own anti-Semitism, or else Shakespeare's desire to keep Shylock's Otherness immediately present. Either way, even in print Shylock is at times reduced to his nationality alone.

Yet Shylock fights against the Elizabethan's tendency to reduce him to a simplistic and nameless Other. "Hath not a Jew eyes?" he asks. "Hath not

a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affectations, passions... If you prick us do we not bleed? If you tickle us do we not laugh?" (3.1.49–54). But Shakespeare is doing more here than making his audience recognize Shylock's humanity—his lines echo a popular female advocate of conjugal mutuality, or the idea that men and women should be equal at least in marriage: "For women have soules as wel as men . . . what reason is it then, that they shall be bound, whom nature hath made free?" (McDonald 262). By quoting a feminist writer, Shakespeare blends both familiar and foreign concepts of the Other while intimately connecting Shylock with the Elizabethan hermaphrodite.

"Hermaphrodite" here means "a person or thing in which any two opposite attributes or qualities are combined" ("Hermaphrodite"). Shylock is *Merchant's* other Other: because he's a Jew and has traditionally Jewish values, he is universally ostracized, even by his own daughter (whereas the familiar Other were welcomed into society). Yet his offer of friendship to Antonio is as much conversational cross-dressing as Desdemona's supplication to the war generals: "I would . . . Forget the shames that you have stained me with / Supply your present wants and make no doit / Of usance for moneys," he says (1.3.131–33), essentially adopting Christian values to appeal to Shylock. Shylock, a man who values exactitude, vengeance, and the black-letter law, offers to exercise charity and forgiveness, two distinctly Christian traits (and, it should be noted, the two traits that the court *forces* Shylock to adopt after the trial). Shylock doesn't give up his Jewish identity—indeed, Shylock's many monologues and speeches constitute attempts to make himself "the complete, the quintessential Jew. We are in effect watching the fashioning of full ethnic or religious identification" (*Shakespeare's Freedom* 59). He nevertheless shows that he is at least initially willing to adopt foreign virtues to better conform to that society. After the rejection, and because of past grievances, Shylock mirrors much of the hatred directed at him: "the villainy you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction" (3.1.59–60). Though he fights against systemized oppression and harmful "othering," opposing the society that has (grudgingly) accepted him for his wealth, Shylock doesn't fight for any kind of equality, much less submit to any kind of established authority. In fact, he openly admits that he hates Antonio, "for he is a Christian" (1.3.36). Whereas Desdemona sought to subvert the patriarchy while still submitting to it (thus making her a blessed hermaphrodite), Shylock actively seeks to bring ruin upon

the Christian society that has rejected him. In other words, Shylock rejects any externally imposed social limits, but, whereas Desdemona's break was calculated, Shylock's is radical. His total refusal to submit to established roles of subordination and his attempts to take revenge on his oppressors make him a cursed hermaphrodite—he dangerously rejects *all* social norms.

Yet *Merchant* also has instances of blessed hermaphrodites, too: Portia and Nerissa cross-dress as lawyers and end up single-handedly saving Antonio. Two women, who were generally considered naturally and intellectually inferior to men, manage to solve a problem that a group of men could not. None of the men present recognize Portia and Nerissa, and they therefore treat them with the respect and deference that they would give other men. Consequently, Portia and Nerissa are able to outperform their male counterparts. This raises an essential question about the “nature” of women—to re-quote Orgel, “What *is* our God-given essence, that it can be transformed by the clothes we wear?” (27). If Portia and Nerissa are treated as men, they perform *at least* as well as any other man would in that situation. If women were really *by nature* inferior to men, Portia and Nerissa should have failed regardless of what clothes they were wearing. Yet, given the opportunity, they more than raise to the occasion. Gender roles then become an arbitrary social construct, rather than a “natural” hierarchy of order.

Portia and Nerissa, *Merchant's* familiar Other, therefore suggest that any concept of Otherness is necessarily socially constructed, a realization they themselves have in the final moments of the play. “The crow doth sing as sweetly as the lark / When neither is attended,” Portia tells Nerissa after returning home. (5.1.102–3). The Elizabethan Other—at least, the familiar Other—breaks down in this moment. Shakespeare's characters, having experienced what it's like to be on the other side of the Other, realize in a moment of epiphany that their subjugation to men is essentially baseless. “Renaissance ideology had a vested interest in defining women in terms of men,” Orgel says; “the aim is thereby to establish the parameters of maleness, not of womanhood” (24). Shakespeare is therefore arguing that *any* concept of the Other, from Shylock's extreme Otherness to Desdemona's more familiar Otherness, is essentially a way for the dominant culture to assert their identity. All “objective” facts about both types of Other, from Renaissance fear of Jews as Christian killers to the belief that women are morally inferior, are simply untrue.

One must ask, then, why the Jew was so ostracized while these women and the Moor were so well respected by their respective communities. Significantly, Othello was a wealthy war general. Class trumped issues of race or ethnicity in Shakespeare's day, and while Othello had no name, he certainly had a big enough title for people to mostly ignore his skin color. Yet Othello's class was not enough to completely erase his racial differences. The Duke's phrase, "If virtue no delighted beauty lack, / Your son-in-law is far more fair than black" (1.3.186–87), suggests that people are choosing to look past Othello's Otherness, but "more fair than black" nevertheless proves that nobody in *Othello* is colorblind. More importantly, the Duke says it is the Moor's virtue that makes him more fair than black, intimating that Othello isn't ostracized because he plays by the rules. He willingly submits to the Duke's authority, is Christian, and doesn't try to upset the established order. Shylock does none of these things, insisting on either respectful coexistence or mutual, vitriolic hatred.

Perhaps the court's decision to force Shylock to convert was an attempt to force Shylock into Othello's role—the integrated outsider. But Shylock's resigned "I am content" (4.1.192) brings up an essential question about the Other that's immediately relevant in modern America: was his dream of peaceful coexistence even possible? Shylock tried so hard to befriend Antonio but was rejected and scorned many times before the play even begins. "Still have I borne it with a patient shrug," he tells Antonio, "for suff'rance is the badge of all our tribe" (1.3.103–4), but eventually it became too much. Shylock's hatred, then, is as much the Christians' fault as it is his own. Shakespeare blames both sides equally for their mutual hatred, a hatred uncommon in Shakespeare's comedies. The uncomfortably frank answer Shakespeare presents, then, is that sometimes there is just too much mutual hatred for either side to change. Both Shylock and Antonio believed that they were in the right, that they were somehow being robbed of justice, until Shylock lost to what basically amounted to a majority vote.

Shylock's fate is uncomfortably immediate to contemporary politics. It's common to think that we've progressed past so-called "archaic morality," that we are all of us champions of freedom and equality for all. We read of past racial and gender issues and believe that we have done away with the Other, both familiar and *Other*. But the increasing popularity, and in some cases resurgence, of social and political movements (such as *Black Lives Matter* and *All Lives Matter*, the neo-Nazi movement and the alt-right, and fourth-wave

feminism and LGBTQ+ rights) suggest that we have an uncomfortable habit of Othering not only “them,” but “us,” whoever “we” or “they” may be. Shylock may have been *Merchant’s* antagonist, but Shakespeare’s treatment of both the familiar Other and the other Other exposes our sometimes-extreme—and usually baseless—xenophobia.

The solution Shakespeare offers to this problem is not to start a revolution, but to seek out experiences that radically decenter us from our imaginary place in the universe. These essentially empathetic experiences give us glimpses of the Other’s experience, glimpses that made Portia and Nerissa realize that “The nightingale, if she should sing by day / When every goose is cackling, would be thought / No better a musician than the wren” (5.1.104–6). “Are such glimpses enough to do away with hatred of the other?” Greenblatt asks. “Not at all. But they begin an unsettling from within. Even now, more than four centuries later, the unsettling that the play provokes remains a beautiful and disturbing experience” (“Shakespeare’s Cure”). Part of the enduring power of Shakespeare’s works comes from their quintessentially human core that, by virtue of their empathy alone, speaks against the prejudices of his time and ours. Shakespeare, then, presents in *Othello* and *Merchant of Venice* an argument against absolutism. Shylock’s fate represents the dangers—and ultimate futility—of attempting to completely reject social norms. Shakespeare doesn’t totally embrace cultural norms, either; Portia and Nerissa encounter the boundaries of the walls that had been constructed for them and realize that their designation as the “familiar Other” was completely arbitrary. Yet Shakespeare does not suggest that we should totally dismiss social expectations or norms. Rather, his solution to forced, absolute social homogeneity is exposure to vitally important, humanizing moments, experienced primarily through art: “Music, hark! . . . Methinks it sounds much sweeter than by day” (*Merchant* 5.1.97–100). Reading authors like Shakespeare, then, becomes essential to increasing our humanity. In this, Shakespeare doesn’t try to break the chains of social oppression, but rather slowly loosens them.

Works Cited

Greenblatt, Stephen, et al., (editors). *The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed, W. W. Norton Company, 2016.

---. "Shakespeare's Cure For Xenophobia." *The New Yorker*, 10 July 2017, www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/07/10/shakespeares-cure-for-xenophobia. Accessed 16 December 2018.

---. *Shakespeare's Freedom*. University of Chicago Press, 2010.

"Hermaphrodite." *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2020. Web. Accessed 16 December 2018.

"Simpleness." *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2020. Web. Accessed 16 December 2018.

McDonald, Russ. *The Bedford Companion to Shakespeare*. Bedford / St. Martin's, 2001.

The Mosaic of Aesthetics

The Manifestation of Clive Bell's and Roger Fry's Aesthetic Theories in The Waves

Nina Katarina Štular

In Roger Fry's "An Essay in Aesthetics," published in 1909, he explores the question of what art truly is. A year after the paper's publication, Fry met Clive Bell on a train and they struck a conversation about aesthetics that marked the beginning of Fry's life-long friendship with the Bloomsbury group—a group that gave home to many influential modernist thinkers and writers. The aesthetic theory that Fry explains in "An Essay in Aesthetics" influenced Bell's *Art*, published in 1914, which in turn affected Fry's *Vision and Design*, published in 1920, in which Fry fully elaborates his aesthetic theory. Bell's sister-in-law, Virginia Woolf, closely followed the evolution of visual art of her time and was familiar with Bell's and Fry's work in art criticism. In her most poetic and experimental novel, *The Waves*, Bell's and Fry's influences emerge in Woolf's innovative organization, as plot disappears, giving way to the distinctive artistry of her prose. Her nine sections, each beginning with an italicized description of the shore, trace the visual changes in the shore from pre-dawn to post-sunset. These descriptive interludes prepare for six friends' choral monologue, which give her work an aesthetic value and contribute to the "mosaic" that Woolf envisioned for *The Waves* (*Letters* 3:298). Analyzing how Woolf's language and form correspond with Fry's and Bell's aesthetic elements reveals *The*

Waves as a powerful vessel of aesthetics that places the ultimate purpose of aesthetic experience on the creation of timelessness amidst the temporary.

In order to discuss the aesthetics of *The Waves*, we must first examine the aesthetic theories of Bell and Fry. Fry argues that in order to have aesthetic value, a work of art must evoke an aesthetic experience by transporting its observer from the everyday to an “imaginative life” (18). In everyday life, emotions play an evolutionary role of prompting people to react properly to stimuli. “Imaginative life” (18), on the other hand, enables a person to experience emotions without having to respond to them; paintings, music, and novels elicit anxiety, excitement, anger, or joy for the sake of the emotional experience itself. Fry’s definition of art in “An Essay in Aesthetics” allows for this vast spectrum of emotions that constitutes a proper aesthetic experience as he names art “an expression and a stimulus of this imaginative life, which is separated from actual life by the absence of responsive action” (20). Both the visual arts and literature fulfill Fry’s conditions for the aesthetic experience as they allow the consumer to retreat to a private world where emotions are experienced in their purest form.

Fry and Bell agree that emotions are necessary for the aesthetic experience, but they also defend the existence of a more formal set of requisites that each work of art possesses and can be consciously acknowledged by reason. In “The Aesthetic Hypothesis,” Bell claims that to have an aesthetic experience from observing “a combination of forms;” (26) he needs to recognize an objective quality in the work of art, or “perceive intellectually the rightness and necessity of the combination” (26). He believes that a precise balance of artistic elements or “a combination of lines and colours” (12) can bring him aesthetical pleasure and that this “significant form” (11) is the common denominator for all the works of art that move him aesthetically. Fry, on the other hand, names “order” (29) and “variety” (29) as the two qualities necessary for an aesthetic experience: the former ensures that the observer is not overwhelmed by stimuli and the latter that the observer is not bored by their lack. Both Bell and Fry distinguish a set of elements that visual artists use to evoke aesthetic feelings for the sake of either balancing order and variety, or achieving “significant form” (11).

Because the most important artistic elements that evoke aesthetic emotions often influence the work most subtly, Fry and Bell have difficulty in phrasing and formalizing experienced sensations and recognized properties in works of art. In Woolf’s biography of Roger Fry, she summarizes his

attempts to verbalize the subjectively-felt properties that underline visual art: “It was to take him many years and much drudgery before he forged himself a language that wound itself into the heart of sensation” (106). According to Woolf, the medium that enables him to translate emotional experience to a reason-driven verbal formulation is the “pressure of meaning behind him” (106). Fry’s driving purpose, which is to discover the properties of true art, shows in the clarity and care with which he chooses terms and draws conclusions. Similarly, the emotion that drives artists to express themselves subtly permeates their work—it can be communicated through the unique pattern of brushstrokes and ways of applying paint or drawing lines in visual arts, or through specific combinations of syntax, the sound of certain words, and types of phrases in prose. This underlying property of rhythm, defined by its driving purpose, serves as an artist’s unique signature. Fry describes rhythm as “the record of a gesture” that “is modified by the artist’s feeling” (33), whereas Bell, in “The Metaphysical Hypothesis,” gives it an even greater importance; he claims that a subject holds no particular value to the aestheticism of a painting or a novel, but that only feelings which the authors succeed in conveying can have the power to influence an observer’s perception of the work.

Bell’s claims about the inherent insignificance of artistic subjects manifest themselves most fully in Woolf’s *The Waves*. The novel recounts the lives of quite ordinary middle-class men and women who do nothing more exciting than to go to school, write, raise children, attend parties, and work. Instead of giving precise, detailed, and chronological reports of their lives, Woolf gives full emphasis to the artistic elements that she uses to capture the six main characters’ expression of emotions, mind-patterns, and their perception of themselves, each other, and the world. It is not the novel’s descriptive quality or exciting plot that primarily gives significance to *The Waves*, but rather its artistic qualities, as in the rhythm of her distinctive prose. In a letter to Ethel Smith, Woolf reveals that she is aware of the risks of “writing to a rhythm and not the plot” as she admits: “though the rhythmical is more natural to me than the narrative, it is completely opposed to the tradition of fiction and I am casting about all the time for some rope to throw to the reader” (*Letters* 4:204). Instead of losing her readers, however, she earns their admiration as her unique rhythm contributes to their aesthetic experience.

Just as the finest painters draw inspiration for their lines from the forms of nature, the rhythm of *The Waves* follows the natural course of thoughts

that enter consciousness in waves. In her diary, Woolf marks this novel as “a series of dramatic soliloquies” and sees a challenge in maintaining the quality of the rhythm or keeping the soliloquies “running homogeneously in and out, in the rhythm of the waves” (*Diary* 3:312). The novel explores the lives of six friends from childhood onwards, who share one cohesive experience of life despite their separate ways of pursuing happiness and the unique challenges that they each face. In his final soliloquy, Bernard summarizes the affinity that his friends display by smoothly sailing from one mind to another’s: “it is not one life that I look back upon; I am not one person; I am many people; I do not altogether know who I am—Jinny, Susan, Neville, Rhoda, or Louis: or how to distinguish my life from theirs” (368). Their use of maritime vocabulary in their description of life further reflects the plurality of their quintessence: in his feelings of alienation, Louis wishes to be protected by the “waves of the ordinary” (240). When their friend Percival dies, Neville feels as if he has received a blow from “the sails of the world” (280), and Jinny marks the plunge into London’s nightlife as a “cool tide of darkness” that “breaks its waters” (298). By breaking the soliloquies with poetic interludes that describe a single day at the sea-shore in all its aesthetic glory, Woolf conveys wave upon wave of rhythmic units that through the rise and fall of the tension pulsate in an intricate pattern.

Alongside rhythm, the cohesion or unity of a work subtly adds to the quality of aesthetic experience. To achieve unity, an artist seeks connections between all the elements of the picture and attempts to balance and link the composition as “each successive element is felt to have a fundamental and harmonious relation with that which preceded it” (Fry 33). Likewise, prose loses artistic élan if its subjects do not interact cohesively. Woolf achieves unity in *The Waves* by constantly connecting scenes, motifs, and her characters’ thoughts to one another and to the greater course of the novel, with the waves themselves serving as the unifying image. Bernard, Louis, Susan, Neville, Jinny, and Rhoda live vastly different lives, yet their thoughts often wander to the motifs of the sea’s course as they all struggle to accept their lives and make peace with Percival’s death. Woolf deliberately interconnects all the parts of the novel by keeping “the sound of the sea and the birds, dawn and garden subconsciously present, doing their work underground” (*Diary* 4: 11). By introducing the interludes, Woolf juxtaposes the progression of the day with the main characters’ development and thus positions nature’s progress parallel to the dynamics of a human life. Whereas the first interlude

corresponds to childhood as the birds' distanced and subdued "blank melody" (180) corresponds to a child's eager anticipation of adulthood, the third interlude indicates adulthood with its full share of challenges and joys as it describes "birds that had sung erratically and spasmodically," displaying maturity as their song includes fear, "apprehension of pain, and joy" (225). Through equating nature to the lives of friends, binding them with shared feelings and associative themes, Woolf achieves aesthetic unity in *The Waves*.

In their quest for "significant form," visual artists face the challenge of balancing relations of light and shade by choosing which parts of their composition to highlight with light and which to hide in the shade (Bell 11). In *The Waves*, Woolf's decision not to give voice to Percival but to leave him mysteriously undefined acts as the counterbalance to the revealed thoughts of the six main characters. The absence of Percival's narrative and later his physical absence in death distinguish him from the others and highlight his importance. The six friends orient themselves with regards to him as they "assume the sober and confident air of soldiers in the presence of their captain" (260) and disassemble in his absence: "without Percival there is no solidity. We are silhouettes, hollow phantoms moving mistily without a background" (259). He is the bright figure of the composition to which all eyes turn, the one who attracts his friends as light attracts moths, the one who unites and completes them: "sitting together now we love each other and believe in our own endurance" (260). Percival "inspires poetry" (202); he represents honor and nobility—timeless principles that enable him to create a "swelling and splendid moment" (276) to which everyone wants to hold on. He inspires his friends to believe that they are significant, that they "can add to the treasury of moments" (276), that they can forge their own destiny: "We too, . . . stride not into chaos, but into a world that our own force can subjugate and make part of the illumined and everlasting road" (276–77). In amplifying his friends' experience of the momentary, Percival embodies the changing power of aesthetic experience that inspires people to strive towards timeless ideals of good in their own lives.

A work with properties of "significant form" necessarily intensifies a moment by manipulating the artistic element of mass (Bell 11). In order for mass to manifest itself through painting, an observer must simply process the visual cues of the composition in front of them. Prose, however, requires the reader first to create a mental image of the text's substance and then to process it. Because of an extra step in the course of perception, prose with

the power to induce aesthetic experience packs itself as fully as possible with mass. In *The Waves*, Woolf wishes to “saturate every atom” and “give the moment whole; whatever it includes” (*Diary* 3:116). By stripping *The Waves* bare of unnecessary information, she has created prose that is tangible and exciting to the senses but at the same time maintains the concept of the “ghostliness of matter’s primary properties” (156). Ann Banfield, a scholar of modernism, introduces this concept in her study of Woolf’s engagement with the philosophical and aesthetic ideas of her contemporaries. Banfield refers to the epistemological reality of matter, describing it as being rooted in the awareness of the physical world in which particles interact on the levels of their own microcosms. Just as all mass in the physical world interacts by creating wave-like disturbances of their surroundings, Woolf’s “phantom waves” (*Diary* 3:236) represent the connecting medium of the unreal world of *The Waves*, binding it into an artistic whole with such vastly different entities of the novel as Bernard’s soliloquies, worms in the land, and circles of light cast by mirror. The unreal mass saturating *The Waves* gains a real propensity to influence the reader’s aesthetic experience of reading as Woolf sculpts it into well-balanced compositions.

Balance of masses, however, only plays its full role in the creation of aesthetic experience if it is paired with an adequate perspective. In *The Waves*, the perspective of narration and the variety of narrative perspectives significantly contribute to the aesthetic emotions that the novel evokes. While Woolf ensures the variety of narrative perspectives by engaging with multiple narrators, the power of perspective implicating narration manifests itself most explicitly in the third interlude. What begins as a panoramic view of the ocean with its “thin swift waves,” illuminated by the light of the risen sun, continues to traverse the scenery as it moves from one subject to another (*Waves* 225). The observer shifts from the perspective of a girl who “drove a straight pathway over the waves” to a flock of birds “swerving high over the elm tree, singing together as they chased each other, escaping, pursuing, pecking” (226). Then the focus moves to a single snail shell, only to continue its exploration of the scenery across the garden as it momentarily lands the reader’s imaginative eye on a single reflective rain drop “with a whole house bent in it” (226), a microcosm in itself. A whole synesthetic experience manifests itself as visual cues intermingle with smells and textures: “matter oozed” from the rotten fruit and “yellow excretions were exuded by slugs” (226). The narrative turbulence of the passage radiates praise of the aesthetic

experience in describing a “phantom flower” that a looking glass projects on the wall, a “phantom flower” that nevertheless is “part of the flower” (226), just as the imaginary world of aesthetics is an important part of the real world. Through the poetic truths relayed in the interlude, Woolf reiterates the epistemological reality of aesthetic experience—namely that, while aesthetics may require some flexibility of changing perspective, they reveal themselves to anyone who dares to seek a carefully balanced combination of artistic elements.

The Waves provide Woolf with a further aesthetic challenge. Daring to observe reality in an unconventional way plays just as important a role in the aesthetic potential of color as it does in the intermixing of perceptions. Evolutionarily, colors signal danger or presence of nutritious substance in fruit, but in order for color to contribute to an aesthetic experience, those who create and those who consume art must surpass the everyday pragmatic perception of color. As Banfield asserts in *The Phantom Table*, “the painter learns, contra naturam, to not see what common sense sees” when observing colors (264). By combining them daringly and unconventionally, a visual artist looks past utility of colors to the underlying rhythm, balance of mass, and unity. In the very beginning of *The Waves*, the children explore these artistic perspectives by ceasing to see the actual objects and their functions and, instead, focusing on the aesthetic experience that colors promise. As the children embrace the “imaginative life” (Fry 18) of the aesthetic vision, reality becomes irrelevant, so “a slab of pale yellow . . . spreading away until it meets a purple stripe” and “a crimson tassel . . . twisted with gold threads” (*Waves* 180) are valued for their inherent quality. Because of the associations that colors have with emotions and the purity of the aesthetic experience that colors help bring to their perceiver, Woolf carefully positions adjectives of color to create a composition with the aptitude to induce aesthetic experience.

Color, mass, and shape are basic elements of visible material substance; it is utterly impossible to imagine the existence of a visible, colorless, massless, and shapeless anything. Evoking sensations of shape through prose, however, takes effort to achieve and, if applied correctly, serves as a remarkable tool of aesthetics. In *The Waves*, Woolf repeatedly uses the shape of rings that matches the cyclical nature of the underlying, wave-like rhythm and historically symbolizes perfection and divinity. In Bernard’s opening line, the ring that he observes “quivers and hangs in a loop of light” (180) and marks his childhood understanding of aesthetic beauty in nature.

In all six main characters' youth, a ring symbolizes their friendship, the connection that they share; it holds the "tremendous power of some inner compulsion" (201) that Louis wishes to make permanent and to "forge in a ring of steel" (201). But Percival "destroys it, as he blunders off," foretelling his own death, which metaphorically breaks up the ring of friends (201). Their lives still intertwine and converge through Bernard's stories, which he views as successive rings, each "passing through another" (275). When they meet years after Percival's death, they once again link unity and intensity of the moment with the shape of the ring: "there was no past, no future; merely the moment in its ring of light, and our bodies; and the inevitable climax, the ecstasy" (351). Rings imply focus and intensity but also an underlying quality of the experience of life as "the being grows rings, like a tree" (373). By continually associating the shape of a ring with an aesthetic experience, unity, permanence, and perfection, Woolf gives the element of shape an important role in the composition of *The Waves*.

Besides the elements of rhythm, unity, relation of light and shade, mass, perspective, color, and shape that, according to Bell and Fry, compose "significant form" and consequently induce aesthetic experience, an astute art lover may have noticed that both visual and written works have another quality that distinguishes them from reality—reflectiveness. A true work of art enables its observers to see themselves and their emotions reflected on the canvas or in the characters that they read about. Is it not the grief and suffering that millions project on the canvas of Picasso's *Guernica* that brought the work its fame? Do the curves of Van Gogh's *Starry Night* not carry dreams and hopes of all whom its vivid colors and bold brush-strokes move? And do those who experience aesthetic pleasure from observing Michelangelo's *David* not admire Renaissance values that they wish to see in their own lives? Just as observers of art retreat to the privacy of their aesthetic experience, Neville's desire for love, Louis's feelings of alienation, Bernard's never-ending quest for phrases, Susan's struggles with motherhood, Rhoda's anxiety, and Jinny's sensuality allow them to see pieces of themselves and their own lives from a safe distance. By projecting their emotions on to an entity that possesses "significant form" the observers distance themselves from having to react, evaluate, analyze, or make changes (Bell 11). They can simply recognize, feel their emotions, and give in to the admiration of the underlying qualities of the work that triggered their aesthetic experience.

Woolf uses artistic elements, established by Fry and Bell in their theories, not only to shape *The Waves* as a powerful vessel of aesthetics but also to bring the reader to the dramatic revelation of the novel. She extends Fry's and Bell's arguments by defining the ultimate purpose and culmination of aesthetic experience as the creation of timelessness amidst the temporary. In his final soliloquy, Bernard leaves behind his former self by saying that he is "done with phrases" (382) and that he wishes to be alone in the company of pure existence: "Let me sit here forever with bare things, this coffee-cup, this knife, this fork, things in themselves, myself being myself" (382). Through forging a connection with the essence of the material world, aesthetic experience manifests itself in Bernard, who has previously turned to others to define himself, and transforms him into a self-sufficient being in harmony with his own identity. His attunement to the core, wave-like rhythm of the novel bears witness to his aesthetic awakening that gradually builds up: "Yes, this is the eternal renewal, the incessant rise and fall and rise again" (383). At the very height of his aesthetic experience, Bernard reaches the state of "imaginative life" (Fry 18), which enables him to make the discovery of the ultimate purpose of aesthetics—"eternal renewal" or the pursuit of permanence despite the reality of transience (*Waves* 383). In light of his aesthetic catharsis he rediscovers his purpose in fighting death, the ultimate adversary of permanence. Bernard embodies art that is "unvanquished and unyielding" and overpowers death by carrying ideas that transcend the short lives of those who create it (383). In the final line of the novel—"The waves broke on the shore" (383)—Woolf summarizes the poetic duality of art that uses the individual artistic elements, each as fleeting and feeble as a single breaking wave, to create an artistic, wave-like assembly of ideas that endure.

A novel so powerful as to induce sensations that evoke aesthetic experience comes as a result of an unconventional art process. Much as Michelangelo described his sculpting as an act of freeing figures from blocks of marble, Woolf, in a letter to Vita Sackville-West, describes her artistic process as the setting free of what is already there: "I believe that the main thing in beginning a novel is to feel, not that you can write it, but that it exists on the far side of a gulf, which words can't cross: that it's to be pulled through only in a breathless anguish" (*Letters* 3:529). Such a remarkable and sensuous description of the artistic process that uncannily matches Michelangelo's recount of his sculpting directly links Woolf to the visual arts. *The Waves* indeed proved to be an "anguish" (*Letters* 3:529) for Woolf

to write as she deems it “the most complex and difficult” book that she has ever written (*Diary* 3:298). In her diary, Woolf planned to write *The Waves* as “a tremendous discussion, in which every life shall have its voice—a mosaic” (3:298). As the analysis of the novel from the aesthetic perspective proves, she truly did justice to her analogy as her descriptive interludes and choral monologues, culminating in Bernard’s climactic final soliloquy, contribute the tesserae she needed for the great “mosaic” (3:298) of aesthetic creation of *The Waves*.

Works Cited

- Banfield, Ann. *The Phantom Table: Woolf, Fry, Russel and Epistemology of Modernism*. Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Bell, Clive. *Art*. Stokes, 1914.
- Fry, Roger. *Vision and Design*. Brentano, 1920.
- Nigel, Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann, editors. *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. Harvest, 1975–82, 6 vols.
- Woolf, Virginia. *Jacob's Room and The Waves: Two Complete Novels*. Harvest, 1952, pp. 179–383.
- . Letter to Ethel Smyth, 28 Aug. 1930. Nicolson and Trautmann, *Volume Four 1929–1931*, 1981, pp. 204–05.
- . Letter to Vita Sackville-West, 8 Sept. 1928. Nicolson and Trautmann, *Volume Three 1923–1928*, 1980, pp. 528–30.
- . *Roger Fry: A Biography*. Harvest, 1976.
- . *The Diary of Virginia Woolf, Volume Three 1925–1930*, edited by Anne Olivier Bell, Harcourt, 1980.
- . *The Diary of Virginia Woolf, Volume Four 1931–1935*, edited by Anne Olivier Bell, Harcourt, 1982.

Works Consulted

- Dowling, David. *Bloomsbury Aesthetics and The Novels of Forester and Woolf*. Macmillan, 1985.
- Olk, Claudia. *Virginia Woolf and The Aesthetics of Vision*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2014.

On Waiters and Writers

Views of Authorship in Charles Dickens's "Somebody's Luggage"

Michela Miller Dickson

The occupation of waitering during the late nineteenth century was not just a way to eke out an existence—it was an art. Or at least, that is the image painted by Charles Dickens in his portmanteau story “Somebody’s Luggage.” This collaboratively written tale was released in Dickens’s 1862 *All the Year Round* publication as an annual Christmas number (Simmons 90). “Somebody’s Luggage” involves a frame narrative, or overarching storyline, written by Dickens that makes up the first and last chapters of the story. Aside from the frame story, each chapter within “Somebody’s Luggage” is composed of a different manuscript written by a different author.

One Dickens scholar, Ruth Glancy, points out that Dickens used the frame stories in his portmanteau tales as a conduit for “vital imaginative and moral expressions made possible through the relationship of . . . writer and reader” (72). With this in mind, it is apparent that the frame narrative for “Somebody’s Luggage” serves as a platform for Dickens’s never-ending supply of opinions. Dickens’s frame story is narrated by Christopher, the head waiter at a small hotel, who discovers a mysterious piece of abandoned luggage containing several story manuscripts. Despite Christopher’s

working-class background, his narration paints the life of a waiter as a noble calling that does not come naturally to everyone. In terms of waitering, Christopher declares, “You must be bred to it. You must be born to it” (3). This suggests that one must be born to the exclusive and dignified position of waiter, which is seemingly contrary to the typical Victorian mindset.

Some critics, such as Rodney Edgecombe, have argued that Dickens uses Christopher’s high-minded impressions of waitering to promote positive perceptions of waiters and working class laborers. That may be true, but only on the surface level. Edgecombe asserts that Dickens uses Christopher’s voice and characterization to encourage a change in social perception when he states, “Again and again we get the sense that the persona behind ‘Somebody’s Luggage’ is trying to correct public ‘misprision’ about the craft of waiting” (27). Dickens does suggest that readers have a flawed perception of waitering; however, deeper examination reveals that Dickens is not merely referring to waiters but also to authors.

Existing literature on “Somebody’s Luggage” also addresses the connection between waitering and authorship. Scholar Emily Simmons comments that this story “speaks to Dickens’s singular position as both author and editor that he can bring together amateur, professional, and established authors of varying styles and combine their work within his own in order to turn a very tidy profit” (118). Essentially, this confirms the claim that Dickens uses the character of the waiter to promote his own position as author and editor. To convey the importance of authorship, Dickens uses the scaffold of the waiter’s character to draw parallels between the misunderstood nature of waitering and the misunderstood nature of Dickens’s own occupations, writing and editing. By portraying Christopher’s role as a misunderstood waiter, Dickens criticizes Victorian society’s views of authors and also emphasizes the often unseen but essential roles of both authors and editors in Victorian society. The purpose of this essay is two-fold. First, to establish how the parallels between waiters and writers in “Somebody’s Luggage” initiate a larger conversation about the value of writers in society. Second, to illustrate how Dickens’s contributions to “Somebody’s Luggage” highlight the importance of editors in the Victorian publishing industry.

Parallels Between Waiters and Writers

The first half of the frame story for “Somebody’s Luggage,” as well as Dickens’s contributions to other chapters, critiques how society views

waitering—and, ultimately, writing. By focusing the narrative on waitering, Dickens is able to set the stage for his argument about the essential role of writers in society. This narrative is enhanced by using his signature first-person narration. First-person narration solidifies a trusting bond between reader and writer, as if the reader has a personal, intimate connection with the narrator. But this perspective also creates a space where the narrator's identity is ambiguous; the story could be interpreted as narrated either by the waiter or Dickens. Edgecombe assents that Dickens's narrator entertains his audience with "solemn earnestness" and also claims that this narration "assures us that we are about to receive the last word on waiters, an inward, privileged view" (26). Furthermore, the first-person point of view "invites readers to imagine themselves being addressed personally by Dickens" (Palmer 29). Overall, the first-person narration adds an element of fluidity to the identity of the narrator and introduces the possibility that Dickens is projecting his own voice and opinions through the character of Christopher.

Simmons argues that Dickens mobilized this story as "a vehicle for very particular messages about authorship and professionalism" (85), one message being the importance of authors in society. Dickens emphasizes that the life of a waiter, and by extension, an author, is a noble, albeit misunderstood, occupation. In self-effacing and quirky narration—described by one critic as "piquant oddity" (Edgecombe 27)—Christopher's "humble lines" elevate waitering from a mere occupation to that of a "calling" (Dickens 1). Dickens writes, "You cannot lay down those lines of life at your will and pleasure by the half-day or evening, and take up Waiter-ing. You may suppose you can, but you cannot; or you may go so far as to say you do, but you do not" (2). This statement confirms that Dickens is trying to correct flawed social perceptions about this seemingly low-class position.

Dickens further points out that the waitering environment forces waiters to hide their true selves and pretend to be interested in all kinds of things to be successful at their trade. Christopher mourns this tendency in himself, "Look at the Hypocrites we are made, and the lies (white, I hope) that are forced upon us! Why must a sedentary-pursuited Waiter . . . have a most tremendous interest in horse-training and racing? Yet it would be half our little incomes out of our pockets if we didn't" (Dickens 7–8). Again, Dickens shows that waiters must pretend to be interested in all sorts of things because they cannot survive financially any other way, and the same applies to authors. Theoretically, authors have the freedom to write about whatever

they wish, yet in reality, some authors can only make a living within the realm of what people will pay for and find entertaining. These parallels convey that being an author requires a level of self-sacrifice, most of which goes unseen by Victorian society.

Dickens furthers his stance on authorship in the chapter "The Brown-Paper Parcel" using the narration of an unnamed artist. Although the framework of waitering isn't utilized in this tale, the chapter serves a similar purpose in conveying the sense that writers, like artists, often go unrecognized. This story is narrated by an opinionated artist who is frustrated about how artists are perceived and often ignored. Like the chapters narrated by Christopher, this chapter opens with first-person narration from the artist, who claims, "MY works are well known. I am a young man in the Art line. You have seen my works many a time, though it's fifty thousand to one if you have seen me" (Dickens 138). On a very basic level, this passage expresses the difficulties of being in a creative field in which the author's real personality is of little consequence; but at the same time, this passage also describes Dickens, who, as an artist himself, uses this character to echo his earlier point: people do not value the artist as much as they value the art. Dickens's descriptions of both the artist and the waiter point to his own occupation as a writer. He claims that although a writer's work may capture the attention of society, no one seems to really know the writer as a person.

Dickens also suggests, through Christopher's commentary, that the notion that writers easily become rich is a myth. Concerning a waiter's income, Christopher questions, "What is meant by the everlasting fable that Head Waiters is rich? How did that fable get into circulation?" (9). This passage points to Victorian society's naïveté and informs readers that it is unrealistic to view waiters as living a life of plenty. Christopher also claims that even waiters can fall into that viewpoint, which is like falling from a "dizzy precipice of falsehood" (Dickens 10). This misguided impression that waitering leads to wealth could be compared to assumptions that becoming a writer will eventually lead to money and fame.

Outside of the economic struggle of waitering, Dickens points out that waiters and writers frequently hide a "heavy heart" and often have to feign interest in their clients in order to make a living (6). In the first chapter of "Somebody's Luggage," Christopher describes this difficulty:

I am ashamed of myself in my own private bosom for the way in which I make believe to care whether or not the grouse is strong on the wing . . . and whether the pheasants is shy or bold, or anything else you please to mention. Yet you may see me, or any other Waiter of my standing, holding on by the back of the box and leaning over a gentleman with his purse out and his bill before him, discussing these points in a confidential tone of voice, as if my happiness in life entirely depended on 'em. (8–9)

Dickens conveys that just as waiters are governed by the whims and fancies of their customers, he as an author is subject to the desires of publishers and readers. Essentially, Dickens's reference to waiters as a more exclusive branch of society suggests that readers should be privileged to hear from a perspective that is normally not valued.

Despite the negative aspects of waitering, Dickens's distinguished interpretation of waiters' roles also insinuates that being a waiter actually gives waiters power over their clients, even clients above their social status. Dickens writes, "The good old-fashioned style is, that whatever you want, down to a wafer, you must be 'olely and solely dependent on the Head Waiter for. You must put yourself a new-born Child into his hands" (13). This excerpt illustrates a fascinating juxtaposition between the lower social status of a waiter and the status of their clients. Although the clients most likely have a higher social standing than the waiter, they are temporarily reliant upon the waiter for their needs, which is a complete switch in the normal social hierarchy. And while a waiter's hard work should merit an expectation of appropriate recognition, that does not always happen (Simmons 100). Overall, Christopher's observations about this power dynamic illustrate the irony in this situation: those who look down upon waiters are actually reliant on them.

A similar relationship based on mutual dependence also develops between writers and readers; the author is dependent on his readers for financial support while the readers, in purchasing and consuming a piece of writing, submit themselves to the writer's words. Supposedly, Dickens enjoyed writing frame stories because they exhibited the narrator's power over his audience. The interdependence between reader and author is also mirrored between authors and publisher. Publishers during the nineteenth century relied on authors to make a profit, yet authors did not always get an equal share of that profit despite being the instigator of that financial success (Nayder 16). Overall, the power dynamics between waiter and customer

are similar to those of authors and readers. Dickens shows that although customers are beholden to authors for their entertainment, authors do not receive adequate compensation, recognition, or appreciation for their work.

Parallels between Waiters and Editors

Parallels between waiters and writers certainly convey the importance of authorship, but Dickens does not stop there. He also uses other chapters in “Somebody’s Luggage” to make a statement about the role of editors in the publishing industry, and this claim is supported by Simmons as well (85). Dickens both criticizes and promotes elements of the publishing industry to convey that editors are the unseen key to success in the publishing process.

Dickens alludes to the risks of being an editor and writer in the chapter “The Brown-Paper Parcel.” The unnamed artist bemoans the burdens of holding a creative occupation in Victorian society, and the way the artist describes society’s treatment of artists is also representative of how the publishing industry treated writers. One aspect of the publishing industry that Dickens touches on repeatedly is the lack of copyright laws. Dickens’s personal letters express his disappointment that there were not laws in place to protect copyright. In one letter written to Henry Austin in 1842, Dickens bemoans, “Is it not a horrible thing that scoundrel booksellers should grow rich here from publishing books, the authors of which do not reap one farthing? . . . Is it tolerable that [an author] . . . should have no choice of his audience, no control over his own distorted text? . . . my blood so boils at these enormities.” This letter underscores the injustice of having no copyright protection, a frustration which surfaces in “Somebody’s Luggage.”

Dickens’s passion for copyright law is manifested through the character of the unnamed artist in the chapter “The Brown-Paper Parcel.” The artist complains that even if he were to become a famous artist, there were no copyright laws to protect his work. Dickens’s opinionated views surface when the narrating artist muses about his popularity and says, “But suppose I AM popular? . . . Then no doubt they [an artist’s works] are preserved in some Collection? No, they are not . . . Copyright? No, nor yet copyright” (Dickens 140). This fiery declaration reveals that creators, whether artists or authors, often got the raw end of the deal and were inhibited by the lack of copyright laws. It also suggests that there is a need for an editor-type figure to protect the work of other writers and artists.

Dickens continues to highlight the work of editors in “The Brown-Paper Parcel” in the commentary of the artist narrator. At one point, the artist states that people are not interested in artists themselves, but only in what they produce. He cries, “You say you don’t want to see me? You say your interest is in my works and not in me? Don’t be too sure about that” (Dickens 138). The artist claims that he is invisible and perhaps only acknowledged because of the services he provides. This claim can be applied to the work of editors, who are necessary to the publishing industry but perhaps overlooked. In Simmons’s analysis of this chapter, she implies that artists need the professional skills of others to succeed in their industry. Simmons states that “knowing how to create is only part of the artist’s occupation, and that, without attendant effort of a more professional nature, the artist cannot expect (or may not want) to receive credit and recognition for his or her work” (100). Dickens’s strong admonition, “Don’t be too sure about that,” shows that editors play a significant role in helping the work of artists, or writers, to come to fruition.

The closing half of the frame story in the chapter “His Wonderful End” illustrates the essential nature of editorial work. In this chapter, Christopher sells the mysterious manuscripts he found in the abandoned luggage for publication, but shortly afterward, he meets the original author of the abandoned manuscripts. When he reveals that the stories were published, Christopher is surprised by the author’s positive, exuberant response (Dickens 208–17). The author confesses, “I have unremittingly and unavailingly endeavoured to get into print. Know, Christopher, that all the Booksellers alive—and several dead—have refused to put me into print . . . but they shall be read to you, my friend and brother” (Dickens 218). This passage implies that Christopher’s role as an editor and compiler of the manuscripts was essential. The writer of the manuscript depended on Christopher, the editor; without Christopher’s assistance, the writer’s work would never have been published. This scenario suggests that without Dickens’s role as an editor, his authors—particularly those who worked with him on collaborative tales—would have had little chance of making their way into print. By exaggerating the toil the original writer experienced (whose corrections only seemed to make the manuscript worse), Dickens conveys that editors are crucial and can even save authors from themselves.

The ending of “Somebody’s Luggage” also describes a publishing industry that is supported by a social hierarchy in which authors must

subject themselves to editors in order to publish. While Dickens seems to condemn the injustices faced by the lower classes that stem from hierarchical Victorian society, he clearly relies on a similar system in his own profession, particularly in maintaining control over his collaborative works. According to scholar Anthea Trodd, Dickens saw collaboration “imagined in hierarchical terms,” which implies that Dickens had the most power in the process (203). In collaborative pieces, Dickens insisted on revisions so drastic that sometimes the collaborator’s work was only a “mosaic rather than retouched compositions” (Stone 48). And despite Dickens’s heavy-handed control over the editing process, he allowed no one other than himself to revise his own work.

While his insistence on having control and power over collaborative publications may seem slightly hypocritical, it does demonstrate that Dickens was an expert in his field and was actually devoted to helping his fellow authors publish and be recompensed for their work. John Feather points out one possible reason for Dickens’s interference. Feather explains that it was easier for famous writers to manipulate copyright and profits in the competitive publishing world than for less prestigious writers who lacked experience and connections (94). In “His Wonderful End,” the author of the manuscripts is overjoyed that his work has been published because he could not publish it himself, and he did not seem to mind that his name was not associated with his writing (218–19). The writer surrenders his identity for the sake of publication, which plays into Dickens’s own argument that budding authors should agree to work collaboratively with him. Dickens’s reputation would sell their writing, and the arrangement would guarantee them a solid profit. Although it required authors to “place [themselves] in the hands of One,” relying on Dickens to publish their work would prove more beneficial than attempting to attempt it on their own (Dickens 208). While a hierarchical structure seems to be contradictory, his commentary in “Somebody’s Luggage” reveals that, without the mediating influence of editors, many writers would be like the writer in the frame story—rejected by publishers and unable to succeed by themselves.

Dickens’s dual identity is solidified at the conclusion of the frame narrative, “His Wonderful End.” The original author of the manuscript edits Christopher’s proofs and asks Christopher to send them back to the editor of the magazine. Here, Dickens’s fictional scenario begins to resemble reality because the magazine is none other than Dickens’s own *All the Year Round*

(perhaps a bit of self-promotion!). The final scene describes the editor of the magazine (who readers at the time would have recognized to be Dickens himself) looking through the edited proofs. Unable to decipher the smeared edits, the editor throws the proofs into the fire and opts to print the original version. The editor of the magazine prefers to accept only the works that were edited by Christopher, not the work of the original author. The magazine editor emphasizes the essential nature of an editor in the writing process by choosing Christopher's manuscript over the original author's work. This scenario underscores that Dickens's own role as editor has a large hand in the success of collaboratively written works and their writers.

The symbolism of Dickens's dual identity as waiter and editor in "Somebody's Luggage" reinforces the importance of each role individually and collectively. Christopher's commentary on waitering serves as a platform for Dickens to demonstrate how social inequality permeates the publishing industry and robs authors of appropriate recognition. However, Christopher's actions also support the Victorian editorial hierarchy by showing that editors play key roles in getting an author published. Ultimately, Dickens uses the memorable character of Christopher to articulate that a cooperative relationship between writer and editor guarantees success for both parties.

Works Cited

- Boege, Fred W. "Point of View in Dickens." *PMLA*, vol. 65, no. 2, 1950, pp. 90–105. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.2307/459457.
- Dickens, Charles. "The Works of Charles Dickens : Letters and Speeches of Charles Dickens Edited by His Sister-in-Law and His Eldest Daughter." *Hearst's International Library*, vol. 1, 1812–1870, *HathiTrust Digital Library*, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uva.x000880144?urlappend=;seq>.
- . "Somebody's Luggage." *All the Year Round*, vol. 4, 1862. *HathiTrust Digital Library*, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.hwjmd3>.
- Edgecombe, Rodney S. "Dickens, Hunt and the Waiter in 'Somebody's Luggage'." *Victorian Newsletter*, vol. 107, 2005, pp. 25–28. *EBSCOhost*.
- Feather, John. *A History of British Publishing*. 2nd ed. Routledge, London, 2006. *EBSCOhost*.
- Glancy, Ruth F. "Dickens and Christmas: His Framed-Tale Themes." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1980, pp. 53–72, JSTOR, doi:10.2307/2933479.
- Nayder, Lillian. *Unequal Partners*. Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Palmer, Beth. *Women's Authorship and Editorship in Victorian Culture: Sensational Strategies*. Oxford University Press, 2011. *EBSCOhost*.
- Simmons, Emily C. *Contextualizing Value: Market Stories in Mid-Victorian Periodicals*. University of Toronto Press, Canada, 2011. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*.
- Stone, Harry. *Charles Dickens' Uncollected Writings from Household Words, 1850–1859*. Indiana UP, 1968. *EBSCOhost*.
- Trodd, Anthea. "Collaborating in Open Boats: Dickens, Collins, Franklin, and Bligh." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, 1999, pp. 201–25.

Torn by Tension

Modernism in Edith Wharton's The Age of Innocence

Kathryn Taylor

The end of the Great War marked massive shifts in almost every aspect of the world. Economics, politics, trade, domestic life, industry, technology, science, and the arts all underwent massive changes that could be linked directly to the loss of an entire generation of people and the complete loss of stability in most of the world. The Victorian Age was officially over and the rest of Europe was trying to come to terms with the effects of the War. Artists, philosophers, and writers turned to the ideas presented in Modernism to help create sense in the chaos. Modernism was marked by a binary of tension as well as the inherent instability and uncertainty of the future. Modernism's dependence on tension between the Old World and the New allowed writers like Edith Wharton, Willa Cather, and Virginia Woolf to explore a nostalgia for the Old and a hope for the New. However, Wharton in particular was able to capture this inherent tension generated in Modernism by using an Old World setting to convey New World ideals.

Wharton wrote *The Age of Innocence* in 1920, not long after the end of the First World War. Wharton uses this novel to explore the New York society of her youth—a society that was lost during the War and was rapidly fading into the past. Wharton uses perceptions of purity and the reality of power to examine aspects of modernity within the three main characters of her novel

while creating a nostalgia for a world lost. While May Wellend is perceived by society, and by Newland Archer, as perfectly innocent and pure, she is an expert manipulator and uses that to retain her power within the matriarchal power structure created by her family and reinforced by society. Ellen Olenska, on the other hand, is perceived as foreign and wrong so society shuns her to protect the world that society has carefully built, despite their envy for her riches and her access to high culture. Much like May, Archer is perceived by society to be perfect, but, in reality, he struggles to fit in and is ostracized when he finds comfort in Ellen. Wharton uses and subverts the power structures present in the novel as well as perception to reveal the different aspects of Modernism—contradiction, nostalgia, and tension respectively—in her main characters in a non-Modern setting.

The way in which women in Wharton's world create familial and societal power structures based on codes of conduct, and how those women use and subvert those power structures to support their beliefs and shun outsiders, is the main focus of Judith Fryer's essay "Purity and Power in 'The Age of Innocence.'" In a similar vein, Margaret Jay Jessee explores how the characters use masks of perception and social conduct codes to hide from reality or perceive reality differently in her essay "Trying it On: Narration and Masking in Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence*." These essays, combined with Carol J. Singley's exploration of changing cultural codes in her essay "Bourdieu, Wharton and Changing Culture in *The Age of Innocence*," set up the chance to explore the power structures in Wharton's novel and how the characters' perceptions of reality showcase the core tenets of Modernism in her novel. When the novel is examined through the lenses presented by these critics, a commentary on Modernism is generated in a non-Modern context. Wharton is exploring a nostalgia for the Old World, but she also explores the opportunities presented by the New World through her characters and what that meant for her changing cultural context.

Wharton was in a unique position to examine this tension and contradiction that marked the Modernism of her time. In Diane Cousineau's book, *Letters and Labyrinths: Women Writing/Cultural Codes*, she explains that an author must be positioned between two worlds in order to examine cultural codes. Alan Price supports this idea in the preface of his book *The End of the Age of Innocence* when he states that "Wharton entered one type of world and witnessed the emergence of another" and that "the world Wharton valued was largely lost. It was obliterated by the mass world, a

world without taste, a world without an aristocracy of intellect" (xvii). Both Cousineau and Price recognize that Wharton's unique placement in history allows her to examine cultural codes and both the Old and New Worlds in a way that couldn't be done in another time. For example, Archer's continual longing for Ellen is reminiscent of the nostalgia that much of Europe held for the lost Old World. By writing alongside the emergence of Modernism, Wharton has the ability to infuse her characters with the very traits she was seeing in the changing world around her.

The Old World of New York society where Wharton was raised had strict cultural codes that demanded a very specific type of conduct and etiquette; Archer tries to adhere to said codes, but ultimately fails. Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield lists several principles of politeness that should drive all aspects of life in his etiquette manual "Principles of politeness, and of knowing the world." According to Stanhope, all young men, and to some extent young women, should be humble, honest, well-bred, practiced in the art of conversation, well-dressed, and show great decorum. In a way, Newland Archer showcases all these characteristics. He is a well-bred, educated, successful young man who managed to secure a great marriage and the good opinions of his peers. However, Chesterfield would be appalled by some of Archer's more awkward moments. Archer's inability to traverse the finer aspects of high society and his struggles in the art of conversation show how he does not fit into New York society. Archer often blurts out his thoughts in conversations, leading to him be ostracized by his peers, such as when he states that "women ought to be free—as free as we are" (Wharton 20). Archer's insistence on the hypocrisy of the situation and the blunt way he expresses his feelings marks him as different from his peers. His defenses of Ellen Olenska and constant examinations of society lead to his peers mocking him or ignoring him completely. Archer often thinks like a society man, but the words he speaks reveal him to be a misfit that doesn't quite fit into the role that New York society would have him play.

One of the repeated motifs in *The Age of Innocence* is the fact that Archer can understand everything that May is saying just by looking at her. A nineteenth-century conduct manual titled *A Young Man's Own Book* describes the art of observation as extremely important (7). While Archer seems to believe that he has mastered the art, this manual shows that he does not quite pass muster. Instead of using his observational skills to craft a conversation, he uses it to project his own thoughts, feelings, and desires on

May and Ellen. Archer's own son points out that May and Archer likely didn't know each other as well as they thought since they believed in completely different images of each other. "You just sat and watched each other, and guessed at what was going on underneath" (Wharton 164). Throughout the novel, Archer believes that he knows exactly what May was thinking, but here, Dallas reveals that Archer may not have been as all-seeing as he thought. May tells her son that when she asked Archer to give up the thing he most wanted, he did; however, Archer reveals that she never asked him. They simply thought that the other knew what they were thinking and used that to drive their conversations and their decisions—something that was not considered true "good breeding" to their society.

Archer is not the only character that appears to fulfill the role society gives, but in reality does not quite meet the standards of nineteenth-century conduct. May Wellend wears the right clothes, attends the right events, and has quite the mastery of archery—all skills that were appropriate in society's eyes. However, May is also incredibly manipulative and a master at playing with masks and perception. Both *The Young Lady's Own Book* and Fryer explain the roles of domesticity given to women. *The Young Lady's Own Book* states that a woman's kingdom is her household and that if women do not live completely virtuously, society will fall. May's symbolic wearing of white and her relation to the Greek goddess Diana reveal that she fulfills those roles well. White is traditionally associated with purity and innocence in Western society and Diana is both the goddess of the moon and virgins. The huntresses in her hunt have all sworn to remain chaste and the moon is a symbol of fertility and power. May's perceived innocence hides the fact that she holds the power over Archer. Archer's constant comparisons of May to Diana showcase how May is virtuous and a moral pillar, at least in Archer's eyes. May wears white to show her purity, and she fulfills her roles of a good wife and mother by being subservient to Archer.

However, what Archer does not see, or rather does not wish to see, is that May plays him expertly. There are several occasions where May uses her skills in conversation to steer Archer away from Ellen. Upon realizing that Archer is going to Washington to see Ellen, May manages to manipulate the situation so that Ellen is coming to visit her while Archer is going to Washington. Instead of being able to see Ellen, Archer will be forced to miss her:

“What a pity,” she said, “that you and Ellen will cross each other on the way!—Newland,” she added, turning to her mother and aunt, “is obliged to go to Washington....it doesn’t seem right to ask Newland to give up an important engagement for the firm—does it? (Wharton 127)

May plays the situation perfectly by keeping Ellen and Archer apart, forcing Ellen onto May’s turf, and informing her family that the situation must be dealt with. It is just after May’s maneuvering that the women in May’s family band together to not-so-subtly show Archer that they will support May and ostracize him if he doesn’t choose carefully. May then proves her quick mind by informing Ellen that she is pregnant, forcing Ellen to decide that she cannot continue on with Archer and that he must stay for his family, so Ellen leaves for Europe. The light of victory in May’s eyes after she reveals both her pregnancy and Ellen’s leaving finally reveals just how well May manipulated the situation (158). While May seems to be subservient to Archer and allows him to believe that he is pulling the strings (all things that *The Young Lady’s Own Book* recommends), she is actually ensuring that she does not get left and that her situation stays desirable.

By all accounts, Ellen follows many of the rules laid out by the nineteenth-century conduct manuals. However, her separation from her husband, choices in dress, and refusal to attend church cast a pall on her otherwise impeccable conduct. Ellen represents a lack of moral fortitude to the rest of society. She has left her husband, presumably by cheating on him, shows more skin than she should, and does not do her best to uphold the moral pillars of society. She socializes with the wrong people and she appears to be having an affair with her cousin’s beau. At first, Ellen’s family bands together around her and supports her, however, her refusal to return to her husband and her relationship with Archer strains the family, and they decide to retract their protection in order to protect their culture and their power structure. Ellen poses a threat because she does not conform to society, so she must be cast out.

Ellen does not pretend to be subservient and she does not exude an overall purity the same way her cousin does. The conduct manuals of this time were very firm that the moral fortitude of the world rested upon the shoulders of women and that anyone who did not take this obligation seriously was morally corrupt. So, Ellen’s innate feelings of power and her perceived lack of moral fortitude caused society to perceive her as a threat. In addition to her more scandalous style of dress, Ellen’s decision to leave

her husband and the fact that she is considering a divorce causes quite the scandal. While her family initially rallies around her, her continued insistence on a divorce causes them to question her morality and place in their family. They make it clear that they will not tolerate her presence if she continues to be “morally bankrupt.” But when Ellen tells Archer that she is leaving and returning home, she reveals that she is far more pure and innocent than society perceived her to be:

“I can’t stay here and lie to the people who’ve been good to me.”

“But that’s the very reason why I ask you to come away!”

“And destroy their lives when they’ve helped me to remake mine?” (144)

Ellen cannot lie and continue a liaison with Archer because it would be betraying her family, so she decides to do what society perceives as the right thing and leave. Throughout the entire affair, Ellen has been conflicted and, in the end, decides that she cannot follow through with it. While May and her family are more than willing to manipulate the situation to suit their desires, Ellen makes the decision for herself that staying with Archer is not the right thing to do.

Each character displays certain aspects of Modernism, but each character embodies one aspect more than others. May relies entirely on being able to contradict the expectations set forth by society and she even winds up with children that would contradict all the things she stood for. May represents the Old World and all of the tradition that supports it. She fulfills the role of wife, mother, and socialite well, but she also subverts expectations by manipulating Ellen and Archer to maintain power. When faced with the possibility of Archer leaving her for her cousin, May rallies her family around her and creates a situation that forces Archer to keep in line with society instead of chasing after Ellen. Even as she ages, May refuses to let the traditions of the Old World go, and Archer states that she doesn’t realize that “the world of her youth had fallen into pieces and rebuilt itself without her ever being conscious of the change” (160). But May’s life falls into contradiction because she believes that her children will follow in her ways, when, in reality, they have found a new order and are uninterested in the past. Wharton uses May’s adherence to the past and her children’s adherence to a new future to embody the contradictions inherent in Modernism. Modernism balances nostalgia and excitement, longing and fear, and any other contradictory feelings that crop up in a rapidly changing world. May’s character manages to balance these contradictions by juxtaposing the two worlds within her.

She contradicts societal norms and gives birth to the new order that is fully immersed in Modernism.

While May represents contradiction, Archer represents a byproduct of May's contradiction—tension. Throughout the novel, Archer is caught between two worlds: what he wants and what he should want. He is trapped by society, but is too afraid of change to break free of it. He finds beauty in May's world, but longs for Ellen's. As his affair with Ellen progresses, Archer's indecision causes tension both within himself and in his interactions with others. Archer becomes short-tempered, hypercritical of others, and unsure in his choices. The tonal difference between most of the novel and the last chapter showcases the tension that Archer experienced. The chapters leading up to thirty-three were anxious, fast-paced, and excited as Archer tried to decide between the two women and his desires. However, in chapter thirty-four, Archer's decision was made, and this chapter occurs years after he has come to terms with it. Archer is settled, content even. He is no longer torn between his desires and his duty. However, when Dallas mentions Ellen, Archer's tension returns. He struggles to communicate and feels inadequate (165). Archer settled into May's world and the re-emergence of Ellen's world brings back all of Archer's tension. This tension, that is a defining aspect of Modernism, exists because it is difficult to reconcile the past and the future. Archer's relationships with May and Ellen, especially in the last chapter, show the difficulty of this reconciliation. Archer eventually decides to stay out of Ellen's world and resolves the tension by keeping the two worlds separate.

The reason May and Archer struggle with Ellen is because she represents change and the future. She should follow all the rules that the Old World has set forth in order to maintain power, but instead Ellen finds power within herself and makes her own way. Her decision to leave her husband, her clothes, and her conduct leave her outside the power structure and these decisions place her among the New World crowd. Fryer describes how Ellen threatens the power structure and causes society to actively attempt to destroy her because Ellen does not adhere to tradition and instead looks to the future. But Ellen's embodiment of progress marks her as a threat to May's embodiment of tradition so Ellen must be sent away. At first, society is more than willing to welcome Ellen back, but when it becomes clear that Ellen has no desire to adhere to their ways, society casts her out. The only character that does not see Ellen as threatening is Archer because he carries the tension

of Modernism in him. He longs for the world that Ellen represents. Even years later, Archer thinks of Ellen like “some imaginary beloved in a book” (160). Both Archer’s longing for and descriptions of Ellen surround her in nostalgia. In this way, Ellen is contradictory because she represents both the future and nostalgia for the past.

Despite the majority of *The Age of Innocence* taking place in a pre-Modern world, Wharton manages to infuse her characters and their world with aspects of Modernism. Each character subverts society’s expectations of them and uses these perceptions to create a space within the power structure. Archer’s inability to choose between the two women and the worlds they represent gives the reader an insight into how Modernism is about compromise. There is good in the old and the new. The future is terrifying because it is not secure, but the past is restrictive, even if it was stable. The instability of the post-war world made navigating this new landscape difficult, but Wharton’s characters manage to find a middle ground where they can reflect fondly on the past, while also seeing new changes available in the future.

Works Cited

- Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope Earl of. "Principles of politeness, and of knowing the world." 1816, Microform.
- Cousineau, Diane. *Letters and Labyrinth: Women Writing/Cultural Codes*. Associated University Presses, 1997.
- Fryer, Judith. "Purity and Power in 'The Age of Innocence.'" *American Literary Realism, 1870–1910*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1984, pp. 153–68.
- Jessee, Margaret Jay. "Trying It On: Narration and Masking in Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2012, pp. 37–52.
- Price, Alan. *The End of the Age of Innocence*. St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Singley, Carol J. "Bourdieu, Wharton and Changing Culture in *The Age of Innocence*." *Cultural Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3–4, 2003, pp. 495–519, doi:10.1080/0950238032000083917.
- The Young Lady's Own Book: A Manual of Intellectual Improvement and Moral Deportment*. Microfilm, 1845. "Opie Collection of Children's Literature."
- The Young Man's Own Book: A Manual of Politeness, Intellectual Improvement, and Moral Deportment*. Illustrated by William Home Lizars, Milner and Sowerby, 1860. *Nineteenth Century Collections Online*.
- Wharton, Edith. *Age of Innocence*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015, pp. 140–41.

Zitkala-Ša and the Holistic God

Redefining American Spirituality in "The Great Spirit"

Jared Brockbank

Experiencing firsthand the United States' rapidly expanding influence over Native Americans, Sioux writer Zitkala-Ša documents and addresses the major changes in her culture through autobiographical essays. Though she had been immersed in Anglo-American culture for many years, the Dakota Native begins her 1902 essay "The Great Spirit" by stating, "When the spirit swells my breast I love to roam leisurely among the green hills" (114). Zitkala-Ša feels her divine Creator's power in nature and celebrates her Native beliefs through depictions of divinity in the beautiful scenery. She then contrasts these joyful scenes with somber images of her converted cousin. Through unnatural imagery depicting her cousin confined by Christianity, she challenges the audience to consider the religion's limitations. Although she appears to criticize American Christianity and its restrictions, Zitkala-Ša acknowledges the influence of America in her life by introducing an image of the national flag embodied in the Great Spirit. She uses this divine imagery throughout her essay to connect these seemingly conflicting ideologies found in the United States.

Zitkala-Ša's exploration of both Christian and Native views elicits various interpretations from cultural critics. Franci Washburn's analysis of Zitkala-Ša's

life explains how this Sioux writer, “torn between two worlds” (273), must grapple with her comfortable Dakota home and the intruding United States of America. Gary Totten, acknowledging Zitkala-Ša’s juxtaposition between these two religious worlds, argues that the essay functions as a “resistance to nationalist narratives” (Totten 105). Rather than resistance, Roumiana Velikova describes “The Great Spirit” as a “gesture of final reconciliation” (51). However, the terms “resistance” and “reconciliation” paint Christianity and Zitkala-Ša’s Dakota beliefs as a dichotomy—two completely separate and irreconcilable belief systems. In this view, she must either pit one against the other in a battle for dominance or accept the existence of both, being unable to change either view.

This dichotomous understanding of the two perspectives was common during the time Zitkala-Ša wrote “The Great Spirit.” Several articles about paganism—a term which Zitkala-Ša uses to describe her Native beliefs—were published shortly before she wrote her essay. One such article, published in 1900 in a New York City magazine called *The Outlook*, claims that

In his best estate [a pagan] ignores religion and lives a drear life entirely bounded by immediate interests and pleasures. . . . There are no springs of ethical vitality in paganism, no deep sources of spiritual inspiration, no breath of that idealism which alone lifts the life of the body on to a high plane and makes man something more than a splendid animal. (“Modern Paganism”)

Rather than supporting this common perception of disconnected worlds and the supposedly inherent inferiority of paganism, Zitkala-Ša’s imagery of divinity’s vastness in “The Great Spirit” suggests a spirituality that transcends religious divides and can, therefore, incorporate the idea of a Christian God. This requires no resistance or reconciliation between the religions. Thus, while her initial depictions of the Dakotan and Christian belief systems appear to suggest a dichotomous relationship in “The Great Spirit,” Zitkala-Ša uses divine imagery throughout her essay to create a more holistic conception of the American God and unite the two religions through this foundational belief.

To form this new vision of the American God, Zitkala-Ša explores the Dakotan and Christian viewpoints present in her life, beginning with her traditional beliefs as seen through the beautiful imagery of nature. She describes “the great blue overhead” and “huge cloud shadows . . . upon

the high bluffs,” sweeping visions of the Great Spirit’s immense grandeur. This grand sight may make human beings feel comparatively small, but nature can also offer peaceful relief from the everyday world, such as in “the sweet, soft cadences of the river’s song.” Zitkala-Ša argues this combination of great and small “[bespeaks] with eloquence the loving Mystery” (114). She teaches the audience that the Great Spirit, like the natural imagery in the introductory scene, embodies both awe-inspiring grandeur as well as peaceful intimacy which allows for a loving relationship between Creator and creation. She finds the grand, intimate, unrestrained Great Spirit in the natural environment and rejoices in her connection with and knowledge of Him.

Combining Zitkala-Ša’s loving depictions of the Great Spirit and the essay’s original title, “Why I Am a Pagan,” leads some critics to interpret “The Great Spirit” as an act of Native resistance against Christianity. According to Totten, Zitkala-Ša “resists the authority of the dominant culture’s narratives by celebrating the natural world” (105). Her celebration of nature in the introductory scene may support Totten’s notion of resistance when considering the essay’s original title, which suggests to the audience that Zitkala-Ša’s piece will be a defense of her “pagan” beliefs and, as Totten might say, a resistance to differing beliefs. “Resistance” implies a conflict where Zitkala-Ša must promote her Dakota beliefs in opposition to the advancement of “nationalist narratives” (Totten 105): a Pagan versus the Christians. Zitkala-Ša appears to be justifying her resistance as she points out the unnatural aspects of Christianity, such as when her “solemn-faced” Christian cousin “[mouths] most strangely the jangling phrases of a bigoted creed” (116). Nature does not jangle—man-made things do; Zitkala-Ša’s solemn description does not include anything natural. By associating her pagan beliefs with nature and then contrasting the Great Spirit’s manifestations with artificial descriptions of Christianity, Zitkala-Ša argues that the Christian God manifests Himself in documents and imperfect ideologies formulated by man; therefore, as an artificial being, the Christian God must not be divinity in its true form. On the other hand, the Sioux author highlights her ability to have a personal connection with a loving Creator in nature, widening the divide between her gloriously complete Great Spirit and the coldly insufficient Christian God. When viewed as an argument for why she is a Pagan, this uncomfortable contrast might support Totten’s notion of resistance.

Although the original title may imply feelings of resistance toward Christianity in Zitkala-Ša's essay, its new title turns the focus from exposing differences to finding religious unity through divinity itself. The original publication of "Why I Am a Pagan" in 1902 was met with backlash—especially from General Richard Pratt, who supervised Zitkala-Ša's work at the Carlisle Indian School. He wrote in the campus publication, *The Red Man and Helper*, that her essay was "trash" and that she was "worse than a pagan" (Zitkala-Ša xix). Following this negative response to her original essay, Zitkala-Ša republished her piece with a new conclusion and a new title: "The Great Spirit." The new title's divine emphasis demonstrates a shift of objective and approach in her essay. Velikova writes that "the retitling of the fourth essay from 'Why I Am a Pagan' to 'The Great Spirit' takes the tendency of replacing the specific and the personal with the abstract and the representative to an even higher level" (51). Since Zitkala-Ša's essay now focuses on the universal Great Spirit rather than specifically her as a pagan, the title no longer suggests that she will be defending her personal Dakota beliefs. Instead, there is no need for conflict because her critique of the Christian God is not a resistance to Anglo-American religion but an invitation to consider the possibilities introduced by her Dakota beliefs, including the limits of Christians' conceptions regarding divinity. In this way, Zitkala-Ša's essay becomes a holistic exploration of spirituality rather than a resistance driven by personal opinions.

By refusing to portray Christianity and her Native beliefs as two conflicting worlds, Zitkala-Ša subverts the common perception of paganism's inferiority at the time of her essay's publication, consequentially inviting readers to broaden their perception of divinity. Zitkala-Ša demonstrates within the first sentence of "The Great Spirit" her ability as a self-proclaimed pagan to be filled with the spirit and feel elevated by her beliefs. Directly opposing the claim made in an article published by *The Hartford Courant* in 1900 that paganism is "a low order of civilization" ("Paganism"), her diverse descriptions of nature present the Natives' beliefs as intricate and nuanced—not barbaric ideologies held by an unrefined people. Additionally, her strong spirituality does not align with the statement that pagans "[live] apart from . . . the best culture" ("Paganism"). She celebrates her own culture and its spiritual beliefs through fond descriptions of nature on a "genial summer day" (Zitkala-Ša 114). Though she does challenge the notion of Christianity's perfection, she in no way demeans Christian believers—noting with a

“strong, happy sense” that everyone is “so surely enfolded in [the Great Spirit’s] magnitude” (Zitkala-Ša 115). As the essay title suggests, Zitkala-Ša focuses on her belief in the divine as a common connection between the two religions. Challenging the common practice of the time to favor one religion over another by criticizing the other’s differences, Zitkala-Ša refuses to resist Christianity by praising paganism. Instead, she focuses on the divine connection between all believers while still acknowledging differing perspectives.

Though the less conflicted representation between Dakota and Christian beliefs causes some critics to read “The Great Spirit” as an act of reconciliation rather than resistance between two separate worlds, this interpretation fails to recognize Zitkala-Ša’s new conception of American spirituality. Continuing her focus of divinity, Zitkala-Ša closes her essay by explaining that “the phenomenal universe is [the Great Spirit’s] royal mantle. . . . Caught in its flowing fringes are the spangles and oscillating brilliants of sun, moon, and stars” (117). This language, reminiscent of the star-spangled banner, simultaneously describes an iconic symbol of the United States and a part of Zitkala-Ša’s Great Spirit. Through this abstract depiction of the American flag, she acknowledges the presence of American religious views in her own life and creates a more inclusive view of divinity. Aware of this inclusion, Velikova states, “[The ending passage] is a tour de force of symbolic integration in which nature, religion, and politics; Indianness and Americanness; the literal and the figurative, merge in a gesture of final reconciliation” (51). Zitkala-Ša concludes her essay by uniting the two cultures in her life, but Velikova’s choice to use the term reconciliation implies that these two worlds remain separate. In other words, the “warring allegiances” are no longer in conflict with each other, but they may not be completely united (Velikova 52). When regarded as reconciliation, Zitkala-Ša’s inclusion of American imagery in her exploration of the Great Spirit demonstrates that she accepts both ideologies in her life while still viewing them as separate worlds, but this interpretation overlooks the author’s efforts to unite believers through imagery of an all-encompassing deity.

Velikova’s notion of reconciliation in “The Great Spirit” aligns with the concept of American pluralism, yet these ideas fail to recognize the deeper spiritual connection that Zitkala-Ša portrays in her essay. In his essay “What Does It Mean to Be an ‘American’?” Michael Walzer states that pluralism exists with “no merger or fusion but only a fastening, a putting together:

many-in-one” (635). Regarding Zitkala-Ša’s spiritual perspective, Velikova says that the author “[allows] a naturalized version of the American flag—the symbol of American statehood—into the universe governed by the Great Spirit of her Indian religion” (61). Therefore, Velikova argues that Zitkala-Ša supports a pluralist view of religion and spirituality. Velikova would agree that “there is no movement from many to one, but rather a simultaneity, a coexistence” (Walzer 636). In this view, Zitkala-Ša’s Native Dakota religion still reigns supreme but with a concession of the existence of Christianity as a limited and imperfect understanding of the Dakota Great Spirit. Zitkala-Ša might accept Christianity as a different religion existing on the American continent, but it is still a separate world—one from which she has turned away.

Rather than dividing Christians and those who share her Native beliefs, Zitkala-Ša asserts a deeper spirituality that contradicts Walzer’s pluralist idea of two separate worlds coming together through mere citizenship. In his essay, Walzer argues that if pluralism denotes many-in-one, “perhaps the adjective ‘American’ describes this kind of oneness. [A person] might say, tentatively, that it points to the citizenship, not the nativity or nationality, of the men and women it designates” (635). Walzer’s view of pluralism posits that the Dakota and the Christian are united by the land on which they live. Simply put, the connection between these two groups is merely geographical. Velikova may not explicitly mention citizenship in her analysis, but her idea of reconciliation between “Indianness and Americanness” still leaves room for a cultural disconnect. According to Velikova, Zitkala-Ša may reconcile the different worlds—possibly through shared citizenship—but they are not perfectly unified. Zitkala-Ša suggests a deeper connection. In her essay, she draws on the “subtle knowledge of the native folk which enabled them to recognize a kinship to any and all parts of this vast universe” (Zitkala-Ša 115). The scope of Zitkala-Ša’s “kinship” transcends the union that comes merely from citizenship. Consequently, applying Walzer’s pluralist idea of religion in America to “The Great Spirit” undercuts Zitkala-Ša’s endeavor to show that all people are intimately connected through God rather than merely citizenship.

Acknowledging the spiritual relationship between human beings, Zitkala-Ša calls for compassion toward all people. She follows her seemingly critical portrayal of Christianity by writing of “a wee child toddling in a wonder world” (Zitkala-Ša 117). Through the innocence and naiveté captured

by this image, Zitkala-Ša demonstrates sympathy for Christians. She suggests that each person, including the Christian, is like a little child searching for protection and comfort. Zitkala-Ša liberates all believers from cultural boundaries and conflicting views by unifying human beings through their shared relationship with God. Both the Christian and Zitkala-Ša have found a connection to God, albeit through different “conceptions of Infinite Love” (Zitkala-Ša 117). By equating humankind with children, Zitkala-Ša shows that her motives for writing “The Great Spirit” are out of “keen sympathy [for her] fellow-creatures” of God and not out of spite (115–16). Her idea of American spirituality focuses on love and understanding, building on the expansive kinship that comes from being children of a divine being.

By emphasizing the need for compassion toward all people because of a divine connection, Zitkala-Ša creates a new conception of the American God. The Dakota author makes it clear to the audience that she is not concerned with “racial lines” or country borders, for she sees that “all are akin” (Zitkala-Ša 115–16). Zitkala-Ša is not simply “allowing” America into the realm of her Great Spirit, as Velikova states, but she is creating a new American spirituality where all perspectives, regardless of their practices, are united through God. As Washburn explains, Zitkala-Ša “[takes] the torn fragments of her life and [stitches] them, at times painfully, into a functioning, productive bicultural identity” (273). The Dakota and Christian beliefs become one in Zitkala-Ša. She depicts a divine being whose influence shines down from the heavens and illuminates all of His children. Zitkala-Ša may refer to Him as the Great Spirit, but the universe from which “His divine breath” flows closely resembles the American flag. With this image, she argues that proper American spirituality is founded on an all-encompassing conception of the divine.

In “The Great Spirit,” Zitkala-Ša lovingly creates a new vision of American spirituality that respects both the Christian and Dakota conceptions of divinity. Although she may illustrate the differences between the two ideologies, she does not resist Christianity as Totten suggests, nor does she imply that one religion must be superior to the other. Instead, Zitkala-Ša’s focus on an all-encompassing God challenges Christian believers to think bigger in terms of divinity. Zitkala-Ša’s depiction of holistic divinity does much more than reconcile two belief systems as Velikova argues; the Native author creates a new conception of God that transcends cultural and religious divides. By focusing on divinity, Zitkala-Ša unites human beings

on an intimate and sacred level. She demonstrates an effective way to confront seemingly different faiths. Instead of dwelling on their fundamental differences, Zitkala-Ša encourages all believers to come together through shared, intrinsic beliefs while respecting the various perspectives and interpretations. This approach does not dilute traditional Dakota or Christian ideologies—it celebrates the great divine being who unites all people.

Works Cited

- "Modern Paganism." Editorial. *The Outlook* (1893–1924), vol. 66, no. 10, 3 Nov. 1900, p. 544.
- "Paganism." Editorial. *The Hartford Courant* (1887–1922), 27 Aug. 1900, p. 11.
- Totten, Gary. "Zitkala-Ša and the Problem of Regionalism: Nations, Narratives, and Critical Traditions." *The American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2005, pp. 84–123.
- Velikova, Roumiana. "Troping in Zitkala-Sa's Autobiographical Writings, 1900–1921." *Arizona Quarterly: A Journal of American Literature, Culture, and Theory*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2000, pp. 49–64.
- Walzer, Michael. "What Does It Mean to Be an 'American'?" *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, vol. 71, no. 3, 2004, pp. 633–54.
- Washburn, Franci. "Zitkala-Ša: A Bridge between Two Worlds." *Their Own Frontier: Women Intellectuals Re-Visioning the American West*, University of Nebraska Press, 2008, pp. 269–302.
- Zitkala-Ša. *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Writings*. Edited by Cathy N. Davidson and Ada Norris, Penguin Books, 2003.

Curing Beauty's Stockholm Syndrome

Erin Lee

While *Beauty and the Beast* is a well-known and well-loved fairy tale, popular culture often diagnoses the heroine with Stockholm syndrome. Beauty (or Belle) is frequently seen as a typical damsel in distress, a poor girl who falls for a cruel captor and has no independence or personality of her own—a depiction of the feminine that is horrifying to modern consumers of the tale. This accusation does hold some merit towards older versions of the story. However, in more modern versions (particularly the most popular adaptations, Disney's films), the relationship between Beauty and her beast is altered for a new audience, creating a space for the two to truly fall in love. The beast becomes a gentler soul trapped in his cursed form, and Beauty is given not only a greater support system but a vibrantly independent personality. Disney also adds the character of Gaston as the Beast's foil, showing through contrast the sincerity of Beauty's relationship with the Beast, Beauty's independence, and her ability to take control of her own life. Analyzing several adaptations of this tale over the centuries since it was first written, particularly the addition of Gaston as a foil for the beast, shows that *Beauty and the Beast* has been transformed into a tale of a woman finding and choosing love rather than that of a victim suffering from Stockholm syndrome.

In order to understand Beauty's diagnosis of Stockholm syndrome, one must understand the history of the term. It was coined in 1973 after a hostage

situation during a bank robbery in Stockholm, Sweden. The situation resulted in a surprising bond between the hostages and their captors. One victim, Kristen, speaking to the police while being held captive, said:

I fully trust Clark and the robber [Olsson]. I am not desperate. They haven't done a thing to us. On the contrary, they have been very nice. But, you know, Olof, what I am scared of is that the police will attack us and cause us to die . . . [Olsson] is sitting in here and he is protecting us from the police.
(Graham 5)

The victims' perception of reality became twisted, and they bonded to their captors as a way to cope with their six-day imprisonment and as a means to ensure their own survival. In fact, this quote was recorded on the second day of their captivity, showing how quickly their symptoms developed. Kristen later is quoted saying, "If someone likes you, he won't kill you" (9). This emotional accommodation led to some sympathy and improved treatment from their captors. The positive feelings of the hostages towards the criminals persisted after the incident ended, though all four of them did testify against their captors in court six months later (however, their apparent recovery is complicated by the fact that years later "two of the woman hostages became engaged to the two captors" [11]). Stockholm syndrome, then, is the twisting of reality where the captors become the "good guys" and the rescuers are the threat. Such a mentally traumatized (and possibly physically abused) victim "needs nurturance and protection, and because the victim is isolated from others, he or she must turn to the abuser for nurturance and protection" (38). Thus, a victim of Stockholm syndrome must be deprived of every system of support beyond his or her abuser. Certain other conditions are also necessary, including an inability or lack of desire to escape (particularly if escaping would pose a threat to the captor), a knowledge of a threat to his or her life as well as the captor's ability to carry out said threat, and the captor showing small moments of kindness or restraint while abusing the victim (Graham 33). If a majority of these conditions are met, then the victim can safely be assumed to be suffering from Stockholm syndrome.

As for the history of *Beauty and the Beast*, it can be traced back to the Greek myth of Cupid and Psyche; however, the version most commonly known was first penned in 1740 by Gabrielle-Suzanne Barbot de Villeneuve. Her tale was then adapted by Jeanne-Marie Leprince de Beaumont (1756) and Andrew Lang (1889), and their works became more well-known than

Villeneuve's writing. Since then, the tale has been remade many times, both directly and indirectly. Direct adaptations contain certain essential elements, as explored below. Indirect adaptations include titles such as *Seven Brides for Seven Brothers* (1954), *Shrek* (2001), the webcomic *Lore Olympus* (ongoing), and *The Tiger's Bride* (1979). These twist the original story in various ways: in *Seven Brides*, the curse is not magical but rather the behaviour of the men is beastly and they must learn to be civilized; in *Shrek*, it is the princess who is cursed. However, for the purposes of this essay, I will set aside indirect adaptations in favor of more closely investigating a select number of direct adaptations of the tale.

Direct adaptations, as defined here, are required to contain certain commonalities with Villeneuve's original story. These include a main character with the name of "Beauty" (or "Belle," which is simply French for "beauty") and a man who is cursed with a terrible, bestial form until he gains the love of a woman. In each telling, Beauty's father must stumble upon the Beast's domain, traditionally a castle, while lost in the woods. Beauty must then trade her life for her father's and promise to remain with the Beast forever. Eventually, Beauty must beg to return home (the reasons why vary) and the Beast, who is now in love with her, must let her go (the permanence of this release also varies). After seeing her family, Beauty must return to the Beast and find him near death, at which point she expresses her love for him and breaks the curse. The lovers marry and—presumably—live happily ever after. These elements from Villeneuve's original are also found in Beaumont and Lang's versions of the tale. Other direct adaptations that fit these qualifications include Robin McKinley's two retellings, *Beauty* (1978) and *Rose Daughter* (1997), the animated Disney film *Beauty and the Beast* (1991) on which the Broadway musical was based, a French film *La Belle et la Bête* (2014), and Disney's live-action adaptation of its 1991 film, also titled *Beauty and the Beast* (2017). Though there are certainly more adaptations that would qualify, these illustrate the most important steps in the story's evolution. Each of these adaptations will be analyzed for Stockholm syndrome in what is more or less chronological order, showing how the symptoms of Stockholm syndrome have gradually vanished from the tale as it has been adapted for modern audiences. The new versions of Beauty instead display feminine independence, determination, and, of course, a healthy romantic relationship based on trust and friendship.

Beauty's first incarnations are almost textbook examples of Stockholm syndrome. Villeneuve's original shows Beauty as terrified of the monster holding her captive. His physical appearance is particularly horrifying—he possesses scales, fur, and a "kind of trunk" (Villeneuve), nothing like the furry humanoid of modern adaptations. Though he is outwardly kind, he is slow and a bit gruff. He still holds her captive in his domain, and after dinner each evening, which he demands she eat with him, he asks her, "May I sleep with you to-night?" (Villeneuve). Beauty refuses each night and fears each night that his calm facade will break and his wrath will be the end of her. Despite her efforts to remain independent, the lack of outside support leaves her especially vulnerable, and those who she thought would support her only encourage her to give in to the Beast. These include a handsome prince in her dreams (who she claims to love, though she has never met him and knows nothing about him), a fairy that also appears in her dreams, and her father, all of whom urge her to "love who loves you" (Villeneuve), to not focus on appearances, and to repay the Beast's kindness by accepting his proposal. Beauty is told, essentially, that her feelings do not matter; she must sacrifice her own personhood to repay the Beast's "kindness."

This is what leads to her development of Stockholm syndrome. She is, from her point of view, left with no other choice but to give into the Beast. Though he has not been outwardly cruel, that does not change the fact that Beauty is his captive—even if her father and the individuals in her dreams do not seem to think so. Bereft of strength, she has no recourse but to turn to her captor for comfort, feeling bound to what she sees as her duty, though her heart belongs to the prince in her dreams. Of course, it turns out prince and beast are one and the same, and Beauty is a long-lost princess of an idyllic nation. In the end, the two are wed. This picturesque ending does not change that Beauty, stuck with a terrifying and physically monstrous captor, alone and bereft of support, is forced into affection for the Beast through both necessity and pressure from those who ought to have protected her. She is denied her own humanity and right of choice in favor of satisfying the Beast. Martin Symonds said this of the mental state of hostages who develop Stockholm syndrome:

Frozen fright develops as the hostage comes out of shock and begins to perceive the reality of the situation. In frozen fright, hostages are affectively paralyzed, enabling them to focus their cognitive and motor functions solely on survival, with concentration centered on the terrorist. In this state

the hostage responds to the captor with cooperative, friendly behavior. As this state continues and the hostages are still not rescued, they will feel overwhelmed and develop traumatic psychological infantilism wherein they respond to the captor with appeasement, submission, ingratiation, cooperation, and empathy. As captivity continues and the hostages are still alive, they will begin to perceive the captor as giving their lives back to them. (Graham 27)

Were it not for Beauty's development of Stockholm syndrome, the sheer horror of the situation may have driven her mad. Stockholm syndrome in this adaptation is not only Beauty's way of staying alive, but of staying sane.

Beaumont and Lang tell much the same story, though simpler, cutting out the revelations of Beauty's royal origins and the detailed account of how the curse came to pass (which takes up nearly half of Villeneuve's original). The moments which most vividly display Beauty's Stockholm syndrome in these three adaptations come in the final seconds of the curse, when the Beast is close to death. "You must not die; live to be my husband," she begs. "For I thought I had only a friendship for you, but the grief I feel now convinces me that I cannot live without you" (Beaumont). Though the event itself is necessary for a retelling to qualify as a direct adaptation, the way it is handled along with the other aspects of the story show the Stockholm syndrome present in the Beauty of this particular version. Note that she claims to have had no romantic feelings for the Beast, only friendship. She is no longer scared of him, nor does she love him. Rather, her feelings and her admission of them are motivated by pity and fear of harm befalling her captor, as the original Stockholm victims feared for the bank robbers who held them hostage—Symonds' traumatic psychological infantilism in action (Graham 27). Beauty has come to perceive the Beast as a force for good, as "giving [her life] back to [her]" (27), and so her Stockholm syndrome causes her to believe she loves the beast who held her captive.

In the adaptations by Beaumont and Lang, Beauty's affection for the Beast comes from the same source as the Stockholm victims' affection for their captors: the need to survive. Her own will and her own humanity are subordinated, both by the Beast and by her own mind, in order to ensure that she can live through her captivity and that she can conform to what she has been taught is her duty. Graham describes these mental developments:

Because the victim's very survival is at stake, she or he becomes hypervigilant to the abuser's needs, feelings, and perspectives. Thus, not only is the victim

compliant, but actively working to anticipate the needs of the abuser. Her or his own needs (other than survival), feelings, and perspectives must take second place to those of the abuser. In addition, the victim's needs (other than survival), feelings, and perspectives only seem to get in the way of the victim's doing what is necessary for survival (they are, after all, feelings of terror). (Graham 38)

Belle puts the Beast's needs and desires ahead of her own as a means of survival in a society where her freedom to choose has been taken. This is both a very sexist view of romance and marriage and an extreme case of Stockholm syndrome. A victimized Beauty, subjected to a romance she does not want, is a remnant from a past where marriages were arranged without the will of the woman involved—where matrimony was a negotiation between men over, essentially, property. Women were not allowed their own voices. Twenty-first century American society in particular looks on this remnant of the past with horror. Imagine if a father forced his teenage daughter to live with a gangster who regularly propositioned her until she agreed to marry him. Many people would correctly see that as sexual harassment bordering on slavery and sex trafficking. Not only is it extremely unhealthy for Beauty, it also dehumanizes her. The original tale, then, is no longer entirely suitable for modern audiences, because of its subjugation of females and its refusal to depict Beauty as a human being rather than a commodity for marriage.

Robin McKinley wrote the next two notable direct adaptations, about twenty years apart: one in 1978 titled *Beauty* and another in 1997 titled *Rose Daughter*. Interestingly, while *Beauty* contains elements of Stockholm syndrome, *Rose Daughter* does not. In *Beauty*, the heroine comes to the castle terrified. Though luxuries surround her, she is heartbroken by the fact that she may never see her family again and terrified by the Beast's nightly proposals. She attempts to find solace in magical pastimes but cannot. Furthermore, the Beast occasionally uses his magic to command the invisible servants that wait upon Beauty's every need, which terrifies her most of all. This magic is a reminder of the power the Beast has over Beauty, whether or not he intends it to be so. Despite all of this, Beauty begins to spend time with him, seeking "nurturance and protection" (Graham 38) from her captor because there is no other solace to be found. In this way, *Beauty* follows the tradition of its fellow older adaptations.

Rose Daughter, on the other hand, portrays Beauty at peace in her captivity. Although Beauty misses her family, she creates her own solace in gardening,

particularly in nursing a greenhouse of roses back to health. Though she has no outer support system, she builds an inner one, and in doing so, opens a space to develop a healthy relationship with the Beast based on mutual interests. McKinley also offers a twist on the story's end in *Rose Daughter*—rather than the Beast becoming a handsome man and the two living in his castle, the Beast remains a Beast and goes to live with Beauty in the small town where her family resides. Notably, Beauty chose this simple life over a life of luxury and magic—chosen for both her and the Beast. Beauty is the catalyst in this retelling, rather than a subordinate to the Beast's desires. In *Beauty*, the heroine's fate and her story are in the Beast's control, but in *Rose Daughter*, Beauty takes the reins and makes her own happiness, thus avoiding the Stockholm syndrome of her predecessor. By leaving out the elements of the story that created Stockholm syndrome and offering Beauty an outside source of impartial support, Beauty is given a voice and made into an active force in her own story rather than someone to be acted upon by the men around her. The Beauty of *Rose Daughter* does not respond to the Beast with “cooperative . . . behavior” (Graham 27), though she is still courteous. She goes her own way rather than giving in to the trauma of being imprisoned. It is no accident that McKinley's newer telling contains less Stockholm syndrome and that her second Beauty is a woman of more modern sensibilities.

There exists, however, at least one exception to the idea that newer adaptations do not contain Stockholm syndrome as the original does. The 2014 French film *La Belle et la Bête* contains the heroine that quite possibly suffers the most from Stockholm syndrome. In this retelling, it is made very clear to the viewer that Belle is a captive. During her three-day sojourn in the castle, the Beast threatens and terrifies her on multiple occasions. In the most notable of these confrontations, he leaps across their dinner table, gets in her face, and tells her that she will eventually be his no matter how she resists. The overtones of sexual violence are obvious, and although Belle maintains an outward show of strength, she is clearly scared. This scene shows that the Beast does not see her as fully human but as an object to be forced to submit to his desires. His bestial nature also horrifies her, particularly in the scene when she stumbles upon his room as he eats, tearing into a raw carcass with claws and teeth—the implied threat is that she could be next.

Yet Belle is still drawn to the Beast since she has no other support, for no one else lives in the castle. Each night she dreams of the handsome king

who became the Beast. Through these dreams, she learns how the curse came to be and that her love could break it. Belle bears a striking resemblance to this king's former queen, and this resemblance, combined with the way the dreams depict the king, seem to instill a sort of debt into Belle—either to the Beast or to this unknown woman that could have been her sister. Even Belle's dreams are pressuring her to love the Beast. She receives no rest and no support, only this pressure and the fear of her captor. One characteristic of sufferers of Stockholm syndrome is that "the victim . . . works to keep the abuser happy, becoming hypersensitive to the abuser's moods and needs" (Graham 38). Thus her dreams can be seen as a manifestation of her development of Stockholm Syndrome, despite their magical nature. These dreams also contain sexual overtones. One depicts a ball, at which the king announces the queen's pregnancy, and the two dance. The following day, Belle offers the Beast a dance in exchange for a few hours with her family—a semi-sexual favor, given to her abuser, in a final attempt to seek outside support. Yet, upon arriving home, she finds that her eldest brother is pursued by a band of thieves, and those thieves raid the Beast's castle. Enraged, the Beast fights back with giant stone soldiers. Belle arrives just in time to stop one such soldier from crushing her eldest brother. This creates another sort of debt between them; she owes him for her brother's life now, which adds to what she feels she owes him already in honor of the woman in her dreams. The Beast is wounded by the thieves during the battle. Belle and her brothers carry him to a fountain of healing water within the castle, a task made infinitely more difficult by the fact that every plant on the grounds has sprung to life and is trying to kill them. It is only Belle's confession of love for the Beast that stops the assault.

As a confession drawn out by fear of death (mutually Belle's, her family's, and the Beast's), it cannot be a confession of true feeling. First of all, words drawn out under duress are extremely suspect: one of the main indicators of Stockholm syndrome is a "perceived threat to survival" (Graham 33). Belle's fear and horror of the Beast are completely ignored and shoved aside, as if such things do not matter in the face of "true love." In reality, love comes without fear and terror. If the Beast loved her truly, he would not threaten her or keep her captive. He would not demand that she marry him. And if Belle did grow to love the Beast, it would have to be in an environment where she would feel safe refusing him. One of the vital elements of consent is "having the option of saying no" as well as not being "under duress, threat,

coercion, or force" ("What is Consent?"). Instead, Belle has followed the path of Villeneuve's beauty, and, under coercion, fear, and a need to survive, has convinced herself that the Beast is "giving [her life] back to [her]" (27). Though the film uses a similar ending to McKinley's *Rose Daughter* (different in that the Beast does transform back into a man), that does not change the fact that Belle's affection for the Beast sprung from the wrong source—terror, abuse, and threat of death.

La Belle et la Bete is a confusing adaptation to analyze. This film, though recent, is not American as the other adaptations are; it is French, the same as Villeneuve's work. Though the two adaptations share a country of origin, enough details are altered from the original that tradition was obviously not a major concern. Additionally, for 2014, a film depicting Stockholm syndrome seems rather odd. Belle is literally terrified into agreeing to marry the Beast. Yet this Belle is not as passive as Villeneuve's heroine, still maintaining her outward confidence even when she is scared. She actively explores the Beast's domain, coming upon him eating his own bestial meal, and defends her family in the face of the Beast's magical defenses. These are positive changes from the original; however, they do not change the Stockholm-esque relationship between Belle and the Beast.

Fortunately, this is not the most well-known adaptation of the fairy tale—that accolade goes to the 1991 Disney animated film (later adapted into a Broadway musical) and the subsequent 2017 live-action remake. Although the two films are much the same (and will be treated equally in most instances), there are a few key differences between them that will be addressed when relevant. Disney, out of all the direct adaptations, changes the story the most. First, the rose serves as the instrument of the enchantment rather than the cause of Belle's captivity (in the 2017 film it is both); second, Belle's father, rather than a wealthy merchant, is a kooky inventor; third, Belle is an only child; and fourth, the Beast's servants are neither invisible nor speechless but rather living household objects, once human, but changed by the curse. The servants play a vital role in the elimination of Stockholm syndrome from the story and have a much bigger role than in any previous adaptations. In fact, the movie is as much about their redemption as it is about Belle and the Beast, particularly in Disney's 2017 film, where they even receive their own song. These servants offer Belle the company and support system that is lacking in Villeneuve's original tale. They give her a nice room, feed her a luxurious dinner (complete with one of the movie's most

well-known musical numbers), and then lead her on a tour of the castle. The most important aspect of these kindnesses is that they are done outside of the Beast's authority and against his wishes—the servants act solely to comfort Belle as she grieves her freedom. That is what makes their support system valid and not just an extension of the original Stockholm syndrome. "The victim's isolation from persons other than the captor/abuser is ideological and usually also physical in nature" (Graham 35). Though Belle is physically isolated from her family in the Beast's castle, she is not ideologically isolated thanks to the support of these magically-transformed servants. Belle, too, is different than her original incarnation—she is somewhat of an outcast and an oddity in the village where she and her father live. She is a bookworm in a society where educated women are frowned upon. In the 2017 version, the villagers actually harm her by throwing her laundry in the dirt because she dares to start teaching a girl to read. This aspect of her character helps her relate to the Beast and also to the enchanted servants—it is the "adventure in the great wide somewhere" that she's always wanted (1991).

However, there is more to Disney's adaptation than dancing candlesticks and talking teapots. Disney makes one vital addition to the story—Gaston. This character, not present in the original story, serves as a foil for the modernized Beast. As a typical "tall, dark, strong, and handsome brute" (1991), he sees himself as the manliest of men and would never stoop to admitting a fault. The other villagers nearly worship him, and local girls fawn for his attention. Yet, he only desires Belle—not for who she is, but because she is the prettiest. And, as he says to his lackey, "That makes her the best! And don't I deserve the best?" (1991). He pays no attention to Belle's interests except to disrespect them (like using her book as a footrest). When Belle turns down his proposal, Gaston exploits her love for her father: he pays a man to lock Belle's father in an asylum unless she marries him. Even the man he pays agrees this is despicable (in the 2017 film, this action is a coverup for some of Gaston's more despicable choices; nevertheless, he does try to use the situation to win Belle over and eventually throws her in the cart with her father). Belle's only reason to consider marrying Gaston is to gain reputation in their village and (in the 2017 film) to avoid becoming an old maid (women without men in their homes, in the 2017 version, are shown as beggars). Gaston is the man that dehumanizes Belle in this version of the story and if, within that marriage—a form of captivity—she convinced herself that she loved Gaston, that could be a type of Stockholm syndrome.

In contrast, the Beast pays attention to Belle's hobbies and interests; he doesn't ignore her beauty, but it is not all he cares about. The Beast shows Belle his library, and, upon seeing how much she loves it, he offers it to her with no strings attached. He also is able to admit imperfection. In a particularly illuminating scene in the animated film, Belle teaches the Beast to feed birds from his hands (or paws). The Beast, overeager, requires some correction and Belle's example before he is able to succeed, but he shows no sign of being embarrassed by his need for help. Eventually, a whole flock of birds settles on his shoulders. Two important aspects of this Beast are on display here: first, that he is not humiliated when Belle knows more than he even though she is a woman; and second, that animals trust him (despite the fact that he is a predator). The latter is a common indicator of purity of heart in Disney movies. In the 2017 version, this scene is replaced with Belle helping the Beast approach and befriend her horse. In a slightly comical, extremely vulnerable, and quite endearing moment, the Beast imitates the horse's nicker—something Gaston would never be caught dead doing. The Beast, then, is far more human than Gaston despite his outward appearance, and genuinely cares for Belle, whereas Gaston has a bestial character and cares only about himself.

The final battle between Gaston and the Beast puts the contrast between them on full display. Where Gaston is aggressive, attacking and taunting and threatening, the Beast only moves defensively—barely even that—until Belle arrives, sees Gaston about to kill the Beast, and cries out in fear. The Beast fights back then, but not for his own sake—for Belle's. Notably in the 2017 film, the Beast puts only enough effort into fighting Gaston to allow the Beast to continue making his way to where Belle waits, indicating he cares nothing for the battle. Gaston, on the other hand, has his worth as a man riding on the fight. He persists until the Beast is forced to defeat him completely. The Beast holds Gaston's life in his hands, literally, dangling him over an abyss, but rather than kill him, the Beast simply demands that he leave before returning him to sturdy ground. He then turns his back on Gaston, trusting in honor. But Gaston, unlike the Beast, has no honor. He stabs (or shoots, in the 2017 film) the Beast in the back. It is this action that causes Gaston to fall to his death—ironically, if he had kept his word, he would have survived. It was his need to be the best that caused his fall. The Beast's honorable nature is what causes his injuries, but it is also what wins him Belle's heart. The Beast's last words are to Belle: "At least I got to see you one last time" (1991). In that

moment, Belle admits her love for him, the curse is broken, and his wounds are magically healed—because of his honor and his love for Belle as much as because of her genuine love for him. Importantly, Belle recognizes that this newly human man is her Beast by looking deep into his eyes—the windows to the soul. Thus, through the entire storyline, the character of Gaston shows by contrast that the Beast has a good heart beneath his rough exterior. Where Gaston has social power, money, and peers on his side, the Beast has nothing. Where Gaston attempts to pressure Belle into loving him, the Beast simply tries to be her friend. This Beauty and Beast fall in love without Stockholm syndrome, through common interests and their shared status as outcasts from society.

The original Beauty of *Beauty and the Beast* did suffer from Stockholm syndrome. She developed feelings for the Beast under duress, alone and unsupported, rather than through genuine connection. However, as the story has been altered for modern audiences, elements of Stockholm syndrome have all but vanished. Importantly, the versions of *Beauty and the Beast* that are most widely known—the two Disney films—change the original story to create a genuine relationship between Belle and the Beast. They give Belle a support system and create a foil for the Beast’s goodness in the form of Gaston. They provide Belle with history, personality, and a friend in the form of the Beast—both of them outcasts, the Beast for his cursed form and Belle for her love for books. Disney’s 2017 live-action film only improved what their 1991 animated feature began—a story where Belle, or Beauty, is more than just a pretty face.

Works Cited

- Beaumont, Marie Leprince de. *Beauty and the Beast*. 1756. *Beauty and the Beast (Two Versions)*. Ebook, Silver Deer Classics, 2018.
- Beauty and the Beast*. Directed by Bill Condon, produced by David Hoberman and Todd Lieberman, Walt Disney Pictures, 2017.
- Beauty and the Beast*. Directed by Gary Trousdale and Kirk Wise, produced by Don Hahn, Walt Disney Pictures, 1991.
- Graham, Dee L.R., et. al. *Loving to Survive: Sexual Terror, Men's Violence, and Women's Lives*. New York University Press, 1994.
- La Belle et La Bete*. Directed by Christophe Gans, Eskwad-Pathé Productions, 2014.
- Lang, Andrew. *Beauty and the Beast*. 1889. *Beauty and the Beast (Two Versions)*. Ebook, Silver Deer Classics, 2018.
- McKinley, Robin. *Beauty*. Pocket Books, Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1978.
- . *Rose Daughter*. Open Road Integrated Media, Ebook, 1997.
- Villeneuve, Gabrielle de. *Beauty and the Beast*. Translated by Ernest Dowson, Ebook, Sakurabinders, 2019.
- "What is Consent?" *Seminole State College - Title IX Office/Safety*, <http://www.sscok.edu/ComSafety.html>.

Andersen vs. Schaffert

Mermaids as a Symbol for Experience's Relationship to Gender

Krista Butts

Timothy Schaffert's "The Mermaid in the Tree" eloquently and solemnly retells the classic Hans Christian Andersen fairytale of "The Little Mermaid." While the retelling has many surprising twists, there is also an underlying social commentary about gendered expectations and society's impact on the outcome of youth's journey into adulthood. Schaffert's retelling showcases the futility of maturation in a more modern world which is devoid of the fairytale enchantment. The females in both the original tale and retelling showcase the loss of innocence that comes with women gaining experience in the midst of society's unjust judgements, but in Schaffert's tale, Desiree gains power in her understanding of her surroundings. Furthermore, the male character, Axel, conveys the difference in societal expectations concerning gender roles as he juxtaposes Andersen's little mermaid by paralleling their experiences with self-image, worship of romantic interests, loss of self, and overall character development and transformation.

The female experiences in both the original tale and the retelling showcase the troubles that come with maturing in the midst of society's slanted judgements, but the spectators at the Mermaid Parade in Schaffert's retelling truly capture this. Desiree is placed in Rothgutt's Asylum for Misspent Youth from a young age for "taking candy from a baby" (Schaffert 172). The

“troubled” girls from the Asylum are allowed to attend the Parade only if they transport the dead mermaids, who have washed up on Mudpuddle Beach, causing the spectators to see the girls as corrupt. In the midst of gaining life experience and being confronted with death, the girls are unfairly judged, and this is representative of how society can misjudge females’ journey into maturation.

A group of nuns illustrate this societal judgement by protesting against the Mermaid Parade. Nuns, of course, are a social and religious symbol for everlasting purity in the service of God. These nuns specifically hail from the convent of the Sisterhood of Poseidon’s Daughters, which is reminiscent of Andersen’s little mermaid and her sisterhood. Thus, the nuns protesting are symbolic of preserving innocence similar to the little mermaid’s sisters when they try to help her become a mermaid again, the most innocent version of herself, after she has lived as a human. In order to preserve innocence, these nuns throw rotten tomatoes at the girls from Rothgutt’s rather than at the dead mermaids. This showcases that the Asylum girls are seen as tarnished, while the mermaids are seen as innocent victims. Women in fairytales—and, oftentimes, in past and present society—are expected to be pure but are also ostracized for it. The Mermaid Parade is a bleak representation of long-standing gendered expectations in society. The mermaids represent degraded innocence and the Asylum girls represent judged growth.

Furthermore, Desiree understands society’s unjust ways, and uses her connection to the mermaid she transports to understand herself and her journey from innocence to experience. Schaffert writes, “Desiree breathed against the glass of the bowl then wiped away the fog with the lace shawl she wore across her naked shoulders, polishing away smears on the glass. She named her mermaid after herself” (175). While Desiree does not see the mermaid at face value, she instead has an intimate connection with her; Desiree feels she is looking through the glass at herself because she too is on display. Desiree’s connection to the mermaid illustrates her understanding of society’s discriminating views on women’s development.

Moreover, the need for Andersen’s little mermaid to relate with humanity, who has taken her power, represents the perpetuated gendered expectation of females’ innocence and their struggle to transition into womanhood. For example, Andersen writes, “[She] again fixed her eyes on the Prince, who murmured in his dreams the name of his bride—she alone was in his thoughts. The knife quivered in the mermaid’s hand—but then she flung it far out into

the waves" (231). In this passage, the mermaid could return to her innocent life as a mermaid if she kills the Prince, but she realizes the Prince and his bride are meant to be together, and she is an outsider. Andersen specifically says the knife quivers in the "mermaid's" hand, and in this he labels her as not human, and essentially below a human. Thus, she cannot mature as she wants to or deserves to. Her experience as a human destroyed her purity as a mermaid; however, she does not let it further destroy her by taking away the happiness of others.

Even though it is unfair that the little mermaid sacrifices herself for the Prince and his bride, there is a strong social commentary in how she learns from her human experience and takes control of her final choice, even if it will not lead back to her original mermaid life she longs for. She has been thrust into experience and is tarnished by the humans' disposal of her. Ultimately, in her struggle to adapt in the midst of this, she exercises some autonomy by making the moral choice of choosing empathy even when the human world refused to show her any throughout her journey and left her powerless.

While Andersen's little mermaid shows empathy for the Prince and his bride, Desiree similarly shows empathy to the dead mermaid in the Parade. Andersen captures the loss of innocence in how the mermaid desperately tries to become as human as possible throughout the tale, yet she ultimately realizes she has simultaneously lost herself because of it. Schaffert captures loss of innocence in how Desiree identifies with the mermaid, whose innocence was stripped by society's desire to preserve her decaying body. Humans in Andersen's tale remain pure—or perhaps ignorant—while mermaids in Schaffert's tale represent females' transition into womanhood being tarnished by the cruel judgement of society. However, in Andersen's tale the little mermaid, who longs to be human, does not get a chance to understand why her situation is unjust. Schaffert articulates how females understand what the little mermaid could not about transitioning into experience.

Schaffert captures the difference in transitioning to adulthood in how the boys and girls grow up in extremely different settings due to society's perceptions of gender. For example, Desiree's observations of Axel's attendance and experiences at the Starkwhip Academy of Breathtakingly Exceptional Young Men comment on how gender is treated differently during adolescence. The Academy appears like a paradise and shelters Axel with other boys; conversely, females are secluded in an asylum. Axel's

relationships with Desiree and his classmates demonstrate that he is not necessarily innocent, but he is not branded by his experiences, while Desiree was sent to the Asylum as an infant for a crime unworthy of the punishment. Despite their comparable innocence, their punishment, or lack thereof, demonstrates society's treatment of gender.

To further juxtapose society's gender bias, Schaffert paints Axel as the little mermaid's symbolic counterpart through their differing views of self-image concerning nakedness. The first time Axel appears to Desiree, he seems to be an ethereal deity, like a mermaid. Schaffert writes, "Desiree on the other side of the barbed wire fence that separated the public beach from the private had whistled into her cupped fists to trill out a melodic birdcall. Immodestly he'd stepped to the fence still naked, running his fingers through his sweaty blond locks" (176–77). Desiree does not judge Axel as he flaunts his nakedness; he knows it is immodest but does not care. He is mermaid-like because of how exotic he seems to Desiree, but he is different from the little mermaid because, as a boy, he is not judged for his nakedness.

In contrast, when the little mermaid first meets the Prince after becoming human, her self-image is painted with shame at her nakedness. Andersen writes, "[The Prince] stared at her with coal-black eyes, so that she cast down her own—and saw that her fishes tail had gone and she had the sweetest little white legs that any young girl could wish for; but she was quite naked and so she wrapped herself in her long flowing hair" (227). The little mermaid notices her nakedness and covers herself because she feels embarrassed. Also, Andersen specifically states that the Prince looks at her with "coal-black eyes" which seem judgmental because he shows a lack of emotion. His black eyes could also be indicative of him seeing her as something tarnished or impure. The little mermaid feels embarrassed by her newfound nakedness because of the judgment from the Prince.

With the setting differences related to gender in the midst of growing up, objects of worship are also painted differently because of their gender. Rapunzel, the mermaid Axel falls in love with, winds up a statue-like being that he lovingly worships, but ultimately becomes a hanging corpse, which serves as a reminder of losing innocence to experience. Rapunzel's statue-like being appears as such: "Her body had decayed quickly, plucked apart by the carrion that found her exotic flesh a delicacy . . . [leaving her a] mermaid's skeleton . . . among the many nooses that still lined the branch" (172–73). Rapunzel is immortalized in a decrepit way, and this lack of respectful

immortalization comes from the transformation in Axel's infatuation of Rapunzel to his worship of his own personal maturation; and in this, he disregards his beloved Rapunzel. Axel's treatment of Rapunzel reflects society's views on the value of women's experience.

The treatment of Rapunzel's statuesque figure compares to the statue of the Prince and provides a cautionary example of how society differentially treats gender. Furthermore, Axel worships, then ultimately disregards, Rapunzel. This contrasts to the little mermaid's respectful worship of the Prince's impermeable and solid statue. Andersen details the little mermaid's fascination with the Prince's statue, "It was the statue of a handsome boy, hewn from the clear white stone and come down to the bottom of the sea from a wreck. Beside the statue she planted a rose-red weeping willow, which grew splendidly and let its fresh foliage droop over the statue right down to the sandy blue" (217). The Prince's statue of "clear white stone" represents something strong and pure. Also, the little mermaid surrounds his statue with beautiful plants to symbolize something blossoming and thriving. She has an innocent love and respect for him through her worship. Both Rapunzel's and the Prince's statues are representative of society painting how gender should be respected.

Society, in addition to disrespecting women, determines what is considered beautiful. Axel's "beauty" is lost as he loses pieces of his physical and emotional being. He permanently inks Rapunzel onto his skin and "the tattooist wrote *cruel destiny* in a fluttering banner beneath the mermaid" (Schaffert 191). The banner in the tattoo suggests that both Rapunzel and Axel will have cruel fates, as evident when Axel literally skins his tattoo and offers to sell it to the casino boss in order to obtain medicine for Rapunzel. Axel offers another piece of himself by promising the child he will conceive with Rapunzel to the casino boss. He barter these pieces of himself to save Rapunzel from the casino boss, but eventually sacrifices her for his own maturation.

The deal Axel made with the casino boss is similar to the little mermaid's deal with the sea witch, which juxtaposes their experiences entering maturation and losing pieces of themselves. For example, the sea witch tells the mermaid, "Once you've got human shape, you can never become a mermaid again. You can never go down through the water to your sisters and your father's palace; and if you don't win the Prince's love, so he forgets father and mother for you and always has you in his thoughts and lets the

priest join your hands together to be man and wife, then you won't get an immortal soul" (Andersen 226). By sacrificing her tail, the little mermaid also sacrifices the beauty of her innocence, which shapes her entire existence and journey into maturity while retrieving the Prince's love, which differs from Axel because he already has Rapunzel's love. The little mermaid not only loses her tail but also endures the loss of her tongue, the pain of walking, and her ultimate sacrifice for a Prince who will never love her. Perhaps, Schaffert depicts Axel as similar to the little mermaid to show how constructed gender roles are reversed in his tale because Axel originally sacrifices himself for the woman he loves, but he reverts to his societal gender role by later sacrificing Rapunzel for his own gain.

Axel's sacrifice of Rapunzel results in servitude to others, which contributes to his character transformation, much like how Andersen's little mermaid's choice to spare the Prince and his bride results in servitude. However, in return for choosing Rapunzel's deadly fate, Axel must serve others for the rest of his life so she can rightfully live on in spirit. To explain this, Rapunzel says, "It wasn't that he changed his mind, Desiree . . . but that he thought he could somehow keep *my* soul alive if *he* lived" (Schaffert 195). Axel is living in pain while serving others to right his mistakes, which provides some form of justice for females and allows them to live in peace. Ultimately, Axel returns to Starkwhip Academy, no longer a student, to serve his former classmates and professors. He is not recognized because he has totally transformed due to his experience and, therefore, is ostracized. Axel's servitude, as a result of his decisions, goes against society's determination of gender roles.

The little mermaid's servitude is similar to Axel's but is degrading because she did not hurt others and is forced to suffer for her choices. She serves the Prince, while in great pain, to win his love. While failing to win his love but still exercising morality, she must continue to serve other humans in order to have a chance at an immortal soul—to essentially rest in peace. The daughters of the air explain, "You, poor little mermaid, have striven . . . with all your heart; you have suffered and endured" (Andersen 232). Despite choosing not to kill the Prince, the little mermaid is still punished because of his lack of love for her. In the end, both she and Axel have to suffer, but his punishment is just while hers is not.

While Axel and the little mermaid's situations are similar, they differ in social narrative because Schaffert showcases the unjust gender roles and

expectations which fairytales and society perpetuate. Schaffert flips these gender roles and places Axel in servitude as a consequence of his actions, but the Prince receives no punishment. While serving others at the Academy, Axel reflects on his injustice towards Rapunzel: "He'd press his fingers hard against his tender throat, and he'd swallow, approximating the strangled breaths Rapunzel must have struggled for in her final minutes of life." (Schaffert 197). In this, Schaffert compares Axel to the Prince and equates the Prince as the one who ultimately kills the little mermaid by choosing his bride instead.

Despite Axel choosing Rapunzel over Desiree, Desiree gains her womanhood and power over him, reflective of the little mermaid's powerless experience with the Prince. In the beginning of their relationship, Desiree hoped that Axel would propose to her, which would get her out of the Asylum and into a normal life, but Axel does not take this seriously. Instead, he falls in love with Rapunzel, breaking Desiree's heart because she knows she is his second choice. Eventually, Axel marries Desiree and "whenever she felt her husband might be drifting away for good . . . she would simply hold out this bone so small, and she would ruin him and she would bring him back" (Schaffert 199). In this passage, Desiree is able to have power over Axel using the bone of his unborn child with Rapunzel, which reminds him of his past mistakes. In Andersen's tale, the little mermaid never gains power over the Prince. After all, "a mermaid has no immortal soul and can never have one unless she wins the love of a mortal. Eternity for her, depends on a power outside her" (Andersen 232). This showcases the little mermaid never had any true autonomy, despite making the right decision in the end. Desiree's power is the opposite of the Prince's power over the little mermaid, which allows Desiree to be in command of her own maturation.

Overall, Schaffert brilliantly executes his retelling of "The Little Mermaid" by daring to have the male character struggle to navigate maturation, while commenting on how the little mermaid's experience is unjust. In her journey from childhood innocence to womanhood, Desiree gains power because she understands the cruelty of society. Because Desiree resides in the Asylum, she is considered tainted for past mistakes. This judgement can be seen by the nuns who try to preserve the innocence of youth, similar to the little mermaid's sisters. Desiree recognizes this judgment and can relate to the dead mermaid she transports because she sees herself in the mermaid; the little mermaid similarly empathizes with the humanity she wishes to join

but is excluded from. Schaffert highlights this societal bias towards gender in comparing how boys and girls are treated when they attend the Academy and the Asylum respectively.

Furthermore, Schaffert expounds on the societal differences by providing a juxtaposition between Axel and the little mermaid. Their roles are compared through their perceptions of self-image, worship of their romantic interests, loss of their beauty for those they love, and consequences of servitude. This juxtaposition is adjusted to compare Axel's and the Prince's role in the deaths of Rapunzel and the little mermaid. Ultimately, Desiree gains power over Axel, while the little mermaid sacrifices her power for the Prince. Schaffert's retelling overturns the gendered expectations in both fairytales and society by showcasing the loss of innocence for women gaining experience.

Works Cited

Andersen, Hans Christian. "The Little Mermaid." *The Classic Fairytales*, edited by Maria Tartar, W.W. Norton & Company, 1999, pp. 216–32.

Schaffert, Timothy. "The Mermaid in the Tree." *My Mother She Killed Me, My Father He Ate Me*, edited by Kate Bernheimer, Penguin Group, 2010, pp.171–99.

Peter, Pan, and Persephone

Keepers of the Mythical Wild

Noelle Conder

First introduced over a hundred years ago, the story of Peter Pan has been told in several books, plays, and movies as a magical story about childhood. While the play was wildly popular at its debut and has since seen many avenues of scholarly criticism mostly in the psychoanalytic style of Sigmund Freud, another equally important area of criticism for *Peter Pan* is in how the story functions in the realm of fairy tales and mythology. Through Peter Pan's ties to Greek mythology, and the way the story changed through each retelling, *Peter Pan* is a myth both in content and in origin. Beyond this, I propose that James Barrie inadvertently created Peter Pan as the lovechild of the Greek nature gods Persephone and Pan, and because of this, his character and story as a whole is a modern addition to the ancient nature myth that bridges the gap between nature and childhood mythology. Through specific traits Peter inherited from these gods along with his intrinsic childlike nature, he becomes a more appropriate symbol for nature than either of his mythological "parents" individually. In this paper, I will look at what exact traits Peter has inherited from those parents, the role mythical allusions serve in helping us understand nature, and whether or not this relationship with nature is what makes a true Eden. In addition, because of the way the story evolved like a myth itself through fragments

of ideas, constant revision, and oral storytelling, this origin allows Peter a far more flexible future as a myth than other children's stories or literature. Knowing this background, I will show that Peter uses his mythical traits and an idealized version of nature to lure his companions, whether the fictional Darlings or his real-life readers, to a wild island unencumbered by civilization. Though this escape to Neverland may seem like an idyllic return to Eden, what Peter's companions learn there decides whether or not they will realize the true desired Eden and be able to return to the adult world to be productive members of society living "betwixt and between" wild nature and modern civilization.

To understand how *Peter Pan* is a myth, we must first understand what a myth is. All cultures throughout history have come up with stories to explain the world around them: these stories become what we call "myths." Though all cultures each have their own belief system of gods and creation myths, the Greek and Roman mythologies (on which *Peter Pan* is more closely based) stand apart in making their gods and goddesses more closely resemble humans than other mythological cultures before them. Edith Hamilton explains in the introduction of her book *Mythology* that their stories are "quite generally supposed to show us the way the human race thought and felt untold ages ago" (3). Additionally, where other cultures held their gods up as deities for religious worship, the Greek and Roman gods were so human and so notably flawed in comparison to other cultures that Hamilton writes, "According to the most modern idea, a real myth has nothing to do with religion. It is an explanation of something in nature; how . . . any and everything in the universe came into existence" (12). It was from this idea of creation and nature myths that Barrie had the idea to create his own myth: *Peter Pan*.

R. D. S. Jack explains in his book *The Road to the Never Land* that Barrie's mythological connection with *Peter Pan* was done intentionally, and through Barrie's constant revisions over twenty years the story bloomed naturally into the complex world we have today. Based on Barrie's notebooks, Jack says, "it seems that Barrie wished to create a new MYTH [sic] based on classical material" (*The Road* 159). Yet part of the charm of myths is that, while some of them have been documented through pictographs or stories, a crucial part of their origin is that they began as an oral tradition. This means that no matter what culture of mythology you study, the story was likely altered multiple times before it was finally written down. Operating under

these constraints, Barrie had to find some way to create a new story in his current time period that simultaneously seemed ancient and modern. As Jack says, “the first major problem is how to embody ‘world without end’—or indeed . . . world without known beginning” (160). Thus, Barrie had to first plant an idea—one that would grow up to be “the boy who wouldn’t grow up.”

Even though this mythology connection may have been intentional, long before anything was written down, snippets of Peter Pan, the Lost Boys, and Neverland were found throughout James Barrie’s works, and events in his life were clearly drawn upon for inspiration. Jack notes that Peter Pan “is the culmination of [Barrie’s] thinking over many years” (*The Road* 155). When Peter was officially introduced, his story as a “Betwixt-and-Between” (*The Little* 138), half-way between boy and bird and living with the fairies in Kensington Gardens was planted as just a small fairy tale within one of Barrie’s novels for adults, *The Little White Bird*, in 1902. Yet even in his first introduction, Peter is referred to so casually as an eternal figure everyone should already know, as if his myth already exists. The narrator in *The Little White Bird* introduces us to this idea by starting, “If you ask your mother whether she knew about Peter Pan when she was a little girl, she will say, ‘Why, of course, I did, child’ . . . Then if you ask your grandmother whether she knew about Peter Pan when she was a girl, she also says, ‘Why, of course, I did, child’” (131). But between the two generations some of the details have already been lost. The important thing this shows, according to the narrator, is that “Peter is ever so old, but he is really always the same age” (131).

Just like those ancient traditions of oral story-telling and constant revisions, Barrie was able to create a story that would develop organically, ever changing to fit a certain situation, just as ancient mythology was known to do. From the idea planted in *The Little White Bird*, the story of Peter Pan bloomed into a full-blown nature myth, just as Barrie intended. Fabio Vericat writes that like Peter’s own status of being not exactly a human and not exactly a bird, the story itself has never been exactly a novel nor exactly a play. Vericat discusses that Barrie was so obsessed with the changeability of the stage version of *Peter Pan* that he was constantly revising the written script. As such, the script, and the novelizations all started playing off one another: two years after *The Little White Bird*, in 1904, Barrie expanded and adjusted Peter’s story to create the annual stage play of *Peter Pan, or the Boy Who Wouldn’t Grow Up*. After more revisions and expansions, Barrie

published the novel *Peter and Wendy* in 1911 which would later become the novel *Peter Pan* we know today. And even though *Peter Pan* is the book that was unofficially declared the official story, Barrie continued to revise the stage play until he finally published the script for *Peter Pan, or the Boy Who Wouldn't Grow Up* in 1928 with changes that neither the original play nor the book had seen. Of this evolution Vericat says, "It is a literary hybrid subject to a precarious but crucial literary existence: betwixt-and-between" (120). With all these changes, even Barrie himself has noted in a dedication of the novel that he "has no recollection of having written it" ("To the Five"). This history shows us that, though Barrie may have started the story, Peter ran off on his own, changing the story along with him as mythical creatures are wont to do. In this way, not only is the character of Peter Pan acting as a figure of mythology, but the way the whole story was pulled together is very reminiscent of oral mythology and folklore telling, which gave us so many different versions of myths and fairy tales.

In further studying Barrie's intentions, Jack adds that, not only did Barrie want to write a myth, but he seemed to have the intent to make a "CREATION Myth [sic]" (*The Road* 160) which connects Peter's island to nature on top of his own intrinsic qualities. Thus Barrie's new world, the Never Land (or later, "Neverland") was born. Though we don't know much about how the island is physically created in Barrie's story, we know that, except for Peter, Neverland exists inside the minds of children. In the terms of Barrie's "creation myth," explaining it this way leaves room for the island to be different in the minds of every child, and likewise different in how each child creates the island. However, Barrie unifies the islands by having a group of simple shared traits always on Neverland: beasts, mermaids, pirates, and "redskins." Despite the negative connotation that today's readers will likely see in Barrie's treatment of the book's natives, and even in the use of the word "redskins," it is notable that Barrie chose Natives so similar to Native Americans for his new myth, and why those Natives, though adults, deserve a truce with the Lost Boys when the pirates do not. Native American cultures have a vast collection of mythology as well, with their most popular stories being their creation myths. With this subtle connection to creation narrative, Tiger Lily's tribe on Neverland actually helps place Barrie's story deeper into a mythology culture possibly more so than any other indigenous tribe on the island would. Though Barrie still describes them from a white European perspective, it is perhaps because of the Native American link to

nature mythology that Peter Pan decides to rescue Tiger Lily and call a truce with the rest of the Piccaninny tribe when the pirates (the only other adults on the island) by contrast are nothing but evil.

Moving on to focus on Peter Pan as a character, Barrie's deliberate introduction of him as someone who is "Betwixt and Between" links Peter directly to mythology and begins to prove his mythological inheritance of becoming the halfling lovechild of the Greek gods Pan and Persephone. Peter exemplifies traits from both Pan, the god of the wild, and Persephone, the goddess of spring, in his features and his actions to such an extent that he becomes a nature deity as well. Peter's mythological father figure, the Greek god Pan, is a satyr (half-goat, half-man) who lords over nature and the wild; like his father, Peter is only a half-boy with a wild temperament who lives with the fairies, rules over the wild of Neverland, and plays Panpipes (named after the Greek god). Additionally, in Barrie's earliest drafts of the story—namely *The Little White Bird* and the first versions of the stage play—Peter even rides a goat to more obviously connect him to his mythical father. Then, like his mythological mother Persephone, Peter seems to show an overall control over the physical island of Neverland, including its nature and warm seasons; this is shown in the book when it says, "feeling that Peter was on his way back, the Neverland had again woke [sic] into life" (*Peter Pan* 71). Further than that, Peter displays a siren-like nature which displays possible connections to the original sirens of lore that were Persephone's companions in the underworld. The way Barrie interweaves all of these traits into one character implies that Peter was always meant to be a mythological character, and it also implies that Peter is an essential figure in nature mythology.

Beginning with Peter's connection to Pan, this heritage is essential for linking Peter to nature myths as Pan has been the god invoked in ancient pastoral poetry since Virgil's *Eclogues*. In Thomas K. Hubbard's book *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, he discusses intertextuality in pastoral poetry: more specifically the links to nature and mythology that are consistently brought up in pastoral poems such as Virgil's *Eclogues* and Theocritus' story of "Thyrsis" from *Idylls*. A central feature of pastoral poems is the focus on shepherds or country workers, and these two poets specifically address *goatherds*, referring back to the half-goat god, Pan. Additionally, the song used in "Thyrsis" is specifically accompanied by *Panpipes*. In *Idylls*, Thyrsis begins addressing the Goatherd with, "Pleasant, the musical

murmur . . . and equally pleasant your piping. Indeed, after Pan, you take second prize" (Theocritus 3), and he again praises and prays to Pan in his song that follows. Reference to Pan in pastoral poetry seems a matter of fact as Pan is the god of the goats and wild; however references to the Panpipes serve a more potent focus of uniting pastoral poems through their use of song. And with this connection to song, Hubbard concludes that "pastoral is from its origins a vehicle of transition from the past to the future" (350). By Peter Pan playing these same Panpipes, he too is brought into that realm of the pastoral tradition, and rather than the pastoral transitioning him from the past to the future, Barrie uses the pastoral to transition his new character into the past.

Even as Pan's relationship to Peter explains the unaging boy's lineage and connection to the past, the traits he inherited from his mother Persephone explain how he is so adept at drawing in those around him and how his "Betwixt-and-Between" nature explains his easy flight and his friendship with the mermaids of Neverland. The central idea of *Peter Pan*, that three children who love their parents dearly would suddenly run away in the middle of the night with a strange boy just because he asks, only begins to make sense when we realize that Peter may have a supernaturally powerful gift of persuasion. The most persuasive creatures in the realm of mythology are the sirens, and their later counterparts the mermaids. Accordingly, as Elisa Di Biase explains in her article, "On that Conspiratorial Smile Between Peter Pan and the Mermaids," Peter's half-bird nature actually makes him a magical cousin of the mermaids, and explains how he is so persuasive and alluring to his companions. Going back to original folklore of mermaids, the more menacing version known as the *sirens* were once "the companions of young Proserpine who [were] turned into birds by Ceres, her mother, in order to fly to the underworld to look for her" after she was kidnapped by Pluto (Di Biase 96). When Persephone (Proserpine) became the queen of the Underworld, the sirens remained her companions who accompanied mortal souls down to her and later sang sweet songs to entice even more souls to come down with them. Like the sirens, Peter deals with death in his origins as well. When Peter first lives at Kensington Gardens with the fairies, he starts worrying that other children who get left in the gardens will be abandoned as he was. Soon he takes it upon himself to gather the lost children at night before they freeze, but sometimes he is too late, and "he digs a grave for the child and erects a little tombstone" (*The Little* 207). This origin has evolved

into other beliefs that Peter began accompanying the dead souls of children to the Never Land so they wouldn't be lonely. From origins such as these Di Biase concludes, "Both Peter and the sirens begin as soul-birds" (98). Nevertheless from this shared bird origin, the physical similarities between Peter and the sirens parted ways as the siren myth got passed down; the luring sirens were merged with the Christian fish-tail symbolism warning of the dangers of womanly lust, until eventually the bird-like sirens became the fish-like mermaids. Though they are now different, Di Biase argues that Peter and the mermaids both remember their true origins and shared heritage, which is why Peter is the only one of the Neverland gang to get special treatment from the mermaids.

Because of all this extra attention, Peter unconsciously starts picking up the mermaids' seductive mannerisms, enticing all the women he comes in contact with—Tinker Bell, Wendy, Tiger Lily, and in a way, even Mrs. Darling. In more general terms, we see that the younger girls he meets—Wendy, Tiger Lily, and Tinker Bell—are all attracted to him without his knowledge. When Wendy asks Peter, "what are your exact feelings for me?," she is very disappointed when he answers that he has the feelings "of a devoted son" towards her, though Peter is far too innocent to understand why this disappoints Wendy. "'You are so queer,' he [says], frankly puzzled, 'and Tiger Lily is just the same. There is something she wants to be to me, but she says it is not my mother'" (*Peter Pan* 145). Tinker Bell feels this too, for when he asks if she would be his mother instead of Wendy, she indignantly replies with, "You silly ass!" and for the first time in the book, Wendy and Tink agree on something (146). Even Mrs. Darling is somewhat bewitched by him even when she only briefly sees him at the nursery window: "He was a lovely boy," "entrancing" (20), and something about him relates to Mrs. Darling enough that even after he's stolen her children she "wanted . . . not to call Peter names" (23).

In a more detailed example, we see Peter acting as a full siren the night he invites Wendy to come with him to Neverland. Right after their first conversation, Peter inadvertently insults Wendy, causing her to dash back under her covers. In an attempt to get her to come back out and talk with him, Peter calls to her "in a voice that no woman has ever yet been able to resist," and Wendy, "every inch a woman, though there were not very many inches . . . peeped out of the bedclothes" (*Peter Pan* 40). While he may not realize it, Peter becomes every bit like the sirens he's related to

as he persuades the young girl to let down her guard and come out of her safe hiding place. Peter Pan's siren nature gets even more sinister when we explore the actions he takes in getting the Darling children, especially Wendy, to follow him to Neverland. Holly Blackford, one of the many psychoanalytic scholars of *Peter Pan*, looks into these siren-like dangers of Peter in her article "Mrs. Darling's Scream: The Rites of Persephone in Peter and Wendy and Wuthering Heights." Blackford reminds us that in the Female Gothic tradition, "heroines, themselves in transition between states of being just as Peter is forever 'betwixt and between' . . . persist in being attracted to various kinds of creatures that embody both immortal youth and an opportunity to express sexual desire" (118). She relates Peter Pan to the darker myths of eternally youthful vampires who wait at a window to be let in, and once inside they steal away the pretty girls who will grow old without them. Blackford argues that Peter is clearly tied to the Persephone myth, when we look at the versions of her origins that show Hades kidnapping her to the Underworld, but Peter relates more to the kidnapper, Hades, than he does to the victim, Persephone.

When Peter steals the Darling children away to Neverland, his darker siren nature seems to take over when he gets the idea that Wendy could come back with him. Barrie writes, "there was a greedy look in his eyes now which ought to have alarmed her, but did not . . . and then Peter gripped her and began to draw her towards the window" (*Peter Pan* 48). Wendy calls out in her distress, but Peter merely continues to entice her to Neverland, telling her specifically about the *mermaids* which she might see on the island. Indeed, "he had become frightfully cunning . . . [Wendy] was wriggling her body in distress. It was quite as if she were trying to remain on the nursery floor. But he had no pity for her" (*Peter Pan* 48). And just a few pages later, the Darlings are all following him out of the nursery window, and he succeeds in capturing his prey. Peter's siren nature fully takes over as he lures not only the Darling children to Neverland, but also all those who read or watch his story play out.

Beyond this parallel to Hades kidnapping Persephone, Blackford also compares Peter and Wendy's flight from London to the Fall from Eden. In the beginning of *Peter Pan*, Barrie writes, "All children, except one, grow up. They soon know that they will grow up," and Wendy knew it by the time she was two. "You always know after you are two. Two is the beginning of the end" (*Peter Pan* 7). Of this passage, Blackford states that it "recites

the fall of the daughter from a pre-linguistic mother-daughter Eden, framing the eternal child-son Peter Pan as a transitional figure between mother and daughter" (116). By the idealistic nature of Neverland, one would assume Neverland would be Eden, but Blackford complicates this idea by claiming that the real Eden is the perfect innocent relationship between mother and child. For although Neverland is a place of magic and possibility, the island only exists inside the minds of children. Thus Neverland could never be a true Eden, for it is unattainable in the waking world, and entirely unattainable for adults in general. The mother/child relationship, with its pure innocence and love, is a much better representation of the ideal Eden. While Peter lacks this Edenic innocence, he does display his own particular brand of innocence that closely aligns with key traits of Nature.

Despite Peter's dark tendencies, he still shows a version of this Edenic childlike innocence, but mixed with his own inherent cockiness, and this combination of traits is what makes Peter a much better representation of nature than either of his mythological parents could be. Innocence is one of the things Barrie was trying to capture as he centered his myth around an immortal child. Barrie's stories came out during a time when adults had a new fervor for creating an actual "childhood" for the new generation—an idea which had been growing in popularity through the Romantic and Victorian eras. In her article "Myths of Innocence and Imagination: The Case of the Fairy Tale," professor of literature Jeannette Sky discusses the importance of this time period on the creation of fairy tales. She suggests that the Romantics were so influenced by nature and the supernatural, that they soon began writing fantasy and fairy tales as adult fiction, long before it was considered "children's literature," just as Barrie began with *The Little White Bird* for adults before moving on to the stories centered on Peter. Because of the new idealized "childhood" idea, children were often subjects of their fairy tales because they seemed more mythical than adults. Out of this idea sprang characters such as Carroll's Alice, Kipling's Mowgli, and Barrie's Peter Pan. In contrast to adults, Mowgli and Peter especially can live mythical lives because they are children who are separated from the adult world and living in nature. Of the comparison of Neverland to Eden, Sky says,

With Peter Pan's Never Land a new and secularised childhood Eden is portrayed, but it is still an Eden, a state separated from the fallen condition of experience that characterizes adulthood. But this is not the voice of the child, it is the adult world that wants Peter Pan and his likes to never grow up, to

remain in a never land. The myth of the innocent child and of the primacy of childhood imagination enshrines adult desires and dreams . . . Maybe this childhood Eden is the only Eden imaginable in the modern world, as the Biblical Eden has become more and more like a true fantasy—nothing but the ‘airy imagination of the brain.’ (363)

In this way, *Sky* *does* interpret Neverland as an Eden in contrast to Blackford, but that belief is still founded on the same principles as before: that childhood innocence is the key to a better Eden. By creating an escape from the reality of adulthood, the adults of *Barrie’s* time tried to create Eden in the literal mind of a child, but because they lack that inward innocence themselves, they still can’t reach it. One cannot stay forever in this natural world secluded from everything because these books were written *about* children rather than *by* children, and adults will always have to return. As *Alice’s*, *Mowgli’s*, and *Peter’s* stories play out, the children eventually return to the adult world: all except for Peter.

As this theory indicates, an immortal child such as Peter is exactly what is needed for a mythological figure of nature that holds true to the most pure form of nature: one of innocence and sentimentality. In Friedrich Schiller’s essay, “On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry,” Schiller breaks poetry into two categories: the naïve and the sentimental. He then compares the two in an attempt to decide which one is better suited to describing Nature. Schiller states that the naïve is closer to that pure innocence of true nature, but lacks the same knowledge displayed in older works. On the other hand, the sentimental has the knowledge and the experience needed to write with better feelings, but lacks the pure innocence of those feelings. In essence, “So long as we were merely children of nature, we were happy and perfect; we have become free and have lost both . . . The sensuous man laments only the loss of the first; the moral one can mourn only for the loss of the other” (Schiller 91). Schiller argues that the epitome of nature is seen as all that is “untouched” or “innocent” and therefore relates most to the perfect innocence of childhood. This “perfect innocence” fits Peter Pan especially in his original 1902 form because he was, in fact, only a week-old *baby* when he flew away to play with the fairies in Kensington Gardens (*The Little* 132). While everyone knows that Peter is a child, his young age is often lost because the popular modern Disney interpretations show this as an older, child-like teenager, and stage performances generally depict him as a small adult who only acts like a child. But these characterizations fall flat because

neither interpretation is the same as the innocent child in Schiller's ideal, and only Barrie's original Peter fully fits this idea. The difference between the Disney Peter and *The Little White Bird* Peter is that despite the fact that neither children nor teenagers have officially entered adulthood, the cocky, teenager Peter seen in production generally maintains an air that he's better than everyone because he knows things the other children don't, as if he's closer to being an all-knowing adult than the others; but a true child is cocky because he doesn't know any better. To Schiller, Nature just *is* because it doesn't have the worldly knowledge to do anything different; likewise the true innocence of the original baby Peter fits this idea of nature more fully, even if this innocence leads to Peter becoming dangerously cocky in his "genius."

However, Peter continues to fit Schiller's ideal of nature, not despite his egotistical nature but because of it. Schiller states, "Every true genius must be naïve or it is not genius. Its naiveté alone makes it genius, and what it is in the intellectual and the aesthetical, it cannot deny in the moral" (Schiller). The genius in the book *Peter Pan* is, of course, the immortal, naïve child Peter himself. When he gets separated from his own shadow, he is naïve enough to believe he can stick the shadow back to himself by using soap. This doesn't work, and when Wendy, who has been preparing to grow up and be a mother since the age of two, has the intelligent idea to sew his shadow to him, Peter crows, "Oh the cleverness of me!" (*Peter Pan* 39). Peter then continues to show his carelessness repeatedly throughout the book. On the first long flight to Neverland, he often deserts the Darling children for long periods of time because he gets bored and "sometimes when he return[s] he [does] not remember them, at least not well" (60). Then, back on the island with the Lost Boys, Barrie writes, "The difference between [Peter] and the other boys . . . was that they knew it was make-believe, while to him make-believe and true were exactly the same thing. This sometimes troubled them, as when they had to make-believe that they had had their dinners" (96). Yet even when the Lost Boys and Darling children start to doubt Peter's character, they still revere Peter as the genius leader of their group. Is this because they trust him entirely? Is it because he merely has more experience than them? The latter might be true sometimes, for Wendy does tell her brothers, "You must be nice to him . . . What would we do if he were to leave us?" (59). Still there are plenty of other instances in the book to negate these ideas, so perhaps Peter's continued leadership despite his clear flaws prove

what Schiller suggests: it is the innocence of a thing that makes it genius. In turn, this genius innocence is what relates best to that pure, untouched genius of Nature.

In comparing Peter to Pan and Persephone, we see many mythological traits that Peter seems to have inherited from those Greek gods of nature, exemplifying the idea that Peter is more of a lovechild of these two characters rather than just being a parallel replacement as he adds his own mother/child twists to the nature narrative. He does inherit the halfling status, his panpipe music, and his dominion over the seasons and creatures from Pan and Persephone, and these connections are how Peter stakes his claim in mythology. At the same time though, he adds his own dark seductive siren qualities and arrogant naiveté of childhood to show the complex innocence and changeability of Nature. His differences from his mythological parents are what put him in the position to take over as the head of Nature—as seen in his role of being the chief of Neverland, itself a representation for the wild. By setting Peter apart from the civilized world, his island of immortal youth serves as the desired “other” to adulthood—a modern Eden to return to. As adults hearing Peter Pan’s story, we too are drawn in by his seductive cry to forget growing up and “come away” with them to Neverland (35). His innocent, playful personality combined with the idea of an eternal childhood creates a magical landscape that is naturally enticing to anyone outside of it. However, with longer exposure to Peter’s character, his egotistical immaturity becomes more of a prevalent flaw. Through his contrast with Wendy especially, Peter shows us the complexities of childhood, and soon Wendy, her brothers, and even the Lost Boys seek to return to the mothers they can barely remember (154–58). Thus, what seems to be Eden at the onset turns out to be the world that a child has to fall into to realize that the true Eden is that mother/child relationship they left at the beginning of the story.

Even as a perfect embodiment of childhood, Peter came into the world as an old story that Barrie doesn’t even take complete credit for fully creating. The story that Barrie wrote down started as a myth that had been told for generations; it continued to get passed on and changed until the story bloomed on its own, and it still gets passed down and changed generations after Barrie’s death, thereby succeeding in becoming a new myth as the author intended. Looking at this story, we may remember Neverland with the nostalgia of wanting to return, but every time we do return, Neverland becomes more foreboding than inviting, which convinces us to come home

again. Peter isn't just a good or bad character, because neither childhood nor nature are *just* good or just bad. *Peter Pan* is so memorable and lasting because it is full of the types of contradictions that come with growing up and living in the real world.

Works Cited

Barrie, J. M. *The Little White Bird*. Scribner, New York, 1902.

---. *Peter Pan*. Penguin, 2004.

---. "To the Five: A Dedication." *Peter Pan and Other Plays*. Oxford University Press, 1928.

Blackford, Holly. "Mrs. Darling's Scream: The Rites of Persephone in Peter and Wendy and Wuthering Heights." *Studies in the Humanities* vol. 32 no.2, 2005, p. 116.

Di Biase, Elisa. "On that Conspiratorial Smile Between Peter Pan and the Mermaids." *Barrie, Hook, and Peter Pan: Studies in Contemporary Myth*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012.

Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology*. Edited by Steele Savage. Little, Brown and Co., 1942.

Hubbard, Thomas K. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*. University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Jack, Ronald D. S. *Myths and the Mythmaker: A Literary Account of JM Barrie's Formative Years*. Brill Rodopi, 2010.

---. *The Road to the Never Land*. Aberdeen University Press, Aberdeen, 1991.

Schiller, Friedrich. "On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry." *Friedrich Schiller: Poet of Freedom*, Schiller Institute, 1990.

Sky, Jeanette. "Myths of Innocence and Imagination: The Case of the Fairy Tale." *Literature and Theology* 16.4 (2002): 363-76.

Theocritus. "Thyrsis." *Idyll 1*. Translated by Daryl Hine, 1982.

Contributors

Janaya Tanner has been passionate about writing and literature for as long as she can remember. She was born and raised in Provo, Utah, and after living in the Houston area for several months and marrying her childhood sweetheart, she is now studying English at BYU and hopes to pursue a career as a novelist.

Emily Cluff is originally from Texas, but she has spent the last few years in Provo, Utah, studying English. She is pre-law and is currently busy interviewing with law schools and stressing over the major life decisions looming ahead. In her limited free time, she loves to read, kayak, and travel.

Gavin Wride is an English major at BYU with an interest in the American modernist movement. He is from Southern California and enjoys spending his time hiking, cycling, reading, and writing. He has a novel published to Amazon entitled *The Dreamer's Sea*.

Samuel Christensen graduated from BYU in 2019 with a major in English and a minor in business strategy. He has a sustained interest in a wide variety of topics including history, politics, philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics, business, and sports. He currently resides in Washington, D.C., and is attempting to improve his quality of life by reforming past habits to become a “digital minimalist.”

Taylor Flinkinger studies English and creative writing at BYU. Born and raised in Utah Valley, he's passionate about stories and the ways they pull at people's lives. After he graduates, he will pursue an MFA and eventually a PhD in creative writing.

Nina Štular is an international student from Slovenia studying at DePauw University. She is majoring in philosophy and English literature. Her current research endeavors are focused on Anglo-Saxon literature.

Michela Miller Dickson is a junior at BYU studying English and editing and publishing with a Japanese minor. She is a crossword enthusiast, a lover of jazz, and enjoys working as a writing consultant.

Kathryn Taylor is an English teaching major with minors in editing and French. She is interested in both contemporary literature and in finding ways to make the classics more engaging for high school students. She spends her free time hiking, drawing, and doing archery.

Jared Brockbank is a junior at BYU and is currently preparing to apply for admission to the School of Communications. He is also minoring in English. Jared is very tall but—sorry to say—doesn't play basketball. Instead, he enjoys art and literature, interests much kinder to his lack of coordination.

Erin Lee is an aspiring novelist who loves fairy tales. She currently lives in Salt Lake City, Utah with her husband and their three fish.

Krista Butts studied literary studies and creative writing at Nicholls State University, where she served as a peer tutor in the writing center and a co-assistant editor of the 2019 edition of *Mosaic*, The Official Literary Magazine of Nicholls. In 2019, she was awarded the First Place David Middleton Poetry Award and also presented research at the ULS Academic Summit. She hopes to inspire and help others through communication and creativity.

Noelle Condor is graduating from BYU this year with a degree in English and minors in editing and business. *Peter Pan* has been her favorite book since she first read it fifteen years ago, and she enjoyed reading it aloud to her two-year-old son as she reviewed the text for this paper. After graduation, she plans to pursue a career in editing and technical writing.

